

## BOOK REVIEWS

*Mighty to Save: A Study in Old Testament Soteriology.* By T. V. Farris. Nashville: Broadman, 1993, 301 pp., \$19.99.

“This study evaluates selected key passages that reflect Old Testament instruction and/or illustration concerning its total message of salvation . . . with a secondary reference to chronological sequence” (p. 14). Accordingly, in Farris’ fifteen chapters he treats the following texts and their contexts: Gen 1:1; 3:1; 4:26; 15:6; 32:28; Exod 19:6; 34:7; Lev 17:11; Job 19:25; Josh 6:2; Joel 2:32; Isa 1:18–20; 52:13; 55:1; and 59:19.

In this excellent thoroughly and extensively documented study, scholars and pastors will find an enormous amount of exegetical and Biblical theology to reflect on for many years. Given the fact that there is so little produced in the area of the doctrine of salvation in the Old Testament, besides the confusion and incorrect analogies that are now getting into evangelical theology in the area of missiology due to poor understandings of Old Testament soteriology, this study fills an enormous vacuum. I found the volume so extremely stimulating that I asked for the privilege of reviewing it in order to call it to the attention of a larger evangelical audience.

Farris’ goal in this book is “an attempt to evaluate selected Old Testament passages and terminology that represent the core salvation message contained in the ‘Old Covenant.’” He warns that his survey is not “extensive,” “exhaustive” or even a “fully structured soteriology.” However, in light of the scarcity of material currently available on this topic (a judgment with which many of us could agree), he hoped he could “call attention to the exciting ‘Gospel in the Old Testament.’” In our judgment he has most assuredly succeeded in that goal.

This does not mean that I always agreed with all the positions that Farris took. On the contrary, I found myself in strong disagreement at several critical points. For example, in discussing the Abrahamic covenant, Farris agrees that it was a unilateral, promissory, “grant” covenant. But then he adds, strangely enough, that it was unilateral and unconditional only in the sense that “no additional requirements were added” (pp. 65, 75), but it was not totally unconditional! Then, in a most exacting discussion of the Hebrew grammar of Gen 15:6, Farris sides with Allen Ross and the NIV (pp. 76–77) in deleting the conjunction between vv. 5 and 6 (plus the fact that Hebrew uses *wāw* with the “perfect” form of the verb rather than the normal narrative *wāw* plus the “imperfect” form of the verb), thereby concluding that Abram’s faith *was not in response* to the promise of a “seed” in vv. 1–5 of Genesis 15! But this conclusion leaves the context dangling in the air, not to mention the fact that Hebrew grammarians are not agreed about the meaning of the “perfect” form of the Hebrew verb in this type of construction in any case. The fact that Farris must omit translating the conjunction in v. 6, lest he appear to connect what he wishes to leave separate, means that he must create another problem in order to “solve” the first one!

The other serious disagreement that I would raise is his rejection of the translation “to ransom or deliver by a substitute” for *kippēr*, in favor of his own to “provide a covering” (pp. 146–147). Despite the fact that the noun and verb translated “pitch” occur only one time in the Old Testament (Gen 6:14), Farris prefers to go with that root rather than the root *kpr*, “ransom.”

Occasionally one is surprised by what was not included in the numerous Hebrew soteriological word studies that appear here. For instance, the word for "forgive" used only of God, *sālah*, is not listed or described.

An index of Hebrew words, authors, and subjects would have proved to be most beneficial. Perhaps in another edition of this work they could be included.

Despite these minor caveats, it is hoped that this work will receive the attention it deserves. The book has arrived at a critical moment in the history of the exegesis of the Old Testament and in the life of the Church.

Walter C. Kaiser, Jr.  
Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary, South Hamilton, MA

*Chronological and Background Charts of the Old Testament: Revised and Expanded.*  
By John H. Walton. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1994, 124 pp., \$18.99 paper.

This revision of Walton's book of Old Testament charts, first published in 1978, demonstrates that the author's grasp of Old Testament material has grown both in breadth and depth. The original volume was already helpful to the student of the Old Testament at every level, but the expanded edition goes far beyond its forerunner.

The revised edition contains 100 charts, compared with 58 in the original work. In addition to 42 new charts, there are revisions of 18 of the charts found in the first book. The new version has several innovative features. Instead of being arranged simply chronologically, as in the original work, the charts are now arranged according to Biblical sections (Genesis, Pentateuch, historical literature, poetic literature) and according to topics (ancient Near East, Bible study). There is an extensive subject index in the back (which was not part of the first edition) that makes it easier to find a chart correlating to the subject one may be studying. Occasionally there are brief bibliographic citations and editor's notes which supplement the charts.

Additionally, this expanded edition reflects contemporary, more sophisticated scholarship. Walton has included charts on versions and manuscripts of the Old Testament, textual criticism, Old Testament textual development and forms of critical analysis. He has even updated the terminology regarding Hebrew parallelism to reflect current nomenclature. Further, the visual presentation of the charts is more eye-pleasing, with the use of black, white and shading, instead of the rudimentary black, white and red of the original work.

Walton has culled together a vast amount of material which displays an overall synthetic grasp of the Old Testament and extends even to obscure data such as is seen in charts depicting military information in the Old Testament, ancient Near Eastern chronologies, and one entitled "Source Books Mentioned in Scripture."

If there is a criticism to be made concerning this volume it is that perhaps Walton occasionally has gotten carried away with the notion of putting information into chart form. The usefulness of some of the charts does not seem clear, and the data of others seem not to be given to being arranged into charts. He has, for example, charts entitled "Succession and Intermarriage Among the 9th c. Royal Houses of Israel and Judah," "Narrative Emphasis in the History of the United Monarchy" and "Subjects of Aftermath Oracles."

All in all, careful scholarship is demonstrated in this helpful collection of charts and, even more than the original, it is useful both to the student and the teacher of the Old Testament.

J. Robert Cosand  
Trinity International University, Deerfield, IL

*Searching the Scriptures*. Vol. 2. *A Feminist Commentary*. Edited by Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza. New York: Crossroad, 1994, 894 pp., \$49.50.

Ruth A. Tucker and Walter Liefeld declared in *Daughters of the Church* that “the nineteenth century brought significant advances for Western women in every area of life. Women began speaking out and organizing and assuming leadership positions as never before in history, and the church above all other institutions became a center for such activity” (p. 245). With Christian women such as Katherine Bushnell, Fanny Crosby, Clarissa Danforth, Jerena Lee, Salome Lincoln, Mary Cole, Catherine Booth, Margaret Van Cott, Amanda Smith and Frances Willard to extol, why should Elizabeth Cady Stanton’s *Woman’s Bible* of 1895 be celebrated or serve as a model for this present work? Even Schüssler Fiorenza apologizes for Cady Stanton’s “anti-immigrant,” “ethnic and racial prejudices” (p. 2). Cady Stanton’s goal was to “interrupt the conservative trend in the suffrage movement” (p. 1). Too many evangelical women were getting involved in the temperance and suffrage movement. Cady Stanton and her collaborators, in contrast, treated the Bible as “the word of men,” which must be rejected. Thus, even though this volume is titled *A Feminist Commentary*, like Cady Stanton’s “feminist” *Woman’s Bible* its basis is not simply the equal social, economic, and political rights of women and men (*Webster’s Unabridged Dictionary*) but it reflects a similar desire *not* to be submissive to the Bible text. Rather, interpreters appropriate authority over the text using some measuring rod of their own.

*Searching the Scriptures* is a two-volume venture. Volume 1 honors Anna Julia Cooper, an African-American thinker of the last century, and volume 2 honors suffragist Elizabeth Cady Stanton. Volume 2 includes the work of forty-one women from several years of panel discussions on the topic “Rethinking the *Woman’s Bible*” sponsored by the Women in the Biblical World Section of annual meetings of the Society of Biblical Literature. After Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza writes a twelve-page apologetic for reopening the canon, all the forty writers use Schüssler Fiorenza’s hermeneutics of suspicion and historical reconstruction to interpret not only the New Testament (60% of the book) but also gnostic and apocryphal material (40%). Even though the three parts all allude to Sophia—“manifestations of” (gnostic materials, Apocrypha, and Revelation), “submerged traditions of” (New Testament letters), and “envoys of” (Apocrypha, New Testament gospels)—the focus is not so much “Sophia,” the suppressed goddess figure (Isis? Gaia? Maat? Hathor?), as “Sophia,” a metaphor for women’s power and voices. But behind the measuring rod of “women’s power” looms the presupposed academically conservative history-of-religions school (e.g. p. 18) or nineteenth-century higher-critical thought. The Bible is not itself considered the Word of God, but a canon within and outside the canon *becomes* the Word of God. Thus, the title should be not so much *Searching the Scriptures* as *Searching for Scriptures* (pp. 4, 349). The history-of-religions school envisions Hebrews and Christians as large sponges which have soaked up all the features (often the worse) of the ancient pagan cultures around them. Most of the entries are simply history-of-religions studies, historically relativist (you can never tell what really happened), with an interest in the feminist perspective. A few go beyond that to direct admiration of some form of the goddess (e.g. chap. 7).

Some writers honestly note that some gnostic myths are “not friendly to women” (p. 64) (Sophia, after all, in some gnostic accounts, erred, thereby creating matter [chap. 34]); other writers ignore the hierarchical, secret, feminized matter aspect of gnosticism. Definitely the writers are looking at Christianity with the same jaundiced eye that Cady Stanton did. For instance, Tina Pippin accuses the Revelation to John of not being fully “culturally diverse”: “Yes, there are all nations and tribes and languages represented in the multitude [Rev 7:9]. But no, only one religion is represented; there is no room for Jews or pagans or anyone who refuses to acknowledge the divinity of Jesus” (p. 122).

Nevertheless, enmeshed in these searches for the crimes of the past are some interesting data pertinent to today. Susan Ashbrook Harvey shows how Christian imagery *before* the industrial and modern era was more fluid and multivalent (p. 86). Imagery revealed “aspects of the divine” but was not attempts “to speak literally about the divine” (p. 95). She cites Gregory of Nazianzus who wrote that “although we speak of God as Father, we know He is not male. Jerome points out that the term for Spirit is feminine in Hebrew, masculine in Latin and neuter in Greek, instructing us that God is without gender” (p. 95).

At times in evangelical academia, “feminism” is confused with the hermeneutical basis of some of its adherents. When the critical attitude to the text that underlies almost all of these writers is removed, what distinguishes this volume as feminist? (1) Literary and sociological techniques, especially, are employed to analyze the role of gender, power, and domination especially as it affects women but also, for some writers, anyone marginalized (pp. 264, 272, 788); (2) the volume brings to light not only the history of women but also the liberating egalitarian vision of the gospel (pp. 470, 510).

Because of the literary nature of some of the studies, some of the conclusions end up surprisingly commensurate with more evangelical ones. For instance, Shelly Matthews concludes that the tone and content of 2 Corinthians “do not require partition theories when these features are understood as part of a carefully crafted rhetorical strategy” (p. 200). Other commentaries can be gleaned for their helpful exegetical insights because their higher-critical attitude does not much affect the final interpretation (e.g. 1 Corinthians, 2 Corinthians, Galatians, Philemon, James, Luke). Commentaries on some of the extra-Biblical material are also quite helpful (e.g. Judith, *Passion of Perpetua and Felicity*).

But, on the whole, the desire to “lay bare the androcentrism” (p. 470) of the Bible and most of the extra-Biblical books, as the new reformulation of radical higher-critical thought, brings out few insights from many of the texts. Especially in part 1, “Manifestations of Sophia,” the ramifications of an open canon come though. When *humans* choose their canon or what is divine, a new god emerges. This god approves of both harlot and holy one (p. 39). When all becomes divine, then nothing is divine. When harlot is holy, and when virgin is whore, then morality has no definition.

But before we continue to look at *Searching the Scriptures* with our own jaundiced eyes, we need to ask ourselves, as we do our own scholarly work, are we willing to treat Jesus as the *only way* to God? Further, are we evangelicals willing to encourage the women of today even as they had been encouraged in the last century so that they are filled with love for God and church and do not feel God and church and institutions are haters of women’s power and voices? Finally, is our measuring rod a Biblical one? If not, we may be partially to blame for the discontent with Christianity exhibited in this volume.

Aída Besançon Spencer  
Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary, South Hamilton, MA

*Readings in Biblical Hebrew: An Intermediate Textbook.* By Ehud Ben Zvi, Maxine Hancock and Richard Beinert. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1993, \$35.00.

One turns to an intermediate workbook on Biblical Hebrew with the hope of finding a teaching resource to fill the gap between the elementary textbooks and the advanced reference grammars. Unfortunately, this text disappoints as often as it delights.

In some ways, it is admirably planned, set forth, and executed. The authors lead the intermediate student through readings of representative selections from the historical books, legal literature, the prophets, wisdom and the Psalms. Each chapter takes the student into a process of meaningful discovery as questions are asked of the text and appropriate hints provided to guide the student's thought. The student must parse the verbs, explaining their unusual features (e.g. pausal forms), assemble each Biblical utterance into a coherent syntactical whole and translate it. Grammatical details are referred back to the basic textbooks (e.g. Weingreen, Lambdin, Seow, Kelley), enabling the student to make connections between the patterns learned in abstract at the elementary level but now seen to be functional in actual text. Interpretative questions are explored, sometimes enlarging the student's own thinking by reference to sophisticated scholarly discussion, especially that provided by practitioners of the new literary criticism. Parallelism is explained. Even the Hebrew accents are taken into consideration. There is much to be commended in this book.

One encounters other features, however, less useful in teaching at the intermediate level. For example, the guidance provided for the student working through the Biblical texts includes a surprisingly frequent appearance of unclear interpretative questions, more baffling than illuminating, alongside other questions so obvious that they are embarrassing or boring for students to answer. In addition, the text interjects at times exegetically unnecessary and "politically correct" preachments (e.g. "Hannah is bitter, but she is not powerless or passive"), more distracting than invalid. One also observes a pedagogical failure to lead the student through the ambiguities of interpretation into the probabilities of validation. The very word "ambiguity" and its cognates appear thirteen times in the discussion on Isa 49:4-6, while the evidences to resolve the ambiguities are not set forth. Students at the intermediate level still need sufficient guidance that they grow in confidence that generally the Hebrew Bible *can* be interpreted, not merely speculated about. Hermeneutically, the authors seem to allow for disparate interpretations lying side by side within the Biblical text—a premise which surely discourages the demanding but necessary discipline of reasoned defense and validation. Finally, one wonders why a workbook such as this would not have been published in paperback, reducing the cost.

While this reviewer applauds what is useful in *Readings in Biblical Hebrew*, its other qualities require enough classroom explanation and correction that he is uncertain whether he can use it again in teaching. One still awaits the appearance of a more satisfying intermediate text.

Raymond C. Ortlund, Jr.  
Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, Deerfield, IL

*What Is Social-Scientific Criticism?* By John H. Elliot. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993, ix + 174 pp., \$13.00 paper.

This volume adds to the growing list of Fortress' Guides to Biblical Scholarship that address methodological approaches to interpreting the NT. Elliot defines social-scientific criticism as the exegetical task of analyzing the social and cultural aspects of a text to determine how they influence the communication process between the composer and the audience. Since there is a social dimension in every text (people are relating to one another in a social setting governed by social customs), it is necessary to understand the nature of social relationships (Jew/Greek, disciple/teacher, Roman politician/Jewish high priest) to interpret a text. Consequently, social relationships

between people inevitably influence the content, style, and manner in which they communicate meanings to one another. If modern interpreters are not aware of these social systems, there is a danger of anachronistic explanations or ethnocentric readings. Elliot describes a methodology that goes beyond the traditional understanding of a few social facts. Rather, he is interested in the social universe of ideas, the nature of social change, self-understanding, and religious beliefs.

In chap. 3 Elliot provides a most helpful history of social-scientific criticism of the NT from M. Weber and A. Deissmann to the present.

A major portion of the book (chaps. 4–6) focuses on methodology. He explains 10 assumptions used in most social-scientific research: (1) All knowledge is socially conditioned; (2) there is a distribution between the social location of the author and the interpreter (the anthropological distinction between *emic* and *etic* viewpoints); (3) social theories and models play a crucial role in the interpretive task; (4) insight can be gained by inductive (from material to hypothesis) as well as deductive (from model to material) logic; (5) sociocultural models from the ancient Near East and Mediterranean region are the most appropriate; (6) texts are social discourses which represent the interests, cultural values, and strategies that the author used to communicate the message; (7) social-scientific study is complementary to historical-critical research; (8) “religion” in the Bible is not separate from social structures and relationships; (9) the practitioner must understand the sociological theory behind the models used; and (10) this approach is interested in how social factors have influenced the interpretation of texts down through the centuries.

Elliot finds two phases in social research: (1) the collection and classification of data concerning social phenomena, and (2) the synthetic, interpretive phase. He briefly explains how in broader studies one could gather information about political, social, economic, and religious issues and then synthesize this by comparing it to existing models to see how they fit, and to discover if the model helps explain the data collected. Later Elliot provides a more detailed example of how this approach might address the social aspects of the persuasive process in 1 Peter by examining the social setting of the sender, the audience, the social situation, the rhetorical strategies of the argument, the sectarian strategies that might motivate the audience, and the ideological interests of the audience.

A final critical assessment of the contribution of social-scientific studies treats the criticisms that it reduces theological beliefs to social factors, excludes “the God hypothesis,” and has been overcome by Marxist determinism. Elliot does admit that reductionism and determinism are a danger for this and all methodologies, but he maintains that the study of social factors is not inherently reductionistic and does not exclude the possibility of revelation, God, or miracles. He sees a greater weakness rooted in the fragmentary amount of evidence in the Bible and other contemporary texts and the imperfect nature of the models used today. He openly recognizes that some have made mistakes by falsely reifying social systems, by employing models without adequately understanding the theory behind them, and by allowing a socio-political agenda to influence interpretation. However, the social approach has brought new life to the study of the Bible: It has forced interpreters to be more serious about studying the setting of the text, brought needed attention to the communication process, and raised fresh questions that allow people to probe the sociocultural nature of texts in a deeper manner.

This is an outstanding introduction to social studies of the NT. Its treatment of the central ideas, chief contributors, methodological processes, and criticisms is concise and fair. Elliot is an insider in the field, yet he is able to be critical as well as challenging concerning false perceptions. He lays out several approaches without extensive criticism, but his emphasis on combining social and rhetorical studies in 1 Peter demon-

strates the value of his own approach. Although total length limited what could be covered, more emphasis on the sociological theories behind assumptions and models would have strengthened the work and helped beginners know where to turn to gain a deeper sociological understanding. I would highly recommend the work and especially draw attention to the 26-page bibliography and social analysis inventory in the appendix. For a similar but weaker introduction to OT studies in this series, see R. R. Wilson, *Sociological Approaches to the Old Testament* (Fortress, 1984).

Gary V. Smith

Bethel Theological Seminary, St. Paul, MN

*A Social Reading of the Old Testament: Prophetic Approaches to Israel's Communal Life.* By Walter Brueggemann. Edited by P. D. Miller. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1994, viii + 328 pp., \$17.00 paper.

Miller collected 15 of Brueggemann's articles which were published from 1975 to 1991 into three topical categories and added his own introductory remarks to draw out some of the key aspects of Brueggemann's social and theological readings of Biblical texts. Miller believes Brueggemann's subversive rendering of the Biblical reality of God is often at odds with our modern picture of God. Thus, Brueggemann helps us imagine a new reality by discerning the dialectical dualities and tensions that are represented in ancient Israel.

The first three chapters are grouped under the title "Guidelines and Approaches." Brueggemann does not see a natural flow between the Mosaic and the Davidic covenants as the Bible implies; instead, he finds a movement of protest against the established institutions by the disinherited in the Mosaic traditions and an attempt to maintain and consolidate what God has faithfully built in Israel in the Davidic traditions. Brueggemann (depending on the peasant-revolt theory of Mendenhall, which is then connected to covenant traditions) pushes this difference between the poor marginalized rural peasants and the wealthy imperial urbanites into a "radical rejection of the liberation consciousness of the Mosaic tradition" (p. 23) by those in power. By selective examples Brueggemann shows how these two trajectories are in conflict throughout Israel's history. In contrast to the imperial model, God embraces Israel in a bold new act that will build a community of faith that reaches out to the world with hope. He enters into a risky solidarity with them and cares about human justice—as opposed to the distant omniscient and omnipotent God who sustains the imperial worldview.

Brueggemann's analysis errs in not recognizing that David was also a liberator in his social context, that there were righteous kings like David, Jehoshaphat, Josiah, and Hezekiah who integrated covenant and royal interests, and that the eschatological era is an ideal time of covenant peace and royal power. In other words, the situation of the poor does not always lead to a covenant ideology and the social context of the powerful does not always produce an imperial ideology. Brueggemann's model only fits some cases; human freedom and God's Spirit empower others within a socio-political class to break free of ideological domination while others surrender to its siren call. The application of sociological insights is needed, but the rigid bifurcation of ideologies seems an overly broad generalization that needs refinement.

The second section, entitled "A Social Reading of Particular Texts," contains four articles that are not tied together well. Brueggemann develops an interesting contrast between the theme of "the mercy of God" and "no mercy from Babylon" to show how the prophets combated exilic views that God could not comfort the nation in its misery (Lamentations and Isaiah). Another essay proposes the strange hermeneutical twisting

of Daniel 1 into a midrashic commentary on Isa 55:1–3. In a rhetorical study of the “vine and fig tree” phrase in Micah 4, Brueggemann carefully uncovers a critique of the nation’s present sociopolitical situation and a triggering of the people’s imagination concerning the future. This case rests on solid grounds (see Micah’s criticism of government officials in chap. 3), but his attempt to read 2 Kgs 4:20–28 as an ironic criticism of Solomon’s government runs against every rhetorical hint the text gives and is unconvincing. The best of this group of articles is a study of “Social Criticism and Social Vision in the Deuteronomistic Formula of the Judges.” Brueggemann traces the formulas of (1) apostasy and oppression (and the anger of the Lord) and (2) crying out and deliverance, concluding that each developed out of a different social world. The first comes from the deed/consequence social framework of the stable upper class while the second arises from the oppressed marginal class. The problem with this analysis is that the imperial upper class would not have the view that they are apostate or oppressors and deserve the anger of God. Rather, this would be the oppressed lower class’ view of the upper class, so both perspectives come from the same group. It also is fallacious to argue that a deeds/consequence theology is only the property of the upper class (p. 79), for the oppressed are very interested in God’s justice.

The third section of eight chapters is called “A Social Reading of Particular Issues.” In one of these studies Brueggemann connects the masculinity of God with his forceful bringing of salvation and the femininity of God with his embrace of people with blessings, and argues that Israel was not as concerned about the sexuality of God as we are. In another article he addresses “Theodicy in a Social Dimension” by arguing that every theodicy settlement involves special pleading by a vested interest group (p. 179). Those who suffer oppression usually revolt against this prejudicial settlement since their questions are unanswered. Brueggemann’s attempt to deny that theodicy is a “God” issue and to make it a “justice” dilemma of economics/land seems a strange bifurcation of two unified ideas in ancient Near Eastern thinking and does not give enough emphasis to the fact that God is the sovereign controller of justice. I agree with his attempt to remove the speculative nature from the theodicy debate. In his study of “The Prophet as a Destabilizing Presence” Brueggemann illustrates how Elijah’s ministry upset the status quo of Israel’s social system. In a pastoral note he then encourages pastors to become more prophetic in their ministry. Two chapters draw on Biblical data to rethink modern models of church and the significance of modern preaching.

A recognition of the social significance of what the Biblical text says gives Brueggemann’s writings value. The sociological investigation is applied with the vested interests of Brueggemann’s theological agenda and his methodological process in full view. He does not hide his thesis, and he takes the Biblical text seriously. He jars one out of traditional ways of looking at issues and challenges one to find a better way of explaining the real world where people work for a living, cry for help, intimidate the weak, and theologically manipulate ideas for advantage. Although I disagree with the sociological analysis in several of the articles above, I do not see many others who dare to enter the fray more vigorously than Brueggemann.

Gary V. Smith  
Bethel Theological Seminary, St. Paul, MN

*Theology in Exodus: Biblical Theology in the Form of a Commentary.* By Donald E. Gowan. Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1994, xviii + 297 pp., \$28.00.

This is an ambitious undertaking of a commentary in the form of Biblical theology from a moderately Reformed point of view. Written as Biblical theology, the readabil-

ity of the commentary is greatly enhanced. The result is a flow of concepts that allows for the inclusion of contemporary interpretive concepts without them seeming intrusive. Naturally, this could impose those concepts onto the text in a forced systematization, but the author has generally sought to avoid this.

For each Exodus section he surveys the intertestamental and extracanonical rabbinic material—although he does not place it on a par with the canon—which he attempts to integrate with OT, NT, and contemporary theology. This gives his theology a sweep often lacking in Biblical theologies, yet it would be better served had he based it more on textual exegesis. Eagerness to go beyond the traditional bounds of reference sometimes leaves the impression that his selection of some material stems from interest rather than from the Biblical text.

Four of eight chapters are devoted to Exodus 3–4, indicating their importance to the author. This allows him to expand several key themes centered on presence and absence, but also leaves a sense of imbalance with regard to the rest of Exodus. Although at points interesting, his extensive use of R. Otto's understanding of the holy digresses from Biblical theology into philosophical eisegesis, and provides a somewhat narrow grid for understanding various difficult passages without full consideration of their control. Yet, despite however much one can object to his use of Otto's categories, his efforts to stir us up in our deeply rationalistic and naturalistic age to a sense of the wonder and mystery that should be in our relationship with a *transcendent* God are admirable.

A lengthy discussion on the *name* of Yahweh includes a helpful summary and critique of the standard views. He suggests the name must be related somehow to God's action of intervention and self-revelation, and also that the name and the person cannot be separated, although God and his name were not understood as something identical. This could lead to divergence from the standard source and tradition-historical assumptions about the polarizations said to be in "D" and "P" if it could be argued that there are no grounds for thinking that God's name and his glory could ever have been perceived as polarized. Nevertheless, he follows the standard view that a Deuteronomistic historian used God's name to represent God's presence in the sanctuary to guard against the idea that his image was there in some way. This does not seem to be a consistent application of his exposition of the name of God.

The author does a unified reading of the difficult narrative in chaps. 33–34, where Moses requests to see God's glory. He offers the refreshing suggestion that Moses' request was perfectly legitimate and serves as the catalyst for what the Lord subsequently does reveal in restoring the covenant.

Stephen Hague  
Oxford, England

*The Theology of Deuteronomy: Collected Essays of Georg Braulik, O.S.B.* By Georg Braulik. Translated by Ulrika Lindblad. Dallas: BIBAL, 1994, ix + 302 pp., \$18.95 paper.

This selection chosen for the American reading public from Braulik's prolific monastic workshop contains seventy-one pages of endnotes and an extensive bibliography, but no index.

His method is literary-historical, which uses redaction-historical principles vacillating between a synchronic and diachronic reading. Deuteronomy is a "literary fiction" (pp. 8, 31, 120) written by a *team* of authors ("world-wise court officials," p. 68) in the late monarchy to "systematize Israel's diverse traditions" (p. 69).

The first essay, "Wisdom, Divine Presence, and Law: Reflections on the Divine Kerygma of Deut 4:5–8," addresses briefly the question of God's presence in the sanctuary without indicating that the standard polarizations of assuming D and P, *name* and *glory* theology, are far from resolved.

Next, "The Joy of the Feast: The Conception of the Cult in Deuteronomy, the Oldest Biblical Festival Theory," addresses the debate about forms of worship, low *vs.* high, etc. The joy of Deuteronomy's feast applied to the NT Church is welcome in light of a common lack of joy within a great part of Christendom, and a healthy antidote to the confusion reigning in our Protestant circles where debate on worship often pits the pragmatic against the aesthetic instead of seeing it as the responsible celebration of the joyful redeemed.

"Commemoration of Passion and Feast of Joy: Popular Liturgy According to the Festival Calendar of the Book of Deuteronomy (Deut 16:1–17)" defines liturgical "celebration" in which the community is supported primarily by the extended family and by the individual. Applied to the modern world this principle is a refreshing alternative to the increasing bureaucratization that has occurred across the spectrum of state and Church.

"Some Remarks on the Deuteronomistic Conception of Freedom and Peace" suggests that an evolving system of predication for rest/peace is conceived only in the Deuteronomistic History in four stages in the meaning of *nwh* (hiphil).

"Deuteronomy and the Birth of Monotheism" presents Josiah's reform as principally concerned with two aims for the cult: worship of YHWH alone (cultic purity) and centralization (cultic unity). Various redactions of Deuteronomy reflect an evolution from polytheism to monotheism based on observations about *ʿel* theology.

"Deuteronomy and Human Rights" contrasts the Enlightenment principles in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948) with the statutes of Deuteronomy (which influenced the wording of the charter). This is the kind of study about the positive influences of the Bible on modern society so often discouraged in our era of political correctness.

"The Development of the Doctrine of Justification in the Redactional Strata of the Book of Deuteronomy: A Contribution to the Clarification of the Necessary Conditions for Pauline Theology" suggests that *šēdāqā* "denotes righteousness as 'justifying grace' which becomes effective in the observance of the deuteronomic law" (pp. 151–152). Thus grace, and Paul's "righteousness that comes by faith" (Rom 10:6), is the "truly internalized deuteronomic law" and is "a word of faith" (Rom 10:8), that is, "gospel." This aligns justification with keeping the commandments, which is then called *gospel*, and consequently confuses the categories of temporal blessings with eternal promises of redemption. I concede that the gospel is not divorced from law (for the justified believer), yet he contradicts Paul's very argument that the "righteousness that comes by faith" is not through obedience to the deuteronomic law, but quite the contrary it is by *confessing* and *believing* (Rom 10:10).

"The Rejection of the Goddess Asherah in Israel: Was the Rejection as Late as Deuteronomistic and Did It Further the Oppression of Women?" notes that in Deuteronomy there is a denigration of Asherah corresponding to a promotion of women. This raises interesting suggestions about the place of women in religious life.

"Deuteronomy and the Commemorative Culture of Israel: Redaction-Historical Observations on the use of למד" analyzes the themes of *teaching* in Deuteronomy by isolating four "strands" and piecing them into a diachronic literary-critical "unity."

None of these essays addresses the critical evaluations of the proposed centralizing altar-law (B. Howerda, J. G. McConville, M. J. Paul, P. Craigie, J. Niehaus, G. Wenham) that he believes underlies the intent of the deuteronomistic authors, nor the

critiques of, and alternatives to, Josianic dating for Deuteronomy (A. C. Welch, T. Oestreicher, H. M. Weiner, G. T. Manley, J. G. McConville, K. A. Kitchen, M. Kline).

Stephen Hague  
Oxford, England

*Scribes and Translators: Septuagint and Old Latin in the Books of Kings*. VTSup 54. By Natalio Fernández Marcos. Leiden: Brill, 1994, x + 98 pp., \$57.25.

This volume presents in published form the Grinfield Lectures of 1991 and 1992 which the author delivered at the University of Oxford. The 1991 lecture (chaps. 1–3) is titled “The Septuagint and the History of the Biblical Text.” It is more general in nature, dealing with basic text-critical concerns such as the relationships between the various families of Hebrew, Greek, and Latin Old Testament texts. The 1992 lecture (chaps. 4–6), titled “Aberrant Texts in the Books of Kings,” is more specific. It focuses on the Old Latin text in particular, and its outlook is limited to the books of Samuel and Kings. Given the author’s use of material from both 1 and 2 Samuel as well as 1 and 2 Kings, both the title and part 2 should substitute “Kingdoms” for “Kings.”

In chap. 1 (“Past and Present in Biblical Text History”), Fernández Marcos summarizes his “reflections on the text history of the Septuagint in the light of the new insights in the realm of textual criticism during the last decades since the Qumran discoveries” (p. 3). He holds that the Greek documents from Qumran have basically supported Lagarde’s view of an original Septuagint translation rather than Kahle’s targumic view. The author also argues that the Hebrew manuscripts from Qumran have validated many Septuagint readings that were earlier thought to have derived from translation technique or from translator error. One of the most important statements in chap. 1 is the reminder that Septuagint text history must not be developed monolithically, but rather each book must be treated separately. While in general agreement with the view of text history espoused by Fernández Marcos, this reviewer would have appreciated a reference to Tov’s more detailed analysis of the *five* textual families present among the Qumran Biblical manuscripts. It is true that textual plurality is evidenced in the Qumran manuscripts, but the contours of that plurality need to be drawn with more precision. The plurality is limited in scope and, what is even more important, the relative representations of the various textual families must be appreciated if we are to correctly interpret the Qumran data.

In chap. 2 (“The Diverse Texts of the Septuagint and the Problems of an Edition”), the author expands on his treatment of the Lagarde-Kahle controversy. He states that “research in the last decades has advanced along the lines of Lagarde’s hypothesis” (p. 16), but also that “the original unity of the translation must be toned down in multiple aspects” (p. 17). In chap. 3 (“The Antiochene Text of the Greek Bible: A Revised and Edited Text”), Fernández Marcos deals with his own recent work in editing not the original Greek OT text, but a part (the books of Samuel and Kings) of a particular Greek text that would have been extant in and around Antioch in the 4th–5th centuries AD.

Chapter 4 (“New Evidence from the Old Latin: A Peculiar Text”) is devoted to the relationship between the *Vetus Latina* and the Septuagint in general, and the Antiochene Greek text in particular, for the books of Samuel and Kings. Chapter 5 (“Translation, Corruption and Interpretation: The Genesis of the Old Latin Variants”) presents a selection of textual evidence that helps to explain how particular readings

in *Vetus Latina* (Old Latin) originated. In chap. 6 (“Different *Vorlage* or Secondary Development? The Enigma of the Old Latin”), the author deals with Old Latin readings that are particularly connected with the original Hebrew.

This brief volume makes the Grinfield Lectures of 1991 and 1992 available to a much wider audience than those privileged to listen to the original lectures. Brill and the editors of Supplements to *Vetus Testamentum* deserve thanks for this service. Those who specialize in Old Testament textual criticism, especially in regard to the books of Samuel and Kings, will want to read this book, although the cost for a book of this size may limit its sales. The book is marred somewhat by careless copy-editing (not expected from this publisher). In addition, the volume reads more like a transcribed lecture series than a book intended for a reading audience. But fortunately these minor flaws do not interfere with the book’s serving as a vehicle for the clear and stimulating content of the original lectures.

Ellis R. Brotzman

Tyndale Theological Seminary, The Netherlands

*Reading Esther: A Case for the Literary Carnavalesque.* By Kenneth Craig. *Literary Currents in Biblical Interpretation*. Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1995, 192 pp., \$15.99 paper.

The subtitle of this book contains a word probably unfamiliar to most Old Testament scholars, but it is the key for understanding the author’s unique approach to the book of Esther. Craig identifies “carnavalesque” with Russian scholar Mikhail Bakhtin (1895–1975), best known for his studies of a festive literary form which he called “literary carnivalesque” that developed over hundreds of years and reached its fullest expression during the Renaissance with the writings of François Rabelais. Bakhtin did not include the Bible or Esther in his study of literary carnivalesque.

Bakhtin described carnivalesque as a celebration of life and an escape from the status quo, a time when oppressive official privileges and prohibitions are set aside for a time of joyful celebration of freedom from structure and order. Unexpected reversals, parody, irony, and banquets, laughter, crowning and uncrowning, duplicity, and death are some of its identifying characteristics.

Scholars have long recognized these same features in Esther. What is new here is Craig’s thesis that these were conscious literary devices used by Esther’s author that Bakhtin called literary carnivalesque. From the outset Craig acknowledges that his major objective is to demonstrate that Esther is an early example of literary carnivalesque, a bias that can lead to accommodating the data to support what one is already predisposed to prove.

Bakhtin’s view that official Middle-Age culture was intolerant, rigid, and serious as opposed to the “free-jolly atmosphere of folk culture” (p. 48) may not be accurate. One wonders if official culture (rulers and the privileged classes) was more solemn and less prone to frivolity than the oppressed, poverty-ridden common people (consider Amos 6:1–7). Ahasuerus’ banquets were part of the “official” culture but were as carnivalesque as anything that could be found among the common people, whose language Bakhtin idealistically described as “absolutely gay and fearless talk, free and frank, which echoes in the festive square beyond all verbal prohibitions, limitations, and conventions” (p. 52).

This reviewer has reservations about Craig’s thesis that Esther is an early example of the literary form Bakhtin called literary carnivalesque. However, it is only

fair to acknowledge that any novel approach to interpreting the Scriptures should be welcomed for the fresh insights it can reveal. By examining Esther against Bakhtin's literary carnivalesque, Craig makes a strong case that failure to be familiar with this literary form explains the dislike for the book by some (e.g. Martin Luther). His study also serves as a reminder that when scholars conclude all has been said that could be said about a book of the Bible, new possibilities for interpretation may lie on the horizon.

Craig is to be commended for a stimulating and scholarly study that challenges the reader on almost every page to rethink his/her understanding of the often-neglected book of Esther. It will not replace more traditional expositions of the book, but it merits careful attention for the fresh insights it provides.

F. B. Huey, Jr.  
Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, Fort Worth, TX

*The Poems and Psalms of the Hebrew Bible.* By S. E. Gillingham. Oxford Bible Series. New York: Oxford University, 1994, xiv + 311 pp., \$45.00 / \$16.95 paper.

With this volume Gillingham introduces the nonspecialist to the study of the poems and psalms of the Hebrew Bible. It contains discussions of the standard topics surrounding the study of Biblical poetry and psalmody (the nature of Hebrew poetry, parallelism, meter, form-critical classification of the psalms, approaches to and the interpretation of the Psalter, etc.), as well as topics that are at the forefront of more recent scholarship (the differentiation between poetry and prose, the shape of the book of Psalms, the Psalters at Qumran, etc.). Gillingham provides clear and judicious treatments of these subjects and illustrates them with copious examples from a wide variety of Biblical texts—though one will not necessarily agree with all of her conclusions. One refreshing characteristic of this work is Gillingham's ability to maintain a balance between the objective and subjective aspects of the interpretation of verse (see especially chap. 1). She rightly maintains that poetry cannot be reduced to a catalogue of sterile schemes and tropes; its emotive and open-ended quality has to be considered to truly appreciate—and understand—any poetic text.

On the whole, this book is a helpful introduction to Biblical poetry and psalmody; as such it would make an ideal college- or university-level text for a course on this subject. The reader should be aware, however, that there are a number of errors in this work, the most conspicuous being Gillingham's claim that the acrostic in Ps 145 runs as *mēm-lāmed-kaph*, rather than *kaph-lāmed-mēm* (p. 197). This is simply not the case. The only anomaly in the acrostic in Psalm 145 is that the *nūn* verse is lacking in the MT.

Tyler F. Williams  
Wycliffe College, University of Toronto

*Isaiah's Vision and the Family of God.* By Kathryn Pfisterer Darr. Literary Currents in Biblical Interpretation. Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1994, 280 pp., \$21.99 paper.

Darr's book is another expression of the recent interest in seeing Isaiah as a whole. Like most other scholars who have this concern, she does not consider the book

to be the work of one author, but rather to be the result of a complex redactional process culminating about 400 BC. But she, like they, insists that the final result is coherent and should be understood as such. In this book, she looks at the images of children and women in Isaiah, finding in them an exposition of the key theme of the book: the denunciation of the people's rebellion and yet God's refusal to cast them away if they will only repent.

The book is laid out in six chapters. In the first is a rather lengthy explanation and justification of the method followed. It is called a reader-oriented approach, but the reader Darr is concerned with is a hypothetical 4th-century-BC one, not a modern one. Thus, in each case she seeks to understand from the ancient Near East and the rest of the Bible how that reader would understand the Isaianic images. In the second chapter images of children are addressed, focusing upon the primary emphasis of rebellion. Chapter 3 looks at images of women in the Bible and the ancient Near East, while chaps. 4 and 5 apply these insights to Isaiah 1–39 and 40–66, respectively. These chapters especially contrast “Lady Zion” with God's treatment of other cities which are imaged as women. The theme of rebelliousness is seen to be primary in 1–39, reconciliation in 40–55, while a combination of the two appears in 56–66. The final chapter compares the image of inability of giving birth in 37:3 with the ease of birth in 66:9.

There is much to commend in this book. The approach to the text is holistic rather than atomistic. There is a refreshing absence of Biblical-critical jargon. It is also refreshing to read a book by a woman dealing with women in the Bible in which the Bible is not forced onto a procrustean bed of feminist agenda and in which the time-conditioned views of women in the Bible are not heavy-handedly corruscated. In the same way, she rejects extreme views in matters of criticism and culture. The interpretations arrived at are both modest and reasonable. The treatment of the images of children I find particularly convincing. Another important contribution is the demonstration that the metaphor of Zion as a woman has a richness of possible meaning that commentators have not sufficiently mined.

If there is a single weakness in the book, it is a certain lack of coherence. Undoubtedly, the images of women and children are important ones in the repertoire of the writer (or writers), but a question remains as to whether they are as important for understanding the book as a whole as Darr might suggest. This question is deepened by her repeated need to assume that the hypothetical 4th-century-BC reader would have high recall of the overall use of images in the book as a whole.

Despite this concern, this is a helpful book. It is a good example of interpretive method, and it will assist persons in becoming sensitive to the significance of imagery, both in Isaiah and elsewhere in the Bible.

John N. Oswalt  
Asbury Theological Seminary, Wilmore, KY

*Jerusalem in the Book of Ezekiel: The City as Yahweh's Wife.* By Julie Galambush. Atlanta: Scholars, 1992, 181 pp., \$19.95 paper.

This work, originally submitted as an Emory University doctoral dissertation, explores the significance of the metaphor of Jerusalem as Yahweh's wife, particularly in Ezekiel 16 and 23. Galambush maintains that the origin of the notion of the city as wife to a god is to be found in the ancient Near Eastern understanding of goddesses who served as consorts to the male patron god of the city.

In the metaphorical use of the city Jerusalem as the wife of Yahweh, Ezekiel was indebted to the Biblical prophets Hosea and Jeremiah, who denounced Israel and Judah for unfaithfulness to Yahweh. By comparing the Israelites' relationship to Yahweh to that of a marriage union, Hosea and Jeremiah equate Israel's and Judah's idolatry and inappropriate foreign alliances to the commission of the act of adultery.

Yet Ezekiel, in describing Jerusalem as the wife of Yahweh, takes the metaphor to a new level in Biblical literature. Ezekiel's use of the metaphor is distinctive in its literary style, content, and the placement of the metaphor in the middle of the book rather than at the beginning. In addition, although understanding the city as a woman is not as explicit throughout Ezekiel as it is in chaps. 16 and 23, it actually is critical to the understanding of the book as a whole. Jerusalem's feminine persona is implicitly depicted throughout the denunciations of chaps. 1–24. This feminine quality enables us to understand the significance of Ezekiel's final sign, which involves the death of the prophet's wife. The death of the wife forecasts the fall of the city.

Most significantly, Galambush claims that since Jerusalem is regarded as a woman it is also appropriate to consider the temple as a woman, since Jerusalem represents the temple. The temple as a female is thus subject to pollution, either through menstruation or illicit activity. Consequently, because Yahweh's presence is in the temple, his character is jeopardized. His presence in an unclean house would be tantamount to having sexual relations with a menstruating or unfaithful woman.

The pollution of the temple is critical to Ezekiel's argument, for whom the status of Yahweh's temple is the chief concern of the prophecy. The defilement of the temple becomes the basis for Yahweh's departure from the temple and for the fall of Jerusalem. A new and undefiled temple and city would need to be erected if God were to return to his people. Thus Ezekiel's solution is the creation of a temple with inanimate stone and without private parts in Ezekiel 40–48, thus allowing Yahweh to again take up his residence.

This book is well written and thoroughly researched, though there are some critical gaps in the flow of discussion. The chief concern involves the development of the metaphor from the city as wife of a patron god, to the Hoseanic/Jeremianic presentation of the nation of Israel/Judah as wife of Yahweh, and finally to Ezekiel once again representing the city as the wife. This is not an easy transition and is not clarified by Galambush's assertion that the metaphor may actually have been a "dead" one by the time it was used by Ezekiel. If the metaphor was dead, it is not clear what exactly is being conveyed explicitly or implicitly to the original readers by the metaphor. Referring to the metaphor as dead also seems inconsistent with Galambush's claim that the sexual connotations in Ezekiel were not below the conscious level. In fact, Ezekiel's very portrayal of this sexual union is open to question given the Biblical writers' penchant for polemical denunciations of pagan notions (see Yehezkel Kaufmann, *The Religion of Israel* [1972], and Nahum Sarna, *Understanding Genesis* [1974]).

On the positive side, Galambush provides an excellent discussion of the use of metaphor in general and Biblical metaphor in particular. This discussion is a valuable presentation for understanding this literary technique. In addition, the comprehensive treatment of the imagery in Ezekiel 16 and 23 surpasses any previous treatment of these chapters, including the excellent discussions in the commentaries of John Calvin and Moshe Greenberg. The treatments of these chapters speak to the value of the book and argue that this work is a significant contribution to the widespread use of metaphor, especially in the Biblical record.

Mark F. Rooker  
Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary, Wake Forest, NC

*Ethics of Biblical Interpretation: A Reevaluation.* By Daniel Patte. Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1995, xi + 145 pp., \$16.99 paper.

Daniel Patte, chair of religious studies at Vanderbilt University, has been feeling the heat from “feminist, womanist, mujerista, African-American, Hispanic-American, Native-American, and/or third-world liberation theologians and biblical scholars” (p. 115). All have lodged demands that male European-American exegetes (like Patte) come down off their high horses of ostensible objectivity and admit their culturally biased hermeneutic. With this book, a reasoned but heartfelt mea culpa, Patte cries uncle. Amidst the ashes of his contrition he seeks to dig footings for the foundation of what he calls an androcritical perspective. This perspective would consciously surrender the hegemony of liberal Protestant hermeneutics of recent centuries with its a priori (and often covert) commitment to this or that secular philosophy and attendant *Weltanschauung*. It would mark the start of self-avowed “critical” exegetes like Patte adopting a more humble stance toward the basis, purpose, and value of their exegetical labors.

They say confession is good for the soul. Patte’s confession should be good for his exegesis. It will certainly stimulate the reader who has patience to plow through this compact, densely argued book. From the outset one is struck with Patte’s recourse to *ethics* as relevant to interpretation. This signals a break with exegesis that enshrines brute *rationality*, or dispassionate *observation*, as the key category for proper interpretation. Chapter 1 argues that it is ethically irresponsible to ply one-dimensional interpretation (i.e., interpretation according to the dictates of “the” historical-critical method) as post-Enlightenment critical scholars (traditionally male, white, and European or North American, though that is changing) have been wont to do. Instead, Patte calls for a multidimensional approach.

Chapter 2 attempts to show what such an approach involves. It is not simply a plurality of criticisms endorsed by present male scholars as worthy of replacing their former one-dimensional criticism. Nor is it “uncritical” for having repented of former hypercritical imbalance. Then what is it? Well, chap. 3 answers that it is to be accountable to (1) its own inherent limitations as just one perspective among many others recognized today, and (2) its duty to bring critical understanding to “ordinary” readings (what feminists, African-Americans, and other minority groups read using their own culture’s experience as a grid) of the text rather than to torpedo such readings from a preassumed platform of critical superiority. Chapter 4 concludes by summarizing results and exploring further implications.

At the broadest level Patte’s thesis should be welcomed by exegetes of all stripes. Here, finally, is frank admission of the left-wing fundamentalism of much “critical” university interpretation. Patte concedes that “critical” readings, too, are “ordinary” readings. That is, they presuppose a worldview that is not itself a result of critical Biblical exegesis but rather the foundation for it. Classic historical-critical exegesis has been guilty of cultural and hermeneutical imperialism of an unproductive, even destructive, kind. It is refreshing to hear Patte’s call for a time out and reorientation.

Some will wonder, however, whether Patte’s well-argued and occasionally profound proposals can serve as much more than a temporary guide to the rapidly changing landscape of “critical” exegesis. With the old center of liberal Protestantism no longer holding, Patte is betting that a multicultural coalition of feminists and ethnic minorities can somehow construct a new core of agreement, or at least working harmony, on how the Bible ought to be handled. Is this a reasonable wager? Are Patte’s proposals adequate to halt the disintegration, the rapid methodological meltdown, in academic Biblical study that is the guild’s most prominent feature today?

It is doubtful that they are, for the simple reason that Patte points to nothing that could halt the fragmentation of communities demanding a hearing for their "ordinary" readings. But the illusory progress of modernism, which glimpsed but never grasped the chimerical grail of universally agreed-upon understanding of what the Bible means, will hardly be bettered by the infinite regression of postmodernism, whose widely diverging conclusions are inherent in the multiplicity of legitimate starting points it affirms.

What to do? Solid intellectual labor like Patte's is an ongoing desideratum. Beyond that, a great deal depends on whether an initially promising approach like Patte's is really open to *Christians* (in a sense broad enough to include the largest demographic grouping currently owning that name in the United States: Protestant evangelicals) as an advocacy group holding valuable keys for unlocking the Bible's meaning. Patte does wrestle with evangelical (which he stubbornly conflates with fundamentalist) use of the Bible, but here he succeeds chiefly in demonstrating a shocking lack of knowledge of his subject. His impressive and valuable bibliography of some 250 works contains all of three about evangelical views and theology. Two of these (Richard Coleman, *Issues of Theological Warfare*, 1972; Robert Johnston, *Evangelicals at an Impasse*, 1979) are obscure, dated, or both, while the third (on which Patte relies heavily) is James Barr's celebrated screed. There is no mention whatsoever of Thiselton, Osborne, Gruenler, Silva, Blomberg, Poythress, Ellis, Noll, Wolterstorff, Stuhlmacher, or any number of other evangelical scholars whose hermeneutical spadework merits at least the respect of Patte's passing familiarity. Nor is there so much as a word about a moderate like Brevard Childs.

Until this sizable body of scholarship is acknowledged as at least as qualified to shed light on the Bible's meaning as the avowedly post-Christian community to whom Patte caters, his calls to repentance will ring hollow to many. As it stands, for Patte the community of believing scholarship remains primarily a bothersome (even threatening) social reality to be coped with, not a wing of valid learning to be respected and learned from. Ranging to Patte's left, he is willing to allow for apparently limitless possibilities for "multidimensional" and "ethical" interpretation, but to Patte's right we are told to expect to find only "evangelical fundamentalists" whose "appeal to the authority of the text is a smoke screen hiding a betrayal of the text" (p. 80). Old Enlightenment prejudices (still curiously virulent in "post"-modernism) against the Church's understanding of its charter document do die hard—and show no faltering vital signs in Patte's proposals at all.

Patte's generally high-caliber reflections will grow considerably in credibility, fruitfulness, and sophistication when he realizes that James Barr has not said quite the last word on the community whose "ordinary reading" of the Bible is largely congruent with historic orthodox Christianity—and when his interpretive proposals embody more skepticism toward criticism's (and not just the Church's) traditional orthodoxies as a result.

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

*The Mystical Way in the Fourth Gospel: Crossing Over into God.* By L. William Countryman. Revised edition. Valley Forge: Trinity Press International, 1994, ix + 164 pp., \$14.00 paper.

"The Logos or Son, now incarnate in Jesus, is the only connection humanity has to the absolute reality of God." L. William Countryman, professor of New Testament

at the Church Divinity School of the Pacific, regards the explication of this central truth as the burden of the gospel of John, which, he says, as a sustained literary whole focuses on progress from “mystical enlightenment” to “mystical union” in the experience of the believer.

That the fourth gospel is mystical is no new suggestion. It is at least as old as Clement of Alexandria and Origen, and as recent as C. H. Dodd. But only a few modern critics, e.g. Evelyn Underhill and Sandra M. Schneiders, have been bold enough to suggest that its principal focus is Johannine spirituality. In this tradition Countryman affirms that John is mystical not incidentally (in terms of background or implied theology), but essentially (in basic literary purpose and structure).

Countryman urges consideration of this gospel as a literary whole. Two well-known perplexing matters that would seem to argue to the contrary concern (1) what he identifies as the “inappropriate response” in this gospel (e.g. 14:22, 23) and (2) the strongly ambivalent attitude toward the Christian sacraments of baptism and eucharist. These, he affirms, are really “points of entry” into the text rather than “interpretive impedimenta”: The former, while seeming to be *non sequitur*, actually provide pause for reflection; and the latter are essential but inadequate symbols, external rites as a means to higher (mystical) ends.

This work differs from most other commentaries in judging the prologue to be 1:1–34 and identifying the epilogue as only 20:30–31. Between these two poles the author charts the progress from mystical enlightenment to mystical union according to six major themes: conversion, baptism, eucharist, enlightenment, new life, and union. He provides his own translation of the text of the fourth gospel, confident that in the effort to offer a smooth and literate English style, others have often misrepresented the Greek of the New Testament writers.

Countryman has given us a volume at once both technical and devotional. Text, notes, and sources cited indicate that he has “done his homework”; yet, true to his stated intention, and in a most edifying way, he traces all that is mystical as the thread which binds together into a coherent whole what others usually have perceived as only disparate and fragmentary narratives.

Countryman is to be commended for his insight and courage in pursuing a minority motif in Johannine studies that modern and analytical scholarship has been loath to consider, especially in the wake of the antagonism toward mysticism so prevalent both in neo-orthodoxy and in apologetic concerns in a perceived postreligious era. One could wish for a larger book, but what we have here is highly significant to the discipline and is likely to prompt the confident further exploration of this worthy theme.

Donald N. Bowdle  
Lee College, Cleveland, TN

*Logos and Sophia: The Rhetorical Situation of 1 Corinthians.* By Stephen M. Pogoloff. SBLDS 134. Atlanta: Scholars, 1992, 313 pp., \$29.95 paper.

Enmeshed in a tedious lengthy introduction is an insightful study of the attitude and practices of rhetoric which Paul criticizes, especially in 1 Corinthians 1–4. Stephen Pogoloff demonstrates what we all should know, that “the heart of the gospel” is that “Christians should not exalt themselves over one another, since their hero is the lowest status person in the world” (p. 275).

Part 1 has 95 pages to defend using the text itself as a basis to understand the historical situation. Biblical scholarship has indeed reached a low ebb when one-third of a book must become an apologetic to use the Bible as a reference! I personally found this part least helpful, but possibly scholars philosophically inclined might find it enlightening. In the first three chapters, Pogoloff discusses the loss and recovery of rhetoric as more than mere form, the role of rhetoric in Paul's first-century Greco-Roman social world, and situational rhetoric. He defends rhetoric as situational and contextual (chap. 1), shows that Greco-Roman education was largely rhetorical (chap. 2), and explains how form serves function (chap. 3) and, therefore, form cannot be separated from content.

Part 2, the last two-thirds of the book (183 pp.), is more interesting to read, depends more on the original ancient texts, and offers a largely consistent re-creation of the ideas Paul aims to undermine, namely, the ancient cultural values attached to rhetoric. Chapter 4 offers an excellent overview of the author's thesis. Paul criticizes the "clever or skilled or educated or rhetorically sophisticated speech" (p. 110) or eloquence which in the Greco-Roman and Jewish cultures was closely related to social status, such as "education, power, wealth, birth, social relations, and tensions between urban/rural and Roman/Greek identity" (p. 127). Chapters 5-8 go on to elaborate different aspects of status: status in general (such as rhetoric and ruling), divisions (orators as competitive), status and different terms, and eloquence at dinner.

What made part 1 less helpful is the frequently adopted dissertation attitude to critique all so as to defend the presence of one's own study. For instance, Pogoloff appears to overstate the conflict of style and rhetoric. Rhetoric is greater than style (pp. 22, 45). However, style for the ancients was a synonym for rhetoric; both were part of the art of persuasion. Also, Pogoloff differentiates rhetorical situation from historical situation. "History" is "an attempt to interpret the past in a way that integrates disparate phenomena into a single meaningful narrative," whereas in "rhetorical situation" the reader interprets "not the past but a *text* received from the past" (p. 86). Since all discourse is symbolic behavior (p. 76), in Pogoloff's own practice (chaps. 4-8) the rhetorical conclusions look identical to historical studies. The helpful difference is that Pogoloff relates the social-historical situation to the rhetorical function or goal. However, formulating this new category, "rhetorical situation" ("a subtext constructed from within the reader's world" and "implied author's world" "for the narrow purpose of interpreting the text" [p. 86]) decreases confidence in the Bible text and increases the disjunction between history and rhetoric, which does not seem necessary or accurate, except as a means to reach a larger audience.

What makes part 2 more helpful is that the "boastful" attitude is gone and insights gleaned from the ancient context enlighten Paul's writings. Pogoloff cites helpful ancient texts which enliven the mind's apprehension of the Corinthian situation. He also integrates well how education, power, wealth, birth, and social relationships all relate to the larger ideal of a cultured cleverness. The competitive and entertaining nature of cultured eloquence (*logos*) which garners the ancient compliment of *sophos* was considered by Paul antithetical to the good news. Chapter 8 is especially enlightening for the reader to see the ramifications of social status at dinner meals.

I would recommend *Logos and Sophia* for anyone who desires to see how the status of "wise words," clever, cultured oratory and conversation, underlies the rhetorical situation that Paul addressed at Corinth.

Aída Besançon Spencer  
Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary, South Hamilton, MA

*Reading the Corinthian Correspondence: An Introduction.* By Kevin Quast. New York/Mahwah: Paulist, 1994, viii + 225 pp., \$14.95 paper.

After introducing the life and letters of Paul and situating the Corinthian correspondence within its historical context (chaps. 1–2) the author devotes twelve chapters to a pericope-by-pericope exposition of the epistles. Quast tentatively concludes that 2 Corinthians 10–13 is most likely Paul’s “severe letter” (2 Cor 2:3–4) written before chaps. 1–9 and 2 Cor 6:14–7:1 is (a fragment of) Paul’s “previous letter” (1 Cor 5:9) warning the church to avoid immorality and idolatry. The final two chapters (15 and 16) discuss ancient epistolography and theological themes in Paul. A thorough bibliography and a subject index conclude the volume.

Quast packs a wealth of helpful information into this introduction. Thirty-eight charts and maps on a variety of topics (e.g. gods and goddesses of Corinth, philosophies of Greece, typical villa floor plan from Corinth’s Roman period, “Belial” in intertestamental Judaism, chiasms in Paul) illustrate and summarize the exposition. Each chapter concludes with a series of study questions that not only ask readers to interact with the preceding material but encourage them to reflect on how the text might apply to contemporary issues. Most major interpretive cruxes are addressed. The volume compares favorably with another recent reading of the Corinthian correspondence by C. H. Talbert (*Reading Corinthians: A Literary and Theological Commentary on 1 and 2 Corinthians* [Crossroad, 1987]), though with less attention to literary contours and no references in the text itself to helpful secondary literature.

Any reading of the Corinthian correspondence will, of course, provoke disagreement. Some will not be persuaded that 1 Corinthians 9 is a “defense of personal freedom” (p. 59). Others will object that Quast overestimates the tension that exists between the Corinthians and their apostle. Would Paul repeatedly offer himself as an example of proper behavior if his ethos was at stake? Because Quast accepts the common consensus that 1 Corinthians is a loosely connected set of replies that mirrors a variety of questions posed by the readers (due largely, I believe, to a misunderstanding of the function of the *peri de* formula; see M. M. Mitchell, “Concerning the PERI DE in 1 Corinthians,” *NovT* [1989] 229–256), he downplays Paul’s own creative role in fashioning 1 Corinthians. The final chapter fails to reflect the recent deliberations about the perils and pitfalls of reconstructing Paul’s theology.

The reader will find nothing new in the pages of this volume. Rather, the author steers a steady course through the often bewildering exegetical options to arrive at a fair reading of the text. The book will find an appreciative reading among those who are making their initial foray into the letters of Paul in general and the Corinthian correspondence in particular.

James L. Jaquette  
Africa University, Mutare, Zimbabwe

*St. Peter versus St. Paul: A Tale of Two Missions.* By Michael Goulder. Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1994, xii + 196 pp., \$15.99 paper.

Goulder advocates and revises a reading of Christian antiquity that was first proposed by F. C. Baur over a century and a half ago. There never was a single, unified Church, virginal and uncorrupted by vain teachings. Earliest Christianity was in fact shaped by the opposition between two missions: one run from Jerusalem and overseen

by Peter (and later James), the other run by Paul from various centers. Apart from a basic agreement about the supreme significance of Jesus, the two factions had little in common.

In twenty-five brief chapters, Goulder explores those disagreements. From the basic tension about the interpretation of the Law (should one observe the Mosaic Law in its literal sense [Petrine Christianity] or does the mission to the uncircumcised demand a different approach [Pauline]?) a host of practical (chaps. 2–13) and doctrinal (chaps. 14–24) differences arise. For Petrites, one became a member of God's people by circumcision; for Paulines, the essential ingredient was faith. Petrites argued that the kingdom had already come; Paulines responded with "Not yet!" Petrine missionaries expected local churches to (indefinitely?) support their endeavors; Pauline churches were strongly rooted locally. Petrites, with their enthusiastic devotion to the accoutrements of a kingdom-already-come, endorsed a radical, wholehearted generosity; Paulines pragmatically rejoined, "If you don't work, you don't eat." The higher holiness of (over-)realized Petrine eschatology endorsed sexual asceticism; awaiting the *parousia*, Pauline Christians accepted the status quo. Petrine excitement over the ecstatic *gifts* of the Spirit contrasted with Pauline nervousness at the excesses, the consequent domestication of the *charismata* and exaltation of the ethical *fruits*.

The most acute problem of all, however, was the answer to the simple question, "Who was Jesus?" Petrites advocated a possessionist Christology. Because we do not have any straightforward statements of the earliest Jerusalem Christology, Goulder fishes among the statements of Ignatius, Irenaeus and Epiphanius, and he concludes that the earliest Petrine Christology was Ebionism. The incarnation, therefore, was a Pauline invention, aided by creative exegesis of select Biblical texts, to secure a place for Gentiles among the people of God via both the humanity and deity of Jesus Christ. As for the resurrection, Paul follows the traditional line: Jesus had risen physically and so would believers. Because Petrites believed that the kingdom had already come, they were already spiritual and promoted a nonphysical idea of resurrection. In Goulder's unitary solution to the problem of the earliest Christian documents, the NT is the product of the "winning" church of Paul.

The study is intended to be provocative rather than definitive, to demonstrate the opposition between Petrine and Pauline Christianity rather than to document them in any comprehensive way. Goulder's detailed exegesis can be found in a number of articles conveniently listed in appendix 2 and will be elaborated in a promised "800 page statement" (p. xi). That statement will have to treat scores of questions. Goulder finds Petrine Christianity in a lot of places where others do not. For example, it is not at all clear that the problems in Corinth are due to a Petrine influence—or even a Jewish one. Indeed, *the Jewish/Petrine problem*—circumcision—does not appear to be a problem at all. The Corinthian enthusiasts are not anti-Paulinists. On the contrary! They adopted Paul's ideas and developed them further. Likewise, it is scarcely demonstrable that Mark had any connection with Paul or Pauline-influenced Gentile Christianity. The Ebionite connection is not new. But it is still dubious. It is only by forcing the evidence that Goulder is able to bridge the great chronological gap between the anti-Pauline witnesses from the periods before and after AD 70.

Conflict in the early churches is, of course, an historical fact. But, like Baur before him, Goulder attempts to force the stream(s) of early Christian history into too narrow a channel. Another Bauer (Walter) has demonstrated the large-scale diversity within Christian antiquity. The Christianity of the first two centuries was too variegated to permit each of its elements to be assigned schematically to either the Jewish-Christian or the Gentile-Christian stream. Such a unitary schema fails as *history*, because—as

can be seen in the havoc it makes of the actual data—history simply does not seem to have moved in neat unilinear patterns.

James L. Jaquette  
Africa University, Mutare, Zimbabwe

*Seek the Welfare of the City: Christians as Benefactors and Citizens.* By Bruce W. Winter. First-Century Christians in the Graeco-Roman World 1. Grand Rapids/Carlisle: Eerdmans/Paternoster, 1994, x + 245 pp., \$18.99 paper.

In several recent works Wayne Meeks suggests that the attitude of the majority of early Christians toward the city is best characterized as an ambivalent *via media*. In contrast, Winter argues that the New Testament authors endorsed a positive attitude toward *politeia* (“public life”) and taught a civic consciousness among the members of the movement. For Winter the paradigm for the role of the early Christians in society is found in Jeremiah’s exhortation to the Jews in Babylonian exile: “Seek the welfare of the city” (29:7). Eschatological exile is the hermeneutical key that paradoxically encouraged early Christians to both fix their hope fully on their heavenly inheritance and actively participate in *politeia* as productive citizens even though the societies in which they lived often treated them as foreigners.

The subtitle of the book indicates both how Winter structures his discussion and how he has chosen to summarize the dual spheres of activity covered by the key term *politeia* in the first century. Part 1 (chaps. 1–4) shows that Christian teaching endorsed the role of benefaction but expanded its definition to encompass every member of the Christian community who had the capacity to meet the needs of others, and it limited the role of client by encouraging Christians to withdraw from an unproductive and dependent existence where they were part of the paid retinue of a patron. Part 2 (chaps. 5–10) explores the civic obligations and privileges of first-century Christians. A concluding chapter highlights how the unique perception early Christians gave to life in *politeia* commended the movement to outsiders.

The volume ranges over a wide variety of legal and epigraphic evidence providing the reader with a clear picture of a number of important socioreligious phenomena. Each chapter (six of which have been previously published) focuses on a specific NT text that Winter thinks provides insights into the different spheres of activity covered by the ancient meaning of the term *politeia* and provides a “series of soundings which map out the public place of early Christians” (p. 2).

Winter’s rather humble suggestion that some of the interpretations are perhaps new is certainly an understatement. A few examples will capture the spirit of Winter’s provocative exegesis. Appealing to epigraphic evidence, Winter translates Rom 13:3 “Do the good [deed] and you shall have praise from [civil] authority” (p. 33), but can only speculate that “there must have been Christians of very considerable means to warrant Paul’s injunction” to costly civic benefaction in Rom 13:3 (p. 37). Winter argues that Paul’s *qui non laborat non manducet* (2 Thess 3:10) is best understood as an attempt to abolish the patronage system in the Christian community and replace it with a whole new class of benefactors who did good without expectations of reciprocity. This conclusion is based on the (unsubstantiated) claim that Paul addresses former clients who either resumed their dependent relationship with a patron after he left the city or refused to surrender their relationship with a patron. Winter reads Gal 2:12–13 against the background of civic obligations to the imperial cult and argues that Christians took evasive action by adopting circumcision and thus placed them-

selves under Judaism as a *religio licita*. But there is no evidence that the Galatian Christians were previously attached to the synagogues, and if, as seems likely, the agitators have come from outside Galatia, the pressure for conformity may have as much to do with Jewish Christianity and Jerusalem as with local synagogues. Winter argues that 1 Cor 7:17–24 reflects the desire on the part of some Corinthians to be upwardly mobile socially. But this serious case of mirror-reading fails to understand the function of this *digressio* within the context of chap. 7 and how it is shaped by the thought-pattern reflected in the baptismal formula most fully stated in Gal 3:28. It is much more likely that the examples are chosen because there is *no* question about circumcision and slavery in Corinth.

This important book breaks new ground and repeatedly drives the reader back to the NT text. While many of Winter's conclusions are unpersuasive, the store of learning in each chapter richly repays careful reading. If the volume is any indication of what this new series will offer, then we are the fortunate beneficiaries.

James L. Jaquette  
Africa University, Mutare, Zimbabwe

*Rabbinic Judaism: The Documentary History of its Formative Age (70–600 C.E.)*. By Jacob Neusner. Bethesda: CDL, 1994, xiv + 408 pp., \$42.00.

For five years, from 1980 to 1985, I read a dozen or so books by Jacob Neusner and dipped into dozens more. Returning to Neusner after ten years was for me an exciting experience because of the changes he has made in his own approach and because of the breadth of his current concerns. In his book, Neusner surveys the history of the documents and infers (at times) the concerns of the communities and authors who created the various documents.

Neusner's theory, well-known to those who have read his more recent books (amply documented in his footnotes), is that the Mishna was a philosophical enterprise while the *Talmud of the Land of Israel* was a move toward religion; it is, however, only in the *Talmud of Babylonia* that we find theology. Because a religious system comprises "a statement of a world-view (ethics), a way of life (ethos), and a definition of the social group that sees the world in accord with the one and realizes in everyday life the other (ethnos)" (p. 3), Neusner uses these broad categories when he investigates the Mishna and the *Talmud of the Land of Israel*. When he gets to the *Talmud of Babylonia* he examines the documents from a more hermeneutical perspective, breaking his discussion into hermeneutical discourse, the theological program, propositional discourse (and the matter of responsibility), and symbolic discourse.

Neusner's most provocative category, in my judgment, is that the Mishna is essentially philosophical, more particularly a philosophy of hierarchical classification. "Rather, the Mishnah is organized topically, and for purposes of classification, that is, of discovering the prevailing rule, the Mishnah investigates the categorial qualities or properties of things. These are not the traits of a corpus of 'traditions' [the prevailing perception of the nature of the *Mishnah*]" (p. 30). They are "physics in an add idiom" (p. 37) which forms "a union of Aristotelian method and neo-Platonic message and therefore, among the philosophers of the Graeco-Roman philosophical tradition, would have been perceived as philosophical" (p. 38). Thus, what the Mishna does is to present numerous cases that all exhibit a general rule, the general rule being what Neusner perceives as philosophical. Ultimately, what the Mishna presents is a perception that all of nature can be understood as "many things are one, one thing is

many" (p. 41). Thus, "the message of hierarchical classification is that many things really form a single thing, the many species a single genus, the many genera an encompassing and well-crafted, cogent whole" (p. 41). Finally, this leads to the following: "The way to one God, ground of being and ontological unity of the world, lies through 'rational reflection on themselves and on the world,' this world, which yields a living unity encompassing the whole" (p. 53). Here we have it: The Mishna, through its orderly (if not tedious) hierarchical classification of "all things," by putting everything in its place and proper subordinating lines shown, evinces a unity that points to one God.

It is impossible to survey this whole book in this kind of a review. For each phase of this literature, Neusner offers stunning and comprehensive perceptual analyses that seek to put the entire development of rabbinic literature into a meaningful whole. Neusner has clearly accomplished a comprehensive picture; whether it is accurate is another matter. I, for one, remain unconvinced by his attempts to show that the Mishna is essentially a piece of philosophy (even when his theory goes on to economics and politics). There are, in my judgment, too few philosophical self-reflections, too much of a *vis-à-vis* stance over against the philosophers, and too much of law for it to be as philosophical as Neusner contends. Furthermore, Neusner's procedure has dramatically changed over the years. From a style of abundant citation of primary evidence with scholarly apparatus, Neusner has now moved to argument by assertion and ideological agenda. I found this development in Neusner disappointing. Finally, the style of this book is grotesquely abundant (read, for example, pp. 139–165), joyously abstract, and therefore inevitably ambiguous if not also turgid. This book will be welcome to those who need to know the development of Neusner's thinking and his current ideological positions with respect to the development of rabbinic Judaism.

Scot McKnight  
North Park College, Chicago, IL

*Sabbath & Synagogue: The Question of Sabbath Worship in Ancient Judaism.* By Heather A. McKay. Leiden: Brill, 1994, xiv + 279 pp., \$71.50.

McKay seeks to reexamine evidence which might show whether Sabbath was a special worship day for nonpriestly Jews, discover if possible what Jews did on the Sabbath, and discuss whether these constitute worship or not (p. 2). She concludes that no unequivocal evidence exists that corporate nonpriestly worship occurred on Sabbath in a special building until after AD 200. Instead, even the word συναγωγή refers only to a community or a given meeting; the building was called a προσευχή, literally *prayer-house*, but was actually a multipurpose meeting house, not for necessarily religious gatherings every Sabbath (p. 134 n. 7).

Following the introduction are eight chapters, each dealing with a different body of literature: (1) the Hebrew Bible, (2) early Jewish literature, (3) Philo and Josephus, (4) Graeco-Roman non-Christian sources, (5) New Testament sources, (6) early Christian sources, (7) Mishna, and (8) archeological data, inscriptions and papyri.

McKay's method (pp. 1–4) is (a) to let each type speak for itself, letting the divergencies stand, rather than combine them to form a consistent picture; (b) to avoid hidden assumptions, taking an approach she admits "some would call minimalist"; (c) to resist the assumption that Jewish attitudes to and behavior on Sabbath remained unchanged over hundreds of years, believing instead that the texts preserve various attitudes and practices over time and locale; (d) to distinguish between Sabbath ob-

servance, mainly inactivity on the Sabbath, and Sabbath worship, which she defines as "rites and rituals which pay homage, with adoration and awe, to a particular god or gods." It is essential to note what she does *not* consider to prove worship (pp. 3–4): "Reading, studying and explaining sacred texts I do not necessarily regard as worship, *unless* given a place in a planned session of worship. Otherwise I regard these activities as educational, or as serving the purpose of preserving and strengthening group identity, and not *necessarily* implying worship; the group's understanding of the god as *addressee* of the worship is vital in my definition."

McKay's stimulating book challenges the reader who, as with many scholars, has not been careful enough about reading into texts possibly unwarranted assumptions. She brings in some helpful correctives to these.

Nevertheless, many issues, chiefly regarding method, need to be raised. Does her definition of worship correspond with the ancient definition? She claims that Luke reads back into the stories of Jesus the synagogue of his own time, AD 80. Is it reasonable that Luke and his readers would both be ignorant of Sabbath practice, and that these slips would go unnoticed when so many people would have still been alive and have known "the old ways"? After pointing out how scholars look at archeological evidence through lenses of assumptions, she concludes with a statement revealing her minimalist position: "Until all scholars can find the evidence unequivocal, the existence of first-century synagogue buildings in Palestine remains, in my estimation, unproven" (p. 236). But, since in each chapter there are a number of texts difficult for her position, for which she chooses equivocal views on dating, etc., which support her position, would her own book stand up to such a requirement?

Lee M. Fields  
Sedgwick, KS

*Provoked to Jealousy: The Origin and Purpose of the Jealousy Motif in Romans 9–11.* By Richard H. Bell. WUNT 2.63. Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 1994, xxii + 471 pp., DM 118.00 paper.

The "new perspective" on Paul and post-holocaust concern for ecumenical dialogue with Jews have combined to thrust Romans 9–11 into the center of recent scholarly discussion of Romans, Paul's theology, and NT ecclesiology. The tendency of this discussion has been (1) to downplay any interest in individual salvation (esp. in chap. 9) in favor of "people" concerns, (2) to suggest that Paul may have seen continuing salvific value in the *tôrâ* covenant of the Jews, and (3) to admit (and in some cases insist) that Paul's teaching on Israel (within his letters, within Romans, or even within Romans 9–11) is incoherent.

Bell's monograph is a welcome addition to the flow of literature because it resists each of these trends (albeit in some cases more than in others). But, as the title suggests, the monograph focuses elsewhere. Bell is especially concerned to illuminate Paul's intriguing use of the concept of jealousy in his sketch of the course of salvation history (see esp. 11:11–15). His basic thesis is that Paul borrowed this jealousy motif from Deuteronomy 32 and that this chapter has had a formative influence on Paul's understanding of salvation history.

Bell begins with introductory chapters on the meaning of the key Hebrew and Greek words for "jealousy" and on basic issues in the interpretation of Romans 9–11. In the first, Bell argues that jealousy in the Bible (and in Romans 9–11) can be ei-

ther negative (“provoke to jealous anger,” in e.g. 10:19, a quotation of Deut 32:21), or positive (“provoke to emulation,” in e.g. Rom 11:11, 14). In the second, Bell follows P. Stuhlmacher in arguing that Paul’s basic purpose in Romans was to defend his gospel against Jewish-Christian attacks and in using justification as the issue that integrates chaps. 9–11 with the rest of Romans. The next two chapters are devoted to exegesis of the two passages in which Paul uses the jealousy motif: 10:14–21 and 11:1–36. Bell goes against the flow of scholarship by claiming that 10:14–21 is not basically about the mission to Israel. Of immediate relevance to his thesis is his conclusion that what Israel did not understand (see v. 19) is that God planned to bring Gentiles into the people of God. In his exegesis of chap. 11, Bell spends most of his time on vv. 11–15, 25–32. His interpretation of the former is unexceptionable, but two conclusions he draws on the latter are more noteworthy. (1) Bell thinks that Paul expects that his own ministry will usher in the eschatological climax of salvation history. (2) He argues that “all Israel” in v. 26 refers to every single member of the Israelite nation that has ever lived (a diachronic sense). Their salvation will occur when they are confronted with Christ at the end of history.

The next two chapters build on the first four as Bell summarizes the jealousy motif (chap. 5) and investigates its theological basis (chap. 6). In the latter, Bell argues against a “transfer” model of the relationship between Israel and the Church and in favor of an “extension” model. Having explained the function of the jealousy motif in Romans 9–11, Bell then goes on to argue that the Song of Moses in Deuteronomy 32 provides Paul with the basic building blocks of both the motif and of his particular understanding of salvation history, culminating in the “mystery” of the salvation of “all Israel.” The two following chapters (8–9) relate the jealousy motif to Paul’s own experience and to the continuing mission of the Church. Chapter 10 summarizes and wraps up the discussion.

As we noted in the introduction, one of the most positive features of this monograph is Bell’s willingness to take positions running counter to the drift of current scholarship. Some examples: (1) Bell notes that 9:1–13 cannot be satisfactorily explained if Paul is not making some reference to individual salvation (p. 180); (2) in contrast to the approach to Paul and the law initiated by E. P. Sanders and carried out most thoroughly by J. D. G. Dunn, Bell argues that Paul does criticize Jews in 9:30–10:3 for “works righteousness” (pp. 186–193); (3) Bell adds his voice to a growing chorus of criticism of the *Sonderweg* interpretation—that Paul expected Israel to find salvation through her own *tôrâ* covenant and apart from Christ. While this view is ecumenically attractive, Bell rightly argues that it can be found in Romans 11 only by eisegesis and, in a neat turn of rhetoric, accuses proponents of this position of anti-Semitism, for “to renounce preaching the liberating gospel to Jewish people is anti-semitism” (p. 355). Unfortunately the purpose of the monograph prevents Bell from developing any of these points as thoroughly as he might have done.

On two other significant exegetical/theological issues not directly a part of Bell’s main thesis I must register demurrals. First, the claim that Paul expected his own ministry to usher in the climax of salvation history, while frequently made, is not compelling. It fails adequately to deal with Paul’s own reserve about his mission (cf. 11:14) and with the degree to which Paul transformed the “pilgrimage to Zion” tradition that he took over from the OT. Second, Bell’s conclusion that 11:26 speaks of the salvation of every single Israelite throughout history does not give adequate weight to the corporate and synchronic use of the phrase “all Israel” in the LXX (Bell notes this evidence but dismisses it too quickly).

The jealousy motif is of course the heart of the monograph. It is a bit unfortunate that Bell feels it necessary to relate the motif to so many different issues, for the re-

sult is a monograph that deals with a lot of things rather cursorily. But when he talks directly about this motif he makes some solid contributions. His claim that Israel's failure to understand in 10:19 relates to the inclusion of Gentiles in the people of God explains what is otherwise a perplexing text (in integrating Bell's arguments into my already completed manuscript on Romans I found that I had already reached the same conclusion). Tracing the origin of Paul's jealousy motif to Deuteronomy 32 also makes good sense, and Bell is right to stress the degree to which Paul's thinking about salvation history is dependent on OT patterns (his study of Paul's use of Deuteronomy 32 by Paul confirms Dodd's thesis about the use of the OT in the NT—at least for this text). I am not convinced, however, that Deuteronomy 32 has played as central a role in forming Paul's salvation-historical scheme as Bell thinks. While the jealousy motif can plausibly be traced to this source, the salvation-historical scheme of Romans 9–11 (echoed elsewhere in the NT) has widespread roots. Nor is the jealousy motif as basic to this scheme in Romans 9–11 as Bell suggests it is. It remains one perspective among many others that Paul exploits to accomplish his purposes in these chapters.

Douglas Moo

Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, Deerfield, IL

*Matthew's Christian-Jewish Community.* By Anthony J. Saldarini. Chicago: University of Chicago, 1994, vii + 317 pp., \$17.95 paper.

A generation ago Matthew's gospel was usually seen as substantially Gentile in orientation. This view has been reversed in recent study. Many would concur with G. Stanton that Matthew's Jewish-Christian community still dialogues vigorously with "the synagogue across the street." Saldarini presses this thesis further. Combining sociological analysis with a close reading of the text, he concludes that Matthew's group remains well within the parameters of Judaism. It would have been viewed as a deviant sect by the majority, but Matthew tries to legitimate its claims by undermining the authority of Israel's traditional leadership, though largely without success.

Chapter 1 surveys the diversity of Judaisms within the first century, noting how both Christian and rabbinic Judaism emerged as competing reformist movements. Chapters 2–5 detail Matthew's use of key terminology: Israel, people, Jews, crowds, Israel's leaders, Gentiles, other non-Jewish characters and authorities, kinship terms, disciples, different categories of individuals within Matthew's church, and his use of *ekklēsia* for the assembly. Saldarini concludes that neither Matthew nor the characters in his narrative ever break from Israel as a whole or unambiguously embrace the Gentile world.

Saldarini's surveys are thorough. Occasionally he engages in detailed exegesis, usually persuasively (as in limiting the referent of 27:25 to the Jerusalemites up to AD 70). References to "the Jews" or "their synagogues" do not put Matthew outside Judaism any more than they do Josephus when he uses similar language. Matthew's major complaint is with Israel's leaders. In sociological terms, his sect is "alienative-instrumental"—rejecting the dominant Jewish culture but trying to impact it with Jesus' own thaumaturgic and millennial hopes for a "fulfilled Judaism." Because of charismatic false prophets in the church Matthew plays down the healings, but he preserves eschatological vision even as reformist tendencies give way to conversionist ones.

Chapters 6–7 turn to Matthew's theologies of the Law and of Jesus. Matthew redacts Mark so as to make it clear Christians keep Sabbath and dietary laws, along with regulations for oaths, tithes, taxes and divorce. Circumcision never appears, but

Saldarini works hard to claim that it was not always crucial for first-century Jews. No interaction with or mention of the more balanced perspectives of R. Banks, D. Moo or R. T. France on Jesus and Law in Matthew appears. Matthew's Jesus is portrayed with equally Jewish titles: Christ, Son of David, Son of Abraham, Son of God (as Messiah and intimate with his Father, not as the second person of the later Christian Trinity), teacher, healer, new Moses, Wisdom personified, prophet, Lord (bordering on a transcendent intermediary from God) and Son of Man (with Daniel 7 winning slightly as the preferred OT background). Crucifixion and resurrection bring "to completion many of the symbolic claims" previously made for Jesus (p. 192).

All of this is well argued and articulated, but one senses Matthew's distinctively Christian slant has been given short shrift. Still, Saldarini's interpretation seems closer to Matthew's intent than supersessionist theories. His work should take a prominent place in the ongoing reclamation of Matthew for Judaism and in aiding modern Jews and Christians better to understand their common heritage.

Curiously, "deity" is misspelled four times on p. 154.

Craig L. Blomberg  
Denver Seminary, Denver, CO

*The Preface to Luke's Gospel: Literary Convention and Social Context in Luke 1:1-4 and Acts 1:1.* By Loveday Alexander. SNTSMS 78. Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1993, xv + 250 pp., \$54.95.

Scholars have often presumed Luke's stylish preface as evidence that he was writing in the fashion of classical historians, but Alexander notes that no one had performed a comprehensive study to ascertain where Luke's preface fits into the whole range of Greek literature. This revision of her dissertation (Oxford, 1978) shows her attempt to fill this scholarly lacuna and to make suggestions regarding the social significance of Luke's preface material.

Alexander surveys the Greek historical prefaces, noting general features, formal characteristics, and recurrent topics—only to conclude (contrary to the assumptions of many) that prefaces comparable to Luke's are not especially to be found in the Greek historical literature (chap. 3). Key differences include length (Luke's preface is much shorter than even the shortest historical preface), anonymity (Luke does not present his own name as was customary among the Greek historians), second-person dedication (Greek historians largely eschewed dedications) and style (although Luke's preface material proves to be above the NT standard in style, it does not attain to the richness of Greek historiography).

The better counterpart to Luke's kind of literary preface is found in Greek technical or professional prose, which Alexander calls the "scientific" tradition. This tradition—outside the realm of normal classical literature—is identified not so much by subject matter as by origin and form (chaps. 4–5). The subjects of the works in this tradition include medicine, philosophy, mathematics, engineering, rhetoric and even magic and astrology. Luke's preface material compares well to the prefaces in this tradition with regard to length, second-person address, and style (syntactical patterns). Rather than Hellenistic Jewish literature (e.g. *Ep. Arist.*, Philo's *Quod omnis probus* and Josephus' *Ag. Ap.*—see chap. 7) or Greek historiography, Luke-Acts fits best into the scientific tradition.

Alexander brings her conclusions to bear upon the issue of Luke's social matrix (chaps. 8–9). Luke's preface should not be used to elevate his writings to the lofty

heights of the ancient *littérateurs* (far above the everyday language of the rest of the NT). Rather, Luke's language is to be placed, with much of the rest of the NT, on an intermediate stratum. Luke had either little acquaintance with or little interest in Greek classical literature. His use of a scientific preface shows him to have contact with that intermediate style of writing. Furthermore the use of such intermediate literature and language is compatible with the other evidence we have suggesting that early Christian communities like Luke's belonged on an intermediate rung of the Greco-Roman sociocultural ladder.

Alexander has convincingly argued that Luke's preface material is more like those found in the Greek scientific tradition than the Greek historiographical tradition. Less convincing, however, is the notion that the third gospel and Acts as literature actually belong in that genre. With much of the Greek historical literature no longer extant and with the great variety of subjects and conventions in the prefaces that are extant (pp. 23–26), cannot Luke's preface material simply be a further example of that variety in the Greek historical literature? Asked in another way: What would a preface look like if someone from the intermediate sociocultural stratum (who also worked within the scientific tradition and was familiar with its literature) wanted to write historiography? Alexander acknowledges the possibility of "cross-fertilization" or "mixing" between traditions (pp. 87 and 103 n. 1). Could there be a confusion here of writing convention (tradition) and genre?

Although Alexander has helpfully supplemented this version of her dissertation with more recent material on the social setting of the NT, the scholarly discussion of genre has gone on (less perfectly without her input) in works by Brodie, Hurtado, Burridge, and Parsons and Pervo, among others. Furthermore it is unfortunate that her labors of 1978 were not more readily available for inclusion in the commentaries produced on the third gospel in the intervening years (e.g. Fitzmyer, Nolland, L. T. Johnson, and now D. Bock). Verse by verse she discusses the structure, vocabulary and style, and interpretation of each portion of Luke 1:1–4 and Acts 1:1 (chap. 6). Alexander's treatment of Luke's preface material is certainly of great value to any Lukan exegete.

Douglas S. Huffman  
Northwestern College, St. Paul, MN

*Scripture Within Scripture: The Interrelationship of Form and Function in the Explicit Old Testament Citations of the Gospel of John.* By Bruce G. Schuchard. SBLDS 133. Atlanta: Scholars, 1992, xvii + 174 pp., \$24.95 paper.

This book sets out to examine every explicit quotation of the OT in the gospel of John, and in particular to identify the OT source of each quotation and the textual version from which it is drawn and to establish the function of each quotation in its Johannine context. The first thirteen chapters work through the quotations Schuchard finds (1:23 [Isa 40:3]; 2:17 [Ps 69(68):10a]; 6:30–31 [Ps 77:24]; 6:45a [Isa 54:13]; 10:34 [Ps 81:6]; 12:15 [Zech 9:9]; 12:38 [Isa 53:1]; 12:40 [Isa 6:10]; 13:18 [Ps 41(40):10]; 15:25 [source uncertain]; 19:24b [Ps 21:19]; 19:36 [Exod 12:10 or 12:46 or both]; 19:37 [Zech 12:10]). The last chapter provides his "concluding observations" (pp. 151–156). There is a bibliography, but there are no indices.

The work is well done, the central conclusions suitably cautious. For instance, at 2:13; 19:37 Schuchard will venture no more than that the gospel passage "recalls" the specified OT passage. His conclusions are essentially twofold: (1) In most instances it

is quite certain that John's OT quotations come from only one textual tradition, the OG; (2) the various changes that John introduces into the quotations—shortening, deploying a synonym, adding material (usually drawn from the same OT context, for which John displays considerable respect)—are part of John's commitment to show how the entire OT testifies to Jesus. There may be good reason for supposing that John thought in Aramaic and knew Hebrew, but he wrote in Greek and was doubtless in contact with one or more synagogues in the Diaspora.

Although the work is circumscribed and suitably cautious, it is for the same reasons so restrained that it is of only specialist interest. Schuchard offers no useful comments on the extraordinary pattern of the introductory formulae in John and makes no attempt to integrate his findings with the very considerable number of OT allusions in John—not even such pivotal ones as 1:51; 3:14; 7:38–39. Yes, John presents Jesus as the One to whom the OT testifies, but there is very little reflection on the ways in which this witness operates—for example, in fulfillment? typological fulfillment? replacement? prediction? What are John's hermeneutical axioms? And the theory that John is in dialogue with a Diaspora synagogue, though certainly dominant in the scholarly literature, plays no determinative role in the exegesis, nor is it particularly supported by it. One could as easily infer that John's interests are evangelistic, aimed at Jews and proselytes in the Diaspora.

In short, the book is competent and useful within its rather narrow, self-imposed limitations.

D. A. Carson

Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, Deerfield, IL

*The Quest for the Messiah: The History, Literature and Theology of the Johannine Community.* By John Painter. 2d ed. Nashville: Abingdon, 1993, 492 pp., \$24.95.

The volume here reviewed is a *tour de force* on the gospel of John by one of today's most noteworthy Johannine scholars. Throughout its pages Painter displays an impressive grasp of the secondary literature and interacts frequently with previous scholarship on the fourth gospel, both in the text and in extended footnotes. The work is thus a virtual compendium of Johannine research of the last forty years and well worth opening for that reason alone.

More specifically, the book is a source- and form-critical analysis of John (and to a limited extent of 1 John). Painter is especially concerned, as the book's subtitle suggests, to elucidate the history and theology of the community that first produced and utilized that gospel. With others before him, Painter discerns several redactional layers in the text that evidence an increasingly isolated Christian sect eventuating in the Johannine community. His reconstruction of the history of that sect largely follows the Johannine history posited by R. Brown. Painter offers some modifications, however, chiefly in reassigning specific portions of the gospel to other of Brown's stages than Brown postulated and by suggesting that after breaking with the synagogue the community experienced an influx of Gentiles who reinterpreted the Johannine tradition. Hence Painter tentatively outlines the history of the community reflected in John and 1 John as involving (1) conversion from John the Baptist to Jesus and witness to fellow "Baptists"; (2) witness to other Jews; (3) various crises—a delayed *parousia*, the Jewish war; (4) conflict with the synagogue, resulting in the expulsion of Christians and the concomitant formation of the Johannine community from the Johannine school; (5) influx of Gentiles and conflict over the relevance of the historical Jesus.

Painter also offers broadly useful insight into the final text of the gospel. He argues that there are two fundamental and related themes in John—namely, “the quest for the Messiah” and “the quest of the Messiah.” That is, Painter understands the evangelist to desire both to portray Jesus as the fulfillment of all first-century Jewish messianic hopes and to present him as the embodiment of God’s search for true worshippers. The evangelist is seen to pursue these themes through a succession of “quest stories” (including quest stories revised into “rejection stories”) that culminate in the paradoxical revelation of the Messiah through his ultimate rejection. The quests for the Messiah and of the Messiah thus find their fulfillment only when Jesus is finally lifted up and God draws all men to himself.

Painter’s conclusions on the theme of John are commendable if not earth-shaking, but his account of the growth of the text paralleling that of its author’s community is problematic. As is the nature of tradition-critical studies generally, the book suffers from the subjectivity of the method. Conclusions concerning various strata of composition evidencing various *Sitze im Leben* remain at the level of explanation of the textual phenomena rather than the demonstration of any historical reality. Painter is not unaware of this problem, but he is only able to justify his work by suggesting that it offers the best explanation of the evidence. Nevertheless his reconstruction (and others like it) strikes this reviewer as plausible but in no way compelling. In particular, it is not clear how subsequent editions of the gospel would function authoritatively in the community (the working of the Spirit of truth notwithstanding), since changes to the gospel in response to common crises must surely have been recognized as having been retrojected to the earthly career of Jesus. Were the putative historical settings accepted as merely esthetic? Without a sufficient answer to that question, I remain unconvinced.

This volume will not persuade those not already amenable to similar reconstructions, but it will still repay its reader much. It will certainly prove a useful research tool for Johannine students generally and, in smaller bites, provide excellent material for classes in historical-critical methodology.

Alan Hultberg  
Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, Deerfield, IL

*John: The Son of Zebedee, The Life of a Legend.* By R. Alan Culpepper. Columbia: University of South Carolina, 1994, 376 pp., \$49.95.

In 1983 Culpepper published his ground-breaking study *Anatomy of the Fourth Gospel* and changed the way scholars and students read the fourth gospel. Now, with the inaugural volume in the Studies on Personalities in the New Testament series, Culpepper has contributed an important study of the apostle John in the NT and the beloved disciple in both the gospel of John and in Church history. While others have written on this subject, this is by far the most comprehensive book ever produced on it.

On my first reading I looked for answers and found more questions. I looked for scholarly squabbles and research, which I found only in the endnotes. This gives the text immense readability. On a second reading I discovered Culpepper’s true contribution: a fresh and nearly original look at the sources (i.e. the NT, the Church fathers, etc.). Culpepper is fully aware of the research and differing opinions on his subject, but his own analysis fills the pages with erudition and evenhandedness.

The book has an introduction, ten chapters of investigation, and a brief conclusion entitled “Reflections.” It begins by setting the context of John the apostle as a

fisherman. Fishing, boating and the like are discussed within the context of first-century Galilee, coupled with Jesus' call of the disciples. The next two chapters are concerned with John in the synoptics and the beloved disciple in the fourth gospel. The major question in the study of authorship is twofold: (1) Was John the apostle also the beloved disciple? (2) Was that the person who wrote the gospel? This question is expanded in the next chapter, which asks whether the seer of the Apocalypse and the elder of the epistles can also be identified in a positive way with John and/or the beloved disciple. Culpepper concludes that the evidence is too varied and inconclusive to know who actually wrote the fourth gospel. Consequently he focuses the rest of his study on the portrayal of John the son of Zebedee as the author of the gospel in history, not so much because he concurs with such a view but because that is how John has been remembered.

The next three chapters deal with how the beloved disciple came to be identified with John during the course of history. From the second century through the middle ages this identification became more fixed, but still there were doubts. In short, there has never been a consensus that John and the beloved disciple were the same person or that it was that person who wrote the gospel.

Chapter 8, "Icon: The Apostle in Art and Literature," is the most intriguing of the book. While the publisher should have provided more photographs of John's portrait in art (only two are in the book) the discussion is enthusiastic and well ordered. The discussion of John in poetry is a most welcome one. While chaps. 9–10 focus on 19th- and 20th-century criticism of the authorship of John, Culpepper's discussion of Herder, Klopstock, Hölderin, Longfellow and Browning balances the negativity of historical criticism with poetic creativity and energetic renditions of the apostle John.

This is a valuable book, one that will be consulted time and again. Not a single page can be skipped or skimmed over without costing the reader both information and insight. In short, Culpepper has not written a book about the scholarly discussion of the authorship of the fourth gospel as might be expected. Rather, he has written about the life and history of an idea. He has taken on the task of holistic reading and interpretation and in doing so has produced a new genre for Biblical studies.

Marc A. Jolley  
Broadman & Holman Publishers, Nashville, TN

*I Am the Way: A Spiritual Journey Through the Gospel of John.* By Philip Wesley Comfort. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1994, 212 pp., \$15.99.

The gospel of John, according to Comfort, takes its readers on a spiritual journey from the heart of God in eternity past where he determined to send his Son into the world to bring back to the Father many more sons. That journey includes not only the disciples of the first century but also every believer who in faith is vitally related to Christ. John, then, is written for believers, to draw them into an ever-deepening relationship with the triune God. The goal of the gospel is that the believer through mutual indwelling might share in the intimate, loving relationship that exists between the members of the Godhead.

The journey motif is also central to a proper understanding of the gospel as a whole. The author, assumed to be John the son of Zebedee, chronicles Jesus' journeys from Jerusalem (where he is consistently rejected) to Galilee (where he achieves a measure of acceptance). In the process the author shows how Jesus took the disciples on a spiritual reenactment of some of the most important features of Israel's sacred

history. Jesus is the one greater than Moses who brings his people out of the darkness of spiritual bondage into a new life of fellowship with him.

The book is a short one, and the reader will be disappointed if he expects that the author will go into detailed discussions of critical issues of interpretation, as that was not his purpose. Nevertheless the author's own conclusions with regard to those issues is evident in the presentation. He is presenting an analysis of the gospel as a piece of literature for the purpose of edifying the believer. Amazingly, though, the author finds space in his footnotes to discuss a number of textual problems. A minor criticism of the book is that at times the author makes references to books in his text for which he does not give complete bibliographic information in either the notes or the bibliography. This would cause a reader who is not familiar with some of those books some frustration. While this book is not a detailed exegesis of the text, the author does give some interesting insights into the gospel of John. Nevertheless the strength of the book is in its literary analysis and spiritual focus.

Edward M. Curtis  
Prairie Bible College, Three Hills, AB

*Becoming Children of God: John's Gospel and Radical Discipleship.* By Wes Howard-Brook. Maryknoll: Orbis, 1994, xviii + 510, \$21.95 paper.

The subtitle of the book identifies the commentary as a call to radical discipleship. For the author, radical discipleship involves a commitment to liberation theology and its practical outworking in society. He seeks to explore the implications of the gospel of John for the community of faith in the United States. Not a theologian by vocation, Howard-Brook recognizes that he is an unknown in this field and offers this reading of the fourth gospel as a means of kindling interest in the social implications of the ministry of Christ. Jesus is not so much a redeemer of the Church as its model for how the oppressed should approach the powers of society.

The author's approach to the Biblical text is first to deny that there is any such thing as an unbiased interpretation, and in the most absolute sense I would have to agree. Nevertheless for the author this means that, with one significant exception, one reading of the text cannot be termed right and another wrong. That exception is the interpretation of fundamentalists and "other exponents of individualistic religion" (p. 19). Their interpretations are wrong. He is also at times critical of source critics who refuse to deal with the text as it has been handed down to the Church (e.g. p. 314).

The book is not a scholarly treatise on the gospel of John. There is comparatively little interaction with those with whom the author disagrees and little discussion of theology *per se*. His focus is on the beliefs and practices of the Johannine community that are reflected in the gospel without making any attempt at systematic or even Biblical theology. He sees the gospel as trying to bridge the rift that has occurred between the apostolic Christian communities and the community the author of John's gospel leads. His goal is to lay open these ideas and practices without critical evaluation. Thoughts of truth versus error or history versus fiction rarely enter his argument. It is what they believed, not what we think about what they believed, that is important. The author seems, however, to accept the miracles of Christ and even the resurrections of Lazarus and Jesus at face value without resorting to naturalistic explanations. He allows the differences in the gospel accounts to stand without attempting any harmonization. Such discussions are unfruitful in the author's mind. He interprets the gospel as though it existed in a vacuum and does not allow the information found in the other gospels to color the way he understands John.

A significant strength of the commentary is its focus on John as a piece of literature. Howard-Brook carefully develops the story line and shows how the author has intricately woven his tale for maximum effect on his readers. While many will view his finding of chiasm everywhere as the fundamental literary structure of the gospel somewhat contrived, he has convinced me that the device is used far more frequently in this gospel than usually thought.

Edward M. Curtis  
Prairie Bible Institute, Three Hills, AB

*What Is Postmodern Biblical Criticism?* By A. K. M. Adam. Guides to Biblical Scholarship. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1995, xiv + 81 pp., \$10.00 paper.

Engagingly written by an exponent and practitioner of postmodern Biblical criticism, this little book is the best introduction to the subject now available. Though he apologizes profusely (and engagingly) for any reductionism or gross oversimplification into which he might fall, he makes only one or two factual errors and provides no better point of access for the complete novice. Even those widely read in postmodern literature, though they will learn nothing new, will find Adam an informed and entertaining guide.

Whatever its complexities and the diversities of its forms, postmodernism, Adam tells us in his first chapter, is "a movement of resistance," a reaction against modernity. The moderns elevated reason against tradition, the present against the past. Modern knowledge became specialized knowledge, each sphere based on foundational assumptions that could not be questioned. In the arena of Biblical studies, there is a chasm not only between modern interpreters and precritical interpreters but also between the Bible and ourselves. The latter chasm can be bridged by scientific inquiry.

But all of this is called into question by postmodernism. Adopting the analysis of Cornel West, Adam asserts that, by contrast with modernism, postmodernism is "anti-foundational, antitotalizing, and demystifying." Postmodern thinkers point out that no posited foundational belief has commanded general assent, with the result that foundationalism itself is called into question. Foundations, they argue, are not necessary anyway: One can reason and evaluate and make judgments within the flux we cannot escape. Modern arguments and judgments are replete with totalizing tendencies, i.e. with contrived "givens" and definitions and analyses that control and therefore oppress opposing arguments (and people). This is even reflected in modernism's focus on the individual. But who decides what counts and what does not? Postmodernism overturns totalizing claims, and aims instead for local relevance. Moreover, while the modern critic advances specialist claims to justify the structure of his or her argument or discipline (claims that mystify the subject for those who are outside the discipline), postmoderns insist that these mystifications usually mask much more concrete and worldly reasons as to why the discipline is shaped as it is: There is profit in it for someone, or the mystique of belonging to a protected guild, or hierarchical structures of power, or the like.

These new perspectives are engagingly defended with interesting examples. The first chapter ends with comments on an array of other common features in postmodern literary analysis: a profound suspicion of metanarratives (i.e. of "big stories" that explain all the little stories—e.g. like the Bible's story line), the importance (in some analyses, like those of Stanley Fish) of identifying the distinctive features of competing "interpretive communities," the polyvalence of meaning. Moreover, postmodern

criticism is “willfully transgressive; it defies the boundaries that restrict modern discourses to carefully delimited regions of knowledge.”

The second chapter is a gentle introduction to deconstruction, with illuminating application to 2 Thessalonians. The third chapter probes the political dimensions of much postmodern Biblical criticism by focusing on some of the contributions of Michel Foucault and of the new historicism. While modernist historians commonly read texts so as to paint coherent pictures, Foucault hunts out discontinuities: He aims to destabilize the big stories others advance, seeing them as manipulative, merely reflective of the biases of the historians and their communities. Similarly, the new historicists regard the pursuit of objectivity as a charade. “Great books” merely reflect someone’s (or some group’s) dominant ideology. Adam sensitively unpacks the ambiguities even in the term “ideology,” and then briefly demonstrates how feminist Biblical criticism reads Biblical texts (criticizing typically androcentric interpretations, offering alternative readings of the texts, and deconstructing the texts themselves because of their androcentric biases), how racial ideology has bred a new generation of postmodern critics, and how (and why) postmoderns are little impressed with the claims of the historical-critical method.

The fourth and final chapter depicts some of the ways in which postmodern readings of texts self-consciously cross boundaries that the traditional disciplines have erected. After all, the texts themselves are inevitably the results of *bricolage*, i.e. an improvising compilation of oddments of antecedent materials: Every text is constituted by other texts (and hence the postmodern analysis of “intertextuality”). Adam shows what happens, for example, when we boldly cross (arbitrary) barriers between fiction and nonfiction.

An appendix tries to help hesitant readers take the first steps in postmodern criticism, primarily by encouraging them, at every level, to “think the opposite.” Typical of the series, each chapter concludes with an annotated bibliography.

Detailed engagement with this introductory book in brief compass is not possible. But five things must be said.

(1) This is the work of a convinced convert. Adam is pushing a case. There is no attempt at evenhanded evaluation of postmodern epistemology. Had I space, I would argue that thoughtful Christians should be committed to neither modernism nor postmodernism, though there are important things to be learned from both epistemological stances.

(2) Adam offers no word on how postmodern Biblical criticism might be affected if there is a sovereign/transcendent and omniscient God out there who talks, i.e. who chooses to disclose himself to his finite image-bearers in *their* language. Not for a moment does he attempt to evaluate how postmodern criticism might be forced to change if the Bible’s metanarrative is true, i.e. if it lays out what is in fact the case, as an omniscient God sees it, however much his disclosure of the same to us is inevitably in accommodated language.

(3) The brief treatment of science is typical of postmodern analysis, but it is woefully inadequate. Readers might usefully compare Paul R. Gross and Norman Levitt, *Higher Superstition: The Academic Left and Its Quarrels with Science* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University, 1994). Gross and Levitt are unreconstructed modernists, of course, but at least they understand science, and the foils they put up in the current welter of literature from postmodern philosophers of science should cause all but the most committed to pause.

(4) Typically, Adam repeatedly denies that what he is advocating descends to absolute relativism. Postmodern interpreters cannot make the Bible mean whatever they want it to mean, “unless there are audiences that find those interpretations

convincing. And thereby hangs the hermeneutical dilemma: No interpretation is self-authenticating, but the validity of any interpretation depends on the assent of some audience." But this confuses relativism and arbitrariness. Besides, does Adam really want to say that the validity of an interpretation depends on the assent of some audience, such as the Ku Klux Klan, maybe, or the Nazi party, or the coterie around Mao Zedong? Again, he insists that "the fact that there are no necessary criteria does not imply that there are no criteria. Even transgressors [i.e. literary critics who cross boundaries] depend on prior definitions of rules and practices, if only to flout them the more extravagantly." True; but then that is merely another way of saying that these are not "criteria" in more than a relative sense.

(5) Above all, Adam resorts to the absolute antithesis I have found in every one of the hundreds of books I have read by postmodernists. Either human beings have absolute and exhaustive knowledge of some subject, or all their knowledge is necessarily relative, based in the interpretive community or the like. Objective truth must be absolute and exhaustive, or one is left with many "truths" whose "validity" is demonstrated in their relevance or their interest or their usefulness. If you buy into this antithesis, the postmoderns are right, for we finite mortals can never enjoy absolute and exhaustive knowledge about anything. If their antithesis stands, and the first pole is excluded, there is not much left but the second. But there are alternative models, of course; I summarized some of them in *The Gaggling of God*. I have not yet seen serious postmodern engagement with these alternatives. Certainly Adam does not attempt such engagement.

D. A. Carson  
Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, Deerfield, IL

*Text, Church and World: Biblical Interpretation in Theological Perspective*. By Francis Watson. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1994, viii + 357 pp., \$34.99.

Watson, who teaches at King's College, University of London, is probably best known for his specialized and important monograph, *Paul, Judaism and the Gentiles: A Sociological Approach* (SNTSMS 56, 1986). The present volume, however, is a much more ambitious project, in which he seeks to develop and justify the view "that biblical interpretation should concern itself primarily with the theological issues raised by the biblical texts within our contemporary ecclesial, cultural and socio-political context" (p. vii).

It must be said at the outset that Watson's writing evinces wide learning, an incisive mind, and a sincere desire to understand what it means to speak of the canonical Scriptures as normative. The point needs emphasis because some readers may be tempted to dismiss this book too quickly when they find out, for example, that Watson does not hesitate to reject a passage from the Bible if he deems its content unacceptable (cf. pp. 116–117, on 1 Cor 14:33b–35). Although his approach is, in my opinion, fundamentally unstable, it would be a grave mistake to characterize it as simply one more example of modern unbelief. To be sure, unbelief lies at the root of every attempt to pare down God's Word in conformity with our judgment (even the staunchest evangelical is not free from this inclination). But Watson's work reflects too frequently, and too earnestly, a genuine struggle with the claims of the Christian faith over against the difficulties raised by a scrupulous reading of the Biblical text. His answers do not prove adequate, but the questions cannot be ignored.

The book consists of three parts with four chapters each. Part 1 examines in turn Hans Frei's brand of realism and Brevard Childs' emphasis on the canonical shape of the Bible, with two additional chapters (which focus on Genesis 37–50) devoted to showing the inadequacies of the historical-critical method and the importance of a synchronic reading. Part 2 addresses postmodernist challenges: Taking glossolalia in 1 Corinthians 14 as a point of departure, Watson examines deconstruction as well as the views of such writers as Lyotard and Lindbeck, then argues that Genesis 1 provides a response to "postmodern privileging of particularity, community and narrative" (p. 151). The third part deals with feminist critique, and the fourth tries "to formulate in more systematic fashion some of the elements of a *theological hermeneutic*, intended as a framework within which exegesis may proceed" (p. 221).

Throughout this wide-ranging discussion, Watson displays an enviable grasp of the subject matter. He seems equally at home providing close exegetical readings of both OT and NT passages, assessing the significance of complex philosophical concepts, or developing theological critiques. The breadth of his interests may be gauged by his surprising use of John Owen's *Pneumatology* (pp. 237–239) in support of the thesis that secular insights can assist the Christian community in its understanding of Scripture. Not that the connection is obvious. While Reformed theology, through the principle of common grace, has characteristically stressed that much truth is to be found in the world at large, one must protest Watson's attempt to align Owen with the view that Christian beliefs and practices may "require critical reappraisal or outright rejection" (p. 240). In the context of the book as a whole, it is clear that Watson has in mind not only the post-Biblical Church tradition but also some explicit Biblical teachings, whereas Owen's most basic commitments are inextricably tied to the infallibility of Scripture.

Similarly, one has to be skeptical of Watson's appeals to Luther in support of the view that, since Scripture "both repels and attracts" (p. 232), we must sometimes resist the plain meaning of the Bible not because it "is a simple misunderstanding but because the authority of the gospel is greater than the authority of the text" (p. 234). If these comments sound like wishful thinking, consider his use of the law-promise contrast in Galatians 3 as the theological justification for transcending the Biblical text: "Whatever the difficulties posed by Pauline elaborations of this theme, the framework seems worth preserving over against both the biblicism which will always seek to mute any protest that is raised against the texts, and the hardening of that protest into a comprehensive rejection which permits the salvaging only of a few fragments" (p. 191).

One begins to suspect that Watson's proposal requires an allegorical reading of the Biblical material. This suspicion is strengthened by his handling of the parable of the prodigal son in Luke 15: "To the elder brother, the Father has been the patriarch concerned primarily with the acquisition, preservation and transmission of property. To the profligate younger brother, the father manifests his own profligacy as one who cares nothing for the doubtful privileges of patriarchal status" (p. 211; capitalization his). Then a couple of chapters later, after a rather fanciful treatment of Mark 5:1–20 (e.g. p. 249: "Jesus' word of command initiates his cure by differentiating between the man and the unclean spirit, just as the divine creative word separated the light and the dry land from the dark, watery abyss"), he explicitly commends the allegorical method: "If an over-reliance on allegorizing interpretation leads towards docetism, then an over-emphasis on historical particularity results in ebionite impoverishment" (p. 251). (Incidentally, as this last quotation illustrates, Watson throughout the book makes generous use of heretical labels to describe positions he dislikes.

This practice has of course become very common among some theological writers, presumably because it imparts an almost scientific tone to the analysis, but in my opinion it is unhealthy rhetoric. If Watson believes there really is an analogy between strict historical readings and Ebionite theology, he should demonstrate it.)

What is truly sad about Watson's approach is that, in his desire to preserve the authority of Scripture, he seems unaware of how these allegorical readings allow him to impose on the Biblical text modern constructs that are fundamentally at odds with the faith commitments of the Biblical writers themselves. In effect, Watson never directly asks the tough epistemological question: What acts as final authority for him? The obvious answer is his own critical reason, which includes a set of modern ethical sensibilities. The canonical Scriptures are thus "normative" for him only in a very lame sense, that is, only to the extent that they support and confirm his own judgments, which themselves are heavily conditioned (more than he realizes, perhaps) by the secular social standards of our day. I would not want to deny that Watson allows Scripture to challenge his assumptions and that therefore it functions for him as one of several sources of "authority." But whether such an epistemology can claim continuity with the prophetic "Thus saith the Lord" or with the dominical "The Scriptures cannot be broken" is another question altogether.

For all my reservations, I wish to stress that the volume contains a host of provocative and useful observations that deserve serious reflection (e.g. his comments on the conflict between historical criticism and the theological perspective, p. 32; his unnerving analysis of Joseph as a self-aggrandizing, counter-Exodus figure, pp. 66 ff.; his trenchant criticism of approaches that tend to "depotentiate" the text through contextualization, pp. 161 ff.). Moreover, one must give full weight to his concluding discussion, which includes this statement regarding the Luke 24 narrative: "To speak with sensitivity and insight about its literary artistry, but to refuse to go beyond that, is to evade the stark either-or that this narrative poses to all of its readers. If Christ has not been raised, then this story is worthless, and so too is a faith that corresponds to it (cf. 1 Cor. 15.14)" (pp. 291–292).

Anyone interested in hermeneutics, particularly as it relates to the theological task, ought to read this book, digest it carefully, and attempt to deal with its challenging proposals.

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

*Biblical Studies and the Shifting of Paradigms, 1850–1914.* Edited by Henning Graf Reventlow and William Farmer. JSOTSup 192. Sheffield: JSOT, 1995, 304 pp., \$45.00.

This volume represents a collection of papers presented at the Bochum symposium (July 20–24, 1992) on conditions that shaped Biblical studies—political, ecclesiastical, educational and theological—in the second half of the 19th century. In particular, several essays explore the changes that state *Interesse* and the *Kulturkampf* effected in Biblical studies. With these objects in mind, the symposium focused, in the main, upon H. J. Holtzmann and the rise of Markan priority as an illustration of these changes.

The volume revolves around a debate between the editors which is laid out in two articles: Farmer's "State *Interesse* and Markan Primacy: 1870–1914" (pp. 15–49) and Reventlow's "Conditions and Presuppositions of Biblical Criticism in Germany in the Period of the Second Empire and Before: The Case of Heinrich Julius Holtzmann"

(pp. 272–290). Farmer, well-known for his resurrection of Matthean priority, puts forth the thesis that H. J. Holtzmann obtained his prestigious post at Strasbourg not on the basis of his scholarship but because of Bismarck's influence. Bismarck, Farmer argues, saw in Holtzmann's explication of Markan priority an opportunity to further the religious unification of Jews, Protestants and Roman Catholics. Bismarck willingly tampered in university affairs (*Interesse*), because religious unity was a prerequisite for German political unity. Reventlow takes issue with Farmer and presents documentation that Holtzmann was awarded his post at the expense of a "troubled conscience" on the part of Bismarck.

Farmer's thesis suffers because he begins with the sociological presupposition that all thought (including Markan priority) is the product of current sociological and political conditions. Markan priority, however, was as much a product of German intellectual history as it was of sociopolitical conditions. Among other things, the *Aufklärung*, romanticism and the rise in historical consciousness all played central roles in the radical paradigm shifts that ascended in 19th-century Germany. Despite this basic methodological error, Farmer has portrayed the *Kulturkampf* in clear terms and has a profound grasp of the hermeneutical consequences of Markan priority. Both articles repay careful reading by students and specialists alike.

In keeping with the nature of any collection, the other essays are of mixed quality. A few articles offer nothing new. David Peabody's essay on the Strasbourg school, "H. J. Holtzmann and his European Colleagues" (pp. 50–131), is nothing more than an abbreviated updating of H. U. Meijboom's dissertation from 1866 (in English since 1993). Similarly, Christian Simon's contribution, "History as a Case-Study of the Relations between University Professors and the State in Germany" (pp. 169–196), is a restatement of previous research. Hans Rollmann describes the role of an influential Roman Catholic layman in the *Kulturkampf*: "Baron Friedrich von Hügel and the Conveyance of German Protestant Biblical Criticism in Roman Catholic Modernism" (pp. 197–222). Friedrich W. Graf provides an excellent summary of the theology of Strauss in "The Old Faith in the New: The Late Theology of D. F. Strauss" (pp. 223–245). The one paper that simply does not fit the themes of the volume is R. E. Clements' article on H. H. Milman's *History of the Jews* (1829).

Two other articles deserve special mention. Gunter Scholtz attempted an invaluable study of the historiographical basis upon which different theological ideas and systems of the period stand ("The Notion of Historicism and 19th Century Theology," pp. 149–167). His portrait of 19th-century historicism is clear, accurate and carefully qualified. Unfortunately, his association of theological ideas with different conceptions of historicism does little more than "plug in" general observations made by Ernst Troeltsch. For example, Scholtz identifies romantic and conservative historicism as two outworkings of a single conception. He fails, however, to demonstrate how this is so. An ideal example at this point would have been the symmetry between Wilhelm de Wette's views on revelation and history and those of J. C. K. von Hofmann (an observation that has not been made since Hengstenberg). Apparently Scholtz had no access to English works. Reference to P. Reill's *The German Enlightenment and the Rise of Historicism* and Hans Frei's *The Eclipse of Biblical Narrative* would have rectified the weakness in his presentation. Scholtz' inability to clearly associate theological ideas with differing concepts of historicism muffled what could have been a serious contribution.

The final article of note is H. G. Reventlow's description of the use of the Old Testament in classical liberalism ("The Role of the Old Testament in the German Liberal Protestant Theology of the Nineteenth Century," pp. 132–148). Reventlow carefully threads his way through the distorted maze of idealism, rationalism and romanticism

which made up the classical liberal worldview, and he explores the effect of this multifarious thinking on Old Testament interpretation. Evangelicals will find some shocking similarities to current conservative interpretation.

In conclusion, the subject of these essays opens many lines of inquiry that, to my knowledge, have yet to be explored (e.g. what role, if any, did the *Kulturkampf* play in the rise of ecumenism?). The article by Farmer and the two by Reventlow pay the biggest dividends to the reader, but those interested in the synoptic problem or the history of Biblical interpretation will also find much of interest.

William A. Tooman  
Madison, WI

*Cracking Old Testament Codes*. Edited by D. Brent Sandy and Ronald L. Giese, Jr. Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 1995, 298 pp., \$24.99 paper.

Much has been written in the last two decades about literary genres within the Bible among scholarly works and in general hermeneutical texts. This is the first book to address OT genres in a thorough and readable manner for a general audience. Sandy and Giese have brought together 16 scholars to write on ten different literary forms found in the OT and to speak to other issues which arise, especially for the person who is new to the field.

Ronald Giese begins the book by defining *genre* and providing an overview of how to approach literary forms. What is clear in this chapter and throughout the book is that genres are dynamic and not static classification systems. Yet what also emerges is the importance of recognizing different forms in order to understand the Bible properly.

After another general discussion in chap. 2 by Branson Woodard and Michael Travers ("Literary Forms and Interpretation"), John Feinberg, in chap. 3, discusses the necessity of genre in any communication and, therefore, the necessity of its use as God communicates his word to people. This chapter is an excellent treatment of how genre relates to inspiration. Feinberg argues that God not only used different human genres in his revelatory acts to mankind but also inspired his writers to do the same. Since God accommodated his communication to human forms, this implies the perspicuity of Scripture. In his characteristically lucid and syllogistic style, Feinberg calms many fears that some may have when it comes to genre discussion.

The one small critique which could be offered about the first three chapters would be that there is too much repetition of discussion about the definition of what a genre is and the overall approach to genre study.

In chaps. 4–13 various OT scholars (Kaiser, Merrill, Averbek, VanGemenen, Butler, Abegg, Longman, Barker, Hildebrandt, Hill) define and give guidance for interpreting ten different genres. These include narrative, history, law, oracles of salvation, announcements of judgment, apocalyptic, lament, praise, proverb and nonproverbial wisdom. Each chapter is very thorough in describing the genre and in giving guidelines for how to interpret it. Some very helpful elements include the treatment of a sample passage in each chapter and a bibliography suggesting books for delving further into each form.

Here are a few of the highlights within these chapters. Chapters 4–5 do a good job of delineating the differences and similarities between narrative and history. Eugene Merrill includes a helpful discussion in chap. 5 of how OT history compares with other history of its general time frame. In chap. 6 Richard Averbek outlines how treaties

and royal grants differ and discusses the relation of OT law material to ancient Near Eastern law codes. Trent C. Butler assists the pastor in chap. 8 to avoid the pitfall of naively following the model of the OT prophet without understanding the complete picture of the prophets. In chap. 9 D. Brent Sandy and Martin Abegg help the reader navigate through the difficult apocalyptic genre with what may be one of the best short treatments of this topic available.

Two areas could be strengthened within this section. To begin with, the treatment of how OT law applies to Christians could be expanded, since this is always a difficult issue for the contemporary believer. Connected to this, Averbek asserts that any distinction between universal and absolute laws is unwarranted because the original authors never intended such a distinction. This may be true; however, when one is discussing how these laws apply to Christians, the NT must be consulted, and it does make distinctions between laws and how they presently apply (compare Matt 22:37–40, Col 2:16–19, and Hebrews 8–10). The second area is found in Kenneth Barker's discussion of parallelism. Little mention is made of the most current thought on how to interpret parallelism. Due to its importance and frequency in the OT, this would have been helpful.

The book ends with a chapter by Walter B. Russell addressing preachers and teachers. It emphasizes why and how genres should be addressed from the pulpit and lectern. This is a very helpful discussion because, as Russell asserts, very few pastors especially consider different literary forms within their interpretation or within their preaching. The negative results are often evident.

This book ought to be on the shelves of as many professors and pastors as possible. Not only does it provide a helpful hermeneutical tool for the college and seminary student, but it also provides a helpful resource for the person who has the great privilege of standing before God's people and expounding his truth. Its contribution will be one of refining hermeneutical skills and aiding in correctly handling the word of truth.

Thomas J. Barnes  
Orchard Evangelical Free Church, Orchard, NE

*A Survey of Old Testament Introduction.* By Gleason L. Archer, Jr. 3d ed. Chicago: Moody, 1994, 608 pp., \$26.99. *An Introduction to the Old Testament.* By Raymond B. Dillard and Tremper Longman, III. Grand Rapids: Zondervan 1994, 473 pp., \$24.99.

These two OT introductions are at the same time both similar and very different. They are similar in that the writers of both books claim to approach their task from a conservative or evangelical perspective (Archer: "This book adheres to a consistently conservative or evangelical viewpoint," p. 11; Dillard and Longman: "This introduction represents a Protestant and evangelical approach to the text," p. 19). They are similar in that both books discuss the date and authorship as well as the historical background and general content of each book of the Old Testament, which, of course, is to be expected from a book of this genre. The books are also similar in their general purpose of acquainting "the reader with information that is important to know in order to read the books of the Old Testament with understanding" (Dillard and Longman, p. 17).

The books differ in that Archer's revision of his earlier work still carries the basic structure and emphases of its original edition (1964, reviewed in *JETS* 8 [1965] 36–37), while Dillard and Longman's volume is a completely new work reflecting the

concerns and issues of a new generation of Biblical scholars (Archer's new edition includes some revision of the second edition's text, plus the addition of numerous two-color charts, maps, pictures and excursuses, as well as updated bibliographies and footnotes). While Archer treats both general (text and canon) and special (individual OT books) introduction, Dillard and Longman limit their volume to special introduction. In a further departure from the traditional format of OT introductions Dillard and Longman do not confine their discussion of each OT book to the themes of authorship, historical background and literary analysis but include a section on theological message as well. In the sections on literary analysis, Dillard and Longman place a much greater emphasis than Archer on genre identification and form-critical investigation, as well as on informing the reader of literary features and rhetorical devices found in OT writings (e.g. irony, key words, point of view, plot, satire, type scenes). The section on the theological message highlights the theological themes found in each book and relates them to their ongoing significance in NT revelation in a section designated "Approaching the New Testament." This new feature of Dillard and Longman's introduction is particularly helpful in alerting the student to the meaning and significance of each OT book in the context of the entire Bible.

Other significant differences between these two introductions will become quite apparent to even the casual reader. Archer's volume is polemical in its treatment of critical positions on source analysis and authorship, particularly as this relates to Pentateuchal criticism and the late dating of the second part of Isaiah and the book of Daniel. In this connection Archer's volume clearly displays an apologetic intent. In speaking of "liberal scholarship" Archer says (p. 12): "This edition of our work will serve to bring out the basic fallacies of their attacks upon God's Word, and reassure the Church of the supernatural and utterly trustworthy authority of the Holy Scriptures." Dillard and Longman's volume is much more irenic in its discussion of these issues, and their conclusions are often different from Archer's. Dillard and Longman say that many of the issues that have divided evangelical and critical scholars in the past continue to do so today, but "we appear to be entering a new era of communication and mutual respect about which we can all be grateful. This introduction will depart from many of the well-entrenched conclusions of critical study, but it will do so *with respect and not with rancor*" (p. 19; italics mine).

Archer's volume contains a detailed and useful critical analysis of the classic documentary source theory of the composition of the Pentateuch as advocated by Julius Wellhausen and his followers (pp. 89–189). Dillard and Longman treat this material in only a few pages (pp. 40–42, 44–47). It is clear that Dillard and Longman have concluded that the time of traditional source criticism is past. Yet, while Dillard and Longman may be correct in predicting the demise of traditional source criticism, the date of "D" and of the materials traditionally ascribed to "P" certainly remain matters of much discussion. And, while the cutting edge of scholarship may be focused more on other matters, the traditional JEDP theory of the origin of the Pentateuch is still presented as one of the "assured results" of enlightened scholarship in many textbooks and popular Bible handbooks that have widespread use today. Assumption of the general validity of the classic documentary source analysis of the Pentateuch also underlies the work of many currently influential OT scholars as, for example, Gerhard von Rad and Brevard Childs. So, on this issue, Archer's full discussion of the JEDP theory provides an important complement to the kinds of literary issues that are more fully discussed in Dillard and Longman.

Other matters on which the two books differ include the following: (1) Archer argues strongly for the Mosaic authorship of Deuteronomy (pp. 105–108, 274–283), with the exception of the appended obituary of Moses in chap. 34, while Dillard and Longman, although providing a useful resume of various positions advanced for the date of the

book, offer little in the way of their own conclusion. "There is no clear consensus on most issues surrounding Deuteronomy" (p. 97).

(2) Archer rejects the concept of a deuteronomistic history in which the final composition of Joshua-Kings is dated to the exilic period. Archer dates each of these books reasonably close to the times that they describe (Joshua, shortly after the death of Joshua, p. 286; Judges, early in the monarchy, pp. 301-303; Samuel, prior to 722 BC, p. 313; Kings, early in the exile, p. 319). Dillard and Longman appear to adopt some version of a "Deuteronomistic History" theory that includes late editorial if not compositional activity on all of the material included in Joshua-Kings. They note that Kings is "marked by the same theological themes and vocabulary that characterized Joshua-Samuel and *these books together with Kings should be thought of as a single literary work*" (p. 152; italics mine). On Joshua: "While one may reject the negative skepticism of the more critical approaches, a distinction is still necessary between the date of sources and the later editor(s) who produced the book in its present form. The book does share the viewpoint of the Deuteronomist History (Joshua-Kings) and *could reflect some compositional or editorial work as late as the exilic editor of Kings (2 Kings 25:27-30)*" (p. 112; italics mine). With respect to Judges, Dillard and Longman comment: "The internal evidence of the books therefore suggests a setting sometime shortly after the schism and *possibly as late as the sixth century B.C.*" (p. 121; italics mine).

(3) Archer vigorously defends the Isaianic authorship of the entire book of Isaiah. Dillard and Longman suggest that chaps. 40-66 were written in the exilic period prior to Israel's release from captivity under Cyrus. Evidences for unity of the book of Isaiah, which have long been cited by conservative scholars, are viewed by Dillard and Longman as deriving from redactional unity rather than from the hand of a single author. Dillard and Longman argue that in principle this is to recognize nothing different than conservative scholars are ready to accept with the non-Mosaic authorship of Deuteronomy 34 (the account of Moses' death). They comment: "Recognizing that the setting of Deuteronomy 34 requires an author living later than Moses, the author traditionally assigned to the book, is not materially different from recognizing that the background of Isaiah 40-66 presumes an author living during the Exile" (p. 275). In taking this position Dillard and Longman maintain that "prophetic inspiration is not thereby eliminated" and that the "question of the authorship of Isaiah probably should not be made a theological shibboleth (Judg. 12:6) or test for orthodoxy" (p. 275).

(4) Archer strongly defends the historicity of the book of Jonah. He concludes his analysis (pp. 343-349) of this question with the statement that "one cannot reject the historicity of Jonah without also rejecting the authority of Christ" (p. 349). Dillard and Longman reject this argument, and claim that "the question is irrelevant to the interpretation of the book" (p. 393). Their own conclusion is that it is not possible "to be dogmatic either way" (p. 392).

These are but a few of the important matters on which differences of approach and conclusion can be found between Archer and Dillard and Longman. There is not space in this review to discuss numerous other matters on which the writers go in different directions. Dillard and Longman raise many questions that need further discussion and clarification within the evangelical community. One important matter that surfaces repeatedly in Dillard and Longman's treatment of the composition of OT books is that of the fluidity of the OT text. For example in discussing the composition of Hosea, Dillard and Longman comment: "It is not impossible that later faithful followers of the prophet's tradition saw the analogy between the situation in the south some decades after the prophet's death and made the connection by inserting Judean concerns into the text. This may account for the occasionally awkward occurrences of Judah in the text. *Such additions would be part of the process of composition of the biblical book and do not in any way impugn the canonical authority of these texts* (roughly

similar to the updatings found in the Pentateuch [pp. 39–41])” (p. 355; italics mine). In their discussion of Daniel, Dillard and Longman comment: “This chapter will proceed on the basis of the view that Daniel, a sixth-century figure, was the subject and author of the book that bears his name. *This view does not rule out the possibility that some later unnamed disciples framed his speeches or even added some or all of the third-person stories.* However, it does exclude the idea that the predictive prophecies were given ‘after the fact’” (p. 332; italics mine). Similar statements are made with respect to the Psalms (p. 213), Jeremiah (p. 292) and Isaiah (see above). This question readily spills over into textual criticism and questions concerning the relationship of text types in the OT.

Both of these volumes are the product of very competent participants in the ongoing study and analysis of OT literature. Comparison of the differences in approach and conclusions reached highlights the breadth of the spectrum of thought within the evangelical community on specific issues in the analysis of OT literature, and how much work remains to be done if any consensus is to be reached.

J. Robert Vannoy  
Biblical Theological Seminary, Hatfield, PA

*Reading Between Texts: Intertextuality and the Hebrew Bible.* Edited by D. N. Fewell. Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1992, 285 pp., \$21.99.

“Intertextuality” has been an important literary concept particularly since the work of Julia Kristeva in the late 1960s. As D. N. Fewell describes it in her opening chapter, intertextuality recognizes the relationship of a text with many other texts. “Texts are always spilling over into other texts” (p. 23). Now the fact that literary texts have a relationship is nothing really new, but the contemporary use of intertextuality says nothing about literary borrowing or dependence. Indeed, a text may not be treated as an isolated entity; it resonates with the spirit of a myriad of other texts. The chronology of texts does not matter; it is possible to study an earlier text in the light of a late text. Note Miscal’s essay, where he asserts the relative dating of Genesis and Isaiah is a matter of indifference as he reads the latter in the light of the former. To interpret a text, therefore, is not to find meaning in a fixed entity, since any one text will draw the reader to many other texts. Indeed, interpretation in the minds of the most radical advocates of intertextuality becomes a suspect venture, since meaning is not determinate.

The volume under review applies this concept to a number of passages in the Bible, and it must be remarked from the very start that there are differences as well as similarities among advocates of an intertextual reading of Biblical texts. This volume does an admirable job, though perhaps not intentionally, in providing examples of these different approaches.

Most of the essays are quite tame, and I mean this as a compliment. That is, they recognize a relationship of some sort (literary pattern usually) between two, three or more Biblical texts and then read the object of their textual attentions in the light of the relationship. For instance, Fewell notes that Esther and Daniel bear similarities. They are both “a foreigner in court, co-opted for service to the oppressor. Daniel, like Esther, undergoes extensive ‘reprogramming’ and training before being introduced to the king. He, like Esther, eventually becomes the king’s ‘favorite’” (p. 150). Ellen Davis reads the book of Job in the light of the fact that Jacob and Job are the only Biblical characters called *tām* (a term whose meaning she examines at some length).

These studies are extremely provocative and interesting. They stimulate thinking about the relationship between different texts. Indeed, I would argue that in its more moderate form intertextuality describes the kind of work that Biblical theologians who follow the work of Geerhardus Vos have been doing for decades, on the presupposition that the Bible is an organic whole ultimately authored by God. Such a viewpoint also provides adequate justification for not being overly concerned about the chronological relationship between Biblical texts.

Other intertextual studies are less restrained or text-oriented and are more reader-oriented. Reader-response and ideological readings of Biblical texts have done much to enlighten our understanding of the act of interpretation, but increasingly such an approach has been used to justify moving beyond interpretation to critique of the Biblical texts. Timothy Beal's article "Ideology and Textuality," which takes a focused look at the role of women in Judges, is a good example. In a nutshell, he takes the position that the intertextual nature of literary texts results in a "surplus of meaning" (p. 31) that produces "an indeterminate surplus of meaningful possibilities." He goes on to suggest that we must construct a meaning based on a strategy which contains the meaning based on the ideology of the interpreter. In his case, he likes the feminist ideology of M. Bal, and so simply chooses not to critique that. He is "reluctant to take apart a feminist reading of Judges." Why? Because her sentiments are similar to his own.

This brings us back to a statement in the preface. The editors of the series remark that "interpreters are being challenged to take responsibility for the theological, social, and ethical implications of their readings" (p. 9). This attitude runs throughout a number of essays. But I find myself constantly asking questions that begin with "why" and "how." Ethical responsibility implies ethical norms. What are they? Where do they come from? Why should I be persuaded by them? The volume, though constantly offering ethical implications, seems to assume we will all give our ready assent without asking too many foundational questions. For instance, Beal simply prefers a feminist view, but why should I care what he feels? I may share some sympathy with some of his points, as he shares sympathy with more of Bal's, but what are we doing more than simply affirming our common prejudices while we are fully aware that we are basically undermining what the text fairly clearly states?

This brings me to my last major point. The recognition that texts have a seemingly limitless relationship with other texts has been used to undermine the determinate meaning of those texts. I agree: We can never fully and comprehensively grasp the meaning of a text. But to reject the idea of a full and comprehensive meaning of a text is not to despair of an accurate, adequate, though not exhaustive understanding of a text.

Also, when a text consciously or unconsciously echoes previous texts, one makes a specific use of them. It is well recognized that Mahler, as a composer, utilized many of the musical phrases of his predecessors, but he does so in a way that is uniquely his own. His composition may be studied in its own right without appeal to his predecessors' work, though a knowledge of that work may enrich our understanding of Mahler. This, of course, raises the issue of authorial intention, something which, in nuanced form, I have not given up on yet, though the mainstream of Biblical literary scholars virtually presupposes the death of the author (see my *Literary Approaches to Biblical Interpretation* [Zondervan, 1987]).

The essays of *Reading Between Texts* do much to promote thought about interpretation in general, as well as provide stimulating if not always persuasive readings of particular Biblical texts. I recommend it highly.

Tremper Longman, III  
Westminster Theological Seminary, Philadelphia, PA

*The New Literary Criticism and the Hebrew Bible.* Edited by J. Cheryl Exum and David J. A. Clines. Valley Forge: Trinity Press International, 1993, 276 pp., \$18.00.

Literary criticism continues to exert a powerful influence on the field of Hebrew Bible studies. This volume, edited and written by some of the more adventurous advocates of the literary approach, promises to introduce the reader to examples of the most recent methods utilized by Biblical scholars. These methods, though far from new in the study of secular literature, include Marxist, feminist and psychoanalytic approaches, as well as deconstruction and reader-response. The method advocated by the book as a whole is eclectic as regards these approaches—Alice Bach's contribution on Numbers 5, for instance, utilizes feminist, psychoanalytic and deconstructive strategies of reading—but the essays are united in certain basic understandings of the text.

The editors spell out some of these in their opening essay, simply entitled "The New Literary Criticism." They point out to their more backward colleagues that new criticism, structuralism, and rhetorical criticism are now old criticisms, already obsolete. If they mean that these approaches are already obsolete in terms of mainstream literary theory, they fail to reckon with the fact that deconstruction, especially the formulaic type advocated by the chapters written by Bach and Clines, is also considered obsolete. It is particularly ideological readers, chafing against deconstruction's radically nonreferential attitude toward the text, who have moved the field away from deconstruction as a frivolous approach.

This leads to a second characteristic advocated by the opening chapters: They are text-centered (pp. 13–14), and indeed it is true that each chapter focuses on an actual text. While this sounds like it promises to provide further insight into the text, this is rarely the case in the essays that follow. Two other overarching principles invalidate such a hope. The first is that there is no "determinate meaning" of a text (p. 19). The second is that the essayists for the most part are more interested in "critique" than "interpretation." That is, one of the main interests of the essays is to expose and then undermine the ideologies expressed by the Biblical text. This is most apparent in the feminist essays written by Bach, Exum and Rashkow.

In my opinion the most telling essay is the one written by Clines himself: "A World Established on Water (Psalm 24): Reader-Response, Deconstruction and Bespoke Interpretation." In this essay, he focuses his attention on Psalm 24 by subjecting it to three reading strategies listed in the subtitle to his chapter. What he does with Psalm 24 is actually not as important or as interesting as what he seems to be advocating methodologically, especially under the name of "bespoke interpretation." On the basis of the lack of meaning of Biblical texts and the importance of community acceptance of interpretation, he presents himself as the "bespoke interpreter," based on the analogy with the "bespoke tailor." The "bespoke tailor" (p. 87), he reminds us, cuts the cloth according to the customer's specifications. So, he argues, since there is no determinate meaning, we should tailor our interpretations to meet the needs of the group we are addressing, those who are paying us for our wares (p. 87).

Perhaps this is the logical route to go once one loses faith in any kind of authority of the text, any kind of determinate meaning. It is almost too easy to poke fun at such a view of interpretation, suggesting other, more colorful, but less respectable analogies to someone who manipulates his or her product to bring the best price. But there are other alternatives to Clines. The first is to refuse to base one's presuppositions on the work of the "masters of suspicion" (Marx, Nietzsche and Freud) and instead consider building them on the authoritative text itself. The second is to acknowledge, as Cline does, the absence of meaning in the text, and then to resign oneself to silence.

Perhaps I am being nostalgic for the 1960s, but I find much more noble and honest existentialism's avowal of meaninglessness followed by despair than postmodernism's embrace of meaninglessness followed by play and ideological manipulations of the text.

One might think I would recommend against reading this book. On the contrary, I highly recommend it. In the first place, it shows the brightest minds utilizing the most avant-garde approaches to the text. Second, I often find the most illumination reading treatments of the text with which I disagree. For one thing, it does shake me loose from my own preconceptions. I have learned most from reading feminist writings in this regard.

Tremper Longman, III  
Westminster Theological Seminary, Philadelphia, PA

*God's Design: A Focus on Old Testament Theology*. 2d ed. By Elmer A. Martens. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1994, 320 pp., \$17.99 paper.

The first edition of E. Martens' book (1981) made a significant contribution to the discipline of Biblical theology. This second edition represents the author's careful reflection and response to criticisms of the original publication. It includes new material in the form of two additional chapters, an appendix, and updated footnotes and bibliographic materials.

Martens notes the difficult challenge present in writing a Biblical theology. The sheer diversity of the OT material—its themes and genres—makes it difficult to summarize its contents under a single rubric. Yet, the book's thesis and its primary development remain the same in both editions: "God's design is the key to the content of the Old Testament" (p. 18).

Martens does not focus on a single element or on categories taken from systematic theology. Rather, he combines both a synthetic and a diachronic approach based upon exegesis of the Biblical text. The synthetic aspect employs a grid of four elements for viewing the OT derived primarily from an exegesis of Exod 5:22–6:8. This grid is the basis for Martens' proposition that God's design "is an appropriate and also adequate grid . . . to present the whole of the Old Testament material" (p. 27). This grid includes the following thematic elements: (1) deliverance, (2) community, (3) knowledge of God, and (4) the abundant life. The diachronic aspect of Martens' approach is presented in parts 2–4. Here, each element of the fourfold synthetic model is developed by examining each component diachronically within the three stages of Israel's history: premonarchy, monarchy, and exile and return.

Martens' responses to criticisms of the first edition are contained in part 5, entitled "Framing God's Design." These criticisms were aimed primarily at two areas of perceived weakness. (1) The book's starting point was the exodus, and insufficient attention had been given to creation. (2) The book's tendency to focus on the particular (Israel as a people) had failed to deal adequately with the universal aspects of how the particular relates to the universal (the peoples of the world).

Does Martens achieve his stated purpose and goal? In a large measure, yes. If the quest for a center is legitimate, Martens appears to have come closer to succeeding in stating and explicating a central organizing principle than many of his predecessors. The additions to the second edition effectively answer the criticisms leveled against the first regarding the creation theme and overemphasis on the particular. On the other hand, the fact that *God's Design* does not adequately treat all the major themes (not to mention minor ones) in the OT raises the question of the legitimacy of stating that

there is *one* central organizing principle. For example, though the book contains a very insightful discussion on holy warfare (pp. 66–70), it does not exhaust the significance of this theme—especially from a diachronic viewpoint.

Aside from its stated claim of achieving a center, *God's Design* does represent what may be considered an up-to-date methodology. In contrast to earlier single-theme treatments, its “multitrack” and “longitudinal” (synthetic and diachronic) approach is increasingly receiving significant emphasis within contemporary scholarship. *God's Design*, especially with the improvements of the second edition, stands as a significant and important contribution to the discipline of OT theology. It serves as a very useful tool for understanding the theological development of the OT with respect to the four-fold thematic grid.

The book also effectively targets a wide audience—from pastors, teachers and laypersons in the church to college, university and seminary students. And appropriately so, because the book is a veritable treasure trove of brilliant exegetical and theological insights, and the treatments are presented in a very interesting, readable format. This book, used in conjunction with theologies which develop other themes, should give the student a deep appreciation for the multiplex, variegated and inexhaustible richness of the Biblical revelation.

Steve Horine  
Calvary Baptist Seminary, Lansdale, PA

*The Messiah in the Old Testament.* By Walter C. Kaiser, Jr. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1995, 256 pp., \$17.99 paper.

As in his *Toward an Old Testament Theology*, Walter Kaiser sees “promise” as the central theme for the understanding of OT theology. He defines the promise as “God’s single unified plan . . . eternal in its fulfillment but climactic in its final accomplishment.”

After dealing with definitions and problems, he goes through the OT describing “sixty-five direct predictions of the Messiah in the promise doctrine”: six in the Pentateuch, four in Job, five in the times of Samuel and David (including Psalms 89 and 132), eleven in other psalms and thirty-nine in the prophets.

I appreciate his conservative position reflecting plenary verbal inspiration and accepting the ninth-century date of Joel and the eighth-century date for the entire Book of Isaiah. He is well aware of the conclusions of liberals with respect to the Messiah in the OT and answers them from the context of the Bible itself.

Chapter 2 shows that messianic titles in the Pentateuch (“Seed,” “Shiloh,” “Scepter,” “Star,” “King” and “Prophet”) are generic terms that provide for the inclusion, not only of a group, but of “the one who represents the whole group.” The context that provides for messianic meaning is discussed in each case. Central attention is given to the repeated Abrahamic prediction (Gen 12:1–3, etc.), pointing out that the two Hebrew forms (niph'al and hithpa'el) of the verb “to bless” (as O. T. Allis showed) should be considered as passive, stressing that the nations are blessed by God (and did not “bless themselves”).

Chapter 3 deals with the theme of royal messianism and the “germ of a priestly messianism.” Kaiser discusses Nathan’s prophecy and its seven main provisions, showing David’s reaction as seen in 2 Samuel and in the Psalms. In chaps. 4 and 5 he describes why he agrees with J. Barton Payne that 13 different psalms constitute “the

greatest single block of predictive matter concerning the Savior to be found anywhere in the Old Testament.”

The remainder of the book deals with messianic prophecies in the prophets, chap. 8 dealing with Isaiah as “one of the most prolific announcers of the Messiah and his times.” He argues for “a now and not-yet” fulfillment of Isa 7:14, taking the near fulfillment to be the birth of King Hezekiah. In the servant songs (Isa 42:1–7; 49:1–6; 50:4–9; 52:13–53:12) Kaiser argues that “the servant is an individual who has a mission to Israel and the nations” and that “when all these passages are put together, that individual turns out to be the Messiah.”

Kaiser’s chief contention is that the evidence for an apologetic case for the Messiah in the OT is overwhelming when the texts are taken on their “own terms without any Western assumptions laid on top” of them. He distinguishes between fulfillments that took place in connection with the first coming of Jesus and those to be fulfilled at his second coming. Kaiser also rejects “replacement theology” and recognizes that the “promise plan” of God includes further fulfillment in the millennium for both the nation of Israel and the Church. In his view “God has not withdrawn his promise to give the land to Israel, to return them back to that territory, or to place one of David’s descendants on his throne in Zion.”

The book brings no real surprises to those who are familiar with Kaiser’s previous works. However, it is worth reading for it gives detailed Biblical encouragement to the vast majority of Bible-believing Christians who know Jesus Christ as their Lord and Savior and who believe he is the fulfillment of OT prophecies and the person on whom our blessed hope of the future focuses.

Stanley M. Horton  
Springfield, MO