

BOOK REVIEWS

Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament: Vol. 7 (לִי-ט). Edited by G. J. Botterweck, H. Ringgren and H.-J. Fabry. Translated by D. E. Green. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995, xxv + 552 pp., \$45.00; *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament: Vol. 8* (לִי-ט). Edited by G. J. Botterweck, H. Ringgren and H.-J. Fabry. Translated by D. W. Stott. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997, xxiv + 560 pp., \$45.00.

This standard reference tool (known as *TDOT*) continues to appear by fits and starts, following the German edition by several years. By now, readers of this *Journal* will be well acquainted with this series (see the reviews of vol. 1 in *JETS* 18.3 [1975] 203–205 and of vol. 6 in *JETS* 38.2 [1995] 253–254), and vols. 7 and 8 bring no major surprises. The quality of the articles remains consistently high. The series also retains its non-evangelical stance on critical issues (although it appears that a few more evangelical works appear in the bibliographies—and even in the articles themselves—than previously). The editorial quality control is remarkably consistent for a series that first began appearing in English in 1974, although inevitably individual articles focus now on one aspect of a word (e.g. ancient Near Eastern backgrounds) and now on another (e.g. on semantic fields). The troublesome early transliteration system, whereby ז was represented by “*ts*” (not *s*) and ש by “*sh*” (not *š*), etc., happily was dropped with the appearance of vol. 5 in 1986. Volume 7 has 75 articles by 43 different contributors, while vol. 8 has 76 articles by 44 contributors; 27 scholars have contributions in both volumes. By comparison, vols. 1–3 average 56 articles by 38 contributors. This difference is primarily because of the longer length of the later volumes; the selectivity has not changed appreciably.

As before, the articles here consider the etymology of words, but they do not lean overly much on etymology to ascertain meaning. Attention occasionally is paid to the LXX translations, and more attention is devoted to the usage of words in the Dead Sea Scrolls; however, pseudepigraphical and rabbinic literature is almost completely ignored (a notable exception is the article on “Leviathan”).

Articles fall into three categories: (1) Those that are devoted to single words or lexemes (e.g. *kābā* “extinguish”; *kōah* “strength, power”; *khd* “conceal, destroy”); (2) those treating groupings of words derived from the same lexeme (e.g. *kʾb*, *kēʾēb*, *makʾōb* “suffering, pain”; *kūn*, *kēn*, *mākôn*, *mēkônâ*, *tēkūnâ* “prepare, establish, place”); and (3) those dealing with groupings of words that approximate a true semantic field conception, i.e. groupings of closely related (but different) words and lexemes (e.g. *kebeš*, *kešēb*, *kibśâ*, *kiśbâ*, *seh* “sheep”; *kāšap*, *kešep*, *kaššāp*, *ʾaššāp*, *yiddēʿōnî*, *lāhaš*, *laḥaš*, *nāhaš*, *naḥaš*, *ʿanan*, *šāhar* “magic”). This last type of entry, which best represents current linguistic theory, is relatively rare, however. Sometimes the semantic field is given within the article itself, but this is not regularly done. It should be noted that the German edition has running indexes to all the words treated, but the English edition does not. These are essential to an adequate study of true semantic fields, and the publisher would be remiss if it did not produce a comprehensive index at the end of the project. (It did so for *TDNT*, so there is no reason to expect otherwise for this companion series.)

A random sampling of vol. 7 yields the following highlights: Thorough treatments of important words such as *kābēd* “be heavy, honor” and *kābôd* “power, honor, glory” and their cognates; *kōhēn* “priest”; *kissē*⁷ “throne”; *kipper* and its cognates “cover, forgive, atone” (although Milgrom’s views are set aside with only a brief, dismissive comment; p. 294); and *lēb* “heart.” Also helpful are the in-depth treatments of seemingly insignificant particles *k-* “as, like” and its cognates and *kōl* “all, every.” Often, it is in careful attention to such small lexemes that significant bits of information are yielded.

This is the standard reference tool in OT studies for in-depth word studies, and it undoubtedly will remain so for decades. It is well conceived and well executed in the main. A new work that will take its place alongside *TDOT* is the five-volume *New International Dictionary of Old Testament Theology and Exegesis*, edited by Willem VanGemeren (Zondervan, 1997). It is a slightly more ambitious counterpart to the four-volume *New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology*, edited by Colin Brown. It will provide a more affordable—and more evangelical—alternative to *TDOT*. However, for its scope, depth and erudition, *TDOT* remains indispensable for any in-depth study of Hebrew words and word fields.

David M. Howard, Jr.

New Orleans Baptist Theological Seminary, New Orleans, LA

Hebrew Bible Insert: A Student’s Guide to the Syntax of Biblical Hebrew. By Frederic Clarke Putnam. Quakertown: Stylus Publishing, 1996, 63 pp., n.p.

This convenient and able summary of Biblical Hebrew syntax, designed to fit into the small edition of the *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia*, is a kind of portable miniature of Waltke and O’Connor’s *Biblical Hebrew Syntax*. But in addition to the syntactical discussion, it also includes a brief explanation of the Hebrew accents, paradigms of nouns and verbs, a glossary of terms and a bibliography.

The explanation of verbal functions is up-to-date and clear, taking advantage of modern linguistic theory without the obfuscation of its technical jargon. The discussion of clauses demonstrates an awareness of recent breakthroughs in that area. The interpretation of noun functions does not acknowledge the three cases, which, in this reviewer’s opinion, remain a meaningful interpretative paradigm (cf. Waltke-O’Connor, chaps. 8–10). The various categories throughout are illustrated with relevant and clearly presented Hebrew examples.

One notes in the English translations attending the Hebrew examples an occasional submerging of data in the original that, it seems to me, deserve more extensive treatment. (This is not unique to the *Hebrew Bible Insert*, however; it is pervasive in many modern translations, with notable exceptions like the NRSV.) For example, in section 2.2.4, the reader is told that a verb in the volitive mood may follow an introductory imperative of, say, *hlk*, “which should be translated only if the context shows that [it is] meant literally.” Then Ps 95:1 is offered as an illustration, with the following English rendering: *lkw nrrnh lyhwh* (“Let us shout for joy to YHWH!”). Is Psalm 95 not the *Venite*, after all? How one interprets a syntactical function, on the one hand, and how one’s translation represents the Hebrew textual data, on the other hand, are related but separate questions. I remain unconvinced of the wisdom of simply deleting something included in the Hebrew text, just because modern sensibilities are not satisfied that it was “meant literally.” After all, *lkw* (“come”) is really there in the text, and it was not required to yield the sense, “Let us shout for joy to YHWH!” While the profound questions of translation philosophy entailed here cannot be addressed in a book review, let the plea be offered that we not impatiently sandpaper

smooth the abrupt, ornate and repetitious texture of the original. The Hebrew text is not a technical, scientific linguistic equation. It is a work of art. And surface structures, where the aesthetic qualities often reside, deserve better than translational sandpaper.

That concern aside, the *Hebrew Bible Insert* will be useful to all readers of the OT except those who have its labyrinthine syntactical arcana already memorized. It makes the Hebrew text more accessible while upholding a proper standard of academic integrity. The author is to be commended for his contribution, and one wishes for this booklet a wide distribution in seminary classrooms.

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

A Cumulative Index to the Grammar and Syntax of Biblical Hebrew. By Frederic Clarke Putnam. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1996, 338 pp., \$24.50.

The *Index* compiles and collates Scripture citations from 14 reference works on the grammar and syntax of Biblical Hebrew. Seven English works and seven German works are referenced.

The English works include Davidson's *Hebrew Syntax*, Gibson's *Davidson's Introductory Hebrew Grammar-Syntax*, Kautzsch's *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar*, Waltke and O'Connor's *Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax*, Joüon's *Grammar of Biblical Hebrew*, Rosenthal's *Grammar of Biblical Aramaic* and Williams' *Hebrew Syntax*.

The German works include Bauer and Leander's *Historische Grammatik der hebräischen Sprache des Alten Testaments*, Beer's *Hebräische Grammatik*, Brockelmann's *Hebräische Syntax*, Richter's *Grundlagen einer althebräischen Grammatik*, Jenni's *Lehrbuch der hebräischen Sprache des Alten Testaments* and Schneider's *Grammatik des biblischen Hebräisch: Lehrbuch*.

The *Index* follows the order of Biblical books in *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia*. Scripture references from English works are cited first, then German. The style of citation in the *Index* matches that of the work being cited. References to more than one verse are listed in ascending order. A key to the abbreviations for works cited is located at the bottom of each page of the *Index*. This is a feature I found especially user-friendly. A potential weakness, acknowledged by the author, is errors and omissions in citations.

The value of this tool is apparent. The seminary student working through an exegesis of an OT passage will find the *Index* a thorough and timesaving tool. The pastor who wishes to make use of his Hebrew in an efficient manner will find the *Index* very helpful.

Loren Lineberry
Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, Deerfield, IL

Whose Bible is it Anyway? By Philip R. Davies. JSOTSup 204. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1995, 150 pp., \$40.00.

The thesis of this alluring little book is simple. Davies argues that there are two fundamental strategies for reading Biblical texts, the confessional method and the

nonconfessional. According to the confessional method the ultimate task of the interpreter is to affirm the values and claims made by the text itself. The nonconfessional method, on the other hand, evaluates the text and accepts or rejects its claims at the discretion of the individual reader. In his first chapter, Davies attempts to persuade us that these two “reading strategies” are “so fundamentally divergent as to require and imply *separate disciplines*” (p. 13, italics original).

Working out the details of this thesis, however, is not simple. Latent in these two approaches are a number of beliefs and assumptions that invariably lead interpreters onto one path or the other. What is a Bible? Whose Bible is it? How does it refer? How did it originate? Davies’ book is a forthright attempt to describe and defend some of the nonconfessional answers to these questions and an attempt to illustrate resulting interpretations in a number of OT texts. To what end, the reader asks? To demonstrate that the confessional and nonconfessional approaches are mutually exclusive, and to exhibit that nonconfessional reading strategies are “no less ethically and intellectually challenging” than confessional reading strategies (p. 16).

Chapters 2 and 3 are dedicated to defining positions, methods and terminology. Davies draws critical distinctions between the interpretive goals of “church and academy,” “theology and non-theology,” and “Bible study and biblical studies.” Each of these approaches is dedicated to a particular conception of Scripture. Davies articulates the precise differences in their Bibliological models and teases out ideological conflicts between such appellatives as “Bible,” “bible,” “scripture,” and “canon.” For himself, Davies defends a purely historical view of the origin and sociological functions of the Bible. Included in these chapters are some highly perceptive criticisms of B. S. Childs and F. Watson that should not be overlooked.

The heart of the argument in these chapters is drawn from Gadamer’s and Ricoeur’s theories of discourse. All discourses, Davies argues, communicate by utilizing a set of conventions agreed upon by the participants. Discourse, by its very nature, conveys or implies a certain ideological bias shared by those who use the same discourse. Everyone has a discourse. It is unavoidable. As a result, communication between people who do not share the same discourse will break down to one degree or another.

This conflict of discourses has often been characterized with the terms “etic” and “emic.” Etic discourse occurs when the two sides of a dialogue do not share the same ideological code. Emic discourse occurs between ideologically compatible partners. Because the confessional and nonconfessional methods have different ideologies (i.e. discourse between them is etic), they lack compatibility and cannot communicate fully.

Chapters 4–7 are less creative and forceful. They illustrate Davies’ nonconfessional approach with interpretive essays on Genesis, the Psalms and Daniel. Each essay uncovers a “sub-text” that stands in radical opposition to the surface text. Davies’ so-called “sub-texts” are typical of the post-modern literature: deceit, oppression, a capricious god and other consciously deconstructive “meanings” emerge.

The beauty of Davies’ book is in his perceptive delineation of presuppositions, assumptions and issues, as well as his exacting clarification of terminology. Throughout, he identifies the unconscious concerns of his readers and ever so reasonably attempts to lay them to rest. His is a sophisticated and carefully articulated seduction.

It is more difficult to pinpoint the book’s weaknesses. The issue at stake is this: Is Scripture the object of criticism by the reader, or is the reader the object of criticism by Scripture?

Davies has certainly clarified the shape of this dispute between the believing and nonbelieving communities. There are, however, two corrections that I would make in Davies’ thesis. The first correction has to do with his use of the misleading terms “confessional” and “non-confessional.” All reading is confessional, and a division cannot

easily be drawn between those communities that recognize the Bible as Scripture and those that do not. Within our confessing community, scholars often evaluate Scripture by dictates external to Scripture itself (e.g. positivism, idealism, common-sense realism, *Heilsgeschichte*). Non-confessional scholars are no different. It is only the articulation of their “confessions” that differs (e.g. pluralism, feminism, rationalism, *Heilsgeschichte*—as confessional history rather than empirical reality).

Davies is not describing reading strategies per se. He is describing the differing *goals* of divergent reading strategies. Is the goal of Biblical interpretation subjection of faith, practice *and methodology* to the nature and dictates of Scripture itself, or is the goal of interpretation exploring and describing the text according to the dictates of another confession?

The second correction is closely related. If Gadamer is correct that only a sympathetic, emic discourse can lead to true comprehension, then it seems impossible to avoid the conclusion that only those who treat the Bible as Scripture stand any chance of apprehending its meaning. Davies convincingly argues that a Scriptural approach and a nonconfessional approach cannot mix. They have different goals and incompatible discourses. However, he also wants to affirm that he can understand the meaning of the Bible as well as anyone. This presupposes that the Bible is an objectified text with a meaning that is equally accessible to everyone. (Surprisingly, Davies does not argue—perhaps by omission—for multiple, nonfalsifiable meanings.) Davies does not consider the possibility that the Bible has a discourse of its own, one that requires faith in its claims and submission to its demands. If the Bible has such a discourse (i.e. it deliberately functions as Scripture), and differing discourses are mutually exclusive, then the community that adapts its own discourse to the discourse of the Bible is the only one that can interact with it meaningfully. (This, in fact, is what the Pietist movement of the 18th century attempted to do, albeit unsuccessfully.)

Scholars from believing and nonbelieving communities alike can stand to reflect more directly on these issues. Evangelicals in particular will find little to their taste in Davies’ examples and illustrations of a nonconfessional approach. Nonetheless, the work deserves to be read for two reasons. First, it is a first-rate (albeit disturbing) encounter with the dominant paradigm in Biblical studies today. Second, we as evangelicals have too often assumed that our interpretive and Biblical-theological models correspond to the nature of Scripture itself, when in fact they are very often nonconfessional in their own right. If this little book can somehow help make this point clear, it will serve our community as well as it undoubtedly will serve Davies’ own “humanistic and agnostic” community (p. 16).

William A. Tooman
University of Wisconsin, Madison, WI

Yesterday, Today and Forever: The Continuing Relevance of the Old Testament. By Larry R. Helyer. Salem: Sheffield, 1996, xii + 459 pp., \$19.95 paper.

Helyer’s contribution to the field of OT survey is as needed as its title suggests and lives up to its purpose: “to stimulate [the] readers’ spiritual tastebuds . . . [and] to whet the appetite for more” (p. vii). I agree with a former seminary professor who, when asked why the teaching of Hebrews and the OT to pastors was necessary, said “so they will love God more.” Helyer has the same practical end in mind and accomplishes it. He explains why his book is a welcome complement to standard survey literature: “[It seeks] to supplement standard OT survey texts by focusing on selected

theological themes . . . [and its aim is] to demonstrate the *significance* and *application* of these themes" (p. vii; italics his). Consequently this is not a survey of OT history or theology but a theological survey of the OT. The author achieves this through a somewhat canonical and chronological overview of passages he selects for their theological significance and application to current evangelicals and events. Any characterization or criticism of a book must, appropriately, focus and be founded on its stated goals.

The methodology Helyer employs is his choice of eight theological themes around which the survey is built and which he says "constitute the essential message of the OT" (p. vii): (1) Creation, (2) Fall and Flood, (3) Promise to the Patriarchs, (4) Exodus and the Sinai Covenant, (5) The Kingdom of God, (6) The Word and the Spirit (Prophecy), (7) Eschatology and (8) Wisdom and Worship. Beyond the formation of this theological perspective and procedure, the author seeks to underscore his claim of the "continuing relevance" of the OT by concluding each of these thematic chapters (nine in all since "the Kingdom" covers two chapters) with a discussion of the binding relationship between its particular theological thread and what he calls "four core truths," to which the student can personally relate and progressively apply the new information from each chapter (see pp. viii–x). These core truths are (1) the unity of God's plan of salvation, (2) faith and politics, (3) faith and the future and (4) faith and ethics. Little is said that is new, but Helyer brings some of the best previously scattered insights together in an innovative and inspirational package. Anyone preaching the OT will benefit from it.

The author's eschatological stance is decidedly in favor of a literal regathering and renewal of Israel in its homeland. As for subjects of an interpretively controversial nature, Helyer is to be commended for clear and concise overviews of opposing interpretive options (e.g. the levitical laws); however, his biases and the constraints of survey lead to an unbalanced presentation of the data when he pushes dogmatically for a particular position on a problem passage (e.g. the "sons of God" in Genesis 6). In such cases he leaves survey proper and begins commentary, which becomes indoctrinational more than instructional when thoroughness is sacrificed. Still the pedagogical profile and purpose of this book are noteworthy. As a seminary educator I appreciate his efforts to make this a true textbook with opening and closing discussion questions for each chapter; and as a missionary I applaud the all-too-rare emphasis on the OT's missiological value. Based on the author's decade of experience with university students, many will find this a useful model for how to do OT survey successfully, although selectively, and spiritually.

W. Creighton Marlowe

Tyndale Theological Seminary, Badhoevedorp, The Netherlands

Old Testament Survey: The Message, Form, and Background of the Old Testament. By William Sanford LaSor, David Allan Hubbard, and Frederic W. Bush. 2d ed. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996, xvii + 860 pp., \$40.00.

The preface to the second edition of this familiar and widely used textbook lists three primary goals for revision. (1) The authors sought a style and format more accessible to college and university students. This goal has been met admirably by simplifying and clarifying the language (e.g. from "not mechanical and stultifying" [1st ed., p. 71] to "not wooden" [2d ed., p. 18] when referring to the repetitive style of

Genesis 1); adding color (blue) to the text in order to highlight its organization; providing succinct summaries of key ideas; moving potentially imposing footnotes and bibliography to the end of the text; and the use of the NRSV instead of the RSV for Biblical quotations. Thus, though the chapters themselves comprise approximately the same number of pages as in the original, the language and layout are much more student-friendly.

The second goal of the revision was to take into account progress in scholarship. A glance at the endnotes shows this goal has been met, though it would be wrong to describe the second edition as a major revision of content. The authors often are content to let previous observations stand, while adding sections drawn from more recent scholarship (e.g. the sections entitled "The Golden Calf" and "Horizons of Interpretation" in the chapters on Exodus and Deuteronomy, respectively). Examples of chapters that are significantly revised are those on "Revelation and Inspiration" and "The Concept of Canon." In the former the authors briefly address the issue of inerrancy, which they did not speak to in the first edition ("it is not necessary to infer from the fact of inspiration a doctrine of inerrancy," p. 596).

The third goal was to include updated and more substantial coverage of OT archaeology. The authors have added a new, 41-page chapter that introduces the discipline and describes ten key sites related to the study of the OT. In addition, more archaeological information has been included in various chapters.

Readers familiar with the first edition (reviewed in *JETS* 27.1 [March 1984] 93–95) will notice some other changes. Some chapters have been relocated. For example, the material related to prolegomena (given the title, "The Background") has been moved from the beginning of the book to the end. This includes chapters on the authority of the OT, revelation and inspiration, canon, geography, etc. The stated purpose of this change is to allow teachers the option of "plunging immediately into the biblical writings" (p. x). Other chapters, e.g. those on Joel and Jonah, have been relocated apparently based on revised understandings of the books' dates of composition. Also, new photographs, maps and charts have been added.

As a professor at a Christian liberal arts college, I judge that the changes in style and language have made this textbook much more usable with undergraduates. This has been accomplished without sacrificing its value to graduate students.

Eric W. Bolger
College of the Ozarks, Point Lookout, MO

God at Sinai: Covenant and Theophany in the Bible and Ancient Near East. By Jeffrey J. Niehaus. Studies in Old Testament Biblical Theology. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1995, 426 pp., \$18.99 paper.

In keeping with a series whose editors hold "it is impossible to present the entirety of the Old Testament message under a single rubric" (p. 11), Niehaus, professor of OT at Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary, does not try to argue that the Sinai theophany is the unifying center of OT theology, but rather embarks on a study of what he terms "biblical glory theophany" (p. 15), using the Sinai theophany as his touchstone for evaluating prior and subsequent glory theophanies. Niehaus argues that the Sinai theophany is of central importance "because the Sinai event was constitutive in Israel's history and crucial in salvation history." He concludes, "As God came to Sinai in the clouds to impart his law, so he will come again on the clouds of

heaven to judge those who have broken that law" (p. 16). It is for this reason that Niehaus refers to all Biblical theophanies as "Sinaitic" or "Sinai-like."

The first four chapters of the book provide the reader with the necessary background for the study. Chapter 1 introduces the reader to the characteristics of Sinaitic theophany. In chap. 2 Niehaus surveys the scholarly treatment and methodology of this subject over the last two hundred or so years. In so doing, Niehaus allies himself with Vos, Kline and others who "assume the events portrayed in both Testaments took place as described" (p. 44). Niehaus' evaluation of the arguments put forth by scholars who take the opposite view is cogent and fair, albeit terse.

Chapters 3 and 4 survey the ancient Near Eastern parallels to Biblical theophany. The Biblical tradition is seen in light of its cultural milieu, consisting of Egyptian, Hittite, Mesopotamian and Canaanite theophanies. Niehaus proposes that the OT sets forth a hierarchical set of themes that form the background to its theophanies, a hierarchy that Niehaus maintains is paralleled in the ancient Near East. They are God as King, God's Kingdom, God's Covenant(s), and God's Covenant Administration (p. 84). Niehaus sees one key difference between pagan theophanies and Yahweh theophanies. According to Niehaus, pagan theophanies are built on the foundation of human military victory, a victory to which a theophany was subsequently assigned as a means for accounting for that victory. In contrast, Yahweh theophanies "occurred and accomplished for Israel a victory it could have never attained on its own" (p. 141), and so the Lord was appropriately exalted by the Biblical writer.

Chapter 5 surveys pre-Sinai theophanies and concludes that each one occurs in a covenantal context. Niehaus argues the first pre-Sinai theophany occurs in Gen 1:2, where he interprets the Spirit's hovering over the face of the deep as a "winged glory motif" in which the Spirit of God appeared in bird-like form; this was common in the ancient Near East and was associated with glory/storm theophanies. Niehaus' interpretation, though perhaps correct, is on weak semantic ground. The significance of the word "hover" (רָחַף) is determined by such diverse sources as Ugaritic literature and the avian descent of the Spirit in Matt 3:16-17. A much stronger argument could have been made from the usage of this word in Deut 32:11, where God is depicted as an eagle "hovering" (רָחַף) over the nest of its young, protecting and nurturing them. If this parallel is correct, the Pentateuchal narrative is framed in its beginning and end by an image of the Spirit of God that has less emphasis on the Spirit's glory and more on his role as nurturer and sustainer of life.

Chapter 6 covers the Sinai theophany in relation to various theophanic appearances in Exodus through Deuteronomy such as the burning bush, the pillar of cloud and fire and the tent of meeting. Niehaus is at his best in comparing and contrasting the Biblical narratives with ancient Near Eastern myths. He argues the OT is mythopoetic only in the sense that "in mythopoetic usage the mythic elements have lost their value as operative myths and survive only as literary symbols or images, that is, as mere vestiges of their original mythic function" (p. 184).

Chapter 7 traces post-Sinai theophanies that Niehaus holds demonstrate "Sinai Theophany characteristics" in the Former and Latter Prophets. In chap. 8 Niehaus notes how the Sinai theophany influenced the often highly metaphorical theophanic descriptions of God in the Psalms and Prophets. In chap. 9 Niehaus conveys the New Covenant fulfillment of the implications of the Sinai theophanies. Especially insightful are his observations on theophanies in the Book of Acts, especially the "tongues of fire" found in chap. 2, which he argues were an ancient symbol of royal election. He states "God chose to adorn them with a symbol that spoke from the common grace of antiquity and can speak to us today" (p. 372). The practical implication of his study

for us as New Covenant believers is that because of Christ's work on the cross, our relationship with God is far more intimate than under the Old Covenant. It is one in which we are being transformed into the likeness of God "who is himself luminous and radiates glory" (p. 229).

Niehaus' work is comprehensive, yet not exhaustive in nature. There are some notable theophanic events that are not discussed at all. One notable omission is Jacob's dream in Genesis 28, in which the Lord reaffirms the promise of a heritage and a land made to Abraham. This is a striking omission, especially since here we have a theophanic event in which God's covenant is continued in effect. This is only a slight criticism, however, and Niehaus' work is highly recommended as an exemplary evangelical study of a major theme in Biblical theology. A scattering of untranslated Latin and German phrases is indicative of the fact that this work is aimed at the graduate student and scholar and is less suitable for use at the undergraduate or introductory level.

David Paul Latoundji
Nyack College, Nyack, NY

The Lord's Anointed: Interpretation of Old Testament Messianic Texts. Edited by Philip E. Satterthwaite, Richard E. Hess, and Gordon J. Wenham. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1995, x + 320 pp., \$19.99 paper.

Fourteen essays by as many authors offer a rather comprehensive overview of the messianic theme in the OT. The volume began with some of the papers offered at the 1994 annual Tyndale Old Testament Study Group. To this were added several other papers that were solicited to round out the collection representing a Biblical theology approach to the entire testament.

J. Gordon McConville introduces the messianic theme of the OT by correctly noting that "If the Old Testament is *the* problem of Christian theology . . . , the Messiah is at the heart of that problem" (p. 2). After reviewing how modern OT scholarship has declared traditional Christian messianic interpretation of OT passages to be "exegetically indefensible," McConville encourages what might be called "'interested' readings, that is, those which read the Old Testament through the spectacles of a particular interested group" (p. 7). McConville prefers to leave us with the questions: How does one decide a text is messianic? How does the canonical context affect our "reading" of a text? Where does one date a text? And must a text be post-exilic to be considered messianic, as S. Mowinckel alleged? Can a study be *exclusively* an OT study? It is difficult to determine with certainty which way McConville would answer all of these questions, but there is little doubt that beside such passages as Isa 9:6-7, 11:1 and Jer 23:5-6, which he affirms are "transparently messianic," he would allow for some type of messianic "reinterpretation" of some OT passages. What this process is and how one determines where to use it are all left as open questions.

T. Desmond Alexander's treatment of "Messianic Ideology in the Book of Genesis" focuses expertly on the unique line of the "seed" from which a king will arise from the tribe of Judah and through whom all the nations of the earth will be blessed. However, Alexander disappoints us by concluding that "it is virtually impossible to sustain a messianic interpretation of [Gen] 3:15 . . . based solely within the context of [Gen] chapter 3" (p. 32). But he quickly adds, "Considered . . . in light of Genesis as a whole, a messianic reading of this verse is not only possible but highly probable" (p. 32). He finds a similar solution to the question as to whether Gen 49:8-12 is messianic, for it

too is intimately linked to the unique line of the seed. Despite this single caveat, this chapter is extremely helpful.

Surprisingly, Satterthwaite finds only an ideal picture of God's anointed king in the books of Samuel, but the books of Kings do not look forward to a future ruler from the line of David who will restore the fortunes of that line! This is all the more startling since in Satterthwaite's discussion of the crucial 2 Samuel 7 text, no discussion is made of key issues such as the phrase in 2 Sam 7:19, *wēzō't tōrat hā'ādām*, which I have argued elsewhere can mean nothing less than "And this is the charter/law for humanity" ("The Blessing of David: A Charter for Humanity," in *The Law and the Prophets* [Presbyterian and Reformed, 1974] 298–318), a teaching that parallels the point of Gen 12:3b. This expression in 2 Sam 7:19 is parallel to the Akkadian term, *terit nishe*, which Henri Cazelles translated many years ago as "qui fixe le destin des hommes" (H. Cazelles, *VT* 8 [1958]: 322). Surely David is promised a "house, a throne and a kingdom" that will last "forever." It will do little good to protest that *ʿad ʿōlām*, and *lēʿōlām* do not always mean "forever," or "eternally," for what will we say when the same terms are used to describe the duration of God's longevity? Six times the text stresses that David's kingdom is to be "eternal" (2 Sam 7:13, 16, 24, 25, 26, 29). Satterthwaite acknowledges that other passages such as 1 Kgs 11:36, 15:4 and Psalm 89 do promise David an eternal kingdom, but he argues that "these passages mark something of a development with respect to 2 Sa. 7, rather than simply restating the terms of this passage" (p. 55). But what kind of development would this be? Can we move from a conditional to an unconditional mood in one and the same promise? Satterthwaite is sure 2 Samuel 7 has some type of promises related to a future line of anointed kings, but the force of the divine threat of punishment against David or his sons for sinning in the future alarms Satterthwaite to such a degree that he cannot see a messianic reference in the books of Samuel—at least not yet—until he is able to see the later texts in the history of revelation! But is this not to confuse the *certainty* of the Davidic *transmission* of the promise without affirming that all who transmit that promise will participate in it except by faith? Iain W. Provan, in chap. 4 of the book, likewise complains that he cannot reasonably distinguish the ideal king presented in these books from a coming messiah.

While surveying Isaiah 1–12 and 28–33, Daniel Schibler distinguishes between messianism and messianic prophecy: For him they are not the same. Accordingly, these chapters in Isaiah are examples of early prophetic messianism, which give expression to a hope and an expectancy for a Jerusalemite king. Whenever the king and the remnant practiced justice and righteousness, just as David did, there messianism arose. But what of the great messianic texts like Isa 7:10–17, 9:1–6, 11:1–9? They imply more than the messianism seen as a whole in the other sections of Isaiah surveyed here. But how? Only on the grounds of the hermeneutical principle of *sensus plenior* do they contain "incipient christological soteriology" (p. 101). That of course does not ground the exegesis on the words of the OT text, but leaves it somewhere between the lines of Scripture—definitely not *graphē*. Whatever else is true about the inspiration of the Scriptures, the apostle Paul's claim was that all *graphē*, "writing" of Scripture is God-breathed, not what is between the lines! And to retroject the NT meanings back on the OT is clearly a case of eisegesis, a reading into the text what was not initially, and therefore actually, there!

My colleague Gordon P. Hugenberger offers an extremely thorough study of "the Servant of the Lord" theme in the Servant Songs and a type study on a second Moses. Hugenberger argues that Isaiah's "Servant" is best identified with the expected "prophet like Moses" (Deut 18:15–18). To his credit, Hugenberger affirms that the Ser-

vant Songs offer “substantial support” for “the New Testament’s messianic interpretation without presupposing that interpretation, as is often done” (p. 139).

Two of my former students, Richard Schultz and Daniel I. Block successfully argue in successive chapters that Isaiah’s king and royal servant are integrally related, while Ezekiel has two explicitly messianic texts, namely, Ezek 34:23–24, and 37:22–25 along with the possible inclusion of the eschatological figure of the *našî*?, “prince.” Next, Philip P. Jensen examines seven metaphors for prophecy (a stone, a line of sight, a code, a stream, a plant, a bird and a musical composition), choosing the last two as the best, since they leave the most “openness” to the character of prophecy. As for Mic 5:2 (MT 1), Jensen concludes that “There is an openness and provisionality that may be seen in Matthew’s use of the Old Testament” (p. 211). One wonders if the apostles might not have flinched at such a conclusion and responded with the apostle Peter’s verdict that “we have a more sure word from the prophets” (2 Pet 1:19).

Philip S. Johnston’s working with Psalm 16 does not wrestle seriously with the estimate also pronounced by Peter on the day of Pentecost that David too was a “prophet,” and that David “seeing what was ahead, spoke of the resurrection of Christ” in his day, ca. 1000 BC (Acts 2:29–31)! Nor has he probed deeply enough the term *hāsîd*, “Holy One” in Psalm 16, a technical term that signals the messianic import of this text. (See my unanswered challenge in “The Promise to David in Psalm 16 and Its Application in Acts 2:25–33 and 13:32–37,” *JETS* 23 [1980]: 219–229).

Knut M. Heim displays an interesting use of “intertextuality” to Psalm 72, but he too takes a minimalist point of view with regard to its messianic potential. “[T]he psalm does not contain propositions which necessitate a messianic interpretation,” he concludes. “However, several features in the psalm lend themselves to a ‘messianic’ re-interpretation at a later stage in Israel’s history” (p. 248). But if it is not in the OT text, who cares how ingenious later writers are in their ability to reload the OT text with truths that it never claimed or revealed in the first place? The issue is more than hermeneutics; it is the authority and content of revelation itself!

In a similar way Brian Kelly cannot tell us whether the Chronicler’s association of God’s kingdom with the son of David is “accidental” or the result of a deliberate “trajectory” of the books of Chronicles themselves. How is the layperson in the Church to know the answer to questions such as this one if we as scholars cannot answer the question?

Iain Duguid expertly examines the prominent messianic themes of the coming king, the good shepherd, and the pierced Messiah in Zechariah 9–14 in light of Zechariah’s use of earlier Scripture imagery. It is a brief, but suggestive and helpful chapter.

The final and summarizing chapter, by Martin J. Selman, is entitled “Messianic Mysteries.” In his judgment, the OT’s portrayal of the Messiah is deliberately enigmatic with regard to his chronology, nature and functions. It is no wonder then, he assures us, that the way Jesus fulfilled the OT was so surprising. We can agree that the chronology was never part of the revelation, but surely much of the nature and function of Messiah was laid out in such a manner that early Christians like the Bereans used the OT to verify the good news about Jesus that was being announced to them by the apostles (Acts 17:11).

The Lord’s Anointed is as enjoyable as it is disturbing. Many of the chapters present so strong a picture that they could well have served as college outline series for those two disciples who were roundly rebuked by our Lord on the road to Emmaus for failing to believe all that Moses, the prophets and the Psalms had said about his person and work (Luke 24:25–27, 44–45). But a number of the essays take a much too cautious and minimalistic approach to the question as to whether the messiah was

predicted in the portion they wrote on or not. This muting of the messianic presence in the OT began with Anthony Collins' two volumes published in 1724 and 1727 and has continued to the present moment. This issue of the interpretation of the Messiah in the OT could be a defining moment for evangelical scholarship and ultimately for the Church's view of the way we regard Scripture.

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

An Old Testament Theology of the Spirit of God. By Wilf Hildebrandt. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1995, 208 pp., n.p.

Hildebrandt's unique and fruitful contribution in this book to OT theological studies is twofold. (1) He uses sound methodology to identify and analyze relevant passages in an effort to formulate an OT theology on the particular area of the Spirit of God. His method essentially is to compile the instances where, contextually derived, *rûah* refers to God. From these data Hildebrandt argues his views on the nature and function of the Spirit. (2) He shows sensitivities to canonical NT teachings on the Spirit by demonstrating how these portrayals were expansions, clarifications and fulfillments of OT teachings.

In the first chapter Hildebrandt discusses briefly the semantic range of *rûah* in the Hebrew canon. He acknowledges that there are "numerous allusions, emblems, symbols, images, and figurative expressions" that denote the presence and work of the Spirit in the texts (p. 2). Though *rûah* is used to speak of such things as "wind" and as an "anthropological and psychological" term in relation to human beings (p. 11), it is truly unique in the way the Hebrew canon uses the term to describe a people's relationship with their God (p. 5). This chapter serves as an introduction to the topics that are discussed in subsequent chapters.

Hildebrandt explores the relationship between the Spirit of God and creation in chap. 2. His study of the creation account delineates much not only on creation, but also in the realms of theology proper, biblical anthropology and pneumatology. Moses shows the people in the wilderness the singularity of God as the only true God in that the creator of heaven and earth is also the one who called them forth from Egypt and sustains them (p. 30). The Spirit is involved in the animating of humanity (p. 29) and is the sustainer of life (p. 55). Various images of the Spirit are discussed, all pointing to the roles of giving and sustaining both life and blessings. Life and blessings are in turn contingent upon the obedience of the people (p. 61). Hildebrandt's treatment cogently explains the idea that "From Israel, however, comes a presentation of creation that differs significantly from the polytheistic accounts of the other nations" (p. 29).

He examines the relationship between the Spirit and God's people in chap. 3. He shows that the Spirit is involved in all aspects of "the establishment, preservation, judgment, and restoration of the people of God" (p. 67). The chapter is essentially an expansion of these themes. A unique contribution in this section is a brief discussion on the "Spirit as Person." Hildebrandt sees the OT's emphasis on the works of the Spirit as a major difficulty in formulating an authoritative OT view on the personhood of the Spirit (pp. 88-89).

Chapter 4, "The Spirit of God in Israel's Leadership," is a section exuding enormous practical import in relationship to church leadership. Hildebrandt does not flesh

out such practicalities, but presents his observations in such a way that makes the practical implications clear nonetheless. From Joseph to the prophets, to the kings (on the Messiah, see pp. 127–135), a multitude of noteworthy examples are presented of how the Spirit empowered effective leadership in the nation. The OT emphasis is that leadership must be spiritually endowed (p. 121).

An exploration of the relationship between the Spirit of God and the prophetic word is found in chap. 5. Hildebrandt, through references to specific prophets, shows how the Spirit led and empowered human agents to proclaim the prophetic word. Important to this discussion is not only the reality of spiritual empowerment but the confirmation of the Spirit's work through the character of the prophet and content of the prophetic message (p. 183). The movement of the Spirit in the production of the prophets' messages should not be viewed as a borrowing of Canaanite tradition (p. 155) but as a movement towards God's intent to make "a kingdom of priests and a holy nation of his people" (Exod 19:6; p. 159).

In his final chapter, Hildebrandt engages in what he calls "Pneumatological Reflections." Relationships are established between the Spirit of God and some important NT themes such as the temple analogy (p. 195), the conception of the Son (p. 197), God's people in the NT (pp. 198–201), leadership (pp. 201–204), prophecy (pp. 205–207) and miracles (pp. 207–208). These treatments essentially affirm what he holds from the beginning, namely, that the OT provides much of the framework for understanding the person and work of the Spirit in the NT.

This book possesses a number of strengths. First of all, Hildebrandt shows a wide breadth of interaction with other scholarly works throughout his discussions in the text as well as in the numerous footnotes. Second, he trenchantly discusses some difficult passages in the course of his presentation of *ruah* in the OT. Such passages include Gen 1:26–27 (pp. 52–55), Gen 6:3 (pp. 83–88), and 1 Kings 22 (pp. 179–182), to name but a few. Third, I have already mentioned above the practical implications that can be derived from his analyses.

I have only two concerns. The first is that from a methodological standpoint his work would have been strengthened if he had begun with a detailed discussion of the instances in which the phrases *ruah yhwh* or *ruah 'elohim* are found. This would have been more to the point in light of the book's title. Second, Hildebrandt is much more cautious in discussing some issues important to many members of the church of Jesus Christ because of his attempt to use a more inductive approach in this study of OT theology. A comparison on two points with Leon Wood's *The Holy Spirit in the Old Testament* shows some of Hildebrandt's problematic caution.

He holds, first of all, that the plural referents in Gen 1:26 speak of God in terms of a "theophanic glory-cloud" (p. 53). Wood, on the other hand, gives more conscious attention to the clearer implications from the NT on the nature of God as Trinity when he says concerning Gen 1:26: "There is no satisfactory way of accounting for this plural except by taking it as a reference to the Trinity of God" (p. 35). Hildebrandt does not deny the Trinity but he gives virtually no attention to the doctrine.

Secondly, he does not deal with the issue of the Holy Spirit indwelling OT believers in terms of regeneration, or prolonged presence beyond the accomplishment of a particular task. Wood dedicates an entire chapter to these matters (chap. 7). Hildebrandt focuses much more attention on the matter of spiritual presence/empowerment for a task or function.

My observations here lend a word of caution concerning what could be—or should be—derived from Hildebrandt's book because of his neglect on these matters above. These are matters of great significance to those aware of the doctrine of the Spirit as

formulated in the orthodox wing of the historic church, as well as the relevant biblical data. If measured in terms of his more inductive approach, however, the book does contribute much to OT theology and to numerous practical considerations.

Bruce L. Fields
Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, Deerfield, IL

From Paradise to the Promised Land: An Introduction to the Main Themes of the Pentateuch. By T. Desmond Alexander. Carlisle: Paternoster, 1995, xxv + 227 pp., n.p. paper.

This book represents the fruitful intersection of modern literary approaches to interpretation and a traditional viewpoint on the nature of Scripture. The topic is the Pentateuch and its key themes. From the author's preface it is clear this book's purpose is not to address the compositional history of the Pentateuch. Alexander sets diachronic issues aside from the beginning, emphasizing the "inordinate amount of time and energy" devoted to developing source and form critical methodologies. Such methods ignore the present literary shape of the Pentateuch in favor of what is likely to remain a hypothetical reconstruction of compositional history. In addition, these methods tend to ignore the meaning of the Pentateuch in its received form, which arguably should be the starting point of study.

Alexander thus sets out to examine the terrain of the Pentateuch, that is, its main features as a unified literary work. This calls for different approaches as the terrain changes. If a theme (e.g. "land") extends through the Pentateuch, its development is traced accordingly. If it is more localized (e.g. the tabernacle in Exodus) then so is its analysis. After a brief survey of the content of the Pentateuch, the author discusses in successive chapters the royal lineage in Genesis, paradise lost, the blessing of the nations, the faith of Abraham, Yahweh's revelation of himself in Exodus, the passover, the covenant at Sinai, the tabernacle, the idea of holiness, the sacrificial system, clean and unclean foods, movement towards the promised land, murmurings, love and loyalty, and Israel's election. Within each chapter there is an introductory summary, an introduction, a discussion of the theme being addressed, a concluding summary and a discussion of what the author calls NT connections. In line with the author's purpose to provide an introductory-level textbook, footnotes are not extensive and usually elaborate briefly on the topic being discussed without entering into more complex scholarly arguments.

The real beauty of this book is that it accomplishes what it sets out to do, that is, to provide an introduction to the main theological themes of the Pentateuch. The author is correct in noting the unfortunate tendency of modern scholarship to focus primarily on diachronic issues in the Pentateuch. His writing is straightforward and informative and the organization of material clear and helpful. Though at times the discussion simply summarizes what is obvious to a careful reader of the Pentateuch, such summaries are valuable to and often necessary for the introductory student. They take seriously the shape of the Pentateuch as a unified work while highlighting for the reader various connections and theological implications. On only a few occasions does the author go unnecessarily on a tendentious limb, most notably in his discussion of the promises to Abraham. With a complex argument and statements that beg the question of consistency, Alexander struggles to portray some of these promises as contingent on Abraham's obedience. At the same time, he recognizes that both the Gen 15:6 and the NT interpretations of Abraham emphasize his faith. Another feature that should be mentioned is the sometimes superficial treatment given in the "NT

Connections" sections (e.g. Rom 10:4 is not cited in the chapter on the Sinai covenant, or for that matter in the Scripture index). These weaknesses are more than made up for by the wealth of useful and accessible information on the Pentateuch (e.g. the mere presence of sections relating the Pentateuch to the NT is a significant improvement over many works on the Pentateuch; Alexander rightly sees the Pentateuch as "oriented towards the future"). This book is especially welcome as a solid introduction accessible to undergraduate students.

Eric W. Bolger
College of the Ozarks, Point Lookout, MO

Judges and Method: New Approaches in Biblical Studies. Edited by Gale A. Yee. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1995, 183 pp., n.p. paper.

As a companion volume to *Mark and Method* this book is intended to introduce "a student audience to new developments in the field of biblical studies" (p. vii). The book of Judges was selected as a testing ground for these methods because of students' relative unfamiliarity with its contents and the fact that it contains some of the most terrifying and absorbing stories in the Hebrew Bible. This is a book about war, betrayal, murder and death, and especially about women, who inflict and endure violence. The latter interest is reflected in the outline for the book offered by Yee (pp. 3-5), who inserts an explanatory comment wherever women are involved in the narrative.

After the editor's own overview of recent trends in the study of Judges, the formal essays represent the work of well-known spokespersons for the newer approaches to the interpretation of Biblical narrative. The volume concludes with a brief bibliography on contemporary hermeneutics, a glossary of terms employed in the book and in the discipline and indexes. Each author begins with a discussion of the particular questions his or her method asks of a text and its primary characteristics, paying particular attention to its similarities to and differences from other contemporary methods and the approaches of historical criticism. The essayist then applies the assigned method to the book of Judges as a whole or to selected texts within the book. A brief bibliography concludes each chapter.

The explanations of the methodologies in this volume are less abstract and more clear than those found in the widely used collection edited by S. L. McKenzie and S. R. Hayes, *To Each Its Own Meaning: An Introduction to Biblical Criticisms and Their Application* (1993). Readers of this volume will be pleasantly surprised with many new insights into the text of the book of Judges. Richard G. Bowman's essay, "Narrative Criticism of Judges: Human Purpose in Conflict with Divine Presence," is too negative and open in its evaluation of God, but otherwise his is a sensitive handling of the issue of divine personality/character. Naomi Sternberg's sociological sagacity in "Social Scientific Criticism: Judges 9 and Issues of Kingship" yields special insights into Abimelech's aborted experiment in kingship, particularly the interconnection between leadership and kingship. Readers will not be surprised with J. Cheryl Exum's comment in "Feminist Criticism: Whose Interests Are Being Served?" that "feminist criticism of the Bible does not take the biblical text itself as the starting point" of interpretation because the Bible presents us with men's views of women (p. 67). Not surprisingly, she finds the common denominator in the accounts involving women to be a fear of women and women's sexuality, and the intention of men (and the narrator) to circumscribe and control women's behavior. David Jobling's essay, "Structural Criticism: The Text's World of Meaning," is the most difficult in the book, but this reflects a problem with

the method, not the author. His conclusion is crystal clear: the function of the structuralist is “*to see what you can make of the Book of Judges*” (p. 116); italics his). In “Deconstruction Criticism: Achsaah and the (E)razed City of Writing,” Danna Nolan Fewell offers a clear discussion of deconstructionism and applies the method with great skill to the story of Achsaah and Othniel. She makes a “patronizing” (or should one say “matronizing”?) concession to a text’s rights to its own meaning (p. 141), but insists that we have an “ethical responsibility to read *Otherwise*” (*sic*). In the final essay, “Ideological Criticism: Judges 17–21 and the Dismembered Body,” Yee seeks to determine the ideological agenda of the last part of the book, commonly treated as an appendix. She concludes that this part was written during the reign of Josiah as part of the Deuteronomist’s propaganda war against the clergy, the country Levites and against tribal loyalties which tended to destabilize monarchic sovereignty.

The subtitle of the book is somewhat pretentious, for two reasons. (1) This book is not about new approaches to the Bible as a whole, but to one particular genre: Hebrew narrative. (2) As an introduction to reader-response approaches to interpreting Hebrew narrative this volume is superb. However, the hermeneutic reflected here represents only one segment of modern approaches to the OT as a whole and the book of Judges in particular. The introductory essay pays lip service to Lillian Klein and Barry Webb, but most readers of this journal will be happy to hear that many recent analyses of the book are much more objectively grounded (see my review below of R. O’Connell’s recent work).

As an introduction to one stream of OT interpretation this volume is a valuable resource. At the same time it offers many new insights into the book of Judges in particular. Who would have thought that Achsaah deserves all the attention she gets in this book? However, readers should be aware that works like this often say more about the essayists and their times than about the documents with which they are working. For interpreters with a more traditional hermeneutic, those who are still naive enough to assume that authors must be allowed to control the meaning of their writings, reading this book may be frustrating. If classical critical approaches to the study of the OT exhibited a certain hubris in predetermining that ancient texts could and should *say*, contemporary methodologies exhibit similar hubris in presuming to determine what ancient Biblical texts may *mean*. In representing the latter this book offers a barometer for measuring the contemporary scholarly scene. However, I doubt that ten years from now, when a new fad has captured the field, this volume will have much more than antiquarian value. To be sure, no interpretation is free from bias, but in the end it is the message of the Biblical author that must command our attention, and not the idiosyncratic and ideological perspectives of post-modernists.

Daniel I. Block

The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, KY

The Rhetoric of the Book of Judges. By Robert H. O’Connell. VTSup 63. Leiden: Brill, 1996, xxi + 541 pp., n.p.

This volume represents an updated version of a dissertation researched and composed under J. A. Emerton of Cambridge University. As one who is currently working on a commentary on the book of Judges, I received this book just in time, for it represents the most thorough literary analysis of the book of Judges available in English.

Departing from the usual academic pattern, the author conveniently summarizes his goals, methods and conclusions in the introduction (pp. 1–9). The aim of this vol-

ume is "to discern the primary rhetorical purpose of Judges from its formal structure and poetics" (p. 10).

Chapter 1 offers a detailed analysis of the deuteronomistic and tribal-political schemata that the Biblical narrator has superimposed upon the accounts of deliverance found in the book of Judges (pp. 10–57). O'Connell concludes that the south-north tribal political schema of the so-called Prologue A (1:1–2:5) portrays Judah as the pre-eminent tribe in Israel. The 12-part religious-historical cycle, introduced in "Prologue B" (2:6–3:6) and developed in the following accounts of Israel's tribal heroes, reflects a second rhetorical agenda: To describe Israel's alienation from Yahweh as distinct from its enjoyment of the blessing of Yahweh in the land.

Chapter 2 contains the bulk of O'Connell's research (pp. 58–267). Each of the literary units in the book is subjected to an exhaustive analysis of the plot structure. What is especially intriguing is O'Connell's careful isolation of a multiplicity of plots in most units. To illustrate his methodology we may summarize his observations regarding the plot structure of the account of Deborah/Barak/Jael (4:1–5:31). According to O'Connell, Judges 4–5 comprises three plot levels, each having its own exposition, development and resolution: Plot A (4:1–7, [8], 9–10a, 12–15a, [15b], 16, [17a, 18–20], 21, 23–24; 5:31b) describes Yahweh's deliverance of Israel from Jabin's military control by the prophetic word of Deborah; Plot B (4:8–9, 10b, [14a, 15a], 15b–17, 17a, 21–22) describes Barak's reluctance to respond to Yahweh's summons to deliver Israel and Deborah's consequent limitation of his glory in battle; Plot C (4:9a, 11, 17–22) glorifies the woman (Jael) who would actually serve as Yahweh's agent of deliverance from Sisera. O'Connell's handling of these criss-crossing and interlocking plots is refreshing. Rather than attributing them to different sources (as in traditional source criticism) or layers of editing (as in redaction criticism), and thus interpreting them separately, the author adopts a holistic methodology. Assuming an intentional process of selection and arrangement, he demonstrates how the characterization of each deliverer and the plot structure of each deliverer cycle have been crafted in accordance with the book's overall rhetorical agenda.

In chap. 3 (pp. 268–304) O'Connell concentrates on the book's rhetorical strategy of entrapment and foreshadowing. The former is achieved by withholding essential information on kingship and the cult center until the double dénouement (chaps. 17–21). The latter is reflected in the compiler/redactor's employment of proleptic narrative analogy to foreshadow evaluatively the portrayals of David and Saul as royal figureheads in 1 Samuel. Through these two methods the book of Judges seeks to reorient its readers toward higher standards of intertribal and religious leadership in Israel. The former is achieved by idealizing Judah as the divinely appointed leader of the nation, the latter by appealing for national loyalty to the cult and covenant justice. O'Connell is especially impressed by the book's deliberate crafting of accounts to furnish analogies to the characterizations of David and Saul in 1 Samuel. He concludes that one specific rhetorical aim of the book was to legitimize the Davidic monarchy by highlighting the preeminent role of Judah, and vilifying Saul by its negative portrayal of the Benjaminites.

In chap. 4 (pp. 305–344) O'Connell attempts to identify the rhetorical situation that might have yielded this literary document. He concludes that the compiler/editor selected his stories and melded them into his own narrative framework to idealize the monarchy in Israel in general and to endorse the kingship of David at the expense of Saul in particular. Through deuteronomistic foreshadowing he not only evaluates the portrayals of Saul and David in 1 Samuel 1–2 Samuel 4, but also seeks to persuade Saulide loyalists and devotees of false shrines to transfer their support to the Davidic monarchy and the cult it sponsors. Accordingly, the time of David's rule in Hebron,

prior to his accession to the throne of all Israel, represents the most likely context for the compilation/redaction of the book.

Having completed the formal presentation of his thesis, O'Connell adds 140 pages of endmatter. Excursus 1 (pp. 345–368) is entitled “Compilation, Redaction and the Rhetoric of Judges”; Excursus 2 (pp. 369–384) treats “Scribal Developments and the Rhetoric of Judges.” The volume concludes with almost 20 pages of bibliography, as well as indexes to Biblical references and secondary sources.

The Rhetoric of the Book of Judges presents a stark methodological contrast to the collection of essays edited by Yee (reviewed above). With painstaking attention to detail the author concentrates on the text itself, intent on discovering the agenda that drives the compiler/redactor and exploring the methods whereby that agenda is communicated. Indeed the work is so exhaustive and so carefully organized and presented that I hesitate to criticize. I welcome in particular O'Connell's disposition toward Hebrew historiographic narrative as rhetoric in general, and his recognition of the call to covenantal and cultic loyalty as a primary ideological concern of the book. However, his conclusions regarding the political agenda of the book are less convincing.

In O'Connell's interpretation of Judges generally as a polemical pro-Judahite composition he enjoys a lot of company, but his treatment of the book as a specific appeal to the pro-Saulide tribes in Israel to transfer their allegiance to the house of David is creative. However, both conclusions are open to question. The former, more general conclusion, seems to confuse agenda and perspective. Few would question that the book looks at the pre-monarchic period from a Judahite point of view, but this is not to say that its stance is polemically pro-Judahite. Although the prologue and epilogue recognize Judah's divinely sanctioned leadership in the holy war, this tribe is not idealized in the book. On the contrary, the conduct of this tribe toward Adoni-bezek (1:5–6) is hardly exemplary; Judah is absent from the roll of tribal/clan participants in the war against Sisera listed in the Song of Deborah (chap. 5); Judah does not appear to respond to any deliverer's call to arms (cf. 3:27; 4:10; 6:35; 7:23; 11:29); Judah is explicitly named, along with Ephraim and Benjamin, as the target of Ammonite aggression, which was expressive of Yahweh's wrath against Israel for its idolatry (10:6–9); Judahites take their stand with the Philistines against Samson, their own countryman (15:9–13). The portrait of the Judahites in the book is anything but complementary.

O'Connell's specific treatment of the book as a pro-Davidic and anti-Saulide composition is even more suspect. While the analogical links between the accounts in Judges and 1 Samuel can scarcely be denied, O'Connell has not demonstrated that the former intentionally foreshadow the latter in such a way that the entire book must be read in the light of the conflict between Davidic and Saulide factions in Israel. Indeed it seems more likely that the opposite is the case: 1 Samuel presents Saul's kingship as the spiritual and cultural continuation of the period of the Judges. The anointing of David finally offers hope for a significant break with the past. But confirmation of the direction of influence depends upon the prior establishment of firm criteria by which it is demonstrated that one account ante-dates another. Not only does the volume fail to establish such criteria; having come to his ideological conclusions regarding the book, O'Connell is driven to some rather forced interpretations, as in his treatment of the captivity of the land mentioned in 18:30.

O'Connell also interprets the disposition of the book of Judges toward the monarchy too positively. Gideon's sham rejection of kingship (8:22–32) and Abimelech's oppressive rule over Shechem (9:1–57) hardly commend the institution. Indeed, the narrator's perspective, expressed in Jotham's fabulous (i.e. involving fable) response to the latter (9:7–21), is highly critical of kingship. The only possible basis for a positive view of the monarchy is found in the four-fold refrain, “In those days there was no king in Israel” (17:6; 18:1; 19:1; 21:25), but even this may be interpreted differently. Writing

from the perspective of a later (Manassite?) period, the narrator is aware of the spiritual damage kings have inflicted on the nation of Israel. With this refrain he is not looking forward to the monarchy as a solution to the nation's ills, but recognizing that in the pre-monarchic period evil was democratized: "every man did what was right in his own eyes."

But all this requires more discussion than this review allows. These criticisms are not intended to detract from the quality or significance of O'Connell's work, which scholars would do well to adopt as a point of reference for many years to come. On the contrary, they highlight the value of this research. O'Connell has taken a fresh look at the book, and with exemplary and meticulous care presented his case. In the process he has not only opened up a series of issues that call for further research, but also provided us with a methodology to be extended to other narrative books of the OT. I hope that any detailed response to his work or application of his method will reflect equally thorough work.

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

Ruth/Esther. By Frederic W. Bush. WBC 9. Dallas: Word, 1996, 514 pp., \$29.99.

Bush, professor of ancient Near Eastern Studies at Fuller Seminary, follows the format for his studies of Ruth and Esther contained in this volume that has come to be associated with the widely acclaimed Word Biblical Commentary series. The study begins with a lengthy introduction dealing with questions of canonical status, text, unity, date and authorship, genre and theology. Bush introduces each of his studies with an outline of the book that he uses as the basis for a study of individual pericopes. Each pericope is introduced by an impressive bibliography of relevant studies. Then the author offers his original translation, followed by notes containing the literal Hebrew when it differs from his translation. His notes also include textual variants found in other ancient versions. Next is an excellent technical analysis that will be most helpful to those interested in the structure of each pericope under consideration. It includes detailed diagrams that reveal the carefully composed literary structure, especially the chiasmic structure found in both books.

The heart of each study are the comments, verse-by-verse discussions, including explanations of Hebrew words and expressions that clarify their grammatical significance. His comments interact with a wide range of English- and German-language commentaries and scholarly articles that confirm his meticulous homework before attempting his own commentary.

Bush is not reluctant to agree with other scholars' interpretations but argues persuasively when he disagrees with them. As an indication of the thoroughness of his comments, his discussion of a single verse or part of a verse may occupy four, five or more pages. He does not like to read speculative ideas into the narratives (a favorite pursuit of some scholars) that are more than the text can legitimately support.

The final section of Bush's study of each pericope, entitled "Explanation," appears to be a less technical summary of the passage he has just analyzed in detail. For those without the patience or background to benefit from his detailed analysis, his summary will be appreciated and may serve as a reminder that it is easy to lose sight of the forest (the overall picture) by intense focus on the individual trees (detailed critical studies). There is a place for both emphases in a well-balanced study, and Bush has succeeded admirably in maintaining both perspectives.

Bush deals with Ruth and Esther in separate studies, though he occasionally makes comparisons between them (e.g. see pp. 311, 325). In the introduction to the book of Ruth, he concludes that Ruth was written at the beginning of the post-exilic period (p. 30). He wastes few words on the question of the book's authorship because he rightly calls such speculation an "exercise in futility" (p. 17), as no amount of guessing can yield a single valid clue as to the identity of Ruth's author.

Bush is convinced that the determination of genre is "unmistakably of critical importance for the interpretation of the book of Ruth" (p. 32), but at the same time he admits the difficulty of determining genre. He provides an extensive discussion of the genre of Ruth (pp. 30–47), concluding that it could best be called "an edifying short story" (p. 46), rather than a novella, idyll, legend or other designations preferred by some scholars.

Bush deals carefully and responsibly with the three questions that are most often raised in connection with the book of Ruth. (1) He argues that the marriage of Ruth and Boaz was not an example of levirate marriage by pointing out the differences between them (pp. 223–227). (2) He denies the sexually implicit interpretations held by some scholars of the events between Ruth and Boaz at the threshing floor, stating that seducing Boaz would be "totally incompatible" with the character of Ruth and Naomi (p. 165). (3) He argues that 4:18–22 is not a "contradictory and clumsy secondary appendage as it is often interpreted" (p. 267). By affirming the genealogy of 4:18–22 as an integral part of Ruth, rather than a later appendage, Bush concludes that "the book is brought into relationship with the Bible's main theme of redemptive history" (p. 268).

He offers the interesting observation that Naomi, not Ruth, is the central figure in the book of Ruth (p. 252), "the person whose 'trial' really holds the whole story together" (quoting E. F. Campbell, *AB* 7, p. 168). I am not quite persuaded, however, to abandon Ruth as the central character around whom the events of the book largely revolve.

The same overall commendation that I give to Bush's treatment of the book of Ruth is also appropriate for his study of the book of Esther. Using the same format, Bush first deals with the critical questions associated with Esther. His extensive bibliography is followed by a detailed study of the problem of Esther's acceptance into the canon that continued at least until the end of the third century AD, though he believes Esther had achieved canonicity in the second century BC (p. 276). Although it may have received canonical status early in the Jewish community, early acceptance was withheld among Christians. Bush observes that none of the church fathers wrote a commentary on Esther. It was not until the 9th century that a commentary was devoted to Esther, written by Rhabanus Maurus, Archbishop of Mainz (p. 277).

Bush does not accept Esther as a unity, as he does Ruth. He acknowledges a redactional history for the book and concludes that the final product was the work of two anonymous authors (pp. 294–295). He dates the redactional process that resulted in MT Esther from the late 4th century to the early 3rd century BC.

Bush believes that the providence of God is implicit in the book of Esther, though God is never mentioned by name. Others have argued that the absence of reference to God may show his disapproval of his people because they had not learned their lessons from the punishment they had recently experienced that the prophets had warned them for centuries was coming. The book of Malachi makes it clear that the post-exilic people were no different from the pre-exilic people in regard to their faithlessness to God. Were the exiles in Persia any different from those Jews in Judah? Would God's absence in Esther be better explained as his hiddenness? The Scriptures often speak of the hiddenness of God because of the people's sins (cf. Isa 59:2).

The most troubling aspect of Bush's study of Esther is his glossing over the moral and ethical misdeeds of both Mordecai and Esther, a kind of "the means justifies the end" ethics. He is uncritical of Esther's deliberate lying to hide her Jewish identity. He is not troubled by her willingness to marry a Gentile unbeliever at the risk of becoming one of his concubines if she did not win his beauty contest that was based solely on physical attributes. He does not recognize that Mordecai's stubborn pride in refusing to bow before Haman resulted in all the tragic events that followed. He prefers to soften Mordecai's stubbornness by calling it "ethnic pride" (p. 385). Bush seems not to be bothered by the excessive vengeance exacted on the Jews' enemies, including the hanging of Haman's ten sons after they had already been executed.

Two questions should be considered before concluding that God's providence is the guiding force behind the decisions made by Mordecai and Esther to save their people. (1) Would God have found a way to deliver his people apart from the questionable ethical means employed by Mordecai and Esther? (2) Can immoral and unethical means used to achieve a worthy goal be justified as examples of God's providence? The acts of Mordecai and Esther may be typical of those today who work out their own problems without consulting God and then later claim his approval.

Bush's commentary on the book of Esther is not as thorough as his commentary on the book of Ruth. He devotes 266 pages to the 85 verses of Ruth and only 227 pages to the 167 verses of Esther. In his verse-by-verse comments on Ruth, he only omits comments on 1:3, 2:17a, 3:6, and 4:22, whereas he omits comments on 56 verses of Esther. Quantitative analysis alone should not be the only criterion for evaluating a commentary, but the difference in the treatment of the two books is noticeable.

This commentary on two Biblical books that are not often given such in-depth, scholarly treatment as other OT books measures up to the high standards already established by this series of Biblical commentaries. If it were rated according to designations used for hotels and restaurants, this reviewer would give it a "Five-Star" rating. It will certainly take its place as an important commentary for years to come for anyone making a careful study of the books of Ruth and Esther.

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

God behind the Seen: Expositions of the Books of Ruth and Esther. By A. Boyd Luter and Barry C. Davis. Expositor's Guide to the Historical Books. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1995, 377 pp., \$16.99 paper.

It is appropriate that the only OT books bearing a woman's name in the title should be the subject of joint expository studies. The format of each study, Ruth by Luter and Esther by Davis, is similar, but there are differences in their approaches. The preface acknowledges that Luter follows a pastoral approach while Davis' commentary provides more technical details. However, neither deals extensively with higher-critical issues.

Both writers see God's providential care of his people underlying the events that unfold in each book. Both writers employ a writing style that reflects the informal culture of the 1990s rather than the more formal, scholarly style associated with traditional commentaries. Two examples will suffice: "... scrambled eggs between his or her ears" (p. 29); "Get your popcorn and soda ready. Sit back and enjoy the true life adventures of Esther and Mordecai" (p. 103).

Both commentaries offer helpful and thought-provoking applications of numerous passages. Both call attention to chiasmic patterns in the structures of Ruth and Esther.

For this reviewer Davis' commentary was more satisfying, as it was a more in-depth study. His interaction with other commentaries was more apparent. His commentary gave greater attention to the meaning of Hebrew words.

Davis' frequent acknowledgment of the many moral and ethical problems will disturb those who defend the conduct of Mordecai and Esther (e.g. the lie of hiding Esther's Jewish identity, her entry in the beauty context she knew would relegate her to a concubine's status in the king's harem if she lost but would make her the bride of a Gentile unbeliever if she won). Davis argues that the absence of the name of God shows that Mordecai and Esther, like many Jews during the exile, had lost their first love for the one true and living God. He insists that the key verse used to suggest God's providence, Esth 4:14, may have only a secular meaning (p. 233). I agree with Davis's honest acknowledgment of the moral and ethical problems found in the book of Esther.

Neither study breaks new ground but is a composite of studies that have already been made. The style of writing will appeal to those who do not have the background or interest for more technical studies. Pastors who want to use Ruth or Esther for preaching or teaching will glean many helpful ideas from this book. It would make an excellent source for a home Bible study group.

F. B. Huey, Jr.

Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, Forth Worth, TX

Psalms. By James L. Mays. Interpretation. Louisville: John Knox, 1994, 457 pp., n.p.

A book written by James Mays (Professor Emeritus of Hebrew and Old Testament Interpretation at Union Theological Seminary in Virginia and editor of the Interpretation series) should always be welcomed, and this Psalms commentary is no exception. It is perhaps the most readable commentary I have seen.

Mays' exposition is thoroughly informed by the latest scholarship, but he does not allow an agenda set by the scholarly guild to dictate the questions he raises. He has a way of getting to what a psalm is about. He is sensitive to the literary beauty of the psalms and to the richness of their imagery. The genius of the commentary, in my view, is that each psalm is seen as part of a broader theological and canonical tapestry. Rather than merely analyzing a psalm into fragments, his horizons include the wider issues and strands represented in a psalm. He considers how individual psalms function within the book of Psalms as a whole and what clues they offer to interpreting neighboring psalms. He also shows how the Psalms and the Prophets echo and complement one another, and he seems particularly skilled at elucidating how psalms find their consummation in the light of Jesus and the NT. His consideration of the psalms as liturgies in ancient Israel and as prayers of the Church gives insight into the worship of God. Most of all, Mays gets us to read the psalms as our prayers.

Mays' theological treatment of the Psalms is never detached or overly doctrinal, but rather pondered within the complexities of human existence. For example, he says Psalm 13 "in its succinct representative character is there to teach us how to pray. But it also shows us who we are when we pray. We are given our true identity as mortals who stand on the earth and speak to God who is ours but never owned. Agony and adoration hung together by a cry for life—that is the truth about us as people

of faith. As the elect of God, we are not one but two. We are simultaneously the anxious, fearful, dying, historical person who cannot find God where we want God to be, and the elect with a second history, a salvation history, a life hid with Christ in God" (p. 80).

Mays does not attempt to treat each psalm by a set pattern, nor does he insist each must fit into a particular model of worship, nor does he pretend to give each the same relative space. And these decisions, in my judgment, contribute to the commentary's success. They reflect the diverse nature of the psalms themselves, which span several centuries and represent a variety of social settings and social circles (priests, wise sages, the "poor," etc.). Any overarching method or framework would thus be doomed from the start. In addition, some psalms are more theologically relevant to the Psalter and to the Bible than others. The format Mays follows is thus a general one. An introductory paragraph usually identifies the psalm's key theological theme and surveys its literary/liturgical structure. Numbered paragraphs and sections follow that discuss its major sections, not by a pedestrian verse-by-verse analysis, but by its key motifs, traditions and terms. A concluding section summarizes the value and contribution the psalm brings to our understanding of life with God, though by no means does Mays restrict this concern to his concluding remarks.

Mays raises the intriguing question "Is there a way of thinking about God . . . that characterizes the entire Psalter and contributes to the identity of every psalm?" (pp. 29–30). He proposes, with some qualifications, that "when viewed as limbs and branches dependent on the substance of this root metaphor, the psalms are the poetry of the reign of the Lord." Mays' attempt at answering this question, not only here but throughout his commentary, is helpful as a point of departure and even as a point of reference to which we may periodically return.

But by proposing that the metaphor of God as king establishes the theological key for psalms, individually and corporately, Mays wrongfully deviates from decisions he has made elsewhere about the Psalms, namely his respect for their diversity. A divine metaphor is not always what defines a given psalm. Many are simply cries for help—to a Deliverer of some kind, no doubt, but they do not suggest any particular imagined role for God. And when metaphors are presented, there are numerous others employed: "my God" (i.e., one's personal, guardian deity), "God of the fathers," warrior, shepherd, judge, covenant-partner, the holy one, the rider of the clouds, (rock of) refuge. Granted, several of these roles can be related to some ancient Near Eastern royal functions, but—to use a popular psalm as an example—"the Lord is my shepherd" is best read with an imagined rural, not a royal, setting (though Mays does not force his point here). If I may expand on Mays' analogy (perhaps unfairly), I doubt that the Psalter came from a single seed. Rather, the Psalter is a garden, fenced in on various terrains (some on the hilltop, some in the valley, some of the flats), containing a variety of species (some native and some imported, some wild and some domesticated, some flowering and some shade-bearing, and some thorny!).

The Interpretation series is geared for pastors and educated laypeople, and Mays' commentary hits the mark here. Few would go wrong if this were the first commentary they read on any given psalm. Readers will find their horizons expanded, not narrowed to a myopic view of jots and tittles. The scholarly community would also be the poorer if they thought this commentary a statement of the obvious. It soon becomes evident that behind Mays' conclusions lie a wealth of research and responsible exegesis (using all the tools of form, historical, literary, canonical criticisms). More than most in the guild, he seems to get to the heart of what psalms are about. I frequently found that even when Mays tells me something I already know, he puts

a thoughtful twist on the idea or somehow brings me to see it in a different light, or—perhaps more telling—puts me in a different light.

Craig C. Broyles
Trinity Western University, Langley, BC

The Structure of Psalms 93–100. By David M. Howard, Jr. Biblical and Judaic Studies from the University of California, San Diego 5. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1997, xvi + 231 pp., \$35.00.

In the last fifteen years, scholars have made significant gains in understanding the Book of Psalms, since they have been studying the Psalter as a literary whole rather than as a random anthology. This work by David Howard (an extensive revision of his 1986 dissertation, directed by David Noel Freedman) makes a major contribution to this area of research. Howard seeks to demonstrate that Psalms 93–100 are a unified, coherent group that has been intentionally ordered around the theme of YHWH's kingship (p. 20).

After showing how his study fits into the history of interpreting the Psalms (chap. 1), Howard briefly discusses his methodology (chap. 2). His approach is a synchronic analysis of the structure and message of the individual psalms and the group as a whole. The text of the MT is the basis of his study: he is not concerned with the order of other traditions (like that of 11QPs^a, which he takes as a liturgical anthology), and he emends the consonants only four times and revocalizes a few other words.

Chapter 3 is a commentary on the text of each individual psalm. In chap. 4, Howard studies each psalm in relation to each of the others in the group. The focus here is on several kinds of links. The most important links are the key-word links: lexical repetitions "that were undoubtedly in the editors' thinking as they made decisions about bringing the Psalter together" (p. 100), e.g. *šûr* in 94:22 and 95:1. But thematic links also play a role. Thematic links are of two kinds: lexical repetitions that are less significant than the key-word links, e.g. *kissē*⁷ in 93:2 and 94:20, and the repetition of the same idea with different vocabulary, e.g. *ʿēdût* and *tôrâ* in 93:5 and 94:12 respectively.

In a sense, chap. 5 is the heart of the book, for here Howard synthesizes the data of the two previous chapters and provides a contextual reading of the group as a whole, taking into consideration the broader context of Psalms 73–89, 90–92, and 101–106. Psalms 96–99 are the core of the group, with their focus on confidence in and praise of YHWH's kingship. This inner core is bounded by Psalms 95 and 100, which have many links between them; Psalm 100 is the climax of the group, and 95 is a bridge back to 93–94. Psalm 93 is a bridge between 90–92 and 94. In keeping with numerous other scholars, Howard sees Psalms 93–100 as the climax toward which Books 1–3 build.

Four appendixes follow: (1) the dates of Psalms 93–100, (2) prose particle counts in Book 4, (3) divine names and titles in Psalms 93–100 and (4) wisdom and royal/Zion traditions in the Psalter.

Howard has here and elsewhere articulated the difference between looking for macrostructures (the overarching shape of the Psalter as a whole) and analyzing microstructures (the detailed connections that exist between neighboring psalms) on the one hand and the need to base the former on the latter on the other hand. In this regard, Howard has made two particular contributions to the study of the shape of the Psalter, in addition to providing many fine insights into the individual texts under

discussion. One, he has succeeded in demonstrating that a detailed analysis of Psalms 93–100 yields the conclusion that these psalms are not in a random order, but have been purposefully placed to communicate a message that is more than the sum of the parts. Two, Howard has shown that there is a methodology to be applied to the Psalter as a whole—a methodology that will yield valuable insights into the shape of the whole as well as into the meaning of the individual texts that make up that whole, and a methodology that can free the pursuit of the shape of the Psalter from the charge of subjectivity (at least to the degree that any method is free from this charge).

Those who consult this work will no doubt find details here and there with which they will take issue, but on the whole Howard has provided an excellent study of Psalms 93–100, which is must reading for all who are interested in these psalms in particular and/or the question of the shape of the Psalter in general. My only major criticism lies in the choice of Psalms 93–100 as the group for analysis. Given that Howard divides Book 4 into three sections, 90–94, 95–100, and 101–106, it is odd that he analyzes 93–100, a group that does not correlate with any of the three sections. Howard himself senses this tension and acknowledges the somewhat artificial nature of the group (pp. 21 and 166). Where is the boundary between the first two sections of Book 4? Should 93 be included with 90–94 or 94 with 93–100? Were 93 and 94 reversed, the boundary would be indisputable, but the separation of 94 from the previous refuge psalms (90–92) and 93 from the following kingship psalms (96–99) has made the boundary fuzzy. That 90–92 (refuge) and 95–100 (kingship) are interlocked via 93 (kingship) and 94 (refuge) is clear (see Creach, *The Choice of Yahweh as Refuge in the Editing of the Hebrew Psalter*, 1996). And given the balanced structure of 96 (“Sing to the LORD a new song”), 97 (“The LORD reigns”), 98 (“Sing to the LORD a new song”), and 99 (“The LORD reigns”), bounded by 95 and 100, the group for analysis is Howard’s own central section: 95–100 in the context of 90–94 and 101–106. Owing to the fuzzy boundary, however, Howard’s decision to treat 93–100 does not detract from the value of the work in any significant way.

The Structure of Psalms 93–100 is not the first of Howard’s publications on the shape of the Psalter, and I hope it is not his last. Much work remains to be done, but Howard has succeeded in showing the value of the quest and in providing a methodological map for others to follow.

Mark D. Futato
Westminster Theological Seminary, Escondido, CA

Psalms of the Way and the Kingdom: A Conference with the Commentators. By John Eaton. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1995, 144 pp., \$33.50.

Every now and then one encounters a genuinely interesting book. Something original and engaging passes under one’s gaze, and one is both charmed and instructed. For me, Eaton’s *Psalms of the Way and the Kingdom* is such a book.

Eaton leads us into “a conference with the commentators” on psalms of the way (1, 19 and 119) and the kingdom (93, 97 and 99). The session having been convened by the author, the participants take their places in historical order. Gathering around the conference table with their diligently prepared work before them, eager to discuss the *crucis* of the selected psalms, are such giants as Delitzsch, Duhm, Briggs, Gunkel, Mowinckel, Kraus and others. After each one offers his proposals, Eaton exercises executive privilege by drawing the discussion to a close, adjudicating the salient questions of interpretation and criticism for each psalm. The reader has the delight of listening in as the proverbial fly on the wall.

While Eaton is scrupulously fair to his learned guests, he does not put them up on a pedestal. Some climb down by themselves, venturing inane opinions even in the midst of their genuine brilliance (e.g. Duhm on Psalm 119) with an endearing lack of self-awareness. Interestingly, Delitzsch, "the earliest and so often the best" (p. 116), wears well even after a century of scholarship breaking new ground on a number of fronts.

The author's own observations on the piety and spirituality of the various psalms supplements what is too often lacking in the commentaries under review.

Eaton's book would be useful in a course on the exegesis of the Psalms as an introduction to modern scholarly discussion of the Psalter. Indeed, it would be perfect for a course on the history of the interpretation of the Psalms, setting before the student the highlights of Psalms research for the past century plus.

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

Urgent Advice and Probing Questions. By James L. Crenshaw. Macon: Mercer University, 1995, 605 pp., \$60.00.

Learning from the Sages: Selected Studies on the Book of Proverbs. Edited by Roy B. Zuck. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1995, 438 pp., \$24.99.

When one thinks of major interpreters of wisdom literature, certainly the name of James Crenshaw should be near the top of the list. His writings are characterized by penetrating insight and an empathy with questions regarding the justice of God or, perhaps better, the justice due humanity.

Mercer's compilation of Crenshaw's essays in the area of wisdom is divided into three parts: "The Nature and Extent of the Wisdom Corpus," "Themes from Wisdom Literature (Theodicy, Education, Method)" and "The Wisdom Books." The majority of the essays seem to fit each category very well. However, I would be tempted to place the fifth essay in the work (they are numbered consecutively throughout), "Studies in Ancient Israelite Wisdom: Prolegomenon," in the section dealing with method.

Generally, the essays are well chosen and in fact, first-time readers of Crenshaw will have at their fingertips most of his significant works. However, some of the essays in the book are rather broad. In fact, I wonder if it is not a detriment to the overall work to include rather broad essays like introductions to each of the wisdom books.

If one wanted to pinpoint the seminal essays of Crenshaw's life work in wisdom literature, I would begin with the aforementioned "Studies in Ancient Israelite Wisdom: Prolegomenon." Over the years, I have gone back to this essay again and again as a reference point. Here, Crenshaw attempts to define wisdom as a concept and as a body of literature. In the end, he argues for a very conservative approach in determining whether a text is wisdom or not. For Crenshaw, the determination of a text as wisdom must meet the criteria of both form and content. Otherwise, through the use of circular reasoning and the neglect of taking seriously common linguistic stock, scholars will tend to see wisdom in many unlikely places in the OT (p. 101).

In regard to the section concerning themes, three essays stand out as important. First is the essay entitled "Introduction: The Shift from Theodicy to Anthropocidy." In this essay, Crenshaw points out various texts that relate to the issue of theodicy in the OT. His basic argument is that divine justice is maintained by demeaning humanity and by a potential loss of divine freedom (p. 151). This emphasis on the justice of God is often raised in Crenshaw's writings. Questions regarding God's justice in relationship to his compassion are the focus of the ninth essay, "The Concept of God in Old

Testament Wisdom." Crenshaw argues that a shift occurs in wisdom literature. The wisdom literature begins with a tremendous interest in divine justice, but eventually an emphasis on God's mercy becoming more explicit by the time of Ben Sira. The reason for this shift could be tied to the changing social and political fortunes of Israel during the time of the Seleucids, a time in which the populace would need the assurance that God is merciful (p. 205). The third essay of importance is "The Expression of *mī yōdē*^{ac} in the Hebrew Bible." Once again Crenshaw probes the complexity of humanity's relationship to God's sovereignty by exploring the use of the "Who knows?" formula. For Crenshaw, the formula "Who knows?" eventually reflects the collapse of the wisdom enterprise and a complete skepticism about the hidden God (p. 291). If one detects a recurring theme regarding the tension between the sovereignty of God and the freedom/dignity of humanity, then one has captured the essence of Crenshaw's thought.

The final section of the book is devoted to representative articles on the three Biblical books of wisdom: Proverbs, Job and Ecclesiastes. The essays represent overviews of the various books, exegetical studies on selected passages and theological musings on certain important themes in each book. The reader will do well to focus on the following essays: "Clanging Symbols," which is a study of Prov 30:1–14, the words of Agur; "In Search of Divine Presence," which is a descriptive analysis of the various streams of thought in the wisdom tradition; and "The Shadow of Death in Qoheleth," which provides a theological sketching of death and Qoheleth's ambiguous relationship to it.

The book ends with Crenshaw's analysis of wisdom studies after 30 years of teaching. He again argues that specialists in wisdom have not heeded his warnings of only identifying wisdom literature when there is a combination of form and content (pp. 590–595). Furthermore, Crenshaw revisits another favorite theme: Sapiential authority. Crenshaw muses about the complexity of knowing the right thing and doing the right thing (p. 586). The tension between knowing and doing is exacerbated by the generational gap between teacher and pupil. However, the sages often instructed their students to "just do it" without giving specifics. This approach made the appropriation of wisdom extremely difficult. Finally, Crenshaw maintains that wisdom literature is an important topic for study, if for no other reason that it offers surprises that force "scholars to reexamine the evidence" (p. 596).

The second work is also a collection of articles by different scholars gleaned from journals and commentaries on the book of Proverbs. Zuck's work is composed in two parts. The first part is an overview of the book of Proverbs (4 essays), as well as an emphasis on certain important themes in the book (5 essays). The final two essays in the first part of the anthology, "Filling in the Blank: Asymmetrical Antithetical Parallelisms" by William Mouser and "Guidelines for Understanding and Proclaiming the Book of Proverbs" by Greg Parsons, are focused on hermeneutical issues presented by proverbial poetry. Both are essential reading, but they do not fit the category of overview and theme.

The second part of the anthology contains 22 essays that span the entire book of Proverbs. Significant sections or chapters in Proverbs generally have more than one essay from two perspectives. Often the perspectives represent an evangelical and a nonevangelical approach. Those texts that have more than one essay include Prov 1:20–33; 8:22–31; 10:1–23:23; 22:6; 31:1–31. Many of the essays are very important for the study of Proverbs. The essay by Phyllis Tribble is a fine example of rhetorical criticism applied to Prov 1:20–33. John Ruffie's is an important response to those who are easily seduced by "parallelomania" in regard to the larger ancient Near Eastern context for Prov 22:17–24:22. Finally, Thomas McCreesh's essay is an important advance in the understanding of the virtuous woman (wisdom) of Proverbs 31.

Many of the other essays are parts of commentaries on selected passages. While there may be some benefit for collecting samples of commentaries no longer available to the general readership, this is not the case in Zuck's anthology. Therefore, I believe that many of the essays/excerpts from commentaries should have been excluded.

One important strength of this collection is the variety of theological positions and methodological approaches to the book of Proverbs. This allows the reader to sample traditional grammatical-historical exegesis, rhetorical criticism, as well as semantic-domain studies within the book of Proverbs.

Rick W. Byargeon

New Orleans Baptist Theological Seminary, New Orleans, LA

"The Place Is Too Small for Us": The Israelite Prophets in Recent Scholarship. Edited by Robert P. Gordon. Sources for Biblical and Theological Study 5. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1995, xviii + 638 pp., \$34.50.

Robert P. Gordon and Eisenbrauns are to be thanked for another volume in this growing series on Biblical and theological study. The focus of this volume is upon recent scholarly developments in the area of the OT prophets, especially the classical/writing prophets. Collected together are thirty-six previously published essays by thirty-five authors and two original contributions (plus section introductions) by editor Gordon.

Gordon's introductory article, "A Story of Two Paradigm Shifts," sets the stage for the entire collection. Applying a contemporary buzz word to the arena of prophetic studies, Gordon reviews the development of scholarly work on the prophets around two different paradigm shifts.

The first shift, as summarized by Gordon, occurred late in the 19th century, in part the result of wide acceptance of the documentary hypothesis. By accepting a late date for the law the emphasis shifted to the prophets as formative individuals of Israel's religion. Critical methodologies were then applied to identify the unique contributions and the original words of the prophets.

According to Gordon, a century of scholarship has focused upon these and related issues but now, as we approach the 21st century, a new shift has occurred. This shift is primarily the result of methodologies derived from fields of study external to Biblical studies that have been applied to the books of the OT prophets. Gordon's delineation of this shift provides a helpful introduction to the collection of works chosen to illustrate these new developments.

Ironically, as Gordon notes, Part 1, "The Near Eastern Background," looks backward in time to cover comparative materials from the ancient Near East. Two articles note similarities (and differences) of form and feature of 'prophetic' materials from the Near East.

The second part gives only passing recognition to a key issue: "The Message of the Prophets." Gordon feels this inadequacy when he states that only "token acknowledgment is made of the fact that the 'message(s)' of the prophets, in one respect or another, must always be at the center of the study of these books" (p. 77).

The heart of the volume is to be found in the third and fourth parts, where newer methodologies are accentuated. Articles in Part 3, "The Art of Prophecy," are quite diverse and give visibility to literary aspects of the prophets. Rhetoric is emphasized, which, as Gordon reminds the reader, includes both structural elements and persuasive effects. As Gordon points out, discussions on metaphor (by C. A. Newsom) or

dialog (by J. T. Willis) are not really new but, because they have been informed by the findings of recent studies in areas like linguistic theory, are also part of the new paradigm.

Part 4, "Prophecy and Society," is most illustrative of Gordon's second paradigm shift. It represents the growing area of Biblical studies that is informed by the social sciences. Here, the focus shifts from the text to the persons (prophets) and their social location. The articles by G. Auld and T. W. Overholt develop different views of how prophets perceived themselves. Three contributions (by B. O. Long, Overholt and R. P. Carroll) center on the issue of false prophets and false prophecy, all from a sociological, rather than a historical or theological perspective.

The emphasis of Part 5, "The Developing Tradition," is upon the final form of the text and the process of shaping that produced the final form. Here, it is the collective work of the redactors that receives attention rather than the message of the original prophet. The studies of H. G. M. Williamson and P. R. Ackroyd, for example, both examine the editors' reasons for locating smaller units within the greater whole.

The volume is brought to a conclusion by two final sections. One (Part 6, "Prophecy After the Prophets") looks backward at the prophets through studies that ask questions beyond the OT canon to consider the perspective of the LXX, Josephus and NT times. The other (Part 7, "Future Directions") is not so much a forward look at the possible impact of these newer methodologies as it is a consideration of their origin and relationship to Biblical and theological studies as a whole. The selection by Ferdinand E. Deist, "The Prophets: Are We Heading for a Paradigm Switch?" is helpful in this regard and might best be read at the beginning.

For the evangelical it will be clear from reading this volume that there are still some important presuppositions driving current studies on the role of the prophet and the shape of the Biblical text with which they will not sympathize, especially the increasing emphasis upon the message of the editors/redactors rather than the message of the prophet. Indeed, the volume brings out the cumulative frustration regarding agreement about locating the *ipsissima verba* of the prophets and illustrates the shift away from attempts to do so. Gordon is also aware of modern movements that shift even further away from the text (i.e. reader-response) but does not see their inclusion in this volume as warranted.

Robert D. Spender
Lancaster Bible College, Lancaster, PA

Isaiah 1-39. By Christopher R. Seitz. Interpretation. Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1993, xvi + 271 pp., \$23.00; *Isaiah 40-66*. By Paul D. Hanson. Interpretation. Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1995, x + 255 pp., \$23.00.

The Interpretation commentary on the book of Isaiah is the work of two prominent OT scholars, Christopher Seitz and Paul Hanson. "Planned and written specifically for teaching needs," these volumes contain minimal technical discussion, and a bibliography limited to a few primary volumes. This approach produces a streamlined effect, enabling both the author and reader to focus on the text. The result is admirable—they have produced works which are both readable and scholarly and which refreshingly concentrate on the message of the text itself.

The text-based approach of these commentaries reflects recent advances in contemporary Isaiah study in which, as Seitz states, "the quest for unity in the Book of

Isaiah—and a proper understanding of the nature of that unity—replaces a narrower historical approach that was concerned to read the book against reconstructed historical backdrops” (p. 3). The replacement of history with unity is not absolute, however. Seitz is “committed to an approach that does justice to the historical roots of the message of Isaiah on the one hand, and the present literary context in which the message is found, on the other” (p. 4). The intended salutary effect of this approach is “to recover something of the theological coherence available to precritical readers” (p. 4).

The attempt to wed historical and canonical contexts together is well illustrated in Seitz’ treatment of the oracles against the nations in chaps. 13–27, where he notes that “older traditions concerning the defeat of foreign nations . . . have been recast so as to accommodate a larger world judgment perspective now introducing the entire nations section” (p. 145). Or, in the case of chaps. 24–27, “the oracles refer to both past and future destruction” (p. 178). Thus history is not negated, it is recast by the final redactor of the text.

Related to the issue of history and canon is the concept of intertextuality. That is, certain texts, coming from a later period, address themes which are present in other, earlier passages. “We must be open to the possibility that certain passages that speak to the future are indeed fulfilled at later points . . .” (p. 45). For example, Seitz cites Hezekiah as a likely fulfillment for the messianic oracles in 9:1–7 and 11:1–9. Such an approach is helpful in finding meaningful connections between texts, but the nature and function of such connections are not always clear. Do such interrelationships necessitate completely different historical origins?

Significant in Seitz’ work is his development of “Zion Theology,” a topic which he has previously addressed in *Zion’s Final Destiny*. “What remains of paramount concern to those who have shaped the present tradition is not Zion’s defeat but rather *God’s fundamental, abiding concern for Zion’s final triumph and permanent fortification against the nations*” (p. 242, emphasis his). He sees it as a “loose governing structure” for chaps. 28–39 as well as a significant link between chaps. 1–39 and 40–66. For those in search of unifying themes within Isaiah, Seitz’ work on this topic deserves careful consideration.

Hanson’s volume on chaps. 40–66 addresses concerns similar to those of Seitz. He observes that Isaiah is marked by “*tensegrity*.” “The distinct parts are brought together into a whole that fascinates through its inner tensions and complex unity” (p. viii). Such a presupposition enables him to avoid an overly rigid bifurcation between chaps. 40–55 and 56–66.

Historical background plays an important part in Hanson’s work. According to Hanson, chaps. 40–55 address Israel in exile, while chaps. 56–66 address the post-exilic community. These historical assumptions obviously affect his interpretation of the text. For example, Hanson dismisses the historically Christian interpretation of Isaiah 53 as an anachronistic imposition: “The unique voice of the text in its ancient setting must never be silenced by later theological developments” (p. 157). Instead, he contends that the Servant is the voice of the Jewish community in exile, a community that was suffering for their refusal to obey God’s will.

Another example of Hanson’s historical assumptions is his assertion that chaps. 56–66 reflect themes of “inner-community conflict and bitter vindictiveness” (p. 192), apparently brought about by the nonfulfillment (or, misunderstanding) of the promises of chaps. 40–55. This tension then recurs throughout his treatment of “Third Isaiah.” For example, when addressing the “salvation-judgment oracle” of 57:3–13, he notes that “one group received promise of salvation while the other was indicted and sentenced to divine judgment” (p. 198). Undoubtedly, such historical reconstructions enable the reader to envision the words of the prophet, but it appears as if they drive the interpretation a bit too much.

Hanson is especially adept at pointing out the significant philosophical questions (“where is God?,” “will God keep silent?”) that the text addresses. It appears that Hanson is driven by a sincere pastoral concern which he sensitively applies to the twentieth century. For example, the words of Isaiah 42 are applied to modern regimes where people looking to God’s redemptive power “can become powerful agents in the transformation of human communities and nature alike” (p. 52) or a lengthy recounting of the alcoholism of baseball pitcher Jeff Musselmann as an illustration of the teaching of 54:1–17. Such applications help to demonstrate exactly how Hanson’s interpretation works itself out in contemporary life. Disagreement with Hanson’s assertions may draw the reader back to the text to clarify its meaning.

Taken together, Hanson and Seitz have produced a thoughtful reflection upon and engagement with the text and its application to 20th-century life. This reflection, though beset by the baggage of traditional historical critical assumptions, merits a close reading. I find it difficult to conclude that they have reached the lofty goal of recovering “the theological coherence available to precritical readers,” but they have made several steps in the right direction.

Neil O. Skjoldal
Trinity International University, Miami, FL

Joel. By James L. Crenshaw. AB 24C. New York: Doubleday, 1995, xiv + 251 pp., \$32.50.

The publication of another commentary on the little book of Joel is always cause for rejoicing, particularly when a scholar of the caliber of James L. Crenshaw is the author and it happens to be in the distinguished Anchor Bible (AB) series.

In the AB format, Crenshaw provides a contemporary translation of the Hebrew text, an overview of the book, discusses introductory issues, and then proceeds with notes and comments on each outlined portion of the text. In a short review, one can only touch on a few of these matters. On the book’s exact historical setting, Crenshaw remains agnostic (p. 28), but he accepts the majority consensus that the book is post-exilic. The order of the Twelve in the MT and LXX is inconclusive, but the internal evidence favors a date in perhaps the fifth century (p. 23). He notes the reference to the captivity and deportation in 3:2, 3 (MT 4:2, 3); the omission of references to the classical enemies, Assyria and Babylonia (p. 24); oft cited postexilic Hebrew words such as *haššelah* and *sôp* (p. 26); the quotations from presumed earlier authoritative biblical texts/traditions (pp. 27–28), and the theocratic form of the community (p. 28) among other things.

Crenshaw does an admirable job of presenting the history of the structural schemes proposed by various scholars and notes that the trend of scholarship is to recognize the structural unity of the book, with 3:3–8 (MT 4:4–8) seen as a later addition by some. After exploring the stylistic and rhetorical features of the book, which he notes is rich in simile and metaphor, the author deals with religious views of the book. Crenshaw takes modern commentators to task for assuming the guilt of the Jerusalemite faith community in their interpretations when the book does not even mention the reason for the locust plague and drought (pp. 40, 146). Turning to the day of Yahweh, Crenshaw believes “that the prophet interpreted a natural catastrophe in Judah, a severe infestation of locusts and a severe drought, in terms of the dreaded day of YHWH’s visitation in wrath, only to transfer this divine manifestation to foreign nations after the Jewish community turned to YHWH and became fortunate recipients of divine compassion” (p. 50).

In his fresh translation of the Hebrew text into modern English idiom, Crenshaw says he has “tried to navigate in treacherous waters, steering between the Scylla of literalism and the Charybdis of paraphrase.” In some cases, he has done an admirable job; in others, methinks he runs aground. The translation of 1:15b as *ûkešôd mišadday* “like destruction from the Destroyer” transfers the alliteration in the Hebrew text and steers confidently between the shoals. Likewise, the rendering of *lebāb* as “mind” and “inner disposition” in 2:12, 13 captures the meaning and contrast with a mere ritualistic tearing of clothing. However, the translation of *rûhî* (“my Spirit”) in 2:28 (MT 3:1) as “my vital force” runs aground on the shores of Charybdis and conjures up visions of *Star Wars* and the *Return of the Jedi*. While the semantic range of *rûah* may encompass a rendering, it is by no means clear that the prophet saw the endowment of Yahweh’s Spirit in this way (cf. Ps 51:11; Isa 48:16 for alternative OT views). Crenshaw’s translation likewise hides the trinitarian possibilities present in full canonical context and the focus on the personal presence of Yahweh that lie in the semantic range of the original Hebrew. Here it would have been better if Crenshaw had stayed with the “surface meaning of the text,” as he calls it (p. 52).

On the famous *hammôreh lišdāqâ* in 2:23, Crenshaw opts for “the early rain in its season” based upon Schmid’s research into the Egyptian and ancient Near Eastern philosophical background of *šedeq* as “order” in the structure of the universe (p. 155) and Joel’s failure to interpret the text if he really meant to render it as “teacher of righteousness.”

Crenshaw has given us an excellent technical commentary, reasonably priced, that shows great erudition and learning. For the scholar, researcher and graduate student, it is a fine addition to one’s library, on a par with Wolff’s in the Hermeneia series. It has a thorough bibliography, except for the strange absence of Douglas Stuart’s commentary on Joel in *Hosea-Jonah* in the Word series. However, the pastor and lay reader should look elsewhere for robust, readable commentary and exegesis for sermon preparation and teaching Sunday School. The book’s highly technical nature extends beyond the notes into the comments section on each pericope, and one is amazed that the AB claims it is aimed at the general reader with little or no formal training in Biblical studies.

David D. Pettus
The Criswell College, Dallas, TX

Of Methods, Monarchs, and Meanings: A Socio-rhetorical Approach to Exegesis. By Gina Hens-Piazza. Studies in Old Testament Interpretation 3. Macon: Mercer University, 1996, x + 199 pp., \$30.00. *Exploring the Texture of Texts: A Guide to Socio-Rhetorical Interpretation.* By Vernon K. Robbins. Valley Forge: Trinity Press International, 1996, x + 148 pp., \$15.00 paper.

Two of the most prominent approaches to Biblical interpretation to arise in the last 20 years use methods and insights drawn from the fields of social science and rhetorical criticism. Two recent publications offer models for integrated approaches to socio-rhetorical interpretation. In *Of Methods, Monarchs, and Meanings*, Gina Hens-Piazza surveys the methods of rhetorical criticism and social-science criticism used in Biblical studies before proposing a collaborative method. Hens-Piazza distinguishes between a rhetorical method centered on classical canons of oratory, exemplified by the approach of George Kennedy (*New Testament Interpretation through Rhetorical Criticism*, 1984) and the approach of James Muilenburg (*A Study in Hebrew Rhetoric*, 1953) that examines rhetoric as compositional artistry.

The review of social science research in Biblical studies carefully notes the problem of identifying the network of social relations in a narrative text as a mirror description of the social world of ancient Israel. Using Clifford Geertz' method of "thick description," Hens-Piazza considers the story world of the text to be a kind of anthropological field in which social structures may be interpreted to expose the "significance and import of social components therein" (p. 30). The proposed three-stage method moves through (1) thick description of social elements, (2) rhetorical assessment of the persuasive and stylistic features of the text, and (3) examination of the interconnections and interactions of the first two activities. While the studies of three texts concerning the judgments of a monarch (1 Sam 14:36–46, 2 Sam 14:1–22, 1 Kgs 3:16–28) begin with stage one, progress through the three stages becomes more fluid and interactive.

Vernon Robbins' *Exploring the Texture of Texts* is designed for classroom use as an introduction to interpretive methods. Stating that no one method of interpretation yields all the insights that can be drawn from a text, he draws together five methods or textures that can guide exegesis, devoting a chapter to each. The five textures—inner texture (getting inside a text), intertexture (entering the interactive world of a text), social and cultural texture (living with a text in the world), ideological texture (sharing interests in commentary and text) and sacred texture (seeking the Divine in a text)—offer a comprehensive map of the various interpretive methods practiced in the academy today.

Each chapter thoroughly outlines the avenues one can take when exploring each texture, highlighting aspects of the text that come to light as terms are carefully defined. Robbins does not attempt to show how the approaches may be integrated, but rather allows each to stand on its own, cautioning that exclusive focus on any of the five would limit and impoverish interpretation. Examples taken from throughout the NT complement the continuing study of the crucifixion in Mark 15. Chapters are followed by one or two guided studies that allow the student to explore the texture under discussion.

Each writer then moves in and out of rhetorical and social-science approaches differently. Although Hens-Piazza makes reference to the diversity of methods used in the field of rhetorical studies, her analysis most closely resembles that of Muilenburg. The reading of 1 Sam 14:36–46 sensitively reads Saul's eroding alignment with God, leadership of the people and relationship with his son. Careful attention to the discourse of characters and narrator show the disastrous effects of Saul's selective attention toward God. Saul has to be reminded to seek God's guidance, yet he invokes God in an oath that would kill his son. The sad state of affairs is indicated by the repetition of "did not answer him," with first God as subject, then Saul's army. Saul rejected God's authority, so first God, then Saul's army, rejected his.

Robbins' approach to rhetorical criticism is explained in the first two chapters. His analysis of the inner texture of texts examines repetition, progression, narration, opening-middle-closing, argumentation and sensory-aesthetic experience (inspired in part by Kenneth Burke's "Lexicon Rhetoricae" from his first book, *Counter-Statement*). The chapter on intertexture carefully catalogues the many kinds of quotation and allusion that were available to NT writers, distinguishes cultural and social references, and lists categories of historical data that are reported in external sources.

Each writer's use of social-science method and research is also distinct. Hens-Piazza begins each analysis with a review of the social and cultural world depicted in the text with special focus on relevant sociological and anthropological research. In the discussion of 2 Sam 14:1–22, clan kinship structure and its assimilation into the monarchy are treated. Most of the commentary notes the difference in status and power between the wise woman and the king, observing that the king is reluctant and distant as the woman skillfully moves him to give her a judgment. Using a similar framework

of status difference, the treatment of 1 Kgs 3:16–28 rejects without sufficient warrant the interpretation that Solomon feigns the stance of a cold, objective judge in order to elicit a compassionate response from the real mother.

Robbins' discussion of social and cultural texture lists the topics one might examine, such as various religious orientations to society, formal and informal contract and economic systems, and final cultural categories of dominant, subdominant, counter-cultural and contracultural orientations. Social roles and interactions are explained through the guided studies of Luke 7 and John 9. The chapter on ideology asks interpreters to examine their own social locations and ideologies as Robbins illustrates from his own life experience. Two guided studies explore assumptions about race and gender that come to light when studying the story of the Ethiopian eunuch in Acts 8 and the role of women in 1 Corinthians 14.

Each volume achieves its intended purpose. Hens-Piazza offers three thoughtful readings of OT narratives on monarchy, and Robbins offers a precise and detailed field guide to the topics and orientations that should be explored in NT exegesis. Both offer a wealth of insights that support their call for an end to over-specialization in Biblical interpretation.

If I could ask for anything more from each writer, it would be a stronger sense that rhetorical criticism is about the business of discerning strategies of persuasion, that Biblical study is conducted to explicate not only the meaning of texts, but their function. The appearance of the word "meaning" in Hens-Piazza's title and its six-fold repetition on Robbins' last page indicates that rhetorical purpose and strategy could be given more focused attention. What is implicit in Robbins' taxonomy and Hens-Piazza's readings could be made more explicit by describing the strategy of a text's call for transformation of belief, behavior and attitude.

Paul E. Koptak

North Park Theological Seminary, Chicago, IL

Revelation: The Torah and Bible. By Jacob Neusner and Bruce D. Chilton. Valley Forge: Trinity Press International, 1995, xv + 175 pp., \$17.00 paper.

Neusner and Chilton share "the written part of the Torah" for Jewish people, and the "Old Testament" for Christianity (pp. x–xi). But each faith expression complements this document: For Jewish people, it is the oral Torah, which then with the written Torah comprises one whole Torah that God gave ("revealed") to Moses, while Christianity adds the NT, making it the "Bible, the word of God" (p. xii).

Neusner provides a logical presentation of a traditional Judaism in the introduction ("Torah and Bible"), as it developed through the successive stages of the Mishnah (by 200 CE), the Yerushalmi Talmud (by ca. 400 CE) and finally the Bavli (by 600 CE), which is "the one whole Torah revealed by God to Moses" (pp. 4–8). No closed canon exists in Judaism: "God speaks all the time through sages" (p. 18). By contrast, Neusner would say that Christianity in the canon of OT and NT was closed by the end of the 4th century but a footnote (added by Chilton?) states that "the pattern of Christian truth" continues "in a different form and forum from the canonical Bible" (p. 18, n. 18).

Neusner in part 1, chap. 1 ("How We Know God in the Torah, Written and Oral") demonstrates that through Torah study "the truth, like God, is one—and the unity makes all the difference; . . . God's mind and humanity's mind are one, which is how humanity can, to begin with, know God at all" (p. 49). In chap. 2 ("How We Meet God in the Torah") Neusner emphasizes further that the student of Torah enters into the mind of God, learning how his mind worked when he formed the Torah, written and

oral. Finally in chap. 3 ("How We Know God in Heart and Soul") another possibility of knowing God is set forth in *Zekhut*, or "virtue" or "uncoerced acts of grace." While study of Torah is necessary to know God, another way exists to know him and even put a "lien of heaven," when godly people perform acts of *Zekhut*: Women, who have not had the opportunity to study Torah, or, common people who have no time for study. This special feature "is the power of the powerless, the riches of the disinherited" and the apex of this feature allows the "woman and the virtue that is natural to her situation" to "sit enthroned" (pp. 102, 193).

Neusner's system is reminiscent of how Aquinas argues in the *Summa* that most of Biblical doctrine can be gained by human reasoning but for those who have no time for this effort, the Scriptures provide the same information.

In part 2, chap. 4, Chilton discusses the Bible in the Church, where Paul claimed that "baptism made for a new Israel, after the manner of Abraham" (p. 126) was no longer subject to the Mosaic law and with the predominance of Gentile believers, Pauline Christianity prevailed. James' position asserts the reestablishment of the tabernacle of David (Acts 15:16, 17), in the midst of Gentiles "who show their awareness of the restoration by respecting the Torah" (p. 122); while this maintains the integrity of Scripture, it separates Christians. Peter interprets Moses "as an artless compromiser" (p. 127), sometimes siding with the traditions of Israel, sometimes with the new practices of the believing communities.

In chap. 5 ("Jesus: The Genesis of Christian Interpretation") the kingdom of God is Jesus' main focus, "derived from the biblical tradition (in Targumic form)" (p. 138), but Jesus left no "theory . . . of how the kingdom and Scripture were related to one another" (p. 140). Fellowship meals were important in "enacting the kingdom of God" (p. 142) for people from all walks of life. Finally, at the last supper, the sacrificial elements of bread (his flesh) and wine (his blood) were a "better sacrifice than what was offered in the Temple" (p. 145). Jesus then died triumphantly, not acknowledging defeat, and in his resurrection, he could present himself alive to his followers. The kingdom he had preached was fully effective; indeed, he is the "force and reality of the kingdom" (p. 147).

Finally, chap. 6 ("The Interpretative Resolution of the New Testament") affirms that Barnabas framed an ecumenical catechesis represented by the Synoptics where Luke in particular develops a homiletical technique that links Jesus and "the purpose behind the Scripture." With John, the "Word" is the Aramaic *Memra*, suggesting that the "word" spoken by Moses is embodied in the person of Jesus. The book of Hebrews, at the end of the period of Scripture formulation, provides a typology that links many of the types of the Hebrew Bible to give us a better understanding of the reality of Jesus.

Revelation by Neusner and Chilton is valuable for the positions they share. One of Chilton's weaknesses, however, is the lack of specific further information that Jesus died specifically as the sacrifice to take away our sins, rather than a comparison of purity between the sacrifice of Jesus and what the Temple provided. Another weakness is the lack of any reference to the deity of Jesus that could account for his resurrection.

Louis Goldberg
Jews for Jesus, New York, NY

The Dead Sea Scrolls: A New Translation. By Michael Wise, Martin Abegg, Jr., and Edward Cook. San Francisco: HarperCollins, 1996, 513 pp., \$35.00.

Wise, Abegg and Cook have undertaken, and succeeded in overcoming, the challenge of developing a one-volume translation of the Dead Sea Scrolls (DSS). Although

limited translations of the caves' fragments were made available within several years of the scrolls' discovery, the 1992 public release of the entire body of DSS photographs has exponentially increased the task of the translator. García Martínez was the first to incorporate much of the new material in a single-volume translation, initially in Spanish (1993) and subsequently in English (1995). The Wise, Abegg and Cook book is the second.

Those who would undertake to produce a "comprehensive" translation of the DSS must initially decide which manuscripts to include out of the more than 800 available. While neither the Wise, Abegg and Cook nor García Martínez volumes translate the Biblical texts, the former chose also not to include the DSS versions of the Pseudepigrapha (Tobit, Jubilees, 1 Enoch and others). What remains, though, are the exciting texts, unique to Qumran, that reveal second-temple history and theology from a sectarian perspective. These Wise, Abegg and Cook open to examination by scholar, students and lay readers alike. A second decision confronting the DSS translator concerns which fragments to include, or rather which ones to exclude, within a single volume. A glance at any of the books in the *DJD* series reveals that several manuscripts have 40, 60 or more fragments, but many of these show only a word or two. These the translators usually omit, but in some cases even a thumbnail fragment is important. For instance, Abegg translates a three-word fragment from 4Q384, because one of its words, "Tahpanhes," the place of Jeremiah's Egyptian exile, weighs heavily in the interpretation of this manuscript. In such situations the non-Hebrew reader is at the mercy of the translator's judgment in selection. To their credit Wise, Abegg and Cook have deftly balanced these considerations to give the reader most of the material without overwhelming with minutiae.

The book has three sections: (1) A prolegomenon of 45 pages, (2) 444 pages of translation and (3) a 20-page epilogue. With the goal of writing for the lay person the authors begin by surveying the discovery, language and content of the scrolls, but their major emphasis in the introduction is to present a new proposal for scroll origins. Positioning a theory of sectarian genesis later than most, they see the movement as having begun in the late second or early first century BC, become politically active during the turbulent times of Rome's takeover of the Hasmonean kingdom, and essentially end with the death of its followers at Masada. The translators support their argument with new data from the calendar texts, the polemics of *Miqsat Ma'ase ha-Torah* (called in this edition the *Sectarian Manifesto*), and the politics of 4Q448 *In Praise of King Jonathan*, in addition to identifying the historical personalities, known only by the sobriquets "Teacher of Righteousness," "Wicked Priest" and "Lion of Wrath." The *King Jonathan* text, which rates heavily in their argument, may be a degree of difficulty harder to decipher than the translators convey. Closing the first section is a two-page illustration entitled "How to Read this Book," which graphically demonstrates the standard brackets, numbers and symbols necessary to depict the translation and reconstruction of a fragment. This truly is a picture worth a thousand words.

The translators divided the 374 manuscripts into 131 texts, arranged generally according to the standard cave and manuscript designations. Each text consists of a helpful introduction to the material translated, the translation itself, a brief running commentary and the translator's name. As for the document's name, often the standard identification has been discarded for a more appropriate, context-derived title, which, though advantageous for the novice reader, introduces another level of classification in addition to the myriad of terminology already in hand. The translations tend toward a dynamic equivalence rather than a literal bent, which makes for a very readable text.

The epilogue consists of bibliography and two indexes, one of manuscripts and the other of references. The bibliography lists 228 entries, which more than adequately

would allow any reader to enter a field of research on any DSS subject. It is regrettable that the García Martínez and Parry comprehensive bibliography was published after this work, as its references would well supplement those given here. As a frequent user of the Wise, Abegg and Cook book, I have found the format of the "Index of Manuscripts" to be wanting. Unlike the reference index, the manuscript index refers to the appropriate text number, which frustrates a quick find that a page number would have given.

Wise, Abegg and Cook have produced a first-rate translation of the Dead Sea Scrolls, which should quickly become the standard English edition of these texts.

George Snyder, Jr.
Practical Bible College, Binghamton, NY

New Testament Greek Manuscripts: Matthew. Edited by Reuben Swanson. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic; Pasadena: William Carey International University, 1995, xx + 304 pp., \$29.95 paper.

The four-volume series *New Testament Greek Manuscripts: Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John* is a welcome tool for students and professors in the disciplines of hermeneutics, textual criticism, theology and Biblical studies. The key for efficiently using this work is the first four sections of the six-section introduction. Within the introduction one finds a useful definition of methodology as well as a detailed listing and description of key abbreviations.

Part 1 of the introduction is "An Historical Review of Text Editions." Swanson's purpose is to "avoid the eclecticism that characterizes all current editions" (p. iii) of the Greek NT. He points to the deficiencies of previous editions of the Greek NT from the 17th century to today, based on their dependence on *Textus Receptus*, which from its inception was an eclectic text.

Part 2 is a call for "A New Edition Based Upon a New Principle and a New Methodology," in which Swanson suggests completeness, accuracy and efficiency as the essential criteria for acceptance of a new edition (p. v). According to Swanson, "Completeness is not to be understood in the sense of a complete reporting of all manuscripts, versions, lectionaries, and church fathers, but rather the complete reporting of every variant from those particular sources of this work" (p. v). A comparison of the Nestle-Aland text with the material reported in the apparatus in this work will indicate inaccuracies in the former. Furthermore, all substantial variants are reported in groupings of parallel lines. The latter makes the comparison of variants easier, since the variants are not printed continuously.

In Part 3, "Particular Sources Used for this Edition," Swanson reproduces information concerning the sources from the UBS⁴ text, which includes papyri, uncials, minuscules, church fathers and editions.

Part 4 is "A Description of the Edition" that Swanson proposes, in which Codex Vaticanus is the exemplar, based on the opinion that it is "the best manuscript available" and its antiquity. He confirms the incomplete status of Vaticanus. However, Codex Sinaiticus, even though complete, lacks the quality of Vaticanus. The text of Vaticanus is printed in full as the lead line for each of the groupings of parallel lines. The witnesses are listed for each line of text in the following order: Vaticanus, papyri in their numerical order, the uncials in their alphabetical order, uncial (0171), and finally the minuscules in the order of Family 1, 13, 33, and the rest of the minuscules in numerical order.

Swanson obviously favors the Alexandrian readings, based on his choice of Vaticanus as the exemplar. However, significant variant readings from the other text families are presented in a format that makes it possible for the reader to follow the text of any manuscript of choice. This allows for a true textual comparison with a plurality of manuscripts rather than with a limited few, without defiling the integrity of each scribal witness.

Steven L. Cox
Mid-America Baptist Theological Seminary, Memphis, TN

Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics: An Exegetical Syntax of the New Testament. By Daniel B. Wallace. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996, xxxii + 797 pp., \$39.99.

Daniel Wallace has invested here an enormous amount of labor, all of it marked by an obvious love for the NT and its language, for students, and for exegesis. Though not intended to be read cover to cover (certainly not at one sitting!), this volume, even when read cover to cover, maintains an upbeat enthusiasm for its subject, a subject that easily could (and in other treatments does) foster tedium and pedantry. Designed as a classroom teaching text (with instructions to teachers, pp. xviii–xix), it will probably function most often as a reference tool. Numerous nearly verbatim repetitions (e.g. pp. 64, §v, and 79, n. 21; pp. 88 and 103–104 on 1 Tim 1:17; pp. 113, n. 111 and 117, n. 125; pp. 499–500 and 556–557—to list a few) enable one to dip in almost anywhere and find cogent information.

Justifying the book as a secondary grammar specializing in exegesis, Wallace provides from the NT hundreds of example texts (all given both in Greek and in English). Many of them are by intention either ambiguous or exegetically significant, and many of these are discussed further, some at considerable length, and frequently with insight and helpfulness. The subtle contrast between the aorist and imperfect of (*exerchomai* at John 4:30, for example, gives point and power to Jesus' call to his disciples to lift up their eyes, for the *approaching Samaritans* are white for the harvest (p. 545).

Charts and graphs, statistics, “user-friendly” definitions, the development of contextually based semantic situations for a multitude of syntactical categories—all these contribute to the book's practicality for both teacher and student alike. Typical of the many diagrams is one illustrating the use of the article (p. 231) or that depicting the ambiguity in the semantic overlap of purpose and result participles (p. 638). A simple scheme of marginal symbols highlights material appropriate to lower, intermediate and advanced levels of proficiency. The treatment of the various syntactical phenomena is organized with priority on structural rather than semantic categories, since most users will come to the book with decoding rather than encoding questions. The some 700 pages of discussion are condensed into a handy summary nearly 40 pages in length, followed by a five-page “cheat sheet” outlining in order the syntactical categories and subcategories covered. A Scripture index concludes the book. The various individual sections provide useful, up-to-date bibliographies of mostly English-language resources, and hundreds, perhaps thousands, of footnotes nuance the discussion.

Fully 90% of the space is devoted to the syntax of words and phrases (pp. 31–655), and only 70 pages to the syntax of the clause. The reason: Basic categories of clause structure are treated in the earlier material. Under words and phrases, Wallace divides the subjects into subsections for nouns and nominals (pp. 31–389) and for verbs and verbals (pp. 390–655). The material on nouns and nominals is treated under the rubrics of the cases (after a useful discussion of the relative merits of the five-case and the eight-case systems, he adopts the former [pp. 31–35]), the article, adjectives, pronouns and prepositions. Verbs and verbals are handled under person and number, voice, mood, tense (dealing here all too briefly with the hot issue of verbal aspect [pp.

499–504]), the infinitive and the participle. The larger *text*-grammatical view offered by some forms of discourse analysis is, disappointingly, not considered—though this is probably wise, as Wallace himself argues (p. xv), since it is a topic that deserves (soon!) its own full-length NT-based treatment.

Among the book's many strengths, a few may be singled out for special mention. (1) Many of the syntactical categories are analyzed not only in terms of form and function, but also in terms of their patterns of usage. We learn, for instance, that the "instantaneous imperfect" is virtually restricted to the verb *elegen* in narrative literature (p. 542); that a participle of means "is frequently used with vague, general, abstract, or metaphorical finite verbs," since it explains the verb (p. 629); or that prepositions with accusative or dative nouns are usually used adverbially, whereas those with genitive nouns are more naturally adjectival (p. 357). Such information enhances the reader's understanding of the category under consideration. (2) Wallace's treatment of the verbal system is current with the recent advances in the understanding of verbal aspect promoted by S. E. Porter, B. M. Fanning and others. In fact the book is dedicated in part to Fanning. Yet Wallace is critical in his use of these advances, and quotes with approval M. Silva's warning against overly rigid theories (p. 511, n. 45). Repeatedly, moreover, Wallace lays emphasis on the fact that mood and aspect (in particular) represent the speaker's or writer's *portrayal* or *representation* of reality rather than reality itself (e.g. pp. 443–445, 503–504). Nevertheless, the multiplicity of types of presents, imperfects, aorists, etc., is as bewildering as ever. (3) Under the treatment of the article, there is an extensive and very helpful discussion of Colwell's rule and the Granville Sharp rule, together with advice for applying them responsibly in exegesis (pp. 256–290). (4) Pertinent warnings may be found throughout: Against overinterpretation of prepositions (pp. 359–360), gender (p. 338), or any grammatical category (p. 515, n. 5); against confusing conditional sentences with their converse or reverse (pp. 685–686); or against reading one's theology into the syntax (e.g. p. 574).

Of course, in a work of this size and scope, one will also find something to complain about! For example, the citation of G. Henry Waterman's short but stimulating article on the verbal genitive (p. 73) leads the reader to expect that what Wallace means by the verbal genitive (pp. 112–121) will correspond to Waterman's own definition, namely that in a noun-plus-genitive-noun construction, the genitive noun itself will be a verbal transform. Wallace defines it the other way around: The head term on which the genitive depends is the verbal noun. This completely neutralizes Waterman's insightful analysis of the genitive noun as capable of representing, by grammatical transformation, any syntactical position in a sentence, including in this instance that of the central verb. Wallace's treatment of the verbal genitive misses this altogether.

An element in the basic approach of the book is the use of the unaffected and (contextually) affected meanings of the various syntactical categories (pp. 2–3). Why Wallace wishes to provide the "unaffected" meaning for the various syntactical categories, however, is not clear. Rightly orienting his treatments to actual, "affected" usage, recognizing the contribution of context, he makes little appeal to the "unaffected meaning" once he has described it. For the nominative case, barely six and a half lines are devoted to it (p. 37). The genitive case he ends up defining in terms of context anyway: If in the five-case system (which he rightly prefers) the genitive may be (unaffectedly) "defined as the case of qualification . . . and (occasionally) separation" (p. 77)—presumably the "occasion" being the affect of context—then one wonders why bother talking about the unaffected meaning at all. Similar observations can be made through the book, even in the discussion of verbal categories (pp. 499, 514–516). The facts of the matter, at least regarding verbs, are well put by Wallace himself (p. 511; italics mine): "In our view, the unaffected meaning of the tenses in the indicative involves both aspect and time. However, either one of these can be suppressed by lexemic, contextual, or grammatical intrusions. *Thus, a proper view of language does not attempt*

to weave a thread of meaning through all the instances of a given form. Too many other linguistic features are vying for power." Exactly.

Sometimes a category is defined in a problematical way, as when the "genitive of relationship" is restricted to *familial* relations (p. 83). This explains the trouble Wallace senses with classifying John 20:28 as a "possessive genitive" (p. 82). Similarly, the category of voice would be less confusingly defined if appeal were made to the notions of topic, comment, actant, goal, agent, focus, etc. (pp. 408, 439; cf. also p. 141, c. 1: The "agent" in the passive is also the "agent" in the active; it is the topic or focus that changes).

Besides these more substantial problems, there are the frequent overly subtle interpretations (e.g. p. 173 on Matt 4:10; p. 242, n. 66) or theologically predetermined results (among many, cf. p. 94 on Acts 2:4; pp. 215, 525 on 1 Tim 2:12; p. 371 on Acts 2:38; p. 380 on what is "impossible" for God; p. 381, n. 69; p. 405 on Mark 15:32 and p. 440 on 1 Cor 12:13). These, in spite of warnings against them (mentioned above). A politically regrettable witticism (p. 71, Acts 13:10) ought to be removed from future editions.

These few objections notwithstanding, Daniel Wallace may be sincerely thanked for a fine, balanced contribution to the exegetical toolbox of professor, pastor and student.

Rich Erickson
Fuller Theological Seminary, Seattle, WA

Studies in the Greek New Testament: Theory and Practice. By Stanley E. Porter. Studies in Biblical Greek 6. New York: Peter Lang, 1996, viii + 290 pp., \$32.95 paper.

Barely into his forties, Stanley Porter has already become as productive as many seasoned scholars in the Biblical studies academy. His works are invariably solid, well researched and rigorously argued treatments on a wide variety of NT issues. This book gathers 13 typical Porter essays, two published here for the first time, and all related in one way or another to the original language of the NT.

The first five chapters are devoted to theoretical matters: The relation between linguistic theory and the Greek of the NT; the nature of Greek verbal aspect, particularly with reference to the work of B. Fanning; tense terminology in the teaching of Greek; NT lexicography; and the nature of NT Greek with respect to "Semitic" influence.

The "practical" chapters address technical linguistic problems in NT interpretation on a wide range of subjects: The importance of the periphrastic for the loosing-binding passage in Matt 16:19; the meaning of *eggizein* for the problem of the conflicting synoptic accounts of Jesus' healing at Jericho; the place of Greek as a spoken language in first-century Palestine, and its implications for whether Jesus used Greek as a teaching medium; the validity of the presumed Thucydidean policy on the use of speeches and its implications for understanding Acts; the background of the *katallassein* group and its relation to the other peace-and-salvation terminology in Romans 5; an evaluation of diatribe as a genre in the interpretation of Romans 5; an assessment of the validity of Wittgenstein's classes of utterance and their relevance for NT ethical statements, particularly with reference to Gal 3:28-29; and, finally, a reinterpretation of the "salvation-by-childbirth" passage at 1 Tim 2:15.

There is much to learn from reading this remarkable collection. The footnotes constitute a virtual card catalog on the subjects at hand and alone may be worth the high price of the book. Porter's procedure itself is instructive: He follows a relatively stable pattern of stating the problem, examining the previous research, analyzing the assump-

tions, exploring unexploited areas of relevance (or re-exploring areas inadequately understood) and drawing conclusions for his subject. One can quibble over this or that, for instance, whether Porter's examples of *eggizein* adduced in chap. 7 are convincing for his thesis, or why the reprinted essay defending his view of verbal aspect (chap. 2) makes no attempt to respond to the telling criticism that Fanning makes (as does Silva) in the same volume where Porter's essay first appeared (S. E. Porter and D. A. Carson, eds., *Biblical Greek Language and Linguistics: Open Questions in Current Research*, JSNTSup 80, 1993, p. 59), that Porter "has been misled by trying to formulate a theory which brooks absolutely no exceptions." But in the main, the approach is stimulating and the arguments well presented.

The volume has its unfortunate side, however. Pervading the entire work is a tone of superiority, almost of superciliousness. Previous research by others is frequently described as "disappointing," "not too informative," characterized by "ancient methods," and the like. One such comment, aimed at a named scholar, is downright cruel (p. 58); it would be cruelty toward Porter to repeat it here. Add to this the fact that although most of his readers will be NT scholars with little if any experience in classical Greek, Porter does not translate the many citations of classical texts (e.g. pp. 180–181, 197, 217–218; though oddly, he translates LXX texts, sometimes twice, pp. 198–199). All this is balanced by an equally unseemly regard for his own work. One indulges a scholar's mild vanity in publishing a collection of his or her essays; it is good to take pride in one's work. But did we really need this book, when eleven of the thirteen essays are reasonably, most easily, accessible in their original place of publication? His apology for the collection, printed in the preface, is typical in this regard. And for a grammarian's work, there are in it a surprising number of obscure sentences (pp. 35, 68–69, 88, 113, n. 49, 161, 248).

But as a NT linguist, Porter is on to something; we will benefit by hearing him. His caustic patronization we may endure; it need not be taken seriously except insofar as it may prevent some of his readers from being more open and sympathetic to his very valuable perspective. We can indulge it, because it takes a particular courage and self-assurance—not to mention brilliance—to succeed in the worthy task Porter has apparently set for his life's work. Still, we can encourage him to examine his presentation, and meanwhile examine our own and learn from each other.

Rich Erickson
Fuller Theological Seminary, Seattle, WA

Customs and Controversies: Intertestamental Jewish Backgrounds of the New Testament. By J. Julius Scott, Jr. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1995, 419 pp., \$19.99 paper.

In the past few decades, new editions and translations of the apocrypha, Dead Sea scrolls and pseudepigrapha, as well as many significant archaeological discoveries, have resulted in a renewal of interest in second-temple Judaism. Scott's excellent survey of Judaism from the destruction of Solomon's temple to NT times therefore comes at just the right time, and should prove to be the ideal companion to the revised *The New Testament Background: Selected Documents* by C. K. Barrett for anyone who teaches a course on NT backgrounds.

Scott begins by reminding his readers (college and seminary students, pastors and inquiring laypersons) that the intertestamental period, *not* the OT, is "the immediate historical, cultural, or religious setting for the life and ministry of Jesus, the apostles, and their associates" (p. 18). Moreover, Scott rightly asserts, Judaism during the

intertestamental period is not the same as the OT Hebrew faith nor the Rabbinic Judaism which developed after AD 70. Therefore, competent NT exegesis requires a thorough understanding of the people, events, literature and institutions of the intertestamental period, and to provide these is the stated, and fulfilled, purpose of this book.

Scott divides his study into three parts. Part 1 addresses the "Background and Setting of Intertestamental Judaism" in five chapters. Each chapter begins with a brief outline. Chap. 1 focuses upon sources (OT, Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, Dead Sea Scrolls, etc.); chap. 2 describes the geography of the land of Israel, including the temple complex; chap. 3 is a chronological survey of the OT from beginnings to the postexilic period; chap. 4 discusses OT ideas and institutions (monotheism, Israel as God's chosen people, Torah, feasts, vows, prophets, kings, etc.) and chap. 5 reviews the history of Intertestamental and NT Judaism from 586 BC to AD 135.

Part Two contains seven chapters on the "Crises and Responses of Intertestamental Judaism." Chap. 6 introduces the two crises: The destruction of the Jewish state in 586, which affected the land, the monarchy, the temple, and the scriptures; and the spread of Hellenism via Alexander the Great, which resulted in diversification of the Jewish community. Chap. 7, one of the most valuable chapters, describes the *responses* of intertestamental Judaism to these crises. They include new emphases (ethics become more important than temple and sacrifice, right behavior began to lead to legalism, Judaism became more isolated and exclusivistic, religious and cultural distinctives became more central to Jewish identity); new methods of scriptural interpretation (targums, halakah, etc.) and new translations; the emergence of the synagogue; and the responses of such groups as the Maccabees, scribes, apocalyptists, etc. Flowing out of chaps. 6 and 7 are chap. 8, which deals with the attempts to reconstruct traditional institutions (restoration of temple, feasts, monarchy); chap. 9, which discusses the scribes who gave structure to postexilic Judaism; chap. 10, covering the emergence of apocalyptic literature and chap. 11, treating the sects and parties of intertestamental Judaism (Pharisees, Sadducees, Herodians, etc.). Chapter 12, "Common Life in First-Century Israel," the final chapter of Part Two, doesn't really fit here, as the author admits, but I agree with his decision to include it in this work, because it contains a useful overview of home life, economics, education and other aspects of the life of the average Jew. Often overlooked in scholarly studies, the daily life of ancient cultures is often more interesting to the average reader than anything else!

Part Three addresses the "Religious Thought of Intertestamental Judaism," with six chapters devoted to the Jewish worldview, the final age, the kingdom of God, the Messianic hope, Covenant and Law in the final age and attitudes toward Gentiles. The volume concludes with a brief epilogue, eight appendixes (the books of the OT Apocrypha, OT Pseudepigrapha, the tractates of the Mishnah, Talmud and Tosephta, a description of crucifixion, Jewish daily prayer and the exclusion of Jewish Christians, a brief discussion of apocalyptic literature and inspired Scripture, interpreting apocalyptic literature, and another brief treatment of "how scholarship works"), a bibliography subdivided into primary and secondary sources, an index of Scripture and Jewish writings, and a subject index.

I recommend this study to anyone who wants to become a better interpreter of the NT. I certainly intend to require it for my NT Backgrounds course. The discussion is balanced; both sides of controversial issues are generally given, and I appreciate an author who admits when he is unsure about which side to take. And the discussion is comprehensive as well. Scott knows and uses even the lesser-known intertestamental and rabbinic sources. The two exceptions to this are any significant discussions of the book of Daniel (otherwise Scott has a good treatment of apocalyptic literature), and

the topic of wisdom and its importance for understanding the significance of Jesus in the gospel traditions ascribed to the Q source.

David G. Clark
Southern California College, Costa Mesa, CA

Jesus and the Holy City: New Testament Perspectives on Jerusalem. By Peter W. L. Walker. Grand Rapids/Cambridge: Eerdmans, 1996, xvi + 370 pp., \$25.00 paper.

This important work in NT theology traces the themes of the temple, Jerusalem and the significance of the land of Israel through the individual NT books. The result is an approach to Jerusalem that sees Jesus as the new temple, the embodiment of a heavenly city and the new locus of the believer's life. Reading a bit like a dissertation, this theology is built via thorough inductive study of virtually all the references to the city in the NT.

Walker is a lecturer at Wycliffe Hall, Oxford and formerly a research fellow at Tyndale House, Cambridge. He hopes his work "will be of interest to New Testament specialists and students of late antiquity, as well as to all those who are concerned with issues relating to the Bible or the Holy Land today" (p. xiii). He previously edited *Jerusalem Past and Present in the Purposes of God* (1994) and has contributed several articles related to Jerusalem. He draws a good deal on the work of N. T. Wright, but as a comprehensive work, this is unique.

Chapters 1–7 share the fruits of Walker's inductive labor. Mark is seen as introducing the new teaching of the risen Jesus as the new temple. He pronounces judgment upon the city, then proceeds both to prefigure and bear the burden of the city's fate at the hands of Rome. Matthew, writing after Jerusalem's destruction, sees Jesus as "a new Zion." He emphasizes God's true workings through the city in the past and sees the promised time of restoration of Jerusalem being fulfilled in the messiah.

Luke more fully develops these themes, showing how salvation in the person of Christ moved first *toward*, then *from* Jerusalem in his gospel and the Acts. Jesus changed Jerusalem's role from "centripetal" to "centrifugal" in salvation theology. Paul would be the apostle who most emphasized the change to a "new centre." The believer is "in Christ," and the temple and city face an impending judgment.

John, with his frequent references to the feasts and the temple, highlights Jesus as "a new temple." The city that was central to God's people has now come to represent "the world." The gospel message emanates from Jerusalem in its historical origin, but more significantly has a universal scope that transcends the local.

Hebrews is a direct challenge to Jerusalem's authority. Christians must come "outside the camp" of Judaism, as Jesus suffered outside the city. This "new calling" is an exhortation to act on the truth of the Christ's fulfillment of the ancient symbols.

Revelation views Jerusalem as spiritual, descending from heaven. The earthly Jerusalem has taken its place with Babylon and Rome, and her destruction in AD 70 is a precursor of the ultimate judgment on the world. Walker allows for a premillennial return of Christ, but this has nothing to do with the earthly city of Jerusalem.

Part II (chaps. 8–10) ties the data together into a coherent whole. Chapter 8, "A New Direction: Jesus and Jerusalem," reviews how this theology is anchored in the teachings of Christ himself. Chapter 9, "A New Theology: New Testament Reverberations," then summarizes the NT message, revealing the essential unity of the writers. Chapter 10, "A New Significance: Towards a Biblical Theology," shows how 1 Peter reflects this kind of process. Walker then deals with some of the theological and political

ramifications of his conclusions. An "Afterword" suggests that this view held sway through the early centuries of Christianity but gave way to a nostalgic view of venerating Jerusalem's memory. Later, "restoration" movements began ascribing an eschatological significance to Jerusalem alien to the NT and even the millennial church fathers.

The evangelical reader will appreciate Walker's emphasis on the unity of the NT message. While some may differ with his understanding of the backgrounds of certain books and his reticence to deal with disputed topics, the work is generally conservative. Perhaps he dismisses too easily the "restoration" of the land. Is it not possible that Christ is the spiritual temple and the locus of a new community, but that he still has an eschatological plan for ethnic Israel and a future redeemed Jerusalem? Here Walker's admission of a premillennial return of Christ begs for elucidation: What does a return to Christ look like that has nothing to do with Jerusalem?

Overall, Walker has achieved his goals well. Rich insights into the text are scattered throughout the book. After studying this work, the reader will view Jerusalem, the temple and Christ's history-changing role in a much more profound way.

Kent Berghuis

Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, Deerfield, IL

Jesus the Messiah: A Survey of the Life of Christ. By Robert H. Stein. Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1996, 290 pp., \$24.99.

This work is an introduction and overview of the life of Christ. It is divided into two parts, the first theoretical, and the second historical. The first part of the work, which consists of three chapters, deals with questions of presuppositions, sources and chronology as they relate to the study of the historical Jesus. The second section ("The Life of Christ"), consisting of 15 chapters, deals with important events in the life of Christ (e.g. baptism, temptation, transfiguration).

One should not criticize a book for not doing what it does not intend to do. Thus, this work should not be criticized for not being a scholarly tome. The lack of footnotes and interaction with the latest literature may disturb some, but this volume is not written for scholars. *Jesus the Messiah* is intended to be used as an introductory textbook for undergraduate or seminary studies, and it should serve that purpose admirably. Stein states in the preface that his book "seeks to introduce readers to the life of Christ." Thus the fact that this is not a "scholarly publication" is not because Stein is incapable of writing such (see his *Gospels and Tradition: Studies on Redaction Criticism of the Synoptic Gospels*) but because he has chosen to make this work accessible to the beginning student of the historical Jesus.

The work has many strong points. The knowledgeable reader will realize that Stein has interacted with the latest Jesus scholarship and that he is well qualified to lay out the options on difficult passages. This laying out of the options, both clearly and concisely, is one of the significant strengths of the book. When faced with a particularly difficult problem, Stein is not afraid to suggest that more work needs to be done (see e.g. p. 203). One of the great strengths of the work lies in the good and up-to-date bibliography at the end of each chapter. Some may find that Stein has oversimplified certain problems, but this is the nature of an introductory text. While there are places where the analysis needs to be nuanced (Stein's paragraph about Schweitzer's view of Jesus' ethic [p. 137] is an example), the work is not seriously marred by these small details.

All in all this is a work that will serve the professor in a "Life of Christ" class well. It is not so technical as to frighten off the beginning student, yet even in its nontechnical nature it will introduce students to the real issues in historical Jesus studies and prepare them well for further research.

Samuel Lamerson
Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, Deerfield, IL

Jesus and His Contemporaries: Comparative Studies. By Craig A. Evans. AGJU 25. Leiden: Brill, 1995, xiii + 532 pp., n.p.

In this hefty volume, Evans brings together a number of his previously published studies on a variety of issues and topics involved in historical Jesus research and rounds out the book with a programmatic introduction to recent developments and a concluding epilogue that ties together the threads of an approach to the historical Jesus that is soundly based, tightly argued and massively well documented. Evans has produced several other important book contributions to current historical Jesus research (*Life of Jesus Research: An Annotated Bibliography* [NTTS 13; Brill, 1989] and *Studying the Historical Jesus: Evaluations of the State of Current Research*, co-edited with B. D. Chilton [NTTS 19; Brill, 1994]), and he intends all these works as resources for, and demonstrations of, sound historical inquiry that sets Jesus within the context of his ancient Jewish Palestinian setting. It should also be mentioned that Evans explicitly distinguishes his approach and emphases from the very widely publicized positions dominant in the Jesus Seminar and its popular publications.

After the introductory chapter, there are ten studies focused on particular historical Jesus questions and data, organized into two parts: "Jesus and His Rivals," and "Jesus and His Opponents." It will perhaps best serve readers to give a list of these studies. Beginning Part 1, "Messianic Claimants of the First and Second Centuries" (pp. 53–82) is an informed survey of the various Jewish figures mentioned as making royal claims and thus likely to have been taken as messianic-claimants by followers and foes. "Jesus and the Messianic Texts from Qumran: A Preliminary Assessment of the Recently Published Materials" (pp. 83–154) is a valuable discussion of texts often not widely well known outside of specialist Qumran circles. To this chapter there is attached an excursus on "Early Messianic Traditions in the Targums" (pp. 155–182). "Was Simon ben Kosiba Recognized as Messiah?" (pp. 183–212; Evans offers a cautious affirmative answer) completes this set of studies of Jewish messianic figures.

"Jesus and Jewish Miracle Stories" (pp. 213–244) affirms that Jesus' miracle working "blends in well against his Jewish environment" and that there is little reason to invoke "Hellenistic" traditions. Evans also demurs from Vermes' overly exclusive use of the Jewish "holy man" category, insisting that Jesus shows resemblances to several types of Jewish figures of the time, prophetic and royal-messianic as well. An excursus deals with "Jesus and Apollonius of Tyana" (pp. 245–250). "Jesus and Rabbinic Parables, Proverbs, and Prayers" (pp. 251–297) emphasizes how all these forms of Jesus' sayings are focused on or presuppose the emphasis on the kingdom of God.

In Part 2, "From Public Ministry to the Passion: Can a Link be Found between the (Galilean) Life and the (Judean) Death of Jesus?" (pp. 301–318) presents a strong argument that this link is found in the inscription on the cross "king of the Jews," which indicates that Jesus' proclamation of the kingdom of God was taken by Roman authorities as expressing or implying his own royal claims. In "Jesus' Action in the Temple and Evidence of Corruption in the First-Century Temple" (pp. 319–344), Evans interacts

particularly with E. P. Sanders, agreeing that the temple incident was important but proposing that it was directed against abuses of the temple authorities. The following study, "Jesus and the 'Cave of Robbers': Towards a Jewish Context for the Temple Action" (pp. 345–366) further supports the same point of view. In an excursus, "Jesus and Predictions of the Destruction of the Herodian Temple" (pp. 368–380), Evans gathers references from a number of ancient sources that provide a context for the warnings about the temple in the Olivet discourse. "God's Vineyard and Its Caretakers" (pp. 381–406) supports Hengel's case that the parable of the vineyard tenants is likely authentic dominical material, including the quotation of Ps 118:22–23, and was originally a "sharp prophetic criticism of the Temple establishment."

Chapter 11, "In What Sense 'Blasphemy'? Jesus before Caiaphas in Mark 14:61–64" (pp. 407–434), Evans argues that the Markan narrative preserves authentic features of an actual interrogation of Jesus by Caiaphas, including Jesus' claim to be the messianic divine son who would sit next to God. This very interesting essay draws upon reports of Aikba's view of Bar Kochba as well as other indications of ancient Jewish interpretations of Daniel 7 and Psalms 110 and 122 to offer a plausible case for such an event. Evans makes a good case, while also granting that the Markan trial narrative has been shaped by post-Easter factors as well. His focus on the one question of whether there is any authentic material in the narrative prevents him, however, from specifying adequately those factors and following up the ways in which the narrative has been made useful to Christians living in the post-Easter period.

In Part 3, "Synthesis," Evans brings together the main lines of the preceding studies. In chap. 12, "From Anointed Prophet to Anointed King: Probing Aspects of Jesus' Self-Understanding" (pp. 437–456), he reiterates his argument that the evidence of first-century Jewish royal claimants and prophets provide the best analogies for placing Jesus culturally and historically. Evans insists that Jesus anticipated "setting up a messianic administration that would displace the religious establishment of Jerusalem" (p. 454), pointing to Jesus' crucifixion by the Romans as important evidence.

In the epilogue, Evans emphasizes the need for careful historical study of Jesus, study that seeks to be self-critical in trying to avoid theological concerns setting the agenda. The main thesis of the epilogue, which Evans offers also as the overarching thesis of the whole book, is that the messianic identification of Jesus so explicit in the post-Easter preaching of the young Christian movement "arose from Jesus' teaching and activities." Thus, the Christology reflected in the NT did not result from "the Easter discovery" alone, but also from Jesus' own ministry.

One can find cause to quibble with this or that point in some of the component studies in this book, but the familiarity with original sources, impressive coverage of scholarly literature and clear-headed style of argument make this collection a treasury for scholars concerned with historical Jesus questions.

L. W. Hurtado

New College, University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh, Scotland

The Moral Vision of the New Testament: Community, Cross, New Creation. A Contemporary Introduction to New Testament Ethics. By Richard B. Hays. New York: Harper-Collins, 1996, xv + 508 pp., \$25.00 paper.

Richard B. Hays, of Duke University, has made a significant contribution to NT ethics. He states that his goal is "to engage the theological problem of how the New

Testament ought to shape the ethical norms and practices of the church in our time" (p. 9). The problem of NT ethics is threefold: How can one appeal to the NT as ethically normative in light of its diversity? How can one translate the culturally specific texts to the modern situation? And, how can one resolve the diversity of hermeneutical methods applied to the NT? Hays pursues a fourfold method to resolve the dilemma: (1) A descriptive task of carefully reading the diverse texts, (2) a synthetic task of describing "a unity of ethical perspective within the diversity of the canon" (p. 4), (3) a hermeneutical task of relating the text to the present situation and (4) a pragmatic task of applying the NT to specific issues.

In his descriptive task, Hays sketches the moral vision of selected texts by letting them speak for themselves in their social location. The selected texts are Paul's letter, the later Pauline tradition, Mark, Matthew, Luke-Acts, Johannine literature and Revelation. Notably absent is the book of James. While disavowing historical development of NT ethics (contra Willi Marxsen, *NT Foundations for Christian Ethics*, 1993), Hays does seem to privilege earlier writings that explicate the cross and new creation and devalue those writings that reflect later development. This would account for the absence of James. Moreover, Hays starts with Paul, possibly because Hays' three focal images emerge from Paul's writings. It is obvious that Hays is already engaged in synthesis during the descriptive task, for he attempts to synthesize major themes and theological motifs in each text that give direction and vision to the specific imperatives. The underlying assumptions of this procedure are that theology precedes ethics and that the two are inseparably linked; that is, the indicative and imperative are related. The vision each author sets before his audience informs them who they are and thus how they are to act in specific instances.

At the heart of Hays' method is the synthetic task of isolating the single moral vision of the NT. The moral vision is viewed as a framework within which moral judgment can take place. Hays' procedure is not reductionistic in restricting NT ethics to a set of rules or to a single principle, such as love. His synthetic procedure, however, is somewhat problematic, for it seeks a canon within the canon, disrupts the narrative structure of the NT and may leave out essential elements. If the diversity is swallowed up in a unifying synthesis, are we really allowing the different voices to speak? Does a reconstructed synthesis violate one's commitment to the entire canon? Are there not subjective elements in any reconstruction that tend to undermine its objectivity and authority? If we listen to the text through the lens of the synthesis, are we not in effect listening to the synthesis? Hays states that only if we can find a "wholeness or unity among the canonical writings . . . can we speak of New Testament ethics as a normative theological discipline" (p. 188). Is Hays correct in saying that the "only" way to speak of the NT as ethically normative is to find wholeness and unity?

According to Hays, the NT moral vision consists of three focal images: (1) Community, (2) cross and (3) new creation. The new creation represents the reversal developed by Marxsen and Allen Verhey (*The Great Reversal*, 1984) and depicts the new life made possible by the cross and resurrection. These three focal images serve as the lens through which one can reread the NT and apply the text to contemporary issues. Hays applies his method to the issues of violence in defense of justice, divorce and remarriage, homosexuality, ethnic conflict and abortion. He carefully reads texts pertinent for each issue, evaluates them in light of the three focal images, reflects on the modes used in the texts (i.e. rule, principle, paradigm, symbol), and then draws normative conclusions. Hays' commitment to Scripture will not allow him to acquiesce to the cultural trend condoning homosexuality. But when the NT witness is contradictory, Hays will draw upon the three focal images. For example, when speaking of women's issues, Hays favors the egalitarian view, for it is part of the new creation in his view (cf. Gal 3:28).

Hays asserts that his synthesizing differs from harmonization and does not distort the messages of the individual books. Harmonization reads one text in light of another, whereas synthesis attempts to find a unifying vision that can creatively be applied to contemporary problems. What Hays is seeking is a moral vision in back of the diverse expressions; he is not attempting to dissolve the diversity by harmonization.

In contrast to Marxsen, Hays affirms that ethical authority resides in the Scripture as canon, not in a reconstruction of the historical Jesus (pp. 158–161). Marxsen's developmental method assumes that the earliest witness (i.e. encounter with the historical Jesus) is normative and the rest of the canon is suspect as a deviation from the norm. In contradiction to Wayne Meeks (*Origins of Christian Morality*, 1993), Hays notes that the "ethical categories and vocabulary" Paul draws from Jewish and Hellenistic sources do not play a major role in his ethical thought. Of greater importance for Paul are the norms of "the unity of the community and the imitation of Christ" (p. 41). That is, the secular moral categories and codes are transformed by viewing them through the lens of the Christian moral vision. In contrast to Luke Timothy Johnson (*Scripture and Discernment*, 1996), Hays does not speak of continuing revelation in Christian experience as a normative voice in Christian ethics. For Hays, revelation is closed.

In summary, Hays offers a positive approach to NT ethics, even though there are some problems. But then, there is no problem-free approach to NT ethics. The question is which approach has fewer and less severe problems. Evangelicals would definitely lean toward the approach of Hays, Verhey or Oliver O'Donovan (*Resurrection and Moral Order*, 1994) over against that of Marxsen, Meeks or Johnson. Hays' approach is compatible with evangelical thought in viewing Scripture, rather than experience and culture, as normative for ethics. Hays' reading of texts is superb and his discussions of specific issues are insightful. Hays' *Moral Vision of the New Testament* is a book that should be read, pondered and discussed by the wider evangelical community.

Richard A. Young
Baylor University, Waco, TX

The New Interpreter's Bible. Vol. 8: General Articles on the New Testament; The Gospel of Matthew; The Gospel of Mark. Edited by Leander E. Keck *et al.* Nashville: Abingdon, 1995, xxix + 744 pp., \$55.00.

Some forty years after the publication of the original *Interpreter's Bible*, the *New Interpreter's Bible (NIB)* is now making its appearance. The format of the *NIB* is a decided improvement over the original, with much improved layout, maps, charts and illustrations. Additionally, the practice of separate exegetes and expositors contributing to the commentary on each book has thankfully been discontinued and thus there is continuity in all the remarks on each book. The commentary includes both the *NIV* and *NRSV* arranged in parallel columns. Tasteful use of green shading and headings makes for aesthetic appeal. Each section of Scripture is handled by way of an initial overview, the commentary proper and concluding reflections that attempt to supply pastors and teachers with ideas for contemporary application.

Volume 8 includes six introductory articles to the NT as well as the commentaries on Matthew and Mark. The introductory articles are brief (covering only 85 pages) but well-done treatments of text and versions (E. Epp), cultural context (A. Malherbe), Jewish context (G. Nickelsburg), ecclesiastical context (V. Wimbush), the gospels as narrative literature (R. Tannehill) and historical criticism of the gospels (C. Tuckett).

E. Boring (Brite Divinity School, Texas Christian University) writes on Matthew from a mainline critical perspective, affirming Matthew's use of Mark, Q and M. He be-

lieves that Matthew was written by an anonymous author around 90 CE, presumably in Antioch. His literary-critical studies lead him to conclude that although the genre of Matthew is not altogether discontinuous with existing genres, it is a new departure fashioned to express the convictions of Matthew's community in narrative form. At this point evangelicals will likely begin to differ with Boring. He makes the point convincingly that Matthew "was composed as a *literary* work to interpret the *theological* meaning of a concrete *historical* event to a people in a particular historical situation" (p. 89). This is a fine summary of the overarching issues involved in gospel studies, but it will be seen that Boring attributes more of Matthew's narrative to the Matthean community and less to the historical Jesus than evangelicals generally do. In this regard he often connects Matthean dominical *logia* to early Christian prophets, in keeping with his earlier work, *The Continuing Voice of Jesus: Christian Prophecy and the Gospel Tradition* (Westminster/John Knox, 1991).

In Boring's view the Matthean community is still related in some way to formative Judaism. It does not understand itself to be advocating a new religion in which Christianity replaces Israel. Rather the community includes Jewish and Gentile Christians who are the continuation of Israel. The nation of Israel has not been abandoned, but has been relegated to the status of other nations, that of being called to be disciples of Jesus the Messiah. This call to discipleship involves the conflict of kingdoms, the main motif in Boring's outline of Matthew. The conflict is initiated and defined in 1:1–12:21 and then developed and resolved (12:22–28:20). The five discourses of Matthew and a chiasmic arrangement also loom large in Boring's approach to Matthew's structure.

The following overview of Boring's approach to several *crucis interpretum* should give readers an idea of the flavor of the commentary. Boring takes Matt 1:1 as a title for the entire gospel, not just the genealogical section or the birth and infancy section. Some of the sayings of the sermon on the mount are viewed as coming from the historical Jesus, but this passage is not a report of a sermon actually given by Jesus. Following W. D. Davies, Boring views the tripartite structure of the sermon as a reformulation of *Abot* 1:2. The matter of Jesus' fulfilling the law in Matt 5:17 as exemplified in the antitheses of 5:21–48 is understood as reaffirmation, radicalization and situational application of the law. An early Christian prophet most likely uttered 10:23, which became an encouragement to continuing mission to Israel despite containing a chronological error. The "unpardonable sin" saying of 12:31–32 came from Jesus in the form of an absolute and universal pronouncement of forgiveness to the son of men, but in subsequent modifications the exception of blasphemy of the Holy Spirit was added and "sons of men" became the Christological title "Son of Man." In 25:31–46 the "least of Jesus' brothers" is viewed as the needy in general, not Christians or Christian missionaries specifically.

Interspersed in the commentary are four excursuses on Matthew as Biblical interpreter, Matthew's miracle stories, the kingdom of heaven in Matthew and Matthean Christology. These are truly crucial themes in Matthew and Boring handles them knowledgeably. However, the discussion of Matthew as interpreter of Scripture raises questions to evangelicals because it affirms that Matthew creates narrative fulfillments to fit OT passages he understands as predictions. Evangelicals will tend to understand many such texts as Matthew's discovery of typological patterns between the OT and the life of the historical Jesus.

The commentary on Mark by P. Perkins (Boston College) is roughly half as long as Boring's treatment of Matthew. This is appropriate given the relative lengths of Matthew and Mark and the simpler tradition history situation in Mark. Perkins begins with a helpful though overly brief orientation to Markan studies. Taking the typical Markan priority view, she posits a probable date of 70 CE, but she hesitates to be dogmatic about the specifics of authorship and recipients. Her analysis of the

content of Mark involves a two part outline, "Jesus Heals and Teaches with Power" (1:1–8:26), and "The Son of Man Must Suffer" (8:27–16:20). The outline hinges upon Peter's recognition that Jesus is the Messiah in Mark 8:29. Only one excursus is included, a one-page summary of the reign of God in Mark. It would seem that a more detailed treatment of this theme is warranted, not to mention additional excursuses on other important Markan themes.

A sampling of the way representative texts are handled is in order. Perkins' comments on Mark 1:1 take this verse as a statement concerning the message about Jesus and salvation, not a title for a book about his life (p. 528). However, her earlier remarks in the introductory section (p. 518) lead the reader to the opposite conclusion, so there seems to be inconsistency here. Her remarks on the purpose of parables (4:12) are somewhat disappointing because she does not deal with the matter of *iva* (cf. *ἵνα* in Isa 6:10) as final or consecutive. She simply states that Jesus would not use parables to cut off access to forgiveness, but does not deal with the syntactical question, which is handled as a final clause ("so that, in order that") in both *NIV* and *NRSV*. Perkins concludes that the apocalyptic discourse of Mark 13 probably goes back to Jesus and is not a *vaticinium ex eventu*. Perkins agrees with many scholars that Mark originally ended at 16:8 and she does not comment on the longer ending, 16:9–20.

Readers will find in this volume knowledgeable and readable introductory essays and comments. There is an excellent balance between exegesis of the parts and synthesis of the whole. The material is a fine guide to current mainline critical scholarship. Boring tends to be a bit more individualistic and speculative, while Perkins is generally more cautious and tends to list alternative views without strong personal preference. Evangelical scholarship is utilized to some extent, with such authors as R. T. France, R. Guelich, R. H. Gundry and G. E. Ladd appearing in the footnotes. Of overarching concern to evangelicals will be the issue of the historicity of the words and deeds of Jesus. The "Reflections" sections also may disappoint evangelicals at times, since these sections voice concerns for the application of the text that do not always mesh with evangelical exegetical conclusions.

David L. Turner
Grand Rapids Baptist Seminary, Grand Rapids, MI

The New Interpreter's Bible: Vol. 9: The Gospel of Luke; The Gospel of John. Edited by Leander E. Keck *et al.* Nashville: Abingdon, 1995, xviii + 875 pp., \$55.00.

The ninth volume of *The New Interpreter's Bible* follows the basic format of the other volumes in using a three-stage analysis of the primary text units. First, the full text and critical notes of the New International Version and the New Revised Standard Version are presented in parallel columns. Then, a Commentary section "provides an exegetical analysis informed by linguistic, text-critical, historical-critical, literary, social-scientific, and theological methods" (p. xvii). Finally, a Reflection section offers "a detailed exposition growing out of the discussion and issues dealt with in the Commentary" (p. xviii).

R. Alan Culpepper's commentary on Luke consists of a 37-page introduction, followed by 453 pages of analysis of the text. The introduction addresses Luke's relation to the other gospels, the book's structure, its Christological emphasis and key themes. It also provides an outline and a selected bibliography of commentaries (all since 1960) and specialized studies. Of the sections in the introduction, those on "Christological

Emphasis" and "Themes" are the most helpful. The latter section fulfills particularly well the author's intent of "serv[ing] as a handy reference point and as a compendium that enables the reader to study the relationship between the Gospel's most important themes" (p. 20).

Other aspects of introductory matters, however, are less complete. No discussion is provided of the place of origin, audience or purpose of the gospel. Culpepper adopts a date in the mid-80s, largely based on the primacy of Mark within the four-source hypothesis. Although he reviews the NT information about Luke and the testimony of the Church fathers, it is difficult to determine whether Culpepper understands "Luke" as the companion of Paul (as suggested by the "we" passages of Acts) or as a convenient designation for the author. In either case, Luke is characterized as a Gentile, skilled in Hellenistic historiography, adept with the Greek language and knowledgeable both in the OT and in Jewish practices and institutions.

Culpepper divides the gospel into seven parts: Prologue (1:1–4), Infancy Narratives (1:5–2:52), Preparation for the Ministry of Jesus (3:1–4:13), Ministry in Galilee (4:14–9:50), Journey to Jerusalem (9:51–19:27), Ministry in Jerusalem (19:28–21:38) and Passion and Resurrection Narratives (22:1–24:53). Each of these seven sections begins with a brief overview, summarizing the content and significant interpretive issues. The section is then divided into primary units of varying length, with the analysis of each unit proceeding in the three stages outlined above.

In reflecting on the four accounts of healing and exorcism in Luke 4:31–44, Culpepper notes that "The interpreter must decide at what level to engage these accounts: literary motif, theology, or history. The foregoing commentary has set this cycle in its literary context and illustrated how it coheres and functions as a unit within the Gospel" (p. 112). This statement summarizes his basic approach to each of the text units: Primary attention is given to the literary and theological aspects of the text. In following this approach, Culpepper does an excellent job of helping the reader see the literary and theological connections within the Gospel. Yet the historical level is not neglected, for he also provides many good historical background details. When it is appropriate, he helpfully lists interpretive options (although he gives no evidence in support of these options). Several figures and charts (e.g. a partial family tree of Herod the Great) provide useful supplementary information.

Culpepper's historical analysis is least satisfying. Three examples from early in the commentary will serve to illustrate this point. In reference to Luke's account of Jesus' birth (2:1–20), he concludes that "undue emphasis should not be given either to Luke's precision as a historian or the significance of the historical problems posed by his reference to the census" (p. 63). In his discussion of Jesus' preaching in Nazareth (4:16–30), Culpepper suggests that "Luke constructed aspects of the . . . scene to serve as an exemplary introduction to Jesus' ministry" (p. 104). Regarding Luke's account of Jesus' call of the first disciples—which includes a miraculous catch of fish—(5:1–11), he argues for the hypothesis that "Luke has taken a post-Easter appearance tradition and placed it back in the ministry of Jesus . . . [and] has created this setting for the story" (p. 117). Instances such as these occur throughout Culpepper's work and tend to diminish the impact of his literary and theological analysis.

This work will not replace the major commentaries on Luke (e.g. Fitzmyer, Marshall, Bock), nor was it intended to do so. Nevertheless, Culpepper's literary and theological analyses makes this commentary worth considering for your library. Once his de-emphasis of Luke's historical interest is taken into account, you might find that it will serve as a useful complementary volume.

Gail R. O'Day's commentary on John consists of a 21-page introduction, followed by 350 pages of analysis of the text. The introduction examines John's theological

world, John's use of sources and traditions, the book's social and religious setting, and the book's structure. It also provides a discussion of Johannine study today, a bibliography of commentaries and related works, and an outline.

O'Day rejects Johannine authorship of any of the five books associated with the name "John." The anonymous author of the gospel "understood himself to be connected to the traditions about Jesus through the eyewitness testimony of the beloved disciple" (p. 500). This author was a Jewish Christian who wrote "for and in a Jewish Christian community that was in conflict with the synagogue authorities of its day" (p. 506), sometime between AD 75 (based on evidence of conflict with the Jewish leadership) and AD 100 (based on manuscript evidence and early church tradition). The place of origin and the precise destination are unknown.

Believing that the conventional division of the gospel into two parts (chaps. 1–12 and 13–20) oversimplifies the contents, O'Day proposes an eight-part structure: Prelude to Jesus' Ministry (1:1–51), "The Greater Things" (2:1–5:47), Conflict and Opposition Grows (6:1–10:42), Prelude to Jesus' Hour (11:1–12:50), Farewell Meal and Words (13:1–17:26), Jesus' Arrest, Trial and Death (18:1–19:42), First Resurrection Appearances (20:1–25) and Jesus' Appearance at the Sea of Tiberias (21:1–15). She argues persuasively for her proposal in the analysis of the text. The basic format of the commentary is the same as that described for Culpepper's work.

O'Day writes that her commentary "pays close attention to both the details of the Gospel's literary style and form and the particulars of its theological claims" (p. 495), and indeed, her work is strong in these areas. She is particularly sensitive to John's use of repetition, ambiguity, metaphor, irony, symbolism and misunderstanding. The literary relationships she identifies between sections of the text are insightful and well supported. Her "Reflection" sections tend to be longer than Culpepper's—primarily because she works with longer passages (e.g. 7:1–52)—and they probe key theological issues. She refuses to let the reader settle into the "popular" reading of familiar passages; she repeatedly returns to the Christological implications of those passages. Although evangelical readers might not agree with all of her conclusions, she asks good questions and raises good issues.

O'Day also gives careful attention to interpretive difficulties in the text. Her extended discussion of 7:37–38, for example, is detailed and balanced. She interacts extensively with a number of important commentaries (e.g. Brown, Barrett, Hoskyns, Bultmann, Dodd, Schnackenburg, Beasley-Murray), although some might wish that Carson's 1991 commentary had been included. Several excurses (e.g. "John 6:51c–58 in Critical Scholarship") and charts (e.g. a comparative chronology of the Holy Week) summarize valuable information.

Unfortunately, O'Day sees the author allowing his theological interests to override historical concerns. Regarding 12:27–28, for example, she comments that "the Fourth Evangelist takes traditional material and reshapes it to fit the theological vision that drives the Gospel" (p. 712). That theological vision reflects the post-resurrection perspective of the author and his community, in particular their conflict with the synagogue authorities. Although she is correct in noting the post-resurrection perspective of the Gospel, she gives it too much emphasis when—in discussing 3:13—she suggests that "the Fourth Evangelist places the witness of the early church in the mouth of Jesus and thus accords that witness greater authority and continuity" (p. 551). Similar comments appear elsewhere (e.g. pp. 558, 592, 620) and weaken a work which is strong in many other ways.

Its strengths make this commentary worth considering. O'Day has done a good job of addressing literary and theological issues. She has evaluated textual and historical problems evenhandedly. She has interacted well with significant literature on

the gospel. Those looking for these qualities in a commentary might wish to add this volume to their library.

John D. Harvey

Columbia Biblical Seminary & Graduate School of Missions, Columbia, SC

Jesus and the Victory of God. By N. T. Wright. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1996, 741 pp., \$39.00.

Jesus and the Victory of God is the second in the series called "Christian Origins and the Question of God." The first was Wright's well-received *The New Testament and the People of God*. Wright plans three more volumes, one of which is now nearly finished.

The work is divided into three parts, the first being an overview of historical Jesus research, the second an extended argument that Jesus' actions should be viewed under the rubric of first-century prophet, and the third where Wright examines the aims and beliefs of Jesus in light of the contention that the return from exile provides a key to understanding many of Jesus' actions in the synoptics.

Part 1 of the book, in which the last 200 years of Jesus research is laid out, is a wonderful overview of the major players in the search for the historical Jesus. Wright does a good job of setting the stage and pointing out why historical Jesus research is seen as essentially having begun with Reimarus' *Fragments*. Wright is particularly good at disagreeing with other Jesus scholars, while taking their work seriously and not demonizing them. His analysis of the Jesus Seminar is particularly helpful. He points out two areas in which criticism should be leveled at the Seminar: (1) The underlying suppositions of the enterprise are unclear; and (2) the way in which the system actually operates gives cause for concern. He notes that there are "several instances in which a high percentage—sometimes a clear majority—voted either red or pink, i.e. either authentic or probably authentic, but the weighted average came out grey because of a high proportion of black votes cast on the other side" (p. 34). Wright's hesitance to accept much of the postulation that has been done in the area of "Q" is refreshing. He deals extensively with the work of Crossan, Mack, Borg, Downing and others. This overview is very helpful to a student attempting to become familiar with the current status of Jesus research.

The second part of the work is much longer (pp. 145–472) and uses "critical realism" (which Wright lays out and defends in the first volume) to examine the works of Jesus using several important questions: How does Jesus fit into Judaism? What were Jesus' aims? Why did Jesus die? How and why did the early church begin? Why are the gospels what they are? The five questions are taken together under the broad headings of Jesus' relation to the early church and Jesus' relation to Judaism. Wright spends much of his time on the first four questions and promises another book in answer to the fifth.

The third portion deals extensively with the meaning of messiahship in the first century and what Wright sees as the reasons that Jesus was crucified by the Romans. He lays out the considerable range of messianic expectations of the period. Wright argues that Jesus died because he was perceived as a false prophet, leading the people astray (hence the Jewish charge) and that he was perceived as being a potential military threat as a revolt leader (hence the Roman charge).

One of the most controversial parts of the work will be Wright's continued argument that the first-century Jew would have still considered himself to be in exile. He

extends this argument, which was advanced in the first volume, by linking exile and forgiveness. He states that "Forgiveness of sins is another way of saying 'return from exile'" (p. 268). He argues that virtually all first-century Jews would have considered themselves to still be in exile, despite the fact that they lived in the land. While many have balked at this suggestion (see the reviews of *The New Testament and the People of God*), I must say that I found the argument convincing in light of the details.

This book is massive by any standard. It deals with a vast amount of material and its strengths are many. Wright has an impressive command of the first-century sources and makes fine use of much of the new data. He writes with a clear style and the book is well laid out.

One of the most important strengths of the work is Wright's attempt to place Jesus' actions and words back into the first-century Jewish milieu. He argues that in order to understand him one must explore the confrontation between Jesus and Judaism, though Judaism is often as difficult to describe as Jesus himself. While other recent scholars have attempted this placement of Jesus into Judaism (e.g. Crossan, Funk), Wright has little of the historical scepticism that is so evident in much other work. He defends many of the events in the gospels (which have been questioned by Sanders and others) as being historical in light of first-century Judaism.

The evangelical will however be troubled by some of the things that Wright says. His attempt to place the fulfillment of the apocalyptic statements in Mark 13 and parallels entirely in the first century will trouble some. In addition, Wright uses the term "the Satan" in his desire to retain the Biblical ambiguity about the "personhood of Satan" (p. 451). This ambiguity may trouble even more readers. Many will be perplexed by Wright's failure to capitalize the word "God," even when referring to the God of Israel (Wright offers a rationale for this decision in the first work of this series). But his statements about Jesus' knowledge of himself will prove most troublesome. Wright argues that Jesus did not "'know that he was God' in the same sense that one knows one is male or female, hungry or thirsty, or that one ate an orange an hour ago. His 'knowledge' was of a more risky, but perhaps more significant, sort: like knowing one is loved. . . . [one should] forget the pseudo-orthodox attempts to make Jesus of Nazareth conscious of being the second person of the Trinity."

While these quotations come in the context of an argument against understanding Jesus' deity by holding to some form of docetism, the statements are still troubling. It should be pointed out that Wright has no doubt that Jesus saw his death as a renewal of the covenant, and thus for the forgiveness of sins. Jesus, then, saw himself as bringing an end to the exile. Wright argues that this provided him with a messianic self-understanding. Even in light of these admissions I find Wright's statements about Jesus' consciousness of his own deity troubling.

Given the above caveats, however, this is a fine work. It contains a wealth of bibliographic data, all in footnotes (rather than those pesky endnotes) and a bibliography that is helpfully divided into primary and secondary sources. There are three indexes (ancient sources, modern authors and subjects).

Samuel Lamerson
Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, Deerfield, IL

Matthew 14–28. By Donald A. Hagner. WBC 33b. Dallas: Word, 1995, xxxix + 935 pp., \$28.95.

With *Matthew 1–13* having been published in 1993, the present volume completes Hagner's commentary on Matthew. Since vol. 1 sets the stage for vol. 2, some intro-

ductory comments on the first volume seem appropriate here. The laudable format of the WBC is already known to readers of *JETS* and is well utilized by Hagner, although I thought that some of the “explanation” sections were not as helpful as the sections on “form/structure/setting” and “comment.” Despite the current trend of emphasis on the new literary criticism, he argues for and writes from the traditional historical-critical perspective, albeit with an evangelical worldview. He believes that Matthew has adapted the Markan tradition to his own ends, though he departs from the mainline critical consensus in his inclination toward a pre-70 CE date. The Markan material is largely assumed to be a stable and reliable tradition that represents the authentic historical Jesus. Thus Matthew’s theological *Tendenz* and his resulting editorial activities are based upon authentic dominical tradition. Matthew has not invented pericopes in a wholesale fashion, though Hagner assumes (*contra* e.g. Carson, *Matthew* [EBC]) that Matthew’s editorial work, not a single historical event, is the basis for the sermon on the mount pericope. Hagner’s approach to the structure of Matthew is based on the alternation of narrative and discourse material, though he does not believe the evidence clearly leads to a detailed structural outline. As to authorship, Hagner believes that a Hellenistic Jewish Christian of the Matthean school redacted material derived largely from the apostle Matthew. The community addressed by the gospel is viewed as consisting of Jewish Christians, who exist in a sort of theological/existential “no-man’s land,” wishing for ongoing continuity with Jewish brothers and sisters at the same time that they need to be responsive to the widening purpose of God in reaching the Gentiles. While sensitive to the fact that Matthean polemics have been used by anti-Semites in a devastating fashion, Hagner nonetheless views the original provenance of this material as conventional intramural Jewish rhetoric.

Judging from the respective lengths of the two volumes, it appears that vol. 2 handles the material in more depth. In this volume Hagner continues his agenda of theological exegesis based on a conservative view of the dominical tradition and an ongoing dialogue with the current scholarly literature. He understands the flow of Matthew 14–28 as comprising eight sections: (1) Further ministry and confrontation with religious authorities (14:1–16:20), (2) the announcement of the cross as turning point (16:21–17:27), (3) the fourth discourse on life within the community (18:1–35), (4) increasing confrontation on the way to Jerusalem (19:1–20:35), (5) the last days in Jerusalem (21:1–22:46), (6) castigation of the scribes and Pharisees (23:1–39), (7) the fifth discourse on the destruction of the temple and the end of the world (24:1–25:46), and (8) the story of Jesus’ death and resurrection (26:1–28:20). These divisions of Matthew 14–28 are rather typical, but the arguments for handling of Matthew 23 as distinct from Matthew 24–25 are notable, since some (e.g. Blomberg, *Matthew* [NAC]) link Matthew 23 with Matthew 24–25 as the two parts of the fifth and final discourse.

Brief comments on several *cruces interpretum* are in order. Hagner takes the view that Peter, who confesses Christ as the representative of the apostles as a whole, is the rock on which Jesus will build his Church (16:18). On the problem of the coming of the kingdom in power (16:28; cf. 10:23), he is less decisive. After some discussion he seems to say that Jesus originally spoke of the 70 CE destruction of Jerusalem, but that Matthew thought of this only in terms of the end of the age, and thus meant that some of the disciples would live to see the glorious return of Jesus. On the difficult parable of the vineyard and its application (21:33–46), it is concluded that God is setting aside Israel in favor of the Church, which becomes in effect the new Israel. This is qualified somewhat by the affirmation that the Church includes some Jews and that the Jews are included in the πάντα τὰ ἔθνη of 28:19. Nevertheless, some will be concerned with this evidently supersessionist view and prefer to understand the parable as teaching that God is replacing Israel’s present *leaders* with new ones, Matthew’s

group and its leaders, as argued by A. Saldarini (*Matthew's Christian-Jewish Community* [1994] 58–63). On a final passage, the Olivet discourse, Hagner argues that due to the theological linkage of the fall of Jerusalem in 70 CE with the end of the age, elements of the preterist view must be combined with elements of the futurist view. However, some will part company with Hagner's view that Jesus' original words about the imminence of the destruction of Jerusalem are taken by Matthew to refer to the imminence of the parousia. This view and the similar approach to the problems of 10:23/16:28 seem to lead to the conclusion that Matthew was mistaken about the timing of the parousia. It is one thing to note that Jesus did not know of this timing (24:36) but another thing to hold that Matthew affirmed a mistaken view of it.

Quibbles over details are inevitable in reviewing any commentary, but even when one disagrees with Hagner's conclusions one must admire his discussion of the evidence and his weighing of the competing viewpoints. In his recognition of both the historical and revelatory aspects of the Bible he has modeled well the "evangelical criticism" spoken of by G. E. Ladd, whose chair he occupies at Fuller Theological Seminary (Ladd, *The New Testament and Criticism* [1967] 33). Among noteworthy recent evangelical commentaries on Matthew (e.g. Blomberg, Bruner, Carson, Gundry, Morris), Hagner's work stands out. The scope and detail permitted by the WBC format have been utilized by Hagner to write what is perhaps the finest evangelical commentary on Matthew in terms of detailed exegetical discussion. This work deserves a wide readership by serious students of Matthew.

David L. Turner
Grand Rapids Baptist Seminary, Grand Rapids, MI

The Matthean Parables: A Literary and Historical Commentary. By Ivor Harold Jones. Leiden: Brill, 1995, 602 pp., \$173.00.

This work represents thirty years of work on Matthew, which may explain the depth of the author's critiques of various literary methodologies that have come in and out of fashion in that period.

The first part of the book thoroughly surveys different approaches to the parables, highlighting the weaknesses of source, redactional and some contemporary literary approaches, as well as pointing to where these approaches provide valuable insights. He demonstrates a firm command of various literary approaches, though he differs from them at points, and his interaction with such approaches is detailed, nuanced, and hermeneutically sophisticated.

Many contemporary scholars will appreciate especially his critique of some weaknesses in traditional form- and redaction-critical methodology. His careful analysis overturns many form-critical assumptions of Jeremias and others (e.g. concerning changes from a Palestinian to a diaspora environment), although he believes that imagery in parable traditions may have grown in their retelling. He also overturns many of Jeremias' redaction-critical assumptions. Jeremias' careful and brilliant approach long dominated parables studies, but Jones suggests that Jeremias' reconstructions are artificial and inaccurate.

Responding to redaction-criticism in general, he notes that Matthew probably uses traditional material besides Mark and what we can reconstruct of Q, which calls into question some conclusions often drawn about Matthew's "style" preferences. (He similarly emphasizes the continuance of oral tradition and allows for oral development following oral performances of Mark, standing behind some of Matthew's and Luke's

“minor agreements”—and confounding traditional form-critical and redaction-critical assumptions.) By detailed linguistic analysis he shows wrongheaded assumptions of older redaction critics concerning a particular author’s usage. At various points he calls attention to the weaknesses of modern editorial hypotheses, asking for a more careful and consistent accounting of the data.

One of Jones’ challenges to redaction criticism involves his contention that Matthew did not rewrite his main sources. He argues for the tendency of Matthew and Luke to respect tradition rather than restate it in their own style, suggesting they sought to conserve more than modern scholarship often supposes. Even conservative scholars, of course, regard Matthew’s conservatism in wording as a matter of degree; paraphrase was standard rhetorical practice (e.g. Theon, *Progymnasmata* 1.93–171; Gerhardtsson, *Memory and Manuscript*, pp. 136–148). But it is heartening to note his recognition of the relative conservatism of the gospel authors.

Jones is evenhanded in his approach to redaction criticism, however. He notes, for instance, that our ability to compare Matthew’s adaptation of sources (including Mark) at some points was one of redaction criticism’s more useful tools, allowing a check on more subjective current literary claims. One should be careful finding a literary pattern in Matthew when Matthew erases it from his source. He suggests on the basis of his redactional observations that Matthew’s use of traditions does constrain his creative liberties.

His discussions (e.g. concerning how different elements of traditions may have been transmitted separately) reflect consideration of variables our more simple models of traditioning generally neglect. Although the book is stronger on methodology than conclusions (a balance that reflects his scholarly caution), he does provide insights (e.g. on “summary parables” concluding four of Matthew’s five main discourses). The work is so detailed that he lists ten interpretations of three words in 13:52 (pp. 204–206); at one point a footnote section continues for five successive pages without new text (pp. 335–340).

He surveys and interacts with most of those who have written on parables; I would estimate around 1300 sources in his bibliography. (English readers needing help with contemporary German scholarship on parables will find this work especially valuable.) Although scholars naturally differ in their interests and focus, I am disappointed by some omissions or brief treatments. Jones cites Jülicher and Jeremias extensively, on literary grounds rightly critiquing their suspicion of allegory (they misunderstand the character of metaphor); but Jones could have augmented his case by more detailed comparisons with other Jewish teachers’ use of allegory in parables. As early as his 1977 dissertation, Robert M. Johnston provided extensive evidence for the presence of allegorical elements in parables among Jesus’ near-contemporaries, yet Jones cites him only rarely, and never with reference to allegory. Jones’ index lists Fiebig only twice and Dodd only three times, but Jones primarily responds to recent scholarship, and Jülicher and especially Jeremias have dominated parables scholarship in recent decades far more than Fiebig or Dodd.

More problematic, Jones believes that Matthew’s genre arises *sui generis* from his implicit literary contract with his audience, against the emerging consensus that the gospels are biographies. He does concede that Mark is a biography and that those outside Matthew’s immediate audience might read Matthew as such; but given the difficulties of reconstructing Matthew’s real audience apart from the audience implied in his text, are our textual clues strong enough to postulate an audience that would hear Matthew quite differently from the way other diaspora Jewish Christians would? Jones is not completely wrong here; Matthew is distinct from other biographies, including other gospels. But then, most ancient biographies have distinctive

characteristics, yet continue to fit into the broader genre of biography. The distinctions within the broader category are valid to note, but extracting Matthew from the general category into one of his own defeats the very purpose for which scholars utilize genre criticism.

Some areas of background could have augmented the work further. Jones correctly suggests the helpfulness of Mediterranean narratives in general for understanding parables, but could have provided more specific context from the Jewish parables genre than he does. (The Septuagint sometimes translates *mashal* as “parable,” and second-century rabbis use *mashal* for the same kind of story parable told by Jesus; unless the rabbis borrowed the genre from Jesus—which is unlikely—Jesus’ parables probably reflect a form of Jewish instruction already widely used by Palestinian sages in his day.) At the same time, Jones helpfully draws on a wide range of sources (ancient Near Eastern, Epictetus, Aesop’s fables) to illustrate the pervasiveness of characteristics some modern scholars have wrongly insisted must be secondary but which could in fact be authentic.

I offer another suggestion, although its object may be more editorial policy than a matter over which the author exercised any say. The indexes are very complete, but in a book this length, readers also would profit from more headings and subheadings within chapters, as well as a more detailed table of contents. Many readers will wish to use this volume as a reference work or to assign specific sections for textbook use, rather than following the entire argument through. In such cases, they would find where to begin reading more easily with more specific markers available. A conclusion for the book, attempting to tie together the results of the work, would also be helpful. The intense theoretical nature of many of his discussions presupposes familiarity with philosophical, theological and hermeneutical currents; this framework is essential as he challenges the logic behind many contemporary questions, but it does not make the book easy for the average reader to follow. Its unremitting scholarly focus is a strength, but also requires plenty of time to read and digest.

Craig S. Keener
Eastern Baptist Seminary, Philadelphia, PA

Text to Text Pours Forth Speech: Voices of Scripture in Luke-Acts. By Robert Brawley. Bloomington: Indiana University, 1995, 178 pp., \$27.95.

In this fascinating study of intertextuality in Luke-Acts, Robert Brawley, Professor of NT at McCormick Theological Seminary, draws on a variety of methodologies to examine the interplay of text and scripture in Luke-Acts. In Brawley’s own words, the book is about “ways Luke-Acts hears voices of scripture and folds them into its own voice.” His goal is “to assist readers in arriving at new levels of meaning as they overhear such voices of scripture in Luke-Acts” (p. 1). The book not only breaks new ground in the utilization of literary theory, but it also builds on theological themes developed by Brawley in his earlier works on Luke-Acts.

“Intertextuality” is distinct from the traditional study of the use of the OT in the NT in that it takes a synchronic rather than a diachronic approach. The question is not merely how a successor text picks up and utilizes a precursor text, but how the two texts interact as their two horizons fuse. The successor text not only revises or alters the meaning of the precursor, but as their horizons meet the new text is transformed by the original. Intertextuality goes beyond the study of citations and allusions to draw upon the “unbounded bank of textual patterns, anonymous and general, from which an author construes a text” (p. 5). An example of this is Luke’s use of Ps 2:1 in

Acts 4:27, where the “peoples” (originally Gentiles) are identified as the people of Israel. While a conventional interpretation might see this as a citation made without respect for its original context, an intertextual approach recognizes that Acts 4:27 plays off the parallelism of “the nations” and “the peoples” in Ps 2:1 with the sharp irony that some Jewish people have taken on the function of Gentiles. The two texts “stand in tension with and extend each other simultaneously” (p. 8).

Brawley draws on an array of methodologies for his study, including Harold Bloom’s “revisionary ratios,” Richard Hays’ criteria for discerning allusions and Michael Riffaterre’s concept of “ungrammaticalities.” Bloom’s ratios, which carry enigmatic names like “clinamen,” “tessera,” “kenosis” and “daemonization,” are intended to clarify intertextual relationships between precursor and successor texts. “Clinamen,” for example, is the appropriation and revision of a precursor text, as in the identification of the “peoples” of Ps 2:1 as the people of Israel in Acts 4:27. “Tessera” is completion of a precursor text by the successor, as in Acts 2:16, where the Pentecost event completes the meaning of the Joel prophecy. For Brawley, Bloom’s ratios are general qualities of intertextuality rather than distinct categories. As texts interact with their precursors in a variety of ways, so a variety of ratios can be applied to any single allusion. Rather than decisively defining or categorizing the intertextual relationship, they provide the reader with a feel for the multiple and overlapping interactions between the texts.

Brawley’s method is to move through select passages of Luke-Acts, identify the intertextual relationships, and link these relationships to key Lukan themes. Themes which repeatedly recur include Luke’s theocentric use of Scripture, the unity of the covenants (especially the Davidic and Abrahamic), and the importance of the broader OT context for the meaning of the citation or allusion.

Chapter 2 employs theories of intertextuality to examine Jesus’ temptation in Luke 4:1–13. Chapter 3 examines the parable of the tenants as a particular example of intertextuality in the context of a specialized genre, *mise en abyme*, an explanatory variant on the text that contains it. Chapters 4 and 5, perhaps the most original (and least convincing to me) in Brawley’s work, draw on the cultural and literary category of the “carnavalesque” to examine the crucifixion of Jesus and the death of Judas. “Carnival” is an absurd presentation of established values that serves to undermine those values. According to Brawley, attempts to portray Jesus as a carnival king at his crucifixion are resisted by Luke through the intertextual use of OT Scripture, especially Isaiah 53 and Psalm 21 (LXX). In Acts 1 Judas’ grotesque death reduces Jesus’ opponents to absurdity in a carnivalesque manner, while the texts used for Judas’ replacement, Psalms 68 (LXX) and 108 (LXX), present Jesus as the righteous sufferer.

Chapter 6, a study of the Joel 3 quotation in Acts 2, is helpful in illustrating an intertextual approach. As Joel explains the significance of the Pentecost event, so Acts expands and elucidates the meaning of Joel. In chaps. 7 (Acts 3–4) and 8 (Acts 13) Brawley draws on labeling and deviance theory to show how the voices of Scripture reverse the social evaluation of Jesus and the apostles from “deviants” to “prominents.” Though rejected by the civil and religious authorities and so labeled as deviant, their vindication by God as confirmed by Scripture reverses this socio-cultural evaluation.

The strength of Brawley’s work is in its introductory and initiatory aspects. Though by no means comprehensive—either methodologically or textually—the work contains a smorgasbord of tough-provoking examples for both literary theory and Lukan theology. In many ways it is a dizzying reading, demonstrating just how diverse and multifaceted the new literary approaches can be. Though difficult for the student

uninitiated in contemporary literary theory, the work rewards by encouraging a fresh reading of Luke-Acts, and by emphasizing and elucidating important themes in Lukan theology. Brawley's most helpful contribution may be his repeated demonstration of the importance of the broader context (textual, historically and literary) of OT citations and allusions for the implied reader of Luke-Acts.

Mark L. Strauss
Bethel Theological Seminary West, San Diego, CA

The Christology of the Fourth Gospel: Its Unity and Disunity in the Light of John 6.
By Paul N. Anderson. WUNT 78. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1996, xv + 329 pp., n.p.

In his foreword, D. Moody Smith calls this work "at once one of the most concentrated and intensive exegetical studies and one of the most wide-ranging and suggestive essays on Johannine christology that I have seen" (p. iii). After reading Anderson's far-reaching work, I could not agree more. Here is a work as seminal and suggestive as R. Alan Culpepper's *Anatomy of the Fourth Gospel*. In its conversance with biblical scholarship, its exegetical competence, and its bold application of extra-biblical paradigms to Johannine studies, this investigation leaves one amazed at the work's scope and potential impact on the future interpretation of John's Gospel. While I do not agree with some of Anderson's more speculative comments regarding John's socio-religious environment (see e.g. pp. 139, 220, and 245-48), I urge everyone interested in the interpretation of John's Gospel to read, and digest, Anderson's work. It is certain to break new ground in Johannine scholarship.

What is the goal of Anderson's study? As he himself puts it, it is "to gain clearer insight into the christological tensions of the Fourth Gospel by means of seeking a deeper understanding of the dialectical process of thought by which the evangelist has come to embrace such a distinctly unitive and disunitive christology" (p. 15). In pursuing this purpose, Anderson focuses on chap. 6, the feeding of the five thousand and subsequent events and discourses. Taking his starting point with Rudolf Bultmann, Anderson accepts that scholar's identification of tensions in John while rejecting Bultmann's efforts to resolve these tensions by source and rearrangement theories. Rather than resorting to source or redaction criticism, Anderson views these tensions in terms of an independent reflection upon the same event recounted somewhat differently in the Synoptics. Drawing on the research of Fowler and Loder, the author applies their insights regarding the experience and development of faith to John's Gospel.

The basic assumption at the outset of Anderson's study is that the fourth gospel evidences Christological tensions, evidently because both sides used passages from John's Gospel in the christological controversies of the early church. Anderson names three such tensions: (1) John's "exalted" vs. "subordinationist" Christology; (2) signs as facilitating belief vs. as having existential significance; and (3) the Gospel's present vs. future eschatology. He lists the following ways of dealing with these tensions: denying their existence (common until the nineteenth century), or attributing them either to John himself (Anderson's view) or to his sources (Bultmann).

Anderson's survey of recent approaches to the fourth gospel's Christology focuses particularly on C. K. Barrett's characterization of John's theology as "dialectical." While concurring with Barrett's basic analysis, Anderson seeks to take his discussion one step further by exploring why John came to think dialectically and probing John's socio-religious context. In chap. 7, clearly the most important of this book, Anderson

breaks new ground by applying two models of faith development to the fourth gospel: a developmental model by J. Fowler and a transformational, more crisis-oriented approach by J. Loder. Fowler's model suggests to Anderson John's dialectical mode of reflection, while Loder's transformational approach signals the "value of subjective, relational-type connectedness to the living Lord" (p. 150).

Significantly, Anderson contends that "many of John's christological tensions cannot simply be ascribed to the evangelist's socio-religious 'dialogues' with the Synagogue, Samaritans, or even other Christians. Jesus' discourses in chaps. 5, 6, 8, 10, 13-17, etc. betray the dialectical thinking of one who refuses to reduce his christology to a definitive and monological statement. Thus, the 'dialogues' within the thinking of the evangelist must also be explored" (p. 148, n. 11). According to Anderson, John is "a reflective, dialogical thinker, who is constantly pushing the limits of his christology to accommodate the polarities of christocentric experiences and socio-religious tensions he has encountered" (p. 152, n. 19). Specifically, the author contends that John engaged in two kinds of reflection: the existentializing of events from Jesus' ministry (especially his signs) and the interpretation of christocentric encounters with God the evangelist had experienced (p. 166).

Anderson describes the Christology of the fourth evangelist as "less dogmatic and far more tolerant of ambiguity" than the Johannine epistles, a fact that Anderson considers to be the strongest argument for a difference in authorship between the epistles and the Johannine gospel (p. 250). Elsewhere, the author contends that Johannine authorship continues to be a valid option, referring particularly to an overlooked Johannine passage, Acts 4:20, which reads: "We announce to you *what we have seen and heard* in order that you might have fellowship with us" (italics mine).

Overall, this is an astonishing, groundbreaking piece of work. It is at times a bit wordy and would benefit from further editorial tightening. Exception has already been taken to Anderson's tendency toward conjecture regarding John's socio-religious environment. Also, one may question Anderson's characterization of the different elements of Johannine Christology as "tensions." But these are relatively small criticisms in light of the scope and caliber of this study. Those who engage in further Johannine scholarship without having read this work will do so at their own peril.

Andreas J. Köstenberger

Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary, Wake Forest, NC

Her Testimony is True: Women as Witnesses according to John. By Robert Gordon Maccini. JSNTSup 125. Sheffield Academic, 1996, 278 pp., \$60.00.

Her Testimony is True represents an attempt to validate an egalitarian commitment through the author's demonstration that women function as witnesses in John's gospel on equal footing with men. In order to substantiate his thesis, Maccini examines the following passages in the gospel of John that feature women as potential witnesses to Jesus: 2:1-11 (Mary at the wedding in Cana); 4:4-42 (the Samaritan woman); 11:1-46 (Mary and Martha at Jesus' raising of Lazarus); 12:1-8 (Mary and Martha at the anointing of Jesus); 19:25-27 (the women at the cross, including Mary the mother of Jesus and Mary Magdalene); and 20:1-18 (Mary Magdalene at the empty tomb). Chapters on John's gospel as a trial and women as witnesses in Biblical culture are designed to provide a framework for the author's investigation.

Apart from Mary at the wedding in Cana, Maccini finds that John presents all the other women featured above as witnesses to Jesus. The Samaritan woman's witness

leads her fellow villagers to Jesus. Mary and Martha confirm the factuality of their brother Lazarus' death. By rendering service to Jesus and by anointing him for burial, the sisters also provide examples of what it means to serve and love Jesus. Mary the mother of Jesus and the other women at the cross witness to Jesus' humanity and death. And Mary Magdalene, similar to the "beloved disciple," testifies to both Jesus' death and resurrection. Maccini concludes that women's testimony in John's gospel is generally considered valid and true and that women function as witnesses to Jesus on par with men.

Overall, *Her Testimony is True* is well-researched and written. Although the author "confesses" to his egalitarian bias at the outset of his study, he largely manages to refrain from imposing an egalitarian agenda on John's gospel. His skepticism regarding the "Johannine community" hypothesis, his concern to keep the gospel's historical and literary dimensions in proper balance, and his rejection of treatments that view John's characters merely in terms of literary symbolism, must also be lauded. Moreover, Maccini's exegesis of passages featuring women as witnesses in the fourth gospel is conducted with appropriate restraint. A case in point is the author's conclusion that Mary in 2:1–11 does not function as a witness to Jesus, much less as a mediatrix to Jesus, as has often been claimed. Hence a realistic portrait emerges that generally avoids ideological overrepresentations plaguing several earlier studies.

Still, Maccini's work is beset by several weaknesses. (1) There is virtually no integration between the introductory and the exegetical chapters. In his discussion of the various women witnesses in John the author does not reinforce the notion that John's gospel is presented as a trial. As is the case with many published dissertations (the present study represents the substance of a dissertation completed at the University of Aberdeen under the supervision of Ruth Edwards), this work is strong on exegetical detail yet weak in theological integration. (2) Maccini's idiosyncratic method of selecting one, and only one, section of John's gospel as an interpretive frame for his exegesis of a given passage unduly excludes relevant information elsewhere in John. This procedure also occasionally renders the author's comparisons rather strained. How significant is it that both the wedding at Cana and the encounter at Sychar "happen in small towns beyond Judea, at specified times, and feature Jesus, his disciples, a woman, and others" (p. 119) and that both the supper at the anointing and the last supper feature "the meal itself" and "the moistening and drying of feet" (pp. 172–173)?

Another weakness is Maccini's neglect of John's salvation-historical framework, recently demonstrated by J. Pryor in *John: Evangelist of the Covenant People*. For instance, Maccini insists that Mary Magdalene's absence at the commissioning in 20:21–23 must not be construed as her exclusion from Jesus' inner apostolic circle, since Thomas was absent at this occasion as well. What Maccini fails to note, however, is the fact that Thomas was one of the Twelve, a category upheld in John's gospel (cf. esp. 20:24), while Mary Magdalene was not. As a result, the author's analogy between Thomas and Mary Magdalene breaks down, for Thomas, as one of the Twelve, may well have been included in Jesus' commission while Mary, at least in a primary sense, was not. This does not mean that Mary is beyond the pale of Jesus' commission; since the Twelve also function as representatives of believers in general in John, Mary, like other believers, is surely included in the commission in a derivative sense. Still, the fourth evangelist demonstrably maintains a salvation-historical distinction between the Twelve and other disciples of Jesus, and this distinction must not be obliterated.

Finally, a comment is in order regarding Maccini's agenda of validating an egalitarian commitment ("I am committed, to the best of my understanding and ability, to the equality of women and men in all aspects of church life" [p. 7]) in the conclusions he draws. While this commitment generally appears not to have had a negative

effect on the author's exegetical work, one is surprised by the following concluding statements: "John is by no means oblivious to the concern for justice in community. . . . Establishing equality for all persons regardless of their gender is a cause surely born in the heart of God" (p. 251). "To help in the effort to advance the cause of equality, not just for women but for all people (!), God sends a powerful and contemporary Paraclete, the Spirit" (p. 252). No evidence is adduced to substantiate these sweeping assertions. And nowhere in his study has Maccini even mentioned, much less demonstrated, John's concern for justice or the sending of the Spirit for the purpose of gender equality.

These lapses into egalitarian ideology mar an otherwise helpful treatment. Arguably, Maccini's finding that women, like men, function as legitimate witnesses in John's gospel has not proven that the author's commitment to egalitarianism is borne out by Scripture. The husband's headship in marriage or the limitation of certain teaching and ruling functions in the church to men are not necessarily affected by whether or not women, like men, serve as witnesses to Jesus in John's gospel or elsewhere. These crucial issues for a comprehensive view of the NT's teaching on male-female roles and relationships are not even explicitly addressed in John. For Maccini to claim that his egalitarianism is confirmed by the conclusions reached in his study therefore far exceeds what is warranted. "Her testimony" may be true, but his, at least in this one instance, is arguably not.

Andreas J. Köstenberger
Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary, Wake Forest, NC

John's Wisdom: A Commentary on the Fourth Gospel. By Ben Witherington. Louisville: John Knox, 1995, ix + 411 pp., \$34.99 paper.

As participants in the Johannine literature section of the Society of Biblical Literature can attest, the work of Johannine scholarship has taken a marked turn toward the absurd. In this climate it is soothing to hear the sane voice of one like Ben Witherington, Professor of New Testament Interpretation at Asbury Theological Seminary. Having written extensively on Jesus, Paul, the Synoptics and gender issues, Witherington here gives us the benefit of his considerable learning as applied to John's gospel. In an age when much scholarship gravitates toward one of two extremes, stale rewrites or daring yet improbable conjectures, Witherington provides us with an original and independent treatment. And while not everyone will agree with the author's proposals, Witherington's clear and persuasive mode of presentation will lead many to give serious consideration to his views.

The author's thesis is this: The gospel of John reflects a notable similarity to wisdom literature (such as Wisdom of Solomon 10–19, Proverbs 8, Sirach 24 or 1 Enoch 24, 70–72), especially in (1) the Logos hymn, (2) the "V-shaped" plot of the gospel (that is, from pre-existence to earth and back to heaven), (3) the "I am" sayings and discourses, (4) the signs, (5) the use of "Father" and "teacher-learner" language and (6) various aspects of John's Christology, soteriology and pneumatology, and John intended for his gospel to be read in light of sapiential literature.

Witherington's commentary proceeds section by section rather than verse by verse, which is helpful in grasping the message of larger units of John's gospel but at times results in loss of exegetical detail. Each section is divided into comments on "the historical horizon" (that is, exegesis of the text) and "bridging the horizons" (that is,

contemporary application). Unfortunately, the outlines given in the introduction (p. 43) and in the actual commentary do not coincide. Also, Witherington frequently refers to his previous book *Jesus the Sage* for substantiation of his views, which makes it difficult for readers to follow who are not familiar with this work.

The author classifies the fourth gospel's genre as *bios*, that is, ancient biography, written in the mode of *drama*, to be used by Christians for evangelistic purposes. He contends that the "subject matter of the Fourth Gospel is *not* the contemporary experience of Johannine Christians, or even the history of the Johannine community, . . . but rather the story of Jesus Christ as . . . interpreted by the Beloved Disciple" (p. 4), disagreeing with much of contemporary Johannine scholarship. Also, Witherington maintains that the fourth gospel is not analogous to the modern novel, taking issue with Culpepper's famous study *The Anatomy of the Fourth Gospel*.

Still, the author advocates a form of the "Johannine community" hypothesis, drawing primarily on passages from the Johannine epistles that Witherington considers to be the earliest Johannine documents. Witherington distinguishes between the beloved disciple, eyewitness of at least some of Jesus' ministry, and the fourth evangelist, "an anonymous member of the Johannine community, likely a close friend and disciple of the Beloved Disciple" (p. 11). According to Witherington, the fourth evangelist occasionally appended his own commentary but otherwise developed the fourth gospel out of material the beloved disciple passed on. Some of this material, in turn, it is suggested, "probably ultimately goes back to Jesus himself" (p. 37).

Significantly, Witherington does not believe that the fourth gospel was written to address a current social crisis between the synagogue and the Johannine community. Rather, the Johannine community in Asia was from the very beginning an essentially separate entity from the synagogue, but at least in its early stages felt compelled to witness to the synagogue since it was made up partly of Jewish converts. Taking issue with both Rensberger and Neyrey, who tend to cast the fourth gospel in terms of dualistic sectarianism, Witherington detects in the gospel evidence of a pervasive missionary orientation.

This is not the place to engage in detailed interaction with the author's densely argued, often intriguing proposals. A few comments must suffice here. First, the scenario Witherington suggests (John the sage casting Jesus as wisdom-become-flesh) is certainly *possible*; it is unclear whether it is the most *plausible* reading of John's gospel. To my mind, Witherington does not adequately account for the complete absence of the term "wisdom" (σοφία) in both gospel and epistles. Witherington's discussion is frequently speculative, such as when he states that "the relationship of Jesus and the Word, or Jesus and Wisdom, was a matter of significant discussion in the Johannine community and thus the evangelist felt it necessary to provide parameters for that discussion" (p. 369, n. 55). Perhaps this is so, but how does the author know?

Second, Witherington argues strenuously that the beloved disciple is not John, the son of Zebedee. But which other close historical follower of Jesus known to us from the other gospels fits the fourth gospel's portrayal of the beloved disciple? Who was closely associated with Peter during Jesus' ministry and in the history of the early church? And is it merely a coincidence that almost everything Witherington postulates regarding the identity of the beloved disciple fits John, the son of Zebedee (even though Witherington himself disavows this conclusion and seems to be unaware of these striking similarities)? Who else is, in Witherington's own terms, (1) "a Judean disciple who was an eyewitness of at least some of the ministry of Jesus," (2) "originally follower of John the Baptist" and (3) "may have been called, or called himself, John, John the elder, or perhaps John the old man" (pp. 16–17)?

Still, there remains much to learn from this thought-provoking book. Witherington's skepticism regarding J. L. Martyn's "Johannine community hypothesis," his proposed genre of John as dramatic biography, and his emphasis on the fourth gospel's missionary orientation reflect sound independent judgment that runs counter to much of contemporary Johannine scholarship yet coheres better with the character of John's gospel than alternative proposals. Here is a commentary on John that merits careful consideration by scholars and serious students of Scripture alike. While remaining to be persuaded by its central thesis, I commend it to those who enjoy being stimulated by fresh, invigorating scholarship on one of the most fascinating books of Scripture.

Andreas J. Köstenberger
Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary, Wake Forest, NC

The Epistles to the Colossians and to Philemon. By James D. G. Dunn. NIGTC. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996, 388 pp., \$32.00.

James D. G. Dunn, Lightfoot Professor of Divinity at the University of Durham, has provided the student of the NT with yet another standard commentary on Colossians and Philemon in that like others it includes introductory background materials and detailed verse-by-verse exegesis of the Greek text. What sets this commentary apart from others, however, is Dunn's ability to place these two letters in their cultural contexts by virtue of his thorough knowledge and mastery of that vast body of ancient literature, Jewish and Greek, both antecedent to and contemporary with the NT, his ability to detect parallels between these two bodies of literature, his ability to show how the one may possibly inform the other and his ability to articulate his understanding of important theological/Christological issues that run through the NT.

It is impossible to do justice to such a thorough piece of work in such a short space allotted, so I will confine my remarks primarily to Colossians and to three matters of interest pertaining to this letter: authorship, the "hymn" about Christ and the Colossian "heresy."

Dunn places himself among those who hold to the "strong likelihood" that Colossians was written by someone other than Paul (p. 35). He does not base this conviction on vocabulary counts, sentence structure, etc., but on what he is confronted with as a commentator in his verse-by-verse study of the letter: its flow of thought, its rhetorical technique, its Christology (1:15–20), its ecclesiology (1:18 with 2:10), its eschatology (2:11–12) and its parenesis making use of "household rules" (3:18–4:1), each of which he considers "markedly" or "significantly" different from those of the undisputed Paulines. Yet it appears that Dunn is not entirely happy with this position, for from time to time he offers caveats such as, "it is possible that Paul's style changed over a few years" or "one could speak of the development of Paul's own thought" (pp. 35–36). Furthermore, the fact that throughout his commentary he uses expressions like, "it may be," "perhaps," "could," "may have been," "might imply," "seems to be," etc. (pp. 46, 47, 49, 55, 81 and *passim*), when he points to matters in the text that suggest another writer of Colossians than Paul, reveal still more clearly his discomfort at denying Pauline authorship outright. So it is not surprising that in the end Dunn speculates that although Timothy actually wrote Colossians, yet it was "for Paul at Paul's behest, [and] . . . with Paul's approval of what was in the event written (prior to adding 4:18)." In the end, then, he concludes that we must "call the

letter 'Pauline' in the full sense of the word" (p. 38). Perhaps Dunn would have moved still closer to the traditional view of Pauline authorship had he made use of Marcus Barth's recent (1994) detailed commentary on Colossians, but I see no reference to such an important work anywhere in this volume.

Dunn's conclusions concerning the "early Christian hymn in which Christ is praised" (1:15–20) are not wholly convincing. Although he himself believes the hymn expresses an extraordinarily exalted Christology, a Christology that claims that nothing less than the highest possible terms of God's self-expression in and through Christ could be used to assess his person and work (p. 101), that claims that in Christ, in his life, "death and resurrection [is to be found] the key to resolving the disharmonies of nature and the inhumanities of humankind," yet Dunn at the same time seems to deny that this hymn makes any claim for the divine preexistence of Christ (p. 119) or for his incarnation (p. 102). Even if Dunn's thesis is acceptable that the "hymn"-writer took over the language of divine "Wisdom" (e.g. Ps 104:24; Prov 3:19) and used it to express the significance of the person of Christ, yet when one reflects on such statements in the hymn as "in/by [Christ] all things in heaven and on earth were created," "he himself is before all things," "he is the beginning," and "he made peace through the blood of his cross," i.e. "through his physical death," it seems incredible that Dunn would conclude that these statements permit no one to infer from them a full-blown doctrine of the preexistence/incarnation of the Christ, the Son of God's love (vv. 13–14).

For Dunn, the Colossian "philosophy," a term he prefers to that of "heresy," is best explained not as a syncretistic religion composed of a non-Jewish core (e.g. Phrygian folk belief) that gathered about it elements of Judaism and Christianity (contra C. E. Arnold, *The Colossian Syncretism*, 1995, p. 243), but rather as originating in and emanating from one of the Colossian synagogues. He comes to this conclusion as a result of his careful exegesis of the letter in which he shows, for example, that the thought expressed in 1:12, 21–22; 3:11–12 focuses on Jewish covenantal distinctives, and that the elements featured in 2:8–23 also fit easily within Judaism, though one tinged with apocalyptic and mystical features, a Judaism not wholly unlike that promoted in the Galatian churches. Into this context Dunn, drawing upon his wide knowledge of contemporary Jewish sources, is able to place and convincingly explain such enigmatic words and phrases as *plērōma* ("fullness," 2:9), *ta stoicheia tou kosmou* ("elemental forces/spirits of the universe," 1:19; 2:9), and the most difficult crux of all, the well-nigh untranslatable 2:18, with its mysterious phrases (literally translated), "willing in humility," "worship of angels," "what he has seen entering." In my judgment, Dunn has made his case: The likely origin of the Colossian church from within the synagogue, the undoubted presence of Israelite sectarianism within the Diaspora, the lack of other evidence of Jewish syncretism in Asia Minor and the eagerness of some Jews to promote their distinctive religious practices all require that one look no further than the Jewish synagogues in Colossae for the source of whatever influences threatened the young church there.

Dunn's introductory and exegetical comments on Philemon are done with the same thoroughness, clarity and insights that mark his comments on Colossians and, indeed, all his writings. Of special interest is his explanation of Onesimus' relation to Philemon and why he sought out Paul in prison.

Even though at times we must disagree with Dunn, we nevertheless owe him a debt of gratitude for the intellectual and spiritual gifts with which he provides us and the challenges he often lays before us. This volume on Colossians and Philemon is no exception.

Gerald F. Hawthorne
Wheaton College, Wheaton, IL

The Colossian Syncretism: The Interface Between Christianity and Folk Belief at Colossae. By Clinton E. Arnold. WUNT 2.77. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1995, 378 pp., DM 118.00, paper.

The roots of this study go back to Arnold's doctoral dissertation that he wrote under the direction of I. H. Marshall at the University of Aberdeen and subsequently published in an abbreviated form as *Ephesians: Power and Magic: The Concept of Power in Ephesians in Light of its Historical Setting* (Cambridge, 1989). Here in this present volume Arnold furthers his investigation and seeks now to explain the origin and nature of the teaching and practices troubling the church in Colossae.

He recognizes that there is indeed a limited amount of local evidence to make use of from Asia Minor as a whole, and more especially from Phrygia, Lydia and Caria—the geographical environs of Colossae. Yet nevertheless he is convinced that there is more of this than scholars have realized, sufficient material to draw an accurate portrait of “the philosophy” against which Paul battled in his letter to the Colossians. The present volume is his serious attempt to draw this portrait.

The first part sets out to unravel the meaning of the difficult expression in 2:18, *threskeia tōn angelōn*, translated “worship of angels,” which Arnold understands does not refer to worship that the angels do, but to angels as the objects of human veneration. He bases his conclusion on the numerous, wide-ranging angel texts he has examined. These are both pagan, Jewish and even Christian texts, and include amulets, inscriptions found on lead tablets or papyri, inferences from the literature of Judaism, and the like. All these materials in his judgment show that Jews as well as pagans of the first century did invoke angels for protection, help and assistance.

The second part, a very long section, is Arnold's reconstruction of the Colossian “philosophy.” Here he has collected material describing local pagan cults, mystery religions, witchcraft, magic and astrology, as well as the alleged syncretistic Jewish cults of Asia Minor. His examination of this evidence enables him confidently to assert that the Colossian “philosophy” is an amalgam of Phrygian folk belief, local folk Judaism and basic tenets of the Christian faith.

The third part is Arnold's discussion of Paul's theological response to “the philosophy” that threatened the health of the Colossian church—the cosmic Christ (1:15–20), who because all the fullness of God dwells in him, holds a position superior to all principalities and powers (2:10) and who has defeated them utterly through his death on the cross (2:15). Hence, because of the Colossians' solidarity with Christ in his death and resurrection they are beyond the reach of the malevolent influences of evil spirits.

Arnold's study is of import for at least two reasons: (1) he has brought together in one volume a great amount of primary source material that has the potential of providing valuable new insight into the religious thought world of the common person of western Asia Minor surrounding the time Paul wrote his letter to Colossae. (2) Arnold has sorted, studied, evaluated and interpreted this material for the benefit of his readers to show how it aids in resolving some of the most difficult cruxes of Colossians, e.g. those found in 2:18—“the worship of angels,” the meaning of the participle *embateuōn*, and the meaning of *ta stoicheia* in 2:8 and 20.

If there is an overarching weakness of this volume, it would be its dependence on a great deal of evidence drawn from a period later than the NT. Arnold is aware of this potential defect in his thesis and attempts to blunt any such criticism right at the start (pp. 17–18). But in spite of his apologetic, one cannot help wondering whether such later materials provide a sufficiently strong foundation upon which to establish a defensible conclusion about the religious teachings and practices in Paul's day.

One wonders, too, if Arnold has not unnecessarily used these data to paint a picture of a syncretistic religious mix, especially involving tenets of pagans and Jews, to explain the Colossian "philosophy," when a close examination of every scrap of information provided by the text itself might suggest instead that the teaching Paul opposed had in fact a strong and thoroughly Jewish stamp to it that might have characterized any of the synagogues in Colossae (cf. 1:12, 21–22; 2:11–13, 16, 21).

These criticisms must not be allowed to detract from the wealth of information that Arnold has provided every serious student of Colossians, or from his valuable insights into what this information means. It is only to say, quoting Marcus Barth (*Colossians*, p. 39), that even yet "the Colossian Religion [= "philosophy"] remains an unsolved puzzle. . . . The available facts are insufficient to settle the issue." Nevertheless, in this book Arnold has added his bit to this store of available facts and has made his contribution toward solving the puzzle. For this he is to be applauded.

Gerald F. Hawthorne
Wheaton College, Wheaton, IL

Paul and the Mosaic Law: The Third Durham-Tübingen Research Symposium on Earliest Christianity and Judaism (Durham, September, 1994). Edited by James D. G. Dunn. WUNT 89. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1996, xi + 368 pp., DM 248.

Perhaps the most contentious issue in contemporary Pauline research is Paul's understanding of the law. This work contains a series of essays presented and discussed in Durham, England on September 19–23, 1994. The lineup of scholars who participated is truly impressive and a wide variety of subjects is tackled. The work commences with an introduction by Dunn. Hermann Lichtenberger briefly describes the Jewish view of the Torah during Paul's day, and Martin Hengel explores Paul's understanding of the law from his conversion until his arrival in Antioch. Jan Lambrecht and Bruce Longenecker suggest alternate interpretations of Gal 2:15–21, while Graham Stanton tackles the law of Moses and Christ in Gal 3:1–6:2. The letter and spirit in 2 Corinthians 3 is examined by Karl Kertelge. N. T. Wright presents Paul's view of the law in Romans 2, and Richard Hays studies Romans 3–4. The contrast between Adam and Christ is carefully interpreted by Otfried Hofius, and the hermeneutical contribution of Romans 7 is sketched in by Hans Hübner. Stephen Westerholm sets forth Paul's view of the law in Romans 9–11. Heikki Räisänen responds to Westerholm, and Westerholm in turn reacts to Räisänen's critique. Peter Tomson helps us think about Paul's Jewish background in 1 Corinthians 7, and Stephen Barton ponders the sociological impact of 1 Cor 9:19–23. John Barclay reflects on the contribution of Rom 14:1–15:6 for understanding Paul's view of the law, and Dunn concludes the work with an essay titled "In Search of Common Ground." A useful bibliography of works composed on the law between 1980–1994 is also included.

The essays are of high quality throughout. In a short review I can only mention a few that piqued my interest. Graham Stanton in his essay on Galatians 3–6 reminds us that the letter was experienced primarily at the oral level. This methodological observation prevents us from "over-reading" the letter, for the main theme—the opposition between faith and the law—is clear when one reads the letter as a whole. Stanton also provocatively contrasts and compares Galatians with Justin's *Dialogue with Trypho*. This comparison provides an entrée into the exegesis of Galatians 3–6 as a whole, an exegesis that is level-headed and stimulating.

One of the most interesting and creative writers on the scene today is N. T. Wright, and his essay on Romans 2 does not disappoint. He rightly argues that the chapter

must be interpreted in light of the OT witness. Thus, the Jewish failure to keep the law testifies that Israel is still in exile because of its sin and that the covenantal promises given to Israel were not yet fulfilled in the nation. Conversely, the doing of the law by the Gentiles indicates that the covenantal promises given to the Gentiles are becoming a reality. I find Wright's contention that the keeping of the law by Gentile Christians relates to "status" less convincing. The Ezekiel 36 text, which informs Romans 2, teaches that those who have the Spirit *will keep God's law* (Ezek 36:26–27). Wright's exegesis also introduces a strange disjunction into the chapter, for on his reading the Jews are indicted for transgressing God's law, whereas the Gentiles are praised not because they keep God's law or because their lives are transformed but because they have a new status. It must be asked what evidence exists for the new status of Gentiles. After all, Jews *also* claimed to have a righteous relationship with God, but Paul argues that their behavior falsifies the claim. Conversely, he maintains that the changed behavior of the Gentiles testifies to their new status before God. Wright's view, on its own terms (if I understand him correctly), comes dangerously close to the very charge which Paul levels against the Jews in Romans 2. Wright claims that the Jewish nation as a whole is culpable *if any Jews* are guilty of adultery, stealing or temple robbery. But would the same standard apply to the Church? Would a single adulterer in the new community show that the covenant is unfulfilled? Wright seems to escape by postulating a new community that is marked by status rather than by doing. This solution seems to lift Paul's theology out of the realm of the real world into an abstract world in which his view could never be falsified.

Westerholm with his usual elegant and witty style explains Paul's view of the law in Romans 9–11 and relates it to Paul's understanding of divine election. He emphasizes the priority of God's grace, but maintains (rightly in my view) that God's grace does not rule out the importance of human response, even though human faith is invariably due to God's gracious work. Westerholm also takes issue with the view that Paul's critique of the law can be confined to salvation history or Jewish nationalism. A fundamental dichotomy between faith and works is also apparent. Barclay's essay on Romans 14–15 is also instructive. He rightly argues that the issue under discussion relates to food laws in Judaism and the observance of the sabbath. Attitudes toward these Jewish customs in the Greco-Roman world are helpfully sketched in. Barclay says that Paul's advice is that the strong should only eat food (and drink) that is inoffensive to Jews at their common meals. No prescriptions are imposed upon the strong for eating their meals in the privacy of their own homes. In effect, Paul protects the law-observance of the weak, even though he sides theologically with the strong. One of Barclay's most interesting observations, a correct one in my opinion, is that Paul's instruction on these matters ultimately undermines the validity of the Mosaic law. The weak are required to maintain fellowship and to desist from judging those who do not observe the law. Such associations can only have the effect of relativizing the law's importance in the long run. Paul has made it abundantly clear that abiding by the prescriptions of the Torah is finally irrelevant and unimportant.

In the concluding essay Dunn sketches in some of the areas of agreement and disagreement on the issue of the law in Paul. Some agreements exist, but the work as a whole does not really resolve the most contentious issues at stake in the argument, and doubtless any hope of such a resolution in five days is hopeless. The individual essays contained in the volume are insightful and thought-provoking, but to a reader who was not at the conference any sense of resolution or advance relative to the issue of Paul and the law is lacking. It is unclear to me that the essays are much different than they would have been if there were no conference at all. Such an observation, of course, may be incorrect. Perhaps some essays were substantially reworked because of the discussions at the conference, but such revisions are not apparent to the reader.

I wonder if more significant advances would be possible if essays were crafted that responded more directly the various positions promulgated, and then the various participants specifically defend or revise their views accordingly. The Westerholm-Räsänen interaction is helpful in this regard. As it is, and perhaps this is inevitable, it is difficult for the reader to see how the conference advanced the agenda significantly on the matter of Paul and the law. Nonetheless, we can all be grateful for a host of stimulating essays.

Thomas R. Schreiner
The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, KY

St. Paul's Theology of Rhetorical Style: An Examination of 1 Corinthians 2.1-5 in Light of First Century Greco-Roman Rhetorical Culture. By Michael A. Bullmore. San Francisco: International Scholars, 1995, 240 pp., \$69.95 paper.

This work is a revision of a doctoral dissertation written at Northwestern University. The first chapter (pp. 1-22) provides the rationale for the research, after reviewing the history of research on the relationship between rhetorical culture and Christian proclamation in the first century. Duane Litfin's work, *St. Paul's Theology of Proclamation: 1 Corinthians 1-4 and Greco-Roman Rhetoric* (Cambridge University, 1994) is discussed extensively. Bullmore of Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, builds on Litfin's work and argues that "Paul . . . effectively introduced Christian preaching into the cultural and intellectual market of the Roman Empire" (p. 3), and that "it is with the particulars of a very specific rhetorical context present in first century Corinth that Paul contrasts his own rhetorical program" (p. 13). Bullmore traces the particular rhetorical situation in terms of debate regarding rhetorical style between the Asianists (grand style) and the Atticists (plain style). His thesis is that Paul "considers rhetorical style an illegitimate means of persuasion and an illegitimate basis for the kind of belief he was hoping to see engendered" (p. 17).

To present the case persuasively, Bullmore examines in great detail in chap. 2 (pp. 23-64) the emergence of the Greco-Roman rhetorical culture in which the city of Corinth was immersed. Chapter 3 (pp. 65-172) discusses the theoretical, practical, political and educational developments of Greco-Roman rhetoric. The discussion on the Asianist-Atticist controversy on rhetorical style (pp. 90-113) and Cicero's contributions to the theory of rhetorical style (pp. 113-144) are the main focus and become the essential argument of the following two chapters. The stylistic ability of an orator to persuade is the primary virtue of the rhetorical culture of the time.

Chapter 4 (pp. 173-204) is an investigation of St. Paul's rhetorical literacy in his historical, intellectual and culture contexts, in which Paul was very much aware of its persuasive style. Chapter 5 (pp. 205-222) is a detailed exegetical study of 1 Cor 2:1-5, as a way to test the thesis proposed in the previous four chapters. Bullmore concludes that "What emerges clearly from Paul's response to this situation is that some members of the Corinthian church, after their conversion, began to interpret their new faith in light of the prevailing Greek philosophical tradition and as a result the Corinthians began to make a false connection between faith (*pistis*) and "wisdom" (*sophia*). It is in this false idea of *sophia* that the schism between the Corinthian church and its founder was rooted" (p. 208). He further states, "But Paul's preaching did not thereby lack persuasion. What it lacked was the kind of persuasion practiced by the traveling orators in which the power lay in the speaker and his stylistic vir-

tuosity" (p. 222). Chapter Six (pp. 223–225) is a conclusion in which a more technical definition of both Paul's rhetoric and the rhetoric he opposed is defined.

The work as a whole is insightful in both ancient rhetorical culture and the specific situation in which Paul lived. Fine-tuning questions, however, come to my mind. I wonder why Apollos was not discussed in light of the Corinthian controversy, given the differences in rhetorical skill and leadership style of Paul and Apollos. Is the "schism" merely between Paul and the Corinthians? Was it not influenced by other leaders?

Further, I get the impression that Bullmore is talking about "St. Paul's Rhetorical Understanding of Christian Theology and Proclamation." Would this title fit the work better? At least the amount of material on rhetorical culture gives one that impression. This raises another intertwined question: What is the relationship between Paul's rhetoric and theology? If it is Paul's theology of the cross that determines his rhetoric (implied in the title of the book), then the fundamental controversy between Paul and the Corinthians is not rhetorical, but theological. Thus, the implication for a research agenda and method is that the discussion on Greco-Roman culture needs to focus on its ideological presuppositions done in contrast to Pauline theology. In other words, the rhetoric and theology of Christian proclamation needs to be closely defined.

As a whole, Bullmore's research on Greco-Roman rhetorical culture does throw new light on our understanding of Paul's debate with the Corinthians as reflected in 1 Cor 2:1–5. Bullmore's proofs are meticulous, resourceful (709 footnotes) and quite convincing. The implications of this work for Christian proclamation and preaching today are significant.

Yeo Khiok-khng

Garrett-Evangelical Theological Seminary, Evanston, IL

Despising Shame: Honor Discourse and Community Maintenance in the Epistle to the Hebrews. By David Arthur deSilva. SBLDS 152. Atlanta: Scholars, 1995, 371 pp., n.p.

After surveying the pervasive use of honor and shame language in Hebrews (chief among which is 12:2, from which the book derives its name), the author sets forth his agenda by a series of interpretive questions to be answered in the course of the book (pp. 5–6). Central to this investigation is the importance of the honor-shame category in the value system of these Hebrew Christians and the author's use of honor and shame language in his argumentation. What the major modern commentators on Hebrews—Lane, Attridge, Hering, Moffatt, Delitzsch, Michel, all anticipated by Chrysostom—observe only in a limited and disconnected way, deSilva develops as a central integrating motif of the epistle: The author exploits the honor-shame axis of thought in order to reinforce the readers' commitment to honoring God as the audience of one even if this invites shame from the court of reputation of this world.

DeSilva is sensitive at the outset to the charge that such an investigation is too narrowly focused (pp. 11–23). He admits that any cultural-anthropological model that views first-century Mediterranean values through a single "lens of honor and shame" might well end up neglecting other equally significant value determinants. His approach is nuanced carefully so that honor and shame become "a (not *the*) pivotal axis of value" that recognizes the presence of other axes that from time to time supersede honor and shame (p. 23). His caveats provide relief from fears that he is about to launch into one more exercise in reductionism. The overall plan of the book

is first to explore the use of shame/honor in Classical and Hellenistic texts (chaps. 2–3) and then to apply the template from these primary sources to the epistle to the Hebrews (chaps. 4–6). DeSilva believes such an approach will “avoid the charge of imposing a modern matrix on an ancient document” (p. 24), though the dissimilarity of Hebrews to many of the works cited may at times create an apples-and-oranges comparison, as I shall point out. This study is in the stream of the burgeoning field of NT applications of socio-rhetorical criticism pioneered by Vernon K. Robbins.

In chap. 2 the author establishes the place of honor and shame in the Greco-Roman world from three primary source materials: The rhetorical handbooks (Aristotle, Quintilian, *Rhetorica ad Herennium*), Greek speeches (Thucydides, Dio Chrysostom, Josephus) and the ethical/wisdom literature (Aristotle’s *Nichomachean Ethics*, Isocrates, and the book of Proverbs in the OT). His mastery of these materials is impressive, though lumping together the Greco-Roman models with Hebraic Biblical material may blur the distinction between very disparate world views. Terminological similarity often does not translate into conceptual congruence. For example, Δοξα means societal honor or reputation in the Hellenistic literature, but denotes God’s honor/glorify in Scripture (refracted into the NT through the Septuagint). The distinction between epideictic (didactic or expositional) and deliberative (exhortational) rhetoric is helpful and certainly is applicable to Hebrews which alternates between the two genres. DeSilva recognizes the limits of applying rhetorical criticism to Hebrews (p. 34) and remains sensitive to the danger of “collapsing all values into the axis of honor and shame” (p. 77). In chap. 3 the language of honor and shame is drawn from Greco-Roman philosophical writings (Plato, Seneca, Epictetus) and Jewish writers (Ben Sira, Wisdom of Solomon, Fourth Maccabees) to show how minority cultures set up their own “court of reputation” in protest to the dominant values of the surrounding culture. The appeal to ultimate accountability before God rather than man, while not absent from the writings of Plato (p. 86) or Epictetus (p. 94), becomes a *leitmotif* of the Jewish writings: Ben Sira (pp. 112–113), Wisdom of Solomon (p. 126) and Fourth Maccabees (pp. 136, 141).

Hebrews’ conceptual affinity is clearly with the Hellenistic Jewish literature and its emphasis on honor “before God.” In chaps. 4–6 deSilva turns to the inculcation of counter-definitions of honor and shame by the writer of Hebrews. A particularly illuminating section is the survey of primary sources (Tacitus, Pliny, Lucian, Celsus, mirror reading of the early Christian apologists) that reveal the dominant culture’s evaluation of Christians in the first centuries CE (pp. 146–154). DeSilva rightly avoids adopting overly specific reconstructions of the events described in 10:32–34; 12:4 (pp. 154–164). He endorses the interpretation of the early church fathers of αἰσχύνῃ καταφρονήσας in 12:2 (contra most modern commentators): Jesus’ rejection of regard for his own reputation and of the court of opinion which regarded his cross-death as shameful (pp. 171–173). The exemplars of faith applauded in Hebrews 11 are like Jesus and “embrace a lower standard in the world’s eyes for the sake of the heavenly reward” (p. 179). The recurrent appeal to analogies from secular literature (pp. 206–207) are less convincing, for “God’s court” as the author of Hebrews understands it far transcends the higher values of a Heracles or a Seneca.

DeSilva seeks to establish in chap. 5 the honor-patronage theme in secular literature as the hermeneutical template by which to understand several Christological emphases in Hebrews: The greater honor of Jesus as the Son in God’s house (3:1–6) and the greatness of his Melchizedekian high priesthood (7:1–28). Even more questionable is the parallel of the giving and receiving of benefactions in the patronal society of Greece to the gracious benefits afforded the covenant community from Christ the benefactor. DeSilva himself admits that in the patron-broker-client relations of Greco-Roman society the “mutual bonds of favor, and the accompanying bonds of

indebtedness, provided the glue which maintained social cohesion" (pp. 226–227). Grace (*χάρις*), however, is God's unmerited, unconstrained favor offered to an undeserving people who respond with praise and thanksgiving, grounded in the constant realization that such a debt could never be repaid. The secular parallels, though helpful, clearly have their limits. This becomes even clearer in chap. 6, where few parallels exist to illumine the dual alternate court of opinion constructed in Hebrews: God the final evaluator of one's convictions and the visible court of opinion in the community of faith.

DeSilva has provided a substantive work that captures and copiously illustrates from ancient sources one important theme of Hebrews, the maintenance of honor before the audience of one, the Lord God, whose approbation alone truly matters. The work would have been enhanced by an exhaustive index of the numerous Greek terms that are treated in the text (beyond the brief listing on p. 356).

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

The Letter of James. By Luke Timothy Johnson. AB 37a. New York: Doubleday, 1995, 412 pp., \$35.00.

The year prior to his launch into the limelight, commanded by his scathing denunciation of the Jesus Seminar in *The Real Jesus*, Luke Timothy Johnson, Robert W. Woodruff Professor of New Testament and Christian Origins at Candler School of Theology, Emory University, published this carefully researched, engaging and at times insightful commentary on the Epistle of James. As in *The Real Jesus*, *JETS* readers will find the Johnson who interprets James to be a comrade in his view of Scripture, a gifted teacher in his exposition, and, for the most part, one who states his positions strongly.

As always in the Anchor Bible series, the commentary abounds with relevant bibliography, listed at the end of each section. It also boasts separate indexes for Scriptural references, ancient sources, pre-modern authors (2nd–17th centuries) and modern authors (17th–20th centuries), 64 pages total. Frustrating, though, is the fact that this volume, unlike most Anchor commentaries, provides no reference headers.

In the preface (p. ix), Johnson notes the changing character of the Anchor commentaries since Bo Reicke's *The Epistle of James, Peter, and Jude*, which launched the series in 1964, as justification for his commentary on James. Whereas Reicke was restricted to providing brief notes and commentary (only 62 pages total), Johnson has free reign. Fortunately, unlike some in this series, he does not abuse the privilege. Thankfully, he supplies some information and analysis unavailable in other commentaries on James, particularly regarding the history of interpretation of James, to which he devotes a fourth of his 160-page introduction.

Johnson believes that only by reviewing the history of James' interpretation can he right the grievous wrong done by Luther's defamation of it as anti-Pauline, which was followed in due course by the historical-critical school branding James "early catholic." Evidence for an early dating of James has always been available, particularly its quotation by 1 Clement and the Shepherd of Hermas, but has been continually clouded over by other issues.

Johnson divides his substantial introduction into four main sections, organized around the concept of "voice," of which the "History of Interpretation" or "How was the Voice Heard?" is the third. First, he covers "The Character of the Writing: the Voice."

Here, he argues that the text is “stable,” the language is “clear and correct *koine* with some ambitions toward rhetorical flourish,” and the style includes Septuagintal influences, as well as Greek diatribe. In terms of James’ structure, he believes that the epistle contains thematic and literary coherence, with the aphorisms of 1:1–27 reappearing as essays in 2:1–5:18. The thematic heart of James is 3:13–4:10, the most perfect expression of James’ voice, 4:4. In terms of genre, he pushes aside Dibelius’ disconnection of James’ paraenesis from social circumstances to call James “a form of protreptic discourse,” because it advocates a form of behavior consistent with those of a community defined by “friendship with God,” among other things.

“The Voice” also includes a probing 40-page examination of the immense variety of “Literary Relationships” James has, thankfully not driven by the concern to find sources. Rather, comparisons and contrasts are drawn between material in James and, for instance, Greco-Roman moralists, OT prophecy, Jewish literature like *Pirke Aboth*, the *Letter of Aristeas* and the *Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs* (which Johnson believes provides “the most complex and compelling set of comparisons to James). He also includes analysis of James’ relationship to noncanonical Christian literature, including the Shepherd of Hermas, which Johnson concludes shows literary dependence on James.

It is within the section on “New Testament Relationships” that Johnson deals most extensively with the relationship between James and Pauline writings. Here, breaking with many commentaries, he accents their commonalities, noting that they diverge only when Paul, as in Rom 3:20 and Gal 2:16, connects *erga* to the term “law.” James shares his use of *ergon* in the moral sense of deed/effort with every other use of *ergon* in the NT and with Paul himself in at least 50 occurrences. Johnson believes there is no basis for concluding that James and Paul are “talking to each other” on this subject in their respective books. Each operates out of his own sphere of particular concerns.

In the second introductory section, “Circumstances of Composition: Whose Voice?” Johnson carefully lays out solid evidence for concluding not only that the voice in the epistle is James, the Lord’s brother, but that the date for the writing is early. The latter conclusion Johnson himself considers “a distinctive contribution” of his commentary (p. xii). I agree heartily. The key to Johnson’s analysis involves “loosening” James from the Pauline entanglements in which it has become unjustifiably ensnared due to the influence of F. C. Bauer and the Tübingen School. Freeing James to be “read in terms of 108 verses rather than 12 verses” has been long overdue.

Johnson’s position is unique in that he does not argue that Paul reacts to James (Mayor’s position), nor James to Paul. Rather, no basis exists for reading them “in tandem” at all. As if to provide an exclamation point to this conclusion, Johnson refuses even to suggest a specific date, seemingly satisfied with anything between AD 46–62. Here, while appreciating what Johnson does for James up to this point, I am disappointed that he does not take the final step in the matter of dating James. He leaves me to assume that he favors the earliest date possible, which seems most consistent with his evidence, but I’d rather hear him speak to the matter himself.

In the commentary section, Johnson treats James in seven sections, providing a welcome effort to comment on the structure, theme and unifying factors of these sections (not a feature of other Anchor commentaries) before moving on to treating each paragraph within the sections in the standard Anchor format of translation, notes and comment. No subheadings exist, so we are provided no detailed outline, but Johnson does talk through the logic of each paragraph in the comments. The notes are amply supplied with the relevant background sources from Greek, Roman and Jewish writ-

ings, as well as interaction with significant Biblical texts. Johnson demonstrates he is in touch with other commentaries (he says he kept track of 16, though he provides no list or bibliography of these), but he certainly does not depend on them. Nor does he hesitate to point out their errors in fact or judgment on occasion, as when he disagrees with Davids that the latter rabbinic concept of the two inclinations influenced Jas 1:14 or 4:2 or when he challenges Martin's claim, regarding 4:5, that *phthonos* can ever be used of God.

Johnson shows sound, careful judgment throughout his comments, for example, when he suggests that in understanding "word of truth" in 1:21, we should not so sharply draw a distinction between creation, covenant and grace, when he recognizes the need to translate *ginomai* in 1:22 as "become" rather than the normal "be" for the imperative form, when he observes that "the fruit of righteousness" in 3:18 is epexegetic, when he assumes in 5:3 that James knows very well gold and silver don't rust, and when he recognizes that the paramount importance of behavior in speech in James does not render "above all else" in 5:12 out of place.

Despite good judgment in most places, however, Johnson's view of "the faith of Jesus Christ" as subjective genitive in 2:1, his dismissal of 3:1 connecting to any historical concern about teachers, and his refusal to admit any reference to Jesus in "the righteous one" in 5:16, will come as a jolt to many *JETS* readers.

Johnson has written a good commentary for veteran scholars but has not ignored the novice. The patient teacher emerges from the pages of the commentary when he begins areas of scholarly discussion, like genre, composition, James' place as a Christian writing or James' relationship to noncanonical Christian literature. He always begins by taking a step back to explain how these explorations help us understand James and takes time to explain terminology. As a teacher myself, I always appreciate a commentary I feel I can recommend to students. This one I can, and I will. However, I also believe Bible scholars will value this landmark commentary as I do.

William R. Baker
St. Louis Christian College, Florissant, MO

New Bible Dictionary. Edited by J. D. Douglas et al. 3d edition. Downers Grove/Leicester: InterVarsity, 1996, xix + 1298 pp., \$39.99.

I have long considered the *New Bible Dictionary* (*NBD*) (1st ed., 1962; 2d ed., 1982) to be the best one-volume Bible dictionary available. It was a scholarly treasure-trove of information about almost every conceivable subject relating to the Bible. I have constantly used it for quick reference, as well as to compare information from longer entries in multi-volume Bible encyclopedias. Its list of contributors was a veritable "Who's Who" in evangelicalism of the British Commonwealth.

This third edition follows in the same tradition and it will now occupy the same position of prominence on my shelf as its predecessors. The new edition adds 20 new contributors (including several Americans), yielding a total of 182; the second edition had 165 contributors, but three are dropped in the third edition.

One finds articles on almost every word or concept in the Bible. If not, the helpful index at the back points readers to places within other articles where such information may be found. The articles are written from an informed evangelical viewpoint, and traditional interpretations are consistently and ably defended. The articles consistently deliver vast amounts of information in a short, concise space.

As a new, updated work, however, the third edition is somewhat disappointing. The editors' preface states that most of the articles remain unchanged, but that bibliographies are updated. Some revisions in the cultural and archaeological areas are made "wherever possible, subject to the limits imposed by the existing format" (p. vii).

These limitations appear to be rather severe, because in most articles I compared, there were no changes at all. A random sample of articles I checked for which I would have expected some revisions—given advances in scholarship since the second edition, or the nature of the current debate—but found none at all includes "Abraham," "City," "David," "Gospels," "Homosexuality," "Isaiah, book of," "Jerusalem," "Jesus Christ, Life and Teaching of," "Patriarchal Age," "Pentateuch" and "Philistines." (In the article on the Pentateuch, for example, "contemporary scholars" [p. 897] refers to scholars such as W. F. Albright, C. H. Gordon, O. Kaiser, Y. Kaufmann, H. H. Rowley and J. A. Soggin. In the "David" article, the latest bibliographic entry is from 1960.)

Surprisingly, the lengthy (8 pages) article on "Archaeology" itself is virtually unchanged. For the Hellenistic-Roman period, I could detect no change whatsoever, although a second contributor is listed, and the bibliography is updated somewhat. For archaeology in earlier periods, the same is true, and only three bibliographic entries are added. An example of the lack of updating here is to be found in the uncritical acceptance of Kathleen Kenyon's dating scheme for Jericho; no mention is made of Bryant Wood's recent (and credible) challenge to Kenyon's methods.

The editors do state that "a number of fresh entries have been written for this volume" (p. vii), and this is true. This appears to mean that several entries were re-written (I could find no new entries for which none existed in the second edition, although I may simply have missed them). Examples I found of completely re-written entries, by new authors, include "Chronology of the New Testament," "Clean and Unclean," "Ebla," "Essenes" and "Law." Some articles are updated by a second contributor (e.g. "English Versions of the Bible"). These new and updated entries are well done, following the same high standards of earlier articles.

I came to this review with the same eager expectations I did in reviewing the *NBD's* companion volume, the *New Bible Commentary: 21st Century Edition* (see *JETS* 39.1 [March 1996] 149–150). Given the extensive and fine revision that this represented, I had anticipated more for the new *NBD*, and so I was somewhat disappointed. The new *NBD's* revisions are much more modest. For those who own the second edition, I'm not sure that the third edition is an indispensable replacement. However, for those who do not own the *NBD* at all, the third edition certainly is a must. It is a fine reference tool, providing erudite, irenic evangelical scholarship throughout, and it will richly repay those who consult it.

David M. Howard, Jr.

New Orleans Baptist Theological Seminary, New Orleans, LA

Voices from the Margin: Interpreting the Bible in the Third World. Edited by R. S. Sugirtharajah. 2d ed. Maryknoll: Orbis, 1995, ix + 484 pp., \$19.95 paper.

When the self-avowed atheist Philip F. W. Bartle joined the Kwawu tribe in order to study Ghana's Akan culture, he was struck with how, after supposing himself to have traveled a world away, the Christian doctrine of the Trinity suddenly made sense to him. Akan thought forms are more hospitable to concepts like the Trinity because of their preference for the "both/and" over the "either/or" paradigm so rampant in Western thinking. Readers may experience such a reaction on entering the revision of

R. S. Sugirtharajah's *Voices from the Margin*. Like its previous volume, it is a collection of chapters from Orbis books, interspersed among essays from a variety of sources, including obscure, international journals.

From the prefacing quotation that opens Part 1, alternative thought forms like the "both/and" paradigm challenge readers to rethink their approach to the Christian faith. Evangelical readers will find much to agree and disagree with in this provocative volume, welcoming these global voices, many of which pulse with a vibrancy of faith, while cautiously avoiding some of their syncretistic tendencies. Editor Sugirtharajah himself wonders about the limits of some of the hermeneutical models proposed (see his passing critique of "caste-based hermeneutics" on p. 463). To the delight of many evangelicals, he challenges the historical-critical method of Biblical exegesis, labeling it, along with redaction criticism, social science, post-structuralism, narrative theories and deconstruction as oppressively colonial "because of the insistence that a right reading is mediated through the proper use of historical-critical tools alone" (p. 460). For him, "It rules out at the outset the right of a reader or an interpreter to use any other means to understand the text, and those who do not practise these methods are seen as outside the circle" (p. 460). At the center of his objection he questions: "Is it an escapist activity in which critical theorization replaces original production, and critical work replaces our ethical responsibilities?" (p. 469). Evangelicals will not like all of the new approaches to hermeneutics proposed by the variety of authors, but some of the more striking and illuminating remind all of us that "the Bible originated largely in Asia" (p. 458) and westerners have much to learn from eastern examinations of the book.

While some authors (like Hisako Kinukawa) do seem hopelessly mired in the historical-critical approach, and some, like Ahn Byung-Mu, in an otherwise fine article, exhibit the annoying Bultmannian tendency to dismiss texts as interpolations without a shred of textual evidence when they do not suit their arguments, others like the nun Sr. Vandana, by applying eastern approaches like the Sanskritic Dhvani interpretive method, produce poignant and eye-opening results. Some of the analyses are heartrending, as is George Koonthanam's application of Isaiah's message to India. Many invite comparison to two-thirds world evangelical discussions, as Khiok-Khng Yeo's defense of ancestor worship summons Bong Rin Ro's critique *Christian Alternatives to Ancestor Practices*. Indeed, the book is a sampler collection of contemporary, even conflicting, approaches to world theology, where Ahn Byung-Mu can oppose Jesus' God to the Yahweh of the OT (p. 102) while George Pixley, Clodovis Boff and others confirm the "God of the Bible is the God who led Israel out of Egypt and who raised Jesus Christ from the dead" (p. 215). But all chapters have this in common: They are anti-greed.

Why did editor and publisher revise this book so thoroughly as to make the second edition nearly a new book? Students of world theology would do well to own both volumes, for together they represent a development (rather than shift) of focus that even a scant four years reflect in this burgeoning discipline. The focusing can be seen when we compare editor Sugirtharajah's introduction to the first edition to his newly revised one. Previously he told readers, "Currently, Christian Scripture is at the centre of the theological agenda" (p. 1), but that the contribution of voices outside the Euro-Western "First World" mindset were not being recognized. This revised edition adds more emphasis on cross-religious hermeneutics with texts other than the Bible, an intention that can particularly be seen in extensive revisions of sections 1 and 4.

Like its predecessor the new edition still contains five sections, now with 34 rather than 33 chapters of uneven distribution. The alteration of Part 1's title from "Use of the Bible: Methods, Principles and Issues" to the more active "Using the Bible:

Reading Strategies and Issues” reveals a more conscious “reader response agenda,” Sugirtharajah’s “both/and” attempt to invite dialogue with readers. But the new inclusive agenda runs much deeper than a name change. The elimination of previous chapters by Boff, Samartha and Itumeleng J. Mosala, interpreting the Bible respectively from liberation, Asian and black modes, and replacing them with more pluralistically focused chapters by George Mulrain and Canaan S. Banana (who wants to “liberate” the Bible from being too exclusive by “rewriting” it) and particularly the re-focusing by the able scholar Samartha in a new lead chapter reveal the extent of this syncretistic emphasis. Previously Samartha had attacked “the shifting sands of Biblical criticism” as “independable foundations” for the west, as well as for Asia, observing that “historical criticism of the Bible . . . has now come to the end of its usefulness to theology.” He complained, “Everytime a Biblical scholar in Europe sneezes theologians in Asia should not catch a cold and manifest the symptoms all over the foot-notes!” (p. 37). But seeking to avoid dependence on rules of interpretation that hinder church growth, reduce Christian credibility, diminish Asian spirits and distort the universality of Jesus Christ, he now turns to a “plurality of scriptures” “in a religiously plural world,” arguing, “The authority of one scripture cannot and should not be imposed on other scriptures” (p. 19). By substituting this for the lead article, emphasis is now placed on pluralist readings of the Bible with other texts. Needless to say, as a result, most authors subsequently struggle with the issue of authority.

Other authors doing rewritings for the book have also attempted a next step to their previous chapters. Itumeleng Mosala of South Africa, for example, previously complained that the concept of the Bible as “Word of God” was “pro-humanity” but “anti-black working class and black women.” Now he himself attempts a theology for South African women, a questionable enterprise given his anti-imperial stance, by generally disagreeing with the book of Esther. How legitimate his effort proves will be revealed in the reader response of African women to his attempt to do theology for them.

But, despite the sharpening of focus on more pluralistic readings, this new edition cannot be easily categorized as the “syncretistic” as opposed to the previous “Christian” edition. Some wonderful chapters have been preserved, as K. H. Ting’s perceptive chapter on the “silences” of the Bible and some equally wonderful ones have been added. Evangelicals will particularly welcome the addition of Bishop Patrick Kalilombe’s chapter on bringing the Bible to non-literate communities. It contains some fascinating suggestions for developing mnemonic, oral and visual devices, learned from such varied sources as the Moslem use of loudspeakers to catechize marketgoers to setting the Beatitudes to music or the parables to traditional storytelling techniques. Fascinating too is the emphasis on “communitarian exegesis” as the Bible is grappled with and applied by Asian women dramatizing the Exodus or Nicaraguan (Solentiname), Indonesian and South African community studies.

If any complaint can be lodged against this superbly varied collection, it is that the greatest danger of emphasizing philosophical viewpoints from which texts must be viewed is that these hermeneutics *use* texts rather than interpret them as vehicles of pre-implanted meaning having integrity in and of themselves. One author even speaks of “reader revolt” against the tyranny of the text to define meaning. For many of these authors, when a text appears to disagree with their philosophical starting points, e.g. a working-class perspective, the demarginalization of women, equal distribution of wealth—all worthwhile perspectives in and of themselves—the result is rejection or radical reinterpretation of the text. While *all* exegetes (including conservatives) regularly deemphasize texts that seem to point to positions outside of their philosophical perceptions, the true exegete recognizes that at its core interpretation

is at first a literary enterprise, not primarily a philosophical one. The flood of so many trained in other fields into the exegetical discipline has all but obscured that fact. The Bible texts are, after all, literary texts and foundational to their handling must be a thorough grounding in literary techniques.

The true contribution of this book is to point out that excellent techniques may well have been developed by, for example, Sanskrit scholars eons ago, but ignored for millennia by those outside the east. A second contribution is to remind us that when many of our "studies" of the Bible are measured by thinkers in the two-thirds world (not to mention by truly trained literary scholars of any origin) they weigh out as historical, sociological or political treatises using texts as illustrative, but telling us essentially nothing about the texts themselves.

The strength of this book for evangelicals, then, will not be simply to hear other voices affirming what we already believe. Many if not most will not do that. Rather, it is to shock complacent Euro-American scholars who have been content to fight the usual battles defined by the atavistic hold of 19th-century higher criticism and its modern spawn into realizing that the way the contemporary west looks at the Bible may be seen as largely irrelevant by the rest of the world. Those who do not look at the text from a technologically comfortable Euro-urban or Amer-suburban existence reveal that one's situation affects profoundly how one reads the Bible and what one appropriates from it. This is not a single TV-dinner helping of recognizably generic western hermeneutics, but a smorgasbord of post-liberal, post-modern global hermeneutical approaches, a chance to discover how the Christian faith and Bible are being perceived by some in Malawi, in Sri Lanka, in the Solomon Islands, in Cameroon. While the authors may perceive this book as a therapeutic, evangelical readers the world over might view it as a diagnosis of what is deficient in our own perspective as well as what is missing in the authors'.

The great effort R. S. Sugirtharajah has expended in bringing these "voices" to us in this volume should be heartily applauded.

William David Spencer
Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary, Boston, MA

Biblical Hermeneutics of Liberation. By Gerald West. 2d ed. Maryknoll: Orbis, 1995, 350 pp., n.p.

In the two-thirds world, liberation theology has recently come under attack by scholars like the Amerindian Robert Allen Warrior and the Palestinian Naim S. Ateek. They see its choice of the OT's exclusive promised-land based exodus and conquest over the NT's shift to a spiritual kingdom of God inclusive to people of all lands for an orienting focus as oppressive, rather than liberating. Identifying with the Canaanites, these see the movement as creating a rationale from the Scripture for newly empowered dispossessed people in turn to steal someone else's land, becoming themselves oppressors under sacred mandate. Nevertheless, liberation theology still thrives in South America, global academia, and in South Africa, where Gerald West, a white, middle-class South African, wants to express solidarity with the poor and the oppressed by creating a means to interface trained exegetes with "ordinary readers," working-class people who, he imagines, will have their appropriation of the biblical truth enhanced by being exposed to a higher-critical Marxist take on the text.

His book is a revision of a book first issued by Cluster Publications of Pietermaritzburg before Nelson Mandela's epoch-making ascendancy to president. In this the real crisis of the book becomes immediately evident. Such a pragmatic "culturally prophetic" approach as Marxism depends upon "struggle" for its vitality. Take away apartheid, provide democratic elections and elevate an influential black president into power and the struggle, having achieved its end, gasps for a reason to exist. West locates a further reason in the continuing existence of the poor, placing his work in a "third phase" of critical interest from origins (sources, authorship, historical reconstruction) to the text (structuralism, literary criticism) now to the reader as hermeneutical determinant.

In a well-organized assessment of two approaches to a liberation hermeneutic, West lines up on one side scholars who read "in front of the text," namely Alan Boesak and more critical readers from other areas of liberation theology like Phyllis Tribble and J. S. Croatto. These search past so-called "oppressive texts" in the Bible for "liberating texts" or construct new readings of texts salvageable from oppressive interpretations to find God's good news for the poor and marginalized. On the other side, headed by Itumeleng Mosala and the growing legions behind Norman Gottwald and Elisabeth Schussler-Fiorenza, are those who read "behind the text," viewing the Bible as largely a creation of the "oppressive" Hebrew ruling and middle class, obscuring an imagined, prior, people-friendly tradition like goddess worship.

West invests much time in this study to examining these two modes of interpretation from numerous angles. The book is a helpful primer for understanding two liberal takes on liberation theology, sampling the range from Latin American to feminist flavors, while focusing on the test case in South Africa. Would that he had internalized Kierkegaard's message in *For Self-Examination* that the text stands in judgment on all, not just the middle and upper classes, the point being made by Ateek and Warrior.

Further disturbing to those with a high view of Scripture is the total absence of the Holy Spirit, Jesus or even God the Father in this initial discussion. From the outset, the study rejects the Bible as the word of God, and even, at times, a word that contains the word of God. Sadly, the reason is that the Bible has been used as a rationale to enslave and oppress, yet it cannot be discarded since the Bible is considered an influential book in the religious community. Therefore, West hopes it can be used by the poor, the focal point of the liberation hermeneutic—for whose service texts are retained or discarded—for support for the struggle for liberation in this interim period until another authority takes precedence. We should identify much of the discussion as diametrically opposed to the ETS statement of faith.

The irony here is that the "ordinary readers," the South African workers, when they finally emerge in full force in chaps. 7 and 8, seem to come with a very high view of Scripture already intact. West himself, while highly influenced by the Gottwald-Schussler-Fiorenza-Mosala mythology, still wants to preserve the Bible as an entire text from which a liberating word can come. Confronted with his ideal, he finds the "ordinary South African reader" arriving with few tools, but a rounded view of the Bible as God's call for personal and corporate repentance. Those two chapters are worth the price of the book. West's initial goal was simply to listen to the common workers. It is well taken. Burying them in a meringue of Marxist higher criticism will orient their readings in a way that cuts the true liberating voice of the Scripture from beneath them by making them doubt the authority of all texts. Paul said, "All scripture is inspired by God and is useful for teaching, for reproof, for correction, and for training in righteousness" (2 Tim 3:16 NRSV). True exegesis finds the *parallel* situation to that dealt with in Scripture and applies it. Truncated views like the otherwise able West's end one in wandering as ultimately this book does, searching around for something to

struggle against (Marxism's life support) now that Mandela has won and Apartheid is reversed. While the workers hear a clear call to individual and corporate repentance, the study gasps as victory pulls out the life-support plug.

William David Spencer
Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary, Boston, MA

Eastern Orthodox Christianity: A Western Perspective. By Daniel B. Clendenin. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1994, 176 pp., n.p.

Clendenin has written a provocative introduction to Eastern Orthodoxy aimed specifically at a western audience. We western Christians have recently grown in appreciation for a tradition that at first glance seems to be totally foreign to American culture. Part of the interest has come from a desire for many Protestants to return to their apostolic roots. Since the fall of the Soviets from power, eastern Europe has opened up to western missionaries, a development that has led to an increased level of interaction.

Clendenin, who spent several years as a visiting professor at Moscow State University, provides personal insights as one who has gained a firsthand introduction to Orthodoxy. He notes significant aspects of affinity between evangelicalism and Orthodoxy. Both groups are avid defenders of the apostolic faith as exhibited in the early ecumenical councils, and both have historically been staunch opponents of liberalism and pluralism. In fact many evangelicals, most prominently former Campus Crusade staff member P. Gillquist and F. Schaeffer, son of the late Francis Schaeffer, have moved into the Orthodox camp.

Clendenin provides a brief overview of the history of Orthodoxy, noting the gradual stages of split with the Roman church leading up to the Great Schism of 1054. He includes discussion of the early Cappadocian fathers, the Orthodox objection to the Roman notion of papal supremacy, the debate over insertion of the *filioque* into the Nicene Creed, and the sack of Constantinople by the Crusaders in 1204. Clendenin also points out that the history of Orthodoxy is a history of persecution, the most recent being sufferings at the hands of Communist regimes. The Orthodox have learned to survive as persecuted minorities.

In his analysis of the contemporary scene, Clendenin observes that the Orthodox movement includes thirteen autonomous churches who share a common doctrine and worship. Each church is headed by its own patriarch, archbishop or metropolitan, and although the most ancient sees (such as Constantinople) carry the most prestige, they do not rule as does Rome.

Clendenin spends considerable time explaining the Orthodox notion of religious authority, an issue that was a major factor in the cleavage between Roman Catholicism and the sixteenth-century Reformers. The Orthodox see Scripture and tradition as one organic whole guided by the Holy Spirit, whose witness is the real guarantee of religious truth. They reject the Protestant elevation of Scripture over tradition. They likewise reject the Roman concept of the plenitude of papal power. For the Orthodox, the first seven ecumenical councils are infallible and the testimony of the early Church fathers is essential for interpreting the Bible. The latter point seems to me very helpful for many evangelicals, who tend to be ignorant of the tradition of the early fathers. The Orthodox emphasis upon history and tradition displays the rich depository of those who have gone before us.

One of the most important concepts within Orthodox theology is *theosis*. The term literally means “to become god or to gain union with God.” Clendenin realizes the difficulty in providing a precise definition of this term because in Orthodoxy *theosis* is ultimately a mystery beyond our ability fully to understand. Orthodox theology is quick to dispel any accusations of pantheism by arguing that the distinction between Creator and created is always maintained. *Theosis* is the transformation from a state of mortality to a state of immortality in which we transition from being created in God’s image to being transformed into God’s likeness. This process requires us to cooperate with God’s grace. Although we begin our journey on the road to this state of immortality in this life, we cannot fully realize it until the end of time.

Clendenin correctly notes the importance of the *Philokalia*, a collection of Orthodox writings on spirituality written between the fourth and fifteenth centuries. The *Philokalia* provides important clues for attaining *theosis*. Although these texts point to a cooperation between human effort and God’s grace, it is clear that one does not attain *theosis* through works. These works also point to the apophatic character of Orthodoxy, which directs us to contemplation and adoration of God.

Clendenin by no means is uncritical of Orthodoxy. He notes its problems of ethnicity and its tendency to look backward rather than forward. Second, he notes the aesthetic beauty of icons but argues that we must not require their use for proper worship. Furthermore, he doubts that icons are the best representation of the gospel message. Third, while Clendenin appreciates the emphasis upon tradition in Orthodoxy and notes that evangelicals often employ an ahistorical approach to Scripture, he points out that the relationship between Scripture and tradition is inconsistent and sometimes unclear in Orthodoxy. Fourth, he appreciates the Orthodox notion of *theosis* but argues that this concept can potentially confuse justification and sanctification and that it receives a greater emphasis in Orthodoxy than Scripture warrants.

Clendenin has made a significant contribution by providing a fair and balanced view of Orthodoxy from an evangelical perspective. His analysis of Orthodoxy is by no means exhaustive, but he has contributed a helpful introduction that will undoubtedly lead to a better understanding between these two traditions. This is vitally important as the evangelical movement continues to make inroads into the former communist countries.

Martin I. Klauber

Trinity Evangelical Divinity School and Barat College, Lake Forest, IL