

BOOK REVIEWS

Malachi. God's Unchanging Love. By Walter C. Kaiser, Jr. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1984, 171 pp., \$6.95 paper.

This latest study from Kaiser's pen is an attempt to apply the principles developed in his earlier work *Toward an Exegetical Theology* (Baker, 1981) to an entire OT book.

The volume contains a section-by-section commentary on the book of Malachi, two appendices, a bibliography, and indices that include Scripture references, names and subjects. Appendix A (pp. 111-145), entitled "A Suggested Outline and Work Sheet for a Syntactical-Theological Analysis," takes the reader step by step through the process that Kaiser himself utilized in producing his commentary. Included is a syntactical block diagram of the entire book of Malachi in both Hebrew and the author's own English translation. Kaiser's purpose is to provide the reader with guidelines for applying this method of study to other sections of the OT. In Appendix B (pp. 147-157), entitled "The Usefulness of Biblical Commentaries for Preaching and Bible Study," Kaiser discusses characteristics of good commentaries and the advantages of their proper use. He notes that the most serious defect in many commentaries is that they may give "a *descriptively* accurate commentary on the text while avoiding any responsibility for the problem of helping the church appreciate what may legitimately be derived as *normative* from that same text" (p. 154).

One of Kaiser's purposes for writing the commentary on Malachi was to rectify this deficiency and to provide a model of the type of commentary that he feels is urgently needed by the Church. In his preface Kaiser argues that "exegesis has not finished its task when it has told us what the text meant to the writer of many centuries past: it must continue to work to the point of saying how those exegetically derived *meanings* yield legitimate *principles* that can be applied to contemporary listeners in a summons for action or response" (p. 9). Kaiser contends that a commentary should be written in a style that renders it useful to both the lay reader as well as the pastor scholar. He offers this volume as a "prototype of what we trust will be a whole new breed of commentary writing" (p. 9).

In the reviewer's opinion Kaiser has done an admirable job in accomplishing what he set out to do. His volume provides a useful and up-to-date commentary on the book of Malachi that not only discusses the lexical, syntactical and theological problems of the original text but also consistently attempts to bridge the historical gap by applying the message of the book to the contemporary reader by means of "principlization." Part of Kaiser's method is to formulate "homiletic keywords" as a means of providing a clear and unified structure for the organization of his commentary. In most instances he is quite successful in following his own admonition that the "key word should be suggested by the Biblical text itself" (p. 144). On occasion, however, it appears that homiletical adaptability has played more of a role in these formulations than the specific subject matter of the text. For example, Kaiser designates Mal 1:6-14 as "A Call to be Authentic" in "Our Profession" (vv 6-7), "Our Gifts" (vv 8-9), "Our Service" (vv 10-12) and "Our Time" (vv 13-14). The emphasis of the text in vv 13-14, however, seems to be more on attitude and gifts than it does on time. This points up one potential weakness in organizing a commentary in this way. Although Kaiser has been quite successful in working out his approach with the prose of the book of Malachi, it may be much more difficult to utilize the same approach with books like Hosea or Isaiah, for example, where the underlying structure is much less apparent.

The reader familiar with Kaiser's previous writings will notice his utilization of a number of methodological procedures that he has argued for extensively elsewhere. These in-

clude among other things the idea of "generic prophecy," "analogy of antecedent Scripture" and single meaning determined by the author's intent. This of course is not the place to discuss the pros and cons of Kaiser's position on such questions, but Kaiser is to be commended for the consistency of his application of these principles in the commentary on Malachi as well as in his other writings. His commentary is a valuable and needed addition to the literature available on a little-known but important book in the OT. It should prove to be especially helpful to those desiring to preach the Word of the Lord as proclaimed by Malachi.

J. Robert Vannoy

Biblical Theological Seminary, Hatfield, PA

1 Kings, with an Introduction to Historical Literature. By Burke O. Long. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1984, xv + 265 pp., \$20.95 paper.

Long's *1 Kings* is the third volume to appear in the Forms of the Old Testament Literature (FOTL) series edited by R. Knierim and G. M. Tucker. The goal of the FOTL project, according to the editors, is to "represent a form-critical analysis of every book and each unit of the Old Testament (Hebrew Bible) according to a standard outline and methodology" (p. xi). Long seeks to demonstrate this methodology on the text of *1 Kings*.

The author begins his work with a brief introduction to historical literature, which he defines as "a product primarily of a literate stratum of society, as that kind of narrative prose which is governed by the aim to record people, objects, and events as they really were" (p. 4). Although some of the OT may for modern readers lack a sense of correspondence to documentable fact, its character nevertheless reflects an "interfusion of literary art with theological, moral, or historiosophical vision" (p. 4). Long also discusses the basic genres of historical literature (list, report, historical story, history), citing numerous Biblical examples for each.

In chap. 1 Long presents an introduction to *1 Kings*, analyzing the book with respect to its overall structure, genre, setting and intention. After presenting an extensive bibliography and structure outline the author surveys past scholarship and reaction to M. Noth's concept of a Deuteronomistic historian. Long suggests that many modern scholars have subjected the Biblical text to modern literary standards not governing the Biblical writers. Following Noth he assumes the essential unity of *1-2 Kings* and the Deuteronomistic history. Long classifies the overall genre of *1 Kings* as history, though his definition of history "neither excludes fiction or fictionalized 'telling,' nor rules out an author's biased interpretation of events" (p. 30). *1 Kings* finds its literary setting among people related to the royal court, the product of a scribe "closely aligned with Deuteronomic ideology and committed to a 'prophetic' vision of reality" (p. 32). And although the primary intention of *1 Kings* is to explain the exile to a distressed populace, Long also sees "a story of God's consistent and persistent dealings with his covenant people through the steady process of his creative word. . . . So the point was not so much to record *events* as to record the *point* of events" (p. 32).

Chapter 2, a unit-by-unit analysis of *1 Kings*, comprises the bulk of Long's book. The author presents a structure outline for each major literary unit and discusses the unit's structure, genre, setting and intention. Then he does likewise with each subunit, also relating the subunit to its larger context. Such an approach unfortunately leads to occasional repetition: A particular subunit may appear in the analysis three or four times. Furthermore, since Long's discussion sections correspond exactly to the divisions of his major structure outlines he would have helped the reader by appropriately lettering or numbering the discussion sections to reflect this feature. As in chap. 1 the lengthy bibliographic sections greatly benefit the reader who desires further reading on a particular text.

Long closes his book with a glossary of almost one hundred genres and formulae occurring in historical narrative. Each entry includes a brief definition along with corresponding Biblical references. Many of the genres are closely related, and the reasons for distinguishing them are sometimes rather subjective (see for example "account" and "report," "prophecy of punishment" and "prophetic judgment speech"). One also wonders whether labeling certain literary features as formulae implies that the features are more fixed than they actually are. For example, is what Long calls an "accession age formula" (p. 264) really a frozen literary convention, or do the confines of language simply limit the ways a writer can report a king's age at accession? Such an issue merits consideration in a book of this nature.

The reader will note that Long uses the terms "setting" and "intention" primarily in a literary sense in keeping with the focus of his work. Nevertheless he also recognizes the theological intentions of the writer of 1 Kings, and often—though not as often as he could have—he relates how the Biblical writer blends his literary tools to accomplish his theological objectives.

According to Long's preface, the chief aim of his book is to present a sustained form-critical analysis of the book of 1 Kings—the whole composition, its parts, and the parts in relation to the whole (p. xv). This Long has done. Readers who may not share all of Long's presuppositions will nevertheless benefit from his insights into the literary purposes of the Biblical writer.

Bryan E. Beyer

Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati

Micah-Malachi. By Ralph L. Smith. Waco: Word, 1984, 358 pp., \$18.95.

This volume represents a prodigious effort to unlock the meaning of the last seven minor prophets. It is the latest in the Word Biblical Commentary series, whose stance is described by its editors as broadly "evangelical." Each volume in the series is set up according to the same format: bibliography, translation, notes, form/structure/setting, comment and explanation. My analysis of Smith's work will follow the same general outline.

Smith's bibliographies are generally quite thorough. There is not only an extensive bibliography at the beginning of each Biblical book but also a small bibliography for each passage. His command of the recent periodical literature is especially noteworthy. There are, however, few conservative authors cited in any of the bibliographies.

The translations are a fresh rendering from the Hebrew text, and in general both the translations and the notes are quite good. But the practice of putting alternate translations in parentheses in the text itself is quite confusing—e.g., "Hear ye peoples, all of you (them)" (Mic 1:2, p. 14); "and he will sing a lament (It has happened)" Mic 2:4, p. 23); "You strip off the mantle with (from) the robe" (Mic 2:8, p. 25). Why not simply indicate alternate translations in the notes that follow? Also, sometimes the notes are not in agreement with the comment that follows. For example, n. 7a on Mic 1:7 rejects the emendation of *'tnnyh* to *'šyrh* because "this would require a fem. verb" (p. 16); yet on p. 18 Smith states that "*'šrh* 'Asherah' could be read for *'tnn* 'harlot's fees' in 1:7a." Compare also n. 5b (p. 15) with p. 18.

The form/structure/setting section is helpful for those who accept the form-critical approach to the OT. The book of Micah, for instance, is seen as consisting of various woe oracles, lawsuits, judgment oracles, salvation oracles, laments, disputations and liturgies. The settings of the various pericopes are also given, though Smith is usually (commendably) cautious in his attempts at recreating the settings. For example, he says of Mic 6:6-8 that "the question and answer pattern could have its *Sitz im Leben* in a cultic entrance liturgy, a prophetic sermon, or in a wisdom teaching situation" (p. 50); Zeph 1:2-6 may have been

spoken "at the autumnal Feast of Ingathering" (p. 126); the setting of Zech 9:11-17 is "probably the New Year festival" (p. 259); the language of Zech 12:1-8 "goes back to the Royal-Zion festival in Jerusalem to celebrate the inviolability of Zion" (p. 274); and for Mal 1:2-5 "a covenant renewal or New Year festival would be an appropriate setting" (p. 305). Again, some may find benefit in such designations, but this reviewer believes that such speculation is highly subjective and that the acceptance of form-critical terminology in many "evangelical" works today is a dangerous practice that can only lead to an undermining of the divine authority of Scripture. Needless to say, the issue of form criticism and evangelicalism must be debated in a larger context than this review will permit.

But the most disappointing and confusing parts of the book are the comment and explanation sections. The editorial preface states that "for a clear exposition of the passage's meaning and its relevance to the ongoing biblical revelation, the 'Comment' and concluding 'Explanation' are designed expressly to meet that need." Yet of the 93 pericopes covered in the book only 16 contain both the comment and explanation sections; 53 contain only the comment section; 21 contain only the explanation section; and 3 passages (Mic 1:8-16; Nah 2:12-14; Zech 14:12-15) contain neither section. There seems to be no consistent distinction between the comment and explanation sections when only one is used, and in fact the explanation section is almost dropped entirely in the last half of the book: Micah has 9 sections with comments, 10 with explanations and 1 with both, while Zechariah and Malachi have 33 sections with comments, none with explanations and 4 with both. Why not simply have one section, entitled "comment"? Furthermore the first book (Micah) contains a summary section (pp. 59-60), but none of the other books do. One wonders whether the commentary was produced a bit too hastily.

Further, the quality of the "comment" section is uneven. Often the comment section is too brief, especially as compared with the form/structure/setting section (Mic 4:6-8 has 20 lines for form, only 10 for comment; Mic 4:9-10 has 27 for form, only 8 for comment; almost no comments in Zephaniah; etc.). Sometimes the comment section is an odd jumble of assorted facts, as on p. 233 where a statement regarding the formation of the material is followed by a quote from Calvin. And by far the most annoying feature of the commentary is that Smith often cites a whole host of writers' opinions concerning a particular passage but never comes to even a tentative conclusion himself. So while one may have an up-to-date survey of various viewpoints, the reader is left in the dark as to Smith's own view of the passage. For example, after a lengthy review of various opinions on the authorship and structure of Micah, Smith lamely concludes: "Scholars still disagree on the outline, date, and authorship of the book" (p. 8). The same approach is taken in the introduction to most of the other books. In Zechariah there are two nearly identical sections on the place of Zechariah 9-14 in the book as a whole (pp. 169-173; 242-249), at the end of which the author does not state his own opinion regarding the unity of the book. This is true for a host of smaller passages within the commentary as well: See for example the comments on pp. 86, 116-117 ("the Hebrew permits all of the above interpretations" is his conclusion), 186-187 (does Smith agree with May that "Zechariah drew his symbolism from his familiarity with the Babylonian New Year festival?"), 191 (view of "seventy years") and 210 (wickedness represented as a woman). Should not a commentary be more than a litany of others' opinions and assist the reader by at least offering the author's probable interpretation of the text?

It should be noted as well that Smith is similarly noncommittal on the messianic passages in the prophets, esp. Zechariah (see his discussion on pp. 175-180). Rather than holding that Zech 9:9 is a prophecy of the triumphal entry, Smith states that "no doubt this passage had a great influence on Jesus. He seems to have deliberately modeled his 'triumphal entry' into Jerusalem according to its outline. The peaceful and universal reign of God was his goal" (p. 257). Similarly he states on 13:7-9 that "whatever the historical setting of the oracle was, Jesus interpreted it eschatologically. He saw himself as the 'smitten shep-

herd' and interpreted his ministry along the lines of this passage" (p. 283). And on 14:1-5 no mention is made of Acts 1:11 or any reference to Jesus.

In summary, this work will be of moderate help to scholars in the bibliography, translation and notes provided for each passage. In addition the form/structure/setting section may be helpful for those who agree with its presuppositions. But the comments and explanations are woefully inadequate for anyone desiring to know the meaning of the text. Conservative scholars will be especially disappointed in the large amount of space given to form-critical matters and the noncommittal treatment of messianic passages.

Todd S. Beall

Paul and Paulinism: Essays in Honour of C. K. Barrett. Edited by M. D. Hooker and S. G. Wilson. London: SPCK, 1982, xxvii + 404 pp., £25.00.

Colleagues and former pupils offer this collection of 29 essays to Barrett on the occasions of his 65th birthday and retirement from his divinity chair in the University of Durham. Perhaps the following critique may serve to highlight the contents of one of the more significant anniversary volumes in recent memory.

W. D. Davies, "Paul and the Law: Reflections on Pitfalls in Interpretation" (pp. 4-16), submits a provocative piece in which Paul's attitude toward the law is shown to be more complex than is often acknowledged. Attention must be paid to the range of meanings *Torah* held for Paul (not just "commandment"). The doctrinal package of justification by faith and irrelevance of the law is an oversimplification alien to Paul. Law and grace are not in simplistic antithesis, but the demands of each are dynamically related to life "in Christ." While Paul respected certain continuities in *Torah* these are submerged in relevance to the implications of experiential grace in his new life.

In "Statements on the Development of Paul's View of the Law" (pp. 17-26) U. Wilkens traces a line of development in Paul's thought as he wrestled with problems caused by the acceptance of Gentiles without observance of the law. Via Galatians Paul reaches an ecumenical level in Romans. Gal 3:13 is a pivot in his doctrine of justification, which is not *ex ergōn nomou* but only *ek pisteōs Christou*. In Romans a broader concept is outlined that proves that the law is not removed by the proclamation of faith. Rather, it is fulfilled (3:31), being realized in love (13:8-10; cf. Gal 5:14). In addition to the positions of Paul's opponents deduced by Wilkens, those working on the reconstruction of the scenario in Galatia will want to consider the input of P. Borgen, "Paul Preaches Circumcision and Pleases Men" (pp. 37-46). Borgen sees Gal 1:10; 5:11 as suggesting that Paul did not imply in earlier missionary preaching that circumcision ought to follow conversion. Instead Paul had insisted on the believer's tie with Christ's crucifixion in the new spiritual life, but this had been misrepresented by opponents as being the ethical meaning of circumcision. Accordingly Paul was represented as still preaching circumcision. This misuse of his preaching allowed legal critics to opt for physical circumcision in Paul's name. The inner logic of Paul's argument, however, had meant the end of the law's reign in this respect, a point forcefully put in more general terms by M. Hooker, "Paul and 'Covenantal Nomism'" (pp. 47-56). She concludes insightfully that the inadequacy of the law is ultimately seen in the fact that the one who was condemned by it had been pronounced righteous by God. The condemnatory nature of the law itself versus the liberty found in faith and the gift of the Spirit is given an excellent exposition by F. F. Bruce, "The Curse of the Law" (pp. 27-36).

J. Court, "Paul and the Apocalyptic Pattern" (pp. 57-66), gives us a useful word study of the terms *ōdines*, *thlipsis* and *telos* in Paul concerning the *parousia*. M. Black, "*Pasai eousiai autō hypotagēsontai*" (pp. 74-82), takes this phrase from LXX Dan 7:27 as background for Christian *peshet* of this concept in 1 Cor 15:24; 1 Pet 3:22; Eph 1:21. While all

powers will be (and are) subject to him at his coming, Black demonstrates that the terms *archai*, *exousiai*, *kurioi* and *thronoi* (understood as cosmocratic angelic beings) are taken from an insufficient word-basis in Hellenistic Jewish nomenclature to substantiate the theory that Peter and Paul merely took over these abstract terms with their meaning intact. Although the NT writers did not invent these words, which were in common use for earthly powers and authorities, Black's work shows that there is sufficient latitude in our sources to warrant the probability that these terms were infused with new meaning and significance in their NT contexts.

P. Benoit, "*Hagioi* en Colossiens 1.12: Hommes ou Anges?" (pp. 83-99), concludes that *hagioi* here may include both Christians and angels. Benoit's work is consistent with the possibility that visions of angels (2:18) were given to illustrate the future inheritance of the believer's life in glory but were vainly misconstrued. J. McHugh, "A Reconsideration of Ephesians 1.10b in the Light of Irenaeus" (pp. 302-309), moves beyond standard lexical data in addressing the phrase *anakephalaiōsasthai ta panta en tō Christō*. He explores four uses of *anakephalaiōsis* in Irenaeus that more properly illuminate the phrase, resulting in the interpretation "to make everything new, in Christ." Also worthy of note is N. A. Dahl, "Romans 3.9: Text and Meaning" (pp. 184-204). Dahl presents a careful contextual exegesis following p⁸ to posit that 3:9a asks the rhetorical question: "What, then, do we plead as a defense?" To ask "What, then, do we hold before us as a defense?" is in effect to suggest the answer that we have nothing that we can plead as an excuse before God.

At Corinth we are provided with a sober and up-to-date clarification of "Gnosis at Corinth" (pp. 102-114) by R. McL. Wilson, taking Yamauchi's work into account and with a quite helpful treatment of the *teleioi/pneumatikoi* and their ideas concerning wisdom and glossolalia by J. Painter, "Paul and the *Pneumatikoi* at Corinth" (pp. 237-250).

Three important and timely contributions to Christology are included. M. Hengel looks at "Erwägungen zum Sprachgebrauch von *christos* bei Paulus und in der 'vorpaulinischen' Überlieferung" (pp. 135-159). Hengel tackles the problem of how *Christos* so quickly became the most frequently used title by Paul; cf. here his earlier "Hymn and Christology" in *Studia Biblica 1978. III* (ed. E. Livingstone; Sheffield: JSOT, 1980) 173-194 for his theory of hymns to *Christos* and the significance of this for Christological development. Hengel rejects the evolutionary theory of titles, which has *Christos* arising in Hellenistic Christianity, and shows that for Paul it is not only a surname and a Jewish messianic title but also designates Jesus as the one who brings salvation through his death/resurrection. Concerning historicity, Hengel grounds the title in the crucifixion of Jesus as a messianic pretender, which in turn established it firmly in pre-Pauline Palestinian communities. Another factor that perhaps contributed to Christological development in Paul's case is set out in an impressively well-argued piece by P. M. Casey, "Chronology and the Development of Pauline Christology" (pp. 124-134). The perception of Jesus as a unique pre-existent divine being less than twenty years after his death was influenced by a dynamic creative process already present in intertestamental Judaism wherein intermediary figures were the focus of status and functions ascribed to them. Were these qualities transferred to Jesus? While creative thinking was undoubtedly present, especially toward prophetic-type figures, Casey gives insufficient credit to the resurrection as stimulating the process anew so that his view of the historicity of that event is left in doubt. Unlike Jewish intermediaries who were limited by monotheistic restrictions, qualities like pre-existence, cosmic lordship, agency in creation and unique salvific action could be perceived and attributed more easily and quickly to Jesus, particularly in Pauline Christianity (even the nonobservance of the law was bound to be attributed to Jesus).

One of the functions attributed to Jesus during this developmental period was of course that of creator and sustainer of *ta panta* (Col 1:16-17; Heb 1:2-3; John 1:3-4, 10). M. Barth, "Christ and All Things" (pp. 162-172), issues a serious challenge to the position of J. Murphy-O'Connor that *ta panta* in Paul is to be restricted to all Christians (cf. the latter's "1

Cor 8.6: Cosmology or Soteriology?”, *RB* 85 [1978] 253-267). For Barth, an anthropocentric Christology and soteriology is not a Pauline concept. Rather, for Paul, Jesus Christ is omnipotent Lord over *ta panta*, which consists not only of humanity but also of the realm of the unseen spiritual and visible material beings of this world (including animals; cf. Jonah 4:11). Given that Paul had the spiritual perception to occasionally detect (perhaps via the *charismata*) realities of the unseen world and that he had a Jewish understanding of creation, his use of the epithet of “cosmic” Christ should be to contend that Christ was and is not concerned solely with humankind but with the entire universe. Barth appears to be on the right track when he insists that Christ’s status and function as glorious eternal *kosmokrator* is a prominent NT motif that has been diminished by theology riddled with insufficiently articulated and wrong-headed presuppositions. Barth is interacting not only with Murphy-O’Connor but also with Vögtle, Schweizer, Bultmann and Dibelius. He labels this condition of unarticulated presuppositions as “The Problems of Hidden Persuaders.”

One of the most influential of these hidden persuaders to past and present NT discussion is of course the notorious assumption, taken for example by Bultmann as axiomatic, that the universe is closed and immune to interference from God. The understanding of the supernatural in NT texts has been extraordinarily perturbed by the now quite unscientific image of the mechanical universe conceived in terms of pre-quantum physics with its billiard-ball Newtonian concepts. The natural laws of physics are not at all violated by a possible interaction of a spiritual being with the material world. Rather, there is plenty of room in such an interaction for a spiritual being to support and maintain these laws. Therefore Barth is correct in chiding theologians for an ivory-tower attitude to academic disciplines that impact incontrovertibly on their own discipline. The result for theology in the case of the closed universe presupposition has inevitably been an overly rigid dichotomy of matter (including Christians) and spirit. Theologians using this thoroughly discredited view of nature have tended to isolate God and/or the spirit world from the material world—e.g., in the *ta panta*.

Barth rightfully will have none of this and challenges great exegetes to bear the burden of their presuppositions. In addition Barth leads the way toward scientific exegesis by explicitly articulating his own presuppositions as a formal part of his essay. This is no doubt a noteworthy procedural challenge to the methodology of many. The awesome specter of theologians analyzing texts that purport to describe the interaction of God with the material world, while themselves at the same time remaining in ignorance (even in general terms) of the construction of that material world and of the open-ended structure it affords to the possible active entrance of an invisible God, can only be relieved by a mandatory departure from insular academic traditions. For such theologians especially one might suggest two recent treatments: P. Davis, *Other Worlds: Space, Superspace and the Quantum Universe* (London: Dent, 1980); J. Trefil, *From Atoms to Quarks: An Introduction to the Strange World of Particle Physics* (London: Athlone, 1980).

I. H. Marshall, “Pauline Theology in the Thessalonian Correspondence” (pp. 173-183), sets out evidence that challenges the hypothesis that alleged differences in content are sufficient to compel the identification of 2 Thessalonians as non-Pauline. Alternatively Marshall demonstrates the probability that while both the letters are distinctive they are nevertheless united to the Pauline corpus. There are constant Pauline factors that both have in common (like use of Christological titles, references to the Spirit, and the “in Christ/Lord/him” formula). Both attain their distinctive commonality due to the life setting they address (with Best, HNTC, 1976), particularly concerning *parousia* concepts. While there is less Pauline theology in 2 Thessalonians it can best be understood as an explanatory appendix to 1 Thessalonians, not as a second-stage deutero-Pauline composition. In the reviewer’s opinion Marshall has raised a convincing question mark against the commentary tradition of Schmiedel (HNT, 1892), Holtzmann (MeyerK, 1929), Friedrich (NTD, 1976) and Trilling (EKKNT, 1980), which argue for the hypothesis of inauthenticity of 2 Thessalonians.

The editors are to be commended for their part in compiling this stimulus to Pauline research. The indices are a valuable resource of Pauline reference material, and there is an interesting bibliography of the honoree's published works from 1942 to 1980. Perhaps an excerpt from one of these is apropos in illuminating his life's work: "Other studies have their place, but Christian theology is founded on the study of texts, and exegesis is founded on a precise understanding of grammar—logic in relation to language" (*ExpTim* 90 [1978] 71). Indeed, his high standards of careful and sober scholarship have served us well. It is a pleasure to join those enrolled on the *Tabula Gratulatoria* in wishing Charles Kingsley Barrett a profitable retirement. *In multos annos!*

Paul Elbert

Middle Georgia College, Cochran, GA

Evangelicals and Inerrancy. Edited by Ronald Youngblood. Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1984, 265 pp., \$8.95 paper.

This volume contains twenty-three essays by twenty authors selected from *BETS* and *JETS* during the period 1954-1979. The purpose of this collection is to indicate how scholars within the society and others related to it have understood the single-plank doctrinal statement of the Evangelical Theological Society, which affirms commitment to Scripture as the inerrant Word of God.

One of the difficult phenomena to square with an inerrancy posture is the sometimes loose way in which the NT writers quote the OT. R. Nicole, in the essay "The OT Quotations in the NT with Reference to the Doctrine of Plenary Inspiration" (1954), carefully examines the problem of verbal differences between the OT texts and the NT quotations. Nicole's analysis and summation of how the NT writers quoted from the OT goes a long way toward reconciling the quotation phenomena with the doctrine of plenary verbal inspiration. The essay by G. R. Lewis, "What Does Biblical Infallibility Mean?" (1963), helpfully clarifies the meaning of infallibility in relation to (1) "formally cognitive" assertions, (2) "empirically cognitive" assertions, and (3) "noncognitive"—i.e., emotive or exclamatory—assertions. Lewis concludes: "All that Scripture teaches cognitively is objectively true. All that Scripture teaches noncognitively is subjectively true." Hence "all sentences are infallible, and all meanings are inerrant for their respective purposes" (p. 47).

A. F. Holmes, in "Ordinary Language Analysis and Theological Method" (1967), argues that inerrancy can neither be induced from the data of Scripture nor deduced from the doctrine of inspiration. Thus he concludes: "Inerrancy [is] a second-order theological construct that is *adduced* for systematic reasons" (p. 135). In response, N. Geisler's essay, "Theological Method and Inerrancy: A Reply to Arthur F. Holmes" (1968), insists that inerrancy represents a valid deduction from the Biblical doctrine of inspiration and thus is a first-order doctrine as germane to Scripture as our Lord's sinlessness.

The essay "Baptists and Biblical Authority" (1974) by C. Pinnock highlights the crisis of the Scripture principle among Baptist theologians in particular and contemporary non-evangelical theologians in general. The thorough documentation Pinnock brings forth would seem to confirm the "slippery-slope" thesis the author proposed in an earlier volume, *Biblical Revelation* (1971), but less prominent in his most recent work, *The Scripture Principle* (1984).

R. J. Coleman, in the essay "Reconsidering 'Limited Inerrancy'" (1974), offers a defense of inerrancy restricted to the Bible's salvific teaching. In two articles that follow, J. B. Payne, "Partial Omniscience: Observations on Limited Inerrancy" (1975), and V. S. Poythress, "Problems for Limited Inerrancy" (1975), sharply criticize any attempt to restrict or limit the full inerrancy of the Bible's explicit teachings.

The final essay in the collection—the ETS presidential address by S. N. Gundry, “Evangelical Theology: Where *Should* We Be Going?” (1979)—proposes a challenging fourfold agenda for evangelical research in the years ahead. In the area of inerrancy Gundry maintains that evangelicals should more carefully define inerrancy with a view to a more unified understanding and articulation of the concept. Furthermore, conservatives should pursue serious research on the issues of authorial intention, the extent to which critical methodologies can be responsibly used, and the nature of the cultural conditioning of the Scriptures. Gundry likewise challenges ETS members and evangelicals at large to clarify crucial issues in the disciplines of ecclesiology, missiology and hermeneutics.

Evangelicals and Inerrancy reproduces “The Chicago Statement on Biblical Inerrancy” (1978) and also contains bibliographies of books, monograph articles, and journal articles on inspiration and inerrancy that should be of considerable help to persons doing research in these areas.

This collection of essays will prove enlightening to the theological student or younger scholar who wishes an introduction to the discussion about inerrancy within the ETS. It will also clarify for the general reader the complex issues involved in defining the nature of the divine Word transmitted through human writers. Therefore this volume is commended as a valuable catalyst to what one hopes will be an ongoing effort to elucidate further the nature of the divine-human word given by a loving Father for human salvation.

Bruce Demarest

Denver Seminary

Literary Interpretations of Biblical Narratives, Volume 2. Edited by Kenneth R. R. Gros Louis with James S. Ackerman. Nashville: Abingdon, 1982, 320 pp., \$10.95 paper.

Though some undoubtedly consider them faddish, literary treatments of Biblical texts are increasing in both number and sophistication. This book, Gros Louis' second collection of essays by Biblical and literary scholars (volume 1: Nashville: Abingdon, 1974), in many ways epitomizes the recent endeavor to treat the Bible as literature.

After a brief preface the nineteen essays are grouped in three sections. Under methodology Gros Louis, in “Some Methodological Considerations” (pp. 13-24), lays out a modified formalist approach that evades many vital critical issues. (Ryken's introductory essay in volume 1 serves as a better foundation.) And in “Some Pedagogical Considerations” (pp. 25-34) T. S. Warshaw presents an overly-simplistic, even trite, essay that exalts broad-mindedness as the cure of the world's educational ills.

In the second section, Genesis, Gros Louis includes three of his own essays: “Genesis 3-11” (pp. 37-52), “Abraham: I” (pp. 53-70) and “Abraham: II” (pp. 71-84). The first, a sequel to an essay in volume 1, renarrates the Biblical account, emphasizing parallel and cyclical patterns with a bit too much emphasis on God's supposed developing nature. In the second he compares Lot and Abraham and Abraham and God, trying to show a convergence of the latter's “perceptions and concerns” (p. 69). In the third, Gros Louis makes possibly his most important contribution by responding to E. Auerbach's characterization of Hebrew narrative in Genesis 22, claiming that Abraham's response to God emerges as part of a “coherent continuum” (p. 75), not from a contextual vacuum. In “Joseph, Judah, and Jacob” (pp. 85-113) Ackerman contends that literary doubling in the Joseph story and the account of Reuben and Judah, rather than merely revealing a conflation of sources, establishes and enhances dramatic effect. E. L. Greenstein, “An Equivocal Reading of the Sale of Joseph” (pp. 114-125), approaches the problem of who took Joseph to Egypt and turns it into an intriguing attempt to justify textual multivalence. B. Dahlberg completes this section with “The Unity of Genesis” (pp. 126-133), a rather uninspired effort at framing the narrative of Genesis between chaps. 1-11 and the Joseph story.

In the third section, on other Biblical narratives, I. Clark begins with a provocative defense of the story quality of the Balaam incident, in "Balaam's Ass: Suture or Structure" (pp. 137-144). J. A. Freeman, in "Samson's Dry Bones: A Structural Reading of Judges 13-16" (pp. 145-160), defends the Bible's inclusion of this story by showing its integral patterning, with n. 2 (pp. 311-313) providing an instructive summary of interpretive stances. In "A Human Comedy: The Book of Ruth" (pp. 161-190) P. Trible presents one of the book's most challenging essays, emphasizing grammatical, structural and social-sexual issues, though her comments on sexism are a bit overdone. And in "1 Samuel 3: Historical Narrative and Narrative Poetics" (pp. 191-203) M. Fishbane writes arguably this collection's best essay, showing how the varied linguistic and structural elements create the intricate narrative of Samuel and Eli. Fishbane's discussion of theoretical and procedural issues is also worth noting.

In "King David of Israel" (pp. 204-219) Gros Louis paints an allusive portrait focusing on the tension between David's public and private acts. J. D. Levenson cites the Abigail, Nabal and David incident as foreshadowing various themes in David's later life ("1 Samuel 25 as Literature and History" [pp. 220-242]). His critique of Auerbach takes the discussion beyond Genesis into other Hebrew narrative modes. In "The Song of Songs" (pp. 243-258) Gros Louis discounts both the allegorical and culturally-bound interpretations to give a sensitive reading of the book as love lyrics treating urban versus rural values. And D. Gros Louis, "Narrative Art in the Book of Judith" (pp. 259-272), describes Judith as well-constructed realistic fiction treating such themes as fear and power, especially in relation to Judith's heroic character.

The final three chapters treat NT texts. Gros Louis emphasizes that Matthew and Luke evidence different approaches to the birth narratives and should not be conflated ("The Jesus Birth Stories" [pp. 273-284]). J. Bishop in "Encounters in the New Testament" (pp. 285-294) and J. Resseguie in "John 9: A Literary-Critical Analysis" (pp. 295-303) discuss Jesus' healing of the man born blind. Bishop's abstruse language, often more befuddling than enlightening, psychologizes and existentializes the story to the point of trivializing it, while Resseguie emphasizes the development of the blind man's character.

I have tried to summarize the major point of each essay. Rather than making a detailed critique I would like to comment briefly on a few general issues regarding the book. Unfortunately the essays do not evidence cognizance of a common audience. Consequently they are addressed to anyone from the high-school teacher to the Hebrew specialist and do not deliver the same degree or kind of penetration of their respective passages. And the fact that a third of the essays is by the editor does not enhance the work's representative value. The production too is rather uneven. I counted at least twenty typographical errors, there are several inconsistencies in format (e.g. the asterisks in Levenson's essay are not explained; cf. p. 9), and vital documentation is often lacking. Several essays cry out for references at many crucial points. And, sadly, the binding only barely lasts through one serious reading.

On a larger scale two issues, I think, must be addressed by those giving literary readings of the Bible. The first is methodological. With formalism no longer an assumption in literary interpretation, any time a literary reading is given we as readers have a right to expect a defense, or at least an awareness, of the particular critical stance employed, whether it be formalism, structuralism, reader-response, or whatever. The philosophical and literary antecedents and consequences of these varied methods must be differentiated, if for no other reason than to eliminate tautological literary judgments (this book is not entirely free of them) being passed off as insights.

Second, I am quite discouraged at the space devoted to the NT, not only in this book but in other literary treatments of the Bible. Recent critical approaches (I do not mean structuralism alone) have broken down or at least modified the traditional concept of what constitutes "good" literature, so that this taboo no longer stands as an impediment to serious

examination of the NT as literature of importance. Perhaps subsequent volumes in this series could address such issues more specifically.

Stanley E. Porter

Sheffield, England

The Strong's New Exhaustive Concordance of the Bible. Rev. ed. Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1984, 1809 pp., n.p.

In this recent revision of an old standby, new features should be expected in order to justify the project. From a comparison it can be ascertained just what has been accomplished by the current editors.

On the positive side, the first feature to be noted is that the new print and format make it easier to read. The main concordance has been revamped, using a computer. This has corrected errors of the old typesetting. Here the word from the *KJV* text is placed in a commanding position at the top of the segment in bold type. There are three columns to a page. Each entry gives a short quotation including (1) the word, (2) the reference, and (3) the Hebrew or Greek word number as listed in the dictionaries in the back. Each line in each of the entries has all this information, making it easy to scan the page for the wanted reference.

Proper names are subdivided when the name is held by several persons and places. This should be a big help in studies involving biography or geography. Variant spellings from major versions are cross-referenced.

It is specifically stated that no section of the original 1890 *Strong's* has been omitted, but an 1890 "Comparative Concordance," included in some editions, is not found here.

There are additions. The most striking is the "Key Verse Comparison Chart" containing more than 1800 verses taken from every book of the Bible. Six versions are used. They are the *KJV*, *NKJV*, *NASB*, *NIV*, *RSV* and *TEV*. These passages were selected by a team of scholars, editors and laity. The criteria for inclusion of these verses was their doctrinal importance and familiarity to readers of the Bible. In the editors' words: "This unique chart also enables the reader to understand some of the interpretive choices the translators faced as they chose among the possible meanings of these Old and New Testament texts." The verses are placed across double pages, horizontally, in block columns. Thus reading straight across the page is facilitated for purposes of comparison.

Other features have been added in the final pages as supplements. These include five pages of "Law and the Bible," giving civil and governmental regulations (mostly from the OT, but a few from the NT); three pages of "Teaching and Illustrations of Christ"; and three pages of seven charts of dates, feasts and measurements. These may be useful but are not strictly germane to a concordance.

Having drawn attention to these positive features, we must note other matters. A retained feature from the original is the appendix to the main concordance, consisting of 47 very common words, such as articles, prepositions, conjunctions and pronouns. A listing of the conjunction "and" takes up five pages, and the definite article fills more than six. The use of an exponent indicates the number of times the word is used in an individual verse. There is no indication, as in the case of the definite article, whether there is a counterpart in the original languages or whether the noun is used without the definite article. Some handling of this matter would have been useful.

Verbal auxiliaries are also listed. "Shall" and the archaic "shalt" are given in this appendix. However, "will" and "wilt" as verbal auxiliaries are treated in the regular main concordance, mixed up with references such as in Acts 21:14 for *to thelêma*, John 15:7 for *thelô*, and John 18:39 for *boulomai*, respectively a noun and two verbs in their own right. In the latter cases the word number is given, but the auxiliary verb has no number. The dual

manner of treatment of these two auxiliary verbs could lead to confusion in the minds of some.

As already mentioned, a useful feature of the older editions was the comparative concordance, which showed variations in the way a word was translated in the *RV* (1881). This is not in this volume. An asterisk in the 1890 concordance indicated a variation in translation. This then could be checked out in the comparative section. The new comparison chart may partially take its place, but there are no indications on individual words that would direct to the comparison section.

There are also no indicators to let the reader know of archaic usages. For example, in Acts 27:13 the expression "we fetched a compass" is the *KJV* rendering for *perierchomai*. MT *sābab* in 2 Kgs 3:9 and elsewhere is treated in the same way. Since these words are not in the key verses they are not included in the comparison charts, and since there is no comparative concordance there is nothing to alert the user that the words are better translated and more understandable in later versions.

In summary this new edition, as with the others, can be quite functional. The *KJV* is considered by the editors as "still the standard English version of the Bible," and this is being challenged. From sales data there is evidence that it no longer occupies such acceptance (see "Rivals to the King James Bible," *Time*, April 20, 1981, pp. 62-63). Since the concordance is an index to the words in the *KJV*, it will be most appealing and useful to persons still loyal to this version. Those using other versions will need first to start from the *KJV* for a reference to find other uses of the word. Usefulness might have been increased if the computer had compiled a listing of important words changed in the five newer versions.

However, users wishing additional in-depth information will find that they will have to supplement this volume with such tools as BDB and BAG (with indexes if needed) and the Schmoller *Handkonkordanz*, giving the listings of contexts in Greek with Latin definitions.

Edmund R. Woodside

La Verne, CA

A Galilean Rabbi and His Bible: Jesus' Use of the Interpreted Scripture of His Time. By Bruce D. Chilton. Wilmington: Michael Glazier, 1984, 213 pp., \$7.95 paper.

The author of this work has already established his expertise in the study of the gospels through his doctoral dissertation, *God in Strength: Jesus' Announcement of the Kingdom* (Freistadt: Plöchl, 1979). Moreover he has tackled some of the difficult problems involved in targumic studies through his monograph, *The Glory of Israel: The Theology and Provenance of the Isaiah Targum* (Sheffield: JSOT, 1982).

In some respects the present work may be viewed as a popularization of his research. As a matter of fact, however, the author has undertaken a much broader task for which Jesus' use of the targum provides something of a springboard. Concerned to avoid the evils of professional specialization, Chilton addresses a wide variety of topics and in the last part of the book gives us his solution to the grave problems that have been raised in connection with Biblical authority and its relation to faith. That solution appears to be a minimalist definition of Biblical faith: "Properly speaking, a believing reader shares with his biblical predecessors the God of Abraham, the God of Paul, and only coincidentally does he hold other beliefs which make his outlook similar to theirs" (p. 150). Whether any readers will find his discussion persuasive I cannot judge, but they will surely wonder how that discussion follows from the body of the book.

After an introductory section where the author surveys first-century Judaism and targumic literature in particular, he devotes the central part to an examination of dominical sayings in which Jesus appears to cite or allude to the targum of Isaiah. He identifies only

three passages as examples of "dictional coherence" (substantive verbal similarity): Mark 4:11-12 (pp. 90-98); Matt 26:52 (pp. 98-101); Mark 9:48 (pp. 101-107). Even with respect to these examples he finds it necessary to use qualifying terms like "seems" and "appeared" (p. 138). His only example of "thematic coherence" (Matt 21:33-46 and parallels, a parable that he claims alludes to the targumic interpretation of Isaiah 5) contains evidence, he tells us, that is even less "probative" (ibid.). On pp. 116-137 Chilton discusses a handful of other passages where Jesus, while not quoting the targum, appears to use diction that has been influenced by the targumic tradition. All in all the evidence appears to me quite meager, and that alone undermines such inferences as the following: "In the course of this investigation, we have not uncovered a single instance in which Jesus seemed arbitrarily to have departed from the Targumic interpretation available in his day" (pp. 165 ff.). But even if we should grant every point and inference in the main body of the book, the material dealt with can hardly provide the grounds for the kinds of theological pronouncements one comes across in the last part.

This reviewer's general impression is that the book lacks coherence, that the author allowed himself too much flexibility in selecting topics that, while certainly very interesting, could not be tied closely to the general argumentation. One wonders, for example, whether a lengthy discussion of the historicity of Jesus' exorcisms (pp. 71 ff.) was really to the point. The impression that the book required a sharper focus is strengthened by a significant number of vague or misleading statements, such as the remark that the debate between A. Díez Macho and J. Fitzmyer is principally "whether Palestinian Aramaic is more ancient than the Babylonian dialect" (p. 43—this is simply incorrect as it stands), or the comment that G. Maier is an example of the kind of people "who are convinced that history is not a certain means to faith" (p. 163—this strikes me as a perfect description of many of the higher critics that Maier opposes).

These criticisms may reflect the reviewer's quite different perspective on many of the questions addressed by Chilton. But even if the criticisms are fair one should not conclude that the book is of little value. In the course of the argument Chilton leads the lay reader to a greater appreciation for Biblical scholarship, particularly its attempt to set the message of the NT in the context of first-century Judaism. His exegetical discussions are always suggestive, and serious students can profit greatly from his assessment of contemporary trends in NT criticism.

Moisés Silva

Westminster Theological Seminary, Philadelphia, PA

Reading the Old Testament: Method in Biblical Study. By John Barton. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1984, 272 pp., \$12.95 paper.

In the available introductory volumes on the OT one gap that has remained wide open until now has been the absence of a good textbook introducing entry-level students to critical methods used in the study of the Hebrew Bible. Barton has closed that gap with a sensible, balanced, sympathetic and generally irenic introduction to the area. The core of the book consists of twelve chapters (plus an introduction, conclusion and extensive end-notes) averaging between fifteen and twenty pages each. In the first four chapters the author takes up in succession the approach, strengths and weaknesses of the traditional diachronic or historical-critical tools (source, form and redaction criticism); in the fifth chapter he exhibits the use of each in short studies of Ecclesiastes. The remaining chapters are devoted to more recent developments in synchronically oriented methods (canon criticism, structuralism and literary criticism). Barton seeks to assess the interrelations and possible mutual influences of these more recent tools; Ecclesiastes commonly provides a test case or exhibit. Each chapter in the book is introduced by suggested "preliminary

reading," bibliographic items that are ordinarily used as sources or for illustrative purposes in the text of the chapter to follow. Each chapter ends with suggested readings leading to further, more in-depth study of each technique.

This volume does not champion any one critical technique as a panacea for unlocking the OT—quite to the contrary, the author resists "imperialism" among the competing methods and calls instead for a judicious use of the full range of critical tools in seeking to elicit data from the text. No one tool is adequate for the task, and Barton describes many of the weaknesses inherent in each. Evangelical readers especially will find his forthright and repeated acknowledgment of the circularity in each of the critical techniques (pp. 5, 37, 42-43, 53, 66, 82, 125-126) refreshing.

Barton's harshest criticisms are directed at the synchronic tools in their seeking to transcend historical-critical techniques. Though it may be a subjective judgment, Barton does seem particularly averse to the canon criticism of B. Childs. In this regard the influence of J. Barr is felt throughout the volume. It is an influence Barton himself acknowledges (p. xi) and can be seen in part by the frequency with which Barr is cited. This does not make Barton's evaluation of the various critical methods any the less trenchant. It may only help to locate his own perspective in the breadth of the total discussion. Though in Childs' own mind canon criticism is born in a theological milieu, Barton traces a number of instructive parallels with literary appreciation ("New Criticism") and foresees the evolution of canon criticism into a literary-critical rather than theological tool (chap. 10). Because of their similarities, canon criticism and new criticism are subject to the same strictures: They stand or fall together in Barton's eyes.

Late in the book (p. 198; cf. pp 1-7) Barton describes his threefold aim as having been (1) to survey critical methods in current use in their interrelatedness, (2) to set OT study in the wider background of literary criticism, and (3) to argue against the pursuit of any one method as "correct." He has succeeded admirably on all three fronts. Volumes in the area of critical method are characteristically dry as dust, but not this one: Barton is both erudite and clear, lively and cogent. He invites his reader to learn from and use a variety of techniques, divorced from their ideological/philosophical baggage, while he also informs him of their liabilities. More extensive critique of the historical-critical tools would have been helpful—e.g., some of the common criticisms of form criticism are not included, nor does the author discuss the kind of monolingual myopia that has so often characterized source-critical arguments. Though the volume was not designed to emphasize the history of the various critical tools, some greater attention to the cultural and philosophical matrices that give rise to particularly the historical-critical techniques would have been helpful. Those cultural and philosophical influences are described at some length with reference to the more recent synchronic techniques, and more of similar analysis for the diachronic methods would have improved the volume.

Raymond B. Dillard

Westminster Theological Seminary, Philadelphia, PA

God's Design: A Focus on Old Testament Theology. By Elmer Martens. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1981, 271 pp., \$12.95.

Martens, of the Mennonite Brethren Biblical Seminary in Fresno, CA, has enriched the evangelical community with his excellent work on the message of the OT. He has written a book that will hopefully become, with Kaiser's, the standard textbook in seminaries and Christian colleges. This book contains many good features that teachers look for: It is well organized and easy to read; it contains very helpful charts (pp. 30, 73, 103, 129, 196, 223), concise summaries, mature theological reflections and, best of all, sound judgment throughout.

Martens claims to have found a "center" in the OT: God's "design" or "purpose," which consists of four parts that come together to form a unified whole. The four parts are (1) salvation/deliverance, (2) covenant community, (3) knowing/experiencing God, and (4) the land. This theme with its components is traced diachronically in the major eras in Israel's history: the pre-monarchical, monarchical and post-monarchical eras. Furthermore, to strengthen his case Martens discusses three crucial texts, one from each of the eras (Exod 5:22-6:8; Hos 2:14-23; Ezek 34:17-31), which illustrate how the various parts come together to make a single design.

Martens should be congratulated on this fine work. He made the correct moves (in the modest opinion of one reader) where it matters. Topics of introduction are treated from an evangelical perspective; the principles of dogmatic theology are not imposed on the text; the text is approached inductively; hard issues are not avoided; major themes are not ignored or left out. All these are pluses in his favor, for they reflect how responsible and conscientious a scholar he is and enhance the value of an already excellent book.

While the book abounds with positive features, it also raises several crucial issues that need to be evaluated. First, what is the basic relationship between the Abrahamic and Mosaic covenants? Is the former the overture and the latter the symphony? Is the Abrahamic covenant a prelude to the main event or the foundation on which everything else stands? This issue is especially important if one takes Exod 6:3-5 (Martens' own pivotal text) seriously. Since God's acts of salvation and deliverance in Egypt are based on his remembering the Abrahamic covenant, the patriarch deserves more detailed treatment than Martens allows. Furthermore Gen 12:1-3 should get the attention that it deserves, all the more so because no less a person than the apostle Paul identifies it as "the gospel" in Gal 3:8.

Second, the whole approach of finding pivotal texts and crucial verses should be considered. Why did the author choose Exod 5:22-6:8; Hos 2:14-23; Ezek 34:17-31? Why not Exod 19:4-6; Deut 6:4-9; 2 Samuel 7; Isaiah 9; Jer 31:31-34—or a host of other important passages? Martens does not want to impose a preconceived grid on the text, but is he not proof-texting by his method of selection? He needs to defend his method and approach and clarify his decisions in picking out his three passages.

Third, without denying that the three passages are very important texts, one cannot but wonder how Martens' "design" is based on them. Would he have been able to arrive at the same conclusion by selecting three other passages from the ones listed above? Would he be able to show from von Rad's "credo" passages that there is a center to the OT?

Fourth, the very method Martens has selected has its own built-in strengths and weaknesses. Its strength is to show how four major themes are developed over a period of time. Its main weakness is that it is a thematic development that tends to gloss over the distinctive differences within the same period. For example, did Jeremiah understand the remnant in the same way as Isaiah? Does the suffering servant appear in the thoughts of Micah? Is there a promise of a "new exodus" in the writings of Amos? Since the treatment within each era is by theme, the individual writers suffer in the process.

Fifth, does Martens have too few eras? It has already been said that the patriarchal era deserves a major expansion, but what about the era of the monarchy? Would it not be better to divide it into at least two parts: the united monarchy and the divided kingdoms? Would it not be better to distinguish between the Assyrian and Babylonian threat even within the era of the divided kingdoms? To put together in one era some four hundred years is to combine too many differences.

Sixth, it has long been recognized that wisdom literature has been the Achilles' heel of OT theology. Two issues alone will illustrate the complexity of the material. First, is it possible to encompass everything under the "fear of the Lord"? The sayings in Proverbs alone may be divided into three groups that give straightforward description of how things are, list things in order of priorities, or give exhortations and warnings using God-lan-

guage. Without accepting McKane's solution to these three types, one is still hard put to see how the first two kinds teach the "fear of the Lord." The issue is complicated when one considers Job. Is the point of that book "the fear of the Lord," "the problem of suffering" or "the silence of God," just to mention three options? What the Song of Songs is teaching is far from being a settled matter. Second, Martens should have explored the relationship between Biblical and international wisdom. This is important because the Scriptures seem to contain some international wisdom and also because it affects the discussion involving "knowing/experiencing God." Martens' discussion is very good; it simply does not go far enough.

The six matters that have just been raised should not detract from the overall excellence of this work. Martens has put us all in his debt with his many insights and sound conclusions. Even if one is not convinced that his center is the right center (assuming that one can be found), he has nevertheless given us a major treatment of four very significant themes of the OT. In addition he has pointed (alas, too briefly) to their development in the NT. May this book get the wide reading it deserves.

Samir B. Massouh

Elmbrook Christian Study Center

A History of Modern Creationism. By Henry M. Morris. San Diego: Master, 1984, 382 pp., n.p. paper.

The publication in 1961 of *The Genesis Flood* by J. Whitcomb and H. Morris catalyzed an international revival of creationism. R. Numbers, professor of history of science at the University of Wisconsin, has called the impact of this revival on both the scientific and Christian communities "immense." As a catalyst and prime mover in the revival, Morris writes to inform and to call Christians to advance the cause of creationism.

The author covers the creation/evolution conflict from antiquity through 1984, but treatment in earnest commences with the beginnings of modern science. He reminds us that many of the founders of modern science were creationists, such as R. Boyle, B. Pascal, J. Kepler and M. Faraday. Sir Isaac Newton, in addition to holding to creationism, wrote books on Bible chronology and Bible prophecy defending the accuracy of Scripture. Lord Kelvin and L. Pasteur were vigorous opponents of evolution.

Next Morris chronicles the ascendancy of Darwinism, noting both its champions and its detractors. Of particular interest are his treatments of social Darwinism and its relation to political and social movements of the time, the Scopes trial, the Darwinian Centennial Celebration (1959) and the American Scientific Affiliation. The chronicle is filled with personal details, reading at times more like a diary than a history.

The last half of the book is devoted largely to a detailed inspection of creationist organizations, including individual chapters devoted to *The Genesis Flood*, the Creation Research Society and the Institute for Creation Research. Unlike the first half of the book, the discussions are so detailed that only the most ardent creationists will remain enthralled throughout. Still, the treatment is informative and most will find it worth the time.

First ignored, then ridiculed, Morris documents in the final chapter how creationism has become the object of organized and heated opposition from the scientific and educational communities. The several appendices include lists of creationist literature and of over a hundred local, state, national and foreign creationist organizations.

Morris' convictions are rather stridently affirmed throughout the book. He holds tenaciously to a literal six-day creation, a young earth, and flood geology. Those holding such views as progressive creationism, the day/age theory, the gap theory, or an "old earth" are repeatedly labeled as "compromisers" who must depend upon "distorted exegesis" (p. 305). *Christianity Today* is stigmatized as "neo-evangelical" (p. 182). Morris feels that "evangeli-

icals" (as opposed to "fundamentalists" such as himself) "insist that [creationism] is not even an important religious concept" (p. 256). Though ETS's diverse membership includes those who embrace beliefs Morris would eschew, this reviewer suspects that he would be pleasantly surprised by the support for his views found among its members.

Though some might differ with Morris over specifics, *A History of Modern Creationism* constitutes a well-taken call to all Christians to oppose evolution and to defend unashamedly the truth of the Biblical statements concerning creation. The reviewer found much of the book fascinating and found his interest in modern creationism stimulated as well as his confidence in the scientific defensibility of Scripture bolstered.

In summary: informative; spurs interest in the topic; sometimes too detailed; always a staunch defense of Biblical revelation by a devout and capable scientist; a worthy contribution to an important topic.

Van Campbell

Homer, Louisiana

The Might That Was Assyria. By H. W. F. Saggs. London: Sidgwick and Jackson, 1984, 339 pp., \$29.95.

A danger for the student of the Bible is the reading of ancient Near Eastern history merely as a vehicle for illuminating the Bible rather than first studying it properly in and of itself. A sound assessment of how the ancient Near East sheds light on Scripture presupposes a good knowledge of ancient Near Eastern history and culture. Unfortunately, there are few well-written surveys. We can be grateful to Saggs for providing us with such a survey, written for the nonspecialist, which covers the history and culture of one of Israel's most famous enemies, Assyria.

The first part of the book (121 pp.) gives a nice overview of the history of Assyria from prehistory to the final collapse of the Neo-Assyrian empire at the battle of Carchemish (605). The second part (166 pp.), perhaps more interesting to the general reader, deals with Assyrian culture: ethnic makeup, social classes, agriculture, marriage and family, education, political structure, dress and household life, trade, technology, religion, medicine, art, military, language and literature. The book concludes with a chapter on the rediscovery of Assyria. A classified bibliography lists two to five technical works for each of the eighteen chapters of the book as well as six general works. There is a good index.

Saggs is not a believer in supernatural religion, and his primary goal is not to illumine the Biblical text. Certain passing remarks reveal an underlying hostility to Israelite religion, which he finds to be racist and superstitious. Biblical parallels are, as it were, footnotes to the history and culture of Assyria, just as Assyrian history is secondary to a history of Israel. In short, Saggs is an Assyriologist, a quite good one we might add, but not a Biblical scholar. Nevertheless an index lists 44 passages from the OT cited in the course of this work. Therein, however, lies the weakest point in the book. Dubious identifications are made between Nimrod (Gen 10:8) and Tukulti-Ninurta (thirteenth century B.C.), Shinar and Sumer, Menahem's payment of tribute (2 Kgs 15:19-20) and Tiglath-Pileser's 738 B.C. campaign (Thiele shows it to be in 743), Manasseh's journey in chains to Babylon and his visit to Assyria mentioned in cuneiform sources, tribes of the north (Jer 1:15) and unrest related to people movements (Jer 25:9 shows the tribes to be allies of Nebuchadnezzar), and the capture of Nineveh and the flood of the river Khosr. While some of these are possible, insufficient indication is given of the debate. A further weakness is the general lack of documentation, although the bibliography certainly helps.

Despite the above, the book remains an excellent presentation of ancient Assyria. The specialist in Assyriology will find it a helpful synthesis of current research, though a bit

thin on debated points, and the nonspecialist will find it an interesting introduction to Assyria. Although it was not so much the author's intention, the Biblical student will find in it much that helps him to understand the Assyria of the Bible.

J. M. Sprinkle

Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, OH

The Dream Theophany of Samuel: Its Structure in Relation to Ancient Near Eastern Dreams and Its Theological Significance. By R. K. Gnuse. Lanham/New York/London: University Press of America, 1984.

The task of assigning a genre classification to Samuel's theophanic experience in 1 Samuel 3 is not an easy one, as the lack of scholarly consensus on the matter attests. In *The Dream Theophany of Samuel*, a revision of his Vanderbilt doctoral dissertation, Gnuse develops the thesis that 1 Samuel 3 is not a "prophetic call narrative," as has sometimes been suggested, but rather "a late literary creation cast in the form of an ancient Near Eastern message dream theophany" (p. 2). The essential outline of Gnuse's argument was previously published in his article entitled "A Reconsideration of the Form-Critical Structure in 1 Samuel 3: An Ancient Near Eastern Dream Theophany," *ZAW* 94 (1982) 379-390.

The book is logically structured and the argument clearly presented. An introductory chapter in which Gnuse compares ancient and modern attitudes toward dreams is followed by fairly comprehensive surveys of dreams and dream reports in the ancient Near East (chap. 2) and in the Bible (chap. 3). These provide the necessary background for a detailed analysis of 1 Samuel 3 in terms of the "dream theophany" genre (chap. 4). In the remainder of the book, Gnuse progressively broadens the discussion to consider traditio-historical and historical issues relating to 1 Samuel 1-3 as a unit (chap. 5) and then to the entire corpus of Samuel traditions (chap. 6).

In the ancient world, dreams were considered "a point of contact with another realm, an avenue of revelation" (p. 13), and because of their numinous character dreams had to be reported in a circumspect manner. Gnuse's investigation of ancient Near Eastern dreams reveals two major categories of dreams that tended to give rise to dream reports: "auditory message dreams" and "symbolic message dreams" (the latter including also "mantic dreams," where a clear-cut message may not be given). These same categories of dreams appear in the Bible: "Auditory message dreams are found in the Elohistic epic, 1 Samuel 3, and 1 Kings 3; symbolic dreams are found in Judges 7, the Joseph cycle, and the book of Daniel" (p. 59). A third category, "psychological status dreams," can be inferred from hints in the "dream omnia collection" (p. 22), but such dreams, primarily the province of the common people, were not deemed worthy of reporting. Not all surviving dream accounts can be subsumed under one of the above categories, and Gnuse recognizes these "non-classifiable dreams" as testimony to "the artificiality of trying to categorize neatly all of the dreams from the ancient Near East" (pp. 22-23).

The focal point of Gnuse's thesis comes in chap. 4, where the author challenges the notion that 1 Samuel 3 may be classed as a "call narrative" and defends his own view that 1 Samuel 3 exhibits the formal characteristics of an "auditory message dream" theophany. Gnuse's critique of the former view is insightful and quite valid—so long as we take "call narrative" as designating a technical, form-critical category such as has been described by Richter, Habel and others. A major difficulty for Gnuse's own suggestion, however, is the lack of evidence in 1 Samuel 3 that Samuel is, in fact, dreaming. The word "dream" (*hālôm*) is conspicuously absent in the context, and Gnuse's attempt to discount the significance of this point by observing that 1 Samuel 3 lies outside the "Elohistic" epic narrative, where the word is a fixed feature of dream theophanies, is inadequate, inasmuch as the term also occurs in dream accounts within the "Deuteronomistic history" (Judg 7:13, 15; 1 Kgs 3:5,

15). In 1 Sam 3:15b, moreover, Samuel's experience is explicitly called a "vision" (*mar'û*; cf. *ḥāzôn* in v 1), and some discussion of these terms would seem to be a desideratum.

The most obvious impediment to accepting 1 Samuel 3 as a dream theophany is Eli's involvement in the affair. Unless we are to assume that Samuel was awakened three times by Yahweh's call, falling asleep again after each trip to Eli and then, anomalously, remaining asleep after the fourth call, there is every indication that Samuel is actually awake during the theophanic encounter. Anticipating this objection, Gnuse argues that the awakening of the recipient is a standard feature of ancient Near Eastern dream reports and that "we have no right to impose our modern definition of dream upon the ancient literary category" (p. 145). It is evident from the examples that Gnuse cites, however, that the awakening almost always marks the termination of the dream (cf. pp. 18, 24, 97, 148-149). Apart from later Greek material, Gnuse finds only two texts in support of his contention that the "awakening" could at times precede the dream message.

The first is an Akkadian text in which a priest of Ishtar is awakened by a dream in order to receive a message for Ashurbanipal (p. 18; for a translation of the text see A. L. Oppenheim, *The Interpretation of Dreams in the Ancient Near East* [Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 1956] 249). In this example, however, a distinction seems to be made between the "dream," which serves only to awaken the priest, and the "nocturnal vision" that follows (cf. *ibid.*, pp. 189-190, 225). The second example is a line from the Ugaritic story of Keret: *wyqmš ubḥlmh* (KRT A:1, line 35). Gnuse's rendering, "and he is startled, and in his dream" (p. 145), follows a definition of *qmš* tentatively suggested in *UT* 478. Gnuse shows no awareness, however, of J. Gibson's rendering of the relevant verb as "curled up" rather than "startled" (*Canaanite Myths and Legends* [Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1977] 83). In the broader context Gibson's translation seems by far the more likely: "Sleep overpowered him and he lay down, slumber (overpowered him) and he curled up. And in his dream El came down" (lines 33-36a).

Beyond these Semitic examples Gnuse can appeal only to the "more developed Greek format" in which the formula "Are you asleep, NN?" sometimes appears (p. 145). Following Oppenheim he suggests that this formula implies the awakening of the recipient at the outset of the dream. Ironically, however, E. R. Dodds, upon whom Oppenheimer depends, takes the phrase to imply precisely the opposite: "He [the dreamer] knows himself to be asleep, since the dream-figure is at pains to point this out to him" (*The Greeks and the Irrational* [Berkeley: University of California, 1951] 105). In short, all Gnuse's examples are inconclusive, and the problem of Samuel's apparent wakefulness in 1 Samuel remains.

In the light of these and other uncertainties Gnuse's central thesis fails to convince, and some of his later historical judgments (e.g., "the quest for the historical Samuel is bankrupt" [p. 219]) will undoubtedly require revision in the light of this failure. Unfortunately the book is further marred by a number of errors, not all of them typographical. But in spite of its shortcomings *Dream Theophany* provides an interesting and informative introduction to dreams and dream theophanies in the ancient Near East and in the Bible. Moreover the liberal sprinkling of brief but, at times, exceptionally well-documented discussions (n. 8 to p. 218, for example, covers five single-spaced pages) of issues tangential to Gnuse's central thesis, but of interest for Samuel studies in general, considerably enhances the value of the volume.

V. Philips Long

Cambridge, England

Signs and Wonders: A Commentary on the Book of Daniel. By Robert A. Anderson. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans; Edinburgh: Handsell, 1984, xviii + 158 pp., \$5.95.

The present volume is part of the International Theological Commentary, a series that proclaims as its goal "the Old Testament alive in the Church." By this claim the series, and

hence this volume, "moves beyond the usual critical-historical approach to the Bible and offers *theological* interpretation of the Hebrew text."

Although the data are often scattered, the author presents a substantial amount of good, sometimes excellent, material in language readily understood by the layman. A case in point is his deliberation over the manner in which the book should be divided. He believes the book is a bifid, with certain chapters of the second half reflecting certain of the first. The reasons given: (1) The stories of Daniel 1-6 are narrated in the third person, those of chaps. 7-12 (with the exception of 7:1) in the first person. (2) The revelations from God in chaps. 1-6 are received through the dreams and visions of foreign kings with Daniel as interpreter; those of chaps. 7-12 are received by Daniel himself with angelic beings as interpreters (although Anderson concedes 2:19 as an exception). (3) Daniel's three companions, Hananiah, Mishael and Azariah, who often appear in chaps. 1-6, are absent from chaps. 7-12.

Equally clear is Anderson's presentation of certain theological themes that form the structure and substructure of the book of Daniel. The first of these is the "acts of God" motif that is found in the opening verses of the book. He stresses that it was not the pagan king acting on his own who conquered Jerusalem but that it was "the very action of God himself (v. 2)." Other references to theological motifs, this time in chap. 4, stress that "the Most High rules the kingdom of men (vv. 17, 25, and 32)" and that "those who walk in pride he is able to abase (v. 37; cf. v. 17)." With reference to chap. 2 Anderson observes that kingship, "whether native or foreign, is always treated in the Scriptures with due deference; it is an institution not without divine sanction, but it was never permitted either to usurp the power of God or to contravene his laws."

Some of Anderson's conclusions will not be acceptable to the majority of evangelicals. For example, he states with some confidence that the origins of the individual segments of the book of Daniel lie not in the exilic period but in the period between the fourth and second centuries B.C.E. These stories were finally set down and edited in 164 B.C.E. Indeed, the evidence for such a dating is so compelling "that it is possible almost to pinpoint, not only the year, but the month when it reached its present form" (pp. xiii, 4).

The historical ties that would normally be a strong point for the commentary, since they are presented lucidly and in some detail, are so conditioned by the presuppositions that attend the writer's view of Daniel's authorship that they are often less useful than they might have been. To maintain this line of interpretation he is compelled to interpret the image of chap. 2 in terms of Babylonia, Media (although he is at a loss to explain the anachronism), Persia and Greece (Macedonia/Seleucids). In following such a schema for chap. 7 he is forced to ignore the obvious signals that have been followed by generations of scholars in identifying the nations represented by the various beasts. For example, he fails to see that the bear raising itself on one side parallels the ram of chap. 8, which has one horn higher than the other. The latter he is compelled to identify as "the kings of Media and Persia" (8:20), but somehow he fails to see its tie to the former. Moreover he neglects to show how the four-headed leopard of 7:6 parallels the "four conspicuous horns" of 8:8. He freely concedes the latter to be the Greek/Macedonian empire but insists that the former is Persia. He likewise fails to see the parallel between the ten toes of the image (2:41) and the ten horns of the fourth beast (7:7). Whether the fourth beast is to be seen as the Seleucids or as Rome may be debated, but the parallels in the text must not be ignored.

Anderson has a generally low view of the reliability of the chronology set forth in Daniel and, for that matter, in Scripture in general. Daniel shares "with much other biblical material a frustrating disregard for chronological exactitude." Moreover, he says, "The chronological note in v.1 [2:1] is not capable of reconciliation with the historical superscription to the book as a whole, nor with the three-year period of Daniel's preparation for court service." One wonders why he sees a problem of such proportions. The third year of Jehoiakim's reign would yield 606 B.C.E. by the Babylonian (accession-year) system of dat-

ing. This corresponds well with Jer 25:1 (= 606 in the Palestine system of dating). Why Anderson cannot reconcile these data with the second year of Nebuchadnezzar (603) and the three-year period of Daniel's preparation is difficult to understand. His interpretation of the seventy weeks of Daniel 9 is similarly conditioned by a highly selective use of evidence (pp. 114-118).

In spite of the above, when Anderson debates the genre of the first part of Daniel (whether fiction or history) on p. 52 he opts for history. This is quite interesting in light of his rejection of an historical Daniel, identifying the personage mentioned in Ezek 14:14, 20; 28:3 with the father of Aqhat and Pughat in Ugaritic literature. I might add here that, irrespective of the identity of the 28:3 reference, which may indeed bespeak a Canaanite hero known to the prince of Tyre (though see the recent essays by H. H. P. Dressler in *VT*), the references in Ezekiel 14 are to standards of righteousness, not to wisdom, and it seems inconceivable to me that they should refer to a Gentile, no matter how pious. On p. 7 Anderson discusses the wisdom/Ibrah motif that constantly appears in Daniel. The prophetic nature of Daniel's confrontation is analyzed on p. 59. Both of the latter are helpful.

William C. Williams

Zechariah. By J. Carl Laney. Chicago: Moody, 1984, 143 pp., n.p. paper.

This is part of the Everyman's Bible Commentary and is a worthy contribution to that series. It is moderately dispensational and premillennial. Laney describes his work as a "cautious" approach to the book of Zechariah. The central message of each prophecy and vision will be expounded. Speculation regarding the uncertain details will be avoided." This was a wise decision.

The book begins with an introduction that covers the title, author, unity, date of writing, historical setting, literary forms, purpose, theme, theology, structure and outline of Zechariah.

Chapter 1 deals with "The Introductory Call to Repentance" (1:1-6), chap. 2 with "The Night Visions of Zechariah" (1:7-6:15), chap. 3 with "The Question concerning Fasting" (7:1-8:23), chap. 4 with "The Oracle concerning Israel and the Nations" (9:1-11:17) and chap. 5 with "The Oracle concerning Israel's Future" (12:1-14:21).

The book closes with an appendix ("Homiletical Suggestions") and a "Selected Bibliography."

Unfortunately the book is marred by several misspelled words and other mistakes. I also found myself questioning a few interpretations. For example, Laney follows Hanson's interpretation of 9:1-17 as a "Divine Warrior Hymn" and claims that "no one historical setting really answers the situation described in the passage" and that the text "must be forced to serve one historical hypothesis or another." While I agree with this view in general, I am not totally convinced of all the details. Laney goes on to say categorically that the hymn "describes the march of a Divine Warrior . . . who intervenes directly, apart from human agents." "Apart from human agents" is a dogmatic assertion that cannot be proved. Actions are often attributed to the Lord in Scripture, even in situations where we know human agents were involved. Exod 23:30 indicates that God would drive out the Canaanites. Yet we know from the next verse (as well as from the book of Joshua) that he would use the Israelites to do the actual driving out. Besides, Zechariah 9 itself speaks of "foreigners" (v 6), "marauding forces" (v 8) and "an oppressor" (v 8).

In my own commentary on Zechariah (*Expositor's Bible Commentary*) I expound 9:1-8 in the light of a particular historical setting, and I certainly hope it is done without "forcing." Specifically I favor the view that in the Lord's march (as the "Divine Warrior") south to Jerusalem, destroying Israel's traditional enemies while sparing Jerusalem, the agent of his judgment was Alexander the Great. This interpretation seems to be supported ade-

quately by both history and Josephus. Significantly Laney himself writes: "The complete overthrow of Tyre by Alexander the Great in 332 B.C. illustrates how even such a powerful city can be broken."

The reader, however, should not allow my few reservations to deter him from using this otherwise very helpful synthesis of the message and meaning of the book of Zechariah.

Kenneth L. Barker

International Bible Society, E. Brunswick, NJ

Die Aramäischen Texte vom Toten Meer. By Klaus Beyer. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1984, 779 pp., DM 240.

Although the title of this massive work is impressive in itself, it is the subtitle and the introduction that actually reveal how comprehensive the work really is. The subtitle indicates that the book includes the Aramaic inscriptions of Palestine from the second century B.C. to the seventh century A.D. with the Testament of Levi from the Cairo Geniza, the Scroll of Fasting, and the old quotations from the Talmud. (All of these are organized as "an Aramaic introduction"; "text"; "translation"; "explanation"; "grammar-lexicon"; "German-Aramaic wordlist"; "index.") This work was presented as a *Habilitationsschrift* to the faculty of the University of Heidelberg in 1967, then reworked to include the materials through 1983. The collection and publication of text with translation and explanation along with bibliographical information is an enormous feat in itself (pp. 155-406). The text includes such apocryphal works as the *Genesis Apocryphon* (both 1QapGen and the probable later edition in 4QapGen); the Testament of Levi; the extremely interesting text "the Heavenly Jerusalem" (cf. Rev 21:10-27 and the recently published Temple Scroll—see Y. Yadin, *The Temple Scroll* [London, 1985]); 4QPrNab; and others. There are other texts from Wadi Murabbaat. These texts are important witnesses to the daily life in Palestine and include such things as a bill of divorce, marriage contract, bills of sale, contract for the sale of a house, etc. These private documents and the ones from Nahal Hever along with the quotations of private documents taken from the Talmud give a person a good insight into the daily life of the period. Other texts include Jewish-Palestinian texts, Galilean inscriptions, middle-west Jordan inscriptions, and Samaritan and Christian Palestinian texts. The introduction to these texts comprises an excellent survey of the history of the Aramaic language (pp. 20-153).

After the various texts Beyer offers a grammar of some 88 pages that deals with the language as found in the text. This of course does not take the place of G. Dalman, *Grammatik des Jüdisch-Palästinischen Aramäisch* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftlichenbuchgesellschaft, 1960), but it is an up-to-date treatment of the grammar with emphasis on morphology.

The "Wörterbuch" that follows the grammar (pp. 499-763) is almost worth the price of the total book (that is, if the price were not so high). Beyer has included not only the vocabulary of the Aramaic texts given in his book but also of the Aramaic portions of the OT. Although KB has provided an excellent dictionary of the Aramaic parts of the OT, the dictionary of Beyer is outstanding. This does not, however, mean that one has to adopt the late date of the book of Daniel or of the other Biblical books with Aramaic sections. The dictionary concludes with a list of proper names followed by a German-Aramaic wordlist. The book is then rounded off with a series of indexes including Biblical passages, persons, places and subjects.

There are, however, a few flaws in the work that may cause some frustration. For example, on p. 536 under the second meaning of the word *bar* Beyer gives the meaning "an adoptive son of a deity" and quotes the Aramaic text with the translation "he will be called the 'son of God' and they will call him the 'son of the most high'." The reference then is to D

(4Q246). Though Beyer refers to this text on p. 224, he does not include the text in his book. (For the text and a discussion of its relation to the NT see J. A. Fitzmyer, "The Contribution of Qumran Aramaic to the Study of the New Testament," *NTS* 20 [July 1974] 391-394.) The text here is listed as 4Q243. There were also a few typesetting errors where an Aramaic letter was written backwards (see pp. 569, 668).

Although one may not agree with all of the premises and conclusions of Beyer (see e.g. the book review by G. D. Kilpatrick in *NovT* 26 [1984] 287-288), one must express a word of appreciation for this outstanding work. Certainly Beyer's book will become a standard work for the study of Palestinian Aramaic and is highly recommended for NT background information.

Cleon Rogers

Freie Theologische Akademie, Giessen, West Germany

Jewish Writings of the Second Temple: Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, Qumran Sectarian Writings, Philo, Josephus: Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum, Section Two: The Literature of the Jewish People in the Period of the Second Temple and the Talmud, Volume 2. Edited by Michael E. Stone. Assen: Van Gorcum; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984, 656 pp., \$35.95.

The first section of the *Compendia* dealt in two volumes with the Jewish people in the first century; this second section focuses on their writings, stretched out over the entire second-temple period. Although this is the second volume in the second section, the other two volumes in this section have not yet appeared. The first deals with *Miqra: Reading, Translation and Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity*, and the third deals with *The Literature of the Sages: Midrash, Mishna, Talmud*. Both of these are expected within the next two years.

The volume under review is divided into fourteen chapters, excluding an introduction by the editor. The first substantive chapter (by I. Gafni) deals with the historical background of the second-temple period. I have read many full-length histories of the second-temple period; this one is astonishingly good for its comprehensiveness in restricted space and for its sensitivity to the organic development of Judaism within the period covered. The second chapter, by G. W. E. Nickelsburg, treats "Stories of Biblical and Early Post-Biblical Times." This includes stories such as Susanna, Tobit, Judith, Joseph and Asenath, and 3 Maccabees. Not surprisingly there is considerable overlap between this section and Nickelsburg's own volume. "The Bible Rewritten and Expanded" (the third chapter, also by Nickelsburg) treats those works that retell Biblical history. The chapter includes not only well-known works like Jubilees, the *Genesis Apocryphon*, large sections of 1 Enoch, and so forth, but also such Hellenistic Jewish poets as Theodotus and Ezekiel the Tragedian. The fourth chapter concerns "Historiography" and was written by H. W. Attridge. It includes brief treatments of 1 Maccabees, 2 Maccabees, 1 Esdras, and fragments of assorted Hellenistic historians (Demetrius, Eupolemus, Pseudo-Eupolemus, Artapanus and Pseudo-Hecataeus). Attridge also writes the fifth chapter, an excellent treatment of Josephus and his works. P. Borgen devotes chap. 6 to Philo of Alexandria and N. Glibert the seventh chapter to wisdom literature. J. J. Collins writes chaps. 8 and 9 on "Testaments" and "The Sibylline Oracles" respectively. The latter is especially competent. The editor writes on "Apocalyptic Literature." Presumably the work went to press too early to interact with the major thesis of C. Rowland in *The Open Heaven*. B. A. Person writes chap. 11 on the highly disputed topic, "Jewish Sources in Gnostic Literature." This chapter has forced me to revise some judgments. Not the least important observation (one based on the work of Stroumsa) is the fact that gnostic texts sometimes preserve exegetical traditions that are recorded only later in written form within rabbinic Judaism—sometimes much later. D. Dimant devotes

chap. 12 to "Qumran Sectarian Literature." The coverage is competent but not groundbreaking, and some Qumran documents (e.g. 3Q15) are treated very lightly indeed. D. Flusser writes chap. 13 on "Psalms, Hymns and Prayers." This chapter includes not only whole texts (e.g. the Prayer of Manasseh) but also a survey of prayers and psalms in much of the literature of the second-temple period. Included are the Magnificat and the Benedictus, both treated in less than a page. The plan of this chapter is excellent, but too few pages are devoted to it with the result that I found less insight than I expected. The final chapter, by P. S. Alexander, concerns "Epistolary Literature." The letters studied are drawn from various books (including 1 Maccabees, 2 Maccabees, 3 Maccabees, the Epistle of Aristeas, Paralipomena Ieremiae, the Syriac Apocalypse of Baruch, and various rabbinic texts) and from the largely fragmentary letters discovered at Murabbaat, Nahal Hever and Masada.

No one writing in this area can afford to neglect this important volume.

D. A. Carson

Prophecy in Early Christianity and the Ancient Mediterranean World. By David E. Aune. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1983, 522 pp., \$29.95.

Every once in a while a book comes along that must be read by anyone who wishes to address the same subject. This book belongs to that class.

Aune, professor of religion at Saint Xavier College in Chicago, begins with a survey of previous treatments of early Christian prophecy, focusing especially on the problem of method. To gain proper objectivity it is necessary to compare closely the form, function, content and social setting of all claims to prophecy in the Mediterranean world—Greco-Roman as well as Jewish. It is especially necessary, Aune insists, to avoid making certain kinds of prophecy the standard by which all others are judged. Too many approaches to the NT make value judgments that are primarily theological (in Aune's usage, this almost always has connotations of subjectivity) as opposed to historical. He aims therefore to adopt a strictly historical method himself, in order to offer a critical assessment of the various forms of prophecy practiced in the Mediterranean world from somewhat before Christ to about the mid-second century. Along the way Aune carefully defines his terms. Prophecy is that form of speech in which it is understood that God or a god speaks through a human intermediary. Divination "may be defined as the art or science of interpreting symbolic messages from the gods." On the other hand, oracles are "messages from the gods in human language, received as statements from a god, usually in response to inquiries" (p. 23). These sweeping definitions are progressively refined: Distinctions are made between technical divination and natural divination, and so forth.

Aune's well-known mastery of Greco-Roman sources is put to good use in the second and third chapters, where he discusses Greco-Roman prophecy—first in terms of oracular places and persons, then in terms of the form and function of Greco-Roman oracles. No similarly comprehensive analysis of the forms of Greco-Roman oracles has ever been attempted; these two chapters alone are worth the price of the book. The fourth chapter assesses ancient Israelite prophecy, carefully noting parallels to and distinctions from prophecy found in the Greco-Roman world. The fifth chapter surveys prophecy in early Judaism, and considerable energy is expended in debunking the view that Jews in the time of Jesus understood prophecy to have ceased, the Spirit apparently withdrawn until the onset of the messianic age. The next two chapters analyze the prophetic role of Jesus and the actual form and content of his prophecies. The eighth chapter assesses the character of early Christian prophecy, including discussion of such questions as who prophesied in early Christianity, the relationship between Christian prophets and other Christian leaders, distinctions commonly made between itinerant and resident prophets, the evaluation of prophecy, and the like. The ninth chapter criticizes the thesis that Christian prophets passed on

messages from the exalted Jesus—messages that were then read back by the Church into the teaching of the historical Jesus. Aune finds major arguments for this view, those of Käsemann and Boring, to be weak and inconclusive at best. The chapter is important to the flow of his argument because Aune goes on to formulate criteria by which we may discover examples of early Christian prophecy imbedded in the NT documents, and of course if he were wrong on this point his criteria would have to change quite a bit. The criteria themselves are set forth in chap. 10, and chaps. 10 and 11 survey all the passages in the NT (chap. 10) and in early Christian literature to the middle of the second century (chap. 11) that Aune judges are potential candidates for his list of early Christian prophecies. These are subjected to rigorous assessment in light of the criteria he has developed, and the survivors are then set in the framework of the matrix of prophecy in the Mediterranean world. The last chapter sums up this treatment and analyzes the basic features of early Christian prophetic speech. An appendix differentiates between Christian prophecy and charismatic exegesis.

The work and its voluminous notes are simply invaluable. This is not to say that every page commands agreement. Aune adopts more or less “standard” critical views on many issues (Ephesians and the pastorals are not written by Paul, Deutero-Isaiah and Trito-Isaiah are postexilic, and so forth), and sometimes these views have an impact on Aune’s judgments of the broader issues. Yet at the same time Aune on occasion adopts minority viewpoints with refreshing frankness. For example, his brief remarks on the closing of the OT canon (p. 106) and his treatment of the relationship between early Christian prophecy and the sayings of Jesus (discussed above) demonstrate that his judgments are not simply along party lines. The book is extraordinarily well-written and therefore easy to read. Only rarely is there a breach in the logic of the argument or in the applicability of the texts cited to the argument at hand. For instance, on p. 203, 1 Cor 12:28-29 and Eph 4:11 do not themselves demonstrate the supralocal nature of leadership roles such as apostle, prophet and teacher. On pp. 51-52, in trying to demonstrate that it would be inappropriate to trace the ambiguity of Greek oracles “to cult officials trying to protect the reputation of their sanctuary, or to political considerations,” Aune argues: “Not all oracles were enigmatic. Questions regarding ritual protocol, for example, were usually answered clearly and unambiguously. The surviving oracles which have been preserved in literary settings are hardly representative of the normal kind of oracular response which was received in antiquity.” True—but the fact that not all oracles were enigmatic does not itself address the question as to possible motives of deception among oracular officials. In fact one might argue that because, from the evidence available, oracles dealing with ritual questions prove the least enigmatic whereas oracles dealing with political, military and personal questions prove the most enigmatic, there is some reason to think that cult officials were prepared to give unambiguous responses in areas where they could scarcely be controverted and that they retreated to more ambiguous responses where the subsequent facts of history could in retrospect cloud their authority. This is not to say that the enigmatic character of many oracles was not itself perceived as evidence of the divine; it is only to say that this fact cannot by itself account for the differences in degree of ambiguity. Or again, on p. 207, where Aune argues that the presentation of John’s prophetic role in the Apocalypse should not be thought unique but rather in line with the nature of prophecy commonly accepted in the Christian community, the argument is not as strong as it might be. Aune argues that John could be accepted as a Christian prophet in the Christian communities he addresses “*only if his modes of speech and behavior were recognizable as characteristically prophetic*” (italics his). True—but Paul can cast himself simply as “a man in Christ” even when he is claiming that he received an extraordinary experience (2 Cor 12:1-10). Paul is concerned to avoid the triumphalism of the Corinthians he is addressing, and Aune himself argues that John is interested in flattening hierarchical distinctions in the Apocalypse. But Paul is certainly not undermining his authority by casting himself in 2 Corinthians 12 as “a man in

Christ." Elsewhere he is quite capable of insisting on the authority bound up with his apostleship, and, similarly, that John calls himself a prophet does not by itself determine whether John and the communities he is addressing perceive in him and his message an authority, content and style that go somewhat beyond that of more common prophets. Again, on several occasions Aune seems to deny the possibility that distinctions exist in some particular category by showing the semantic sweep of the word or category involved. For instance, in his treatment of "apostle" (pp. 202-203) he shows the sweep of the semantic range of the word but does not exegetically assess those passages that seem to mean that there are apostles and apostles. Moreover in this instance his critical stance prompts him to overlook some rather important evidence from the synoptic gospels: Though they are doubtless written after Paul's first writing, they insist that Jesus appointed twelve men to be disciples in some special sense and that he himself designated them "apostles."

The historical method Aune adopts, though very powerful in setting up objective criteria in order to allow careful comparisons to be made, occasionally leads him astray. Because Aune refuses to make any distinctions whatever between the formal categorization of false prophecy and true prophecy, OT prophesying can be said to include self-flagellation (1 Kgs 18:28-29; Zech 13:6). I am uncertain that the latter reference has any relevance to the discussion at all, and the former refers to the prophesyings of the prophets of the Baals. Of course these prophesyings occur in the course of "OT" history, but it is not "OT" prophecy in the sense that it is bound up with the religion of Yahweh. The point is not a minor one: Later on the precise distinction is occasionally obliterated. Similarly the category "magic ritual" is stretched to the breaking point (p. 100).

As we have seen, Aune forcefully argues that prophecy did not cease in the period from the last of the writing prophets to the ministries of John the Baptist and of Jesus. There is a sense in which he is surely right. But having made the point he does not interact with his own repeated discussion of the many differences between prophesyings in the OT canon and in the later period (see pp. 106-112 ff., 139, 153, 195, etc.). The failure to attempt some integration has some bearing on Aune's treatment of the relative degrees of authority in OT prophets, Josephus, NT prophets, apostles, and so forth—for apparently the prophets of the late second-temple period saw themselves in a different light and gave utterances that were formally and materially different from their antecedents. Nor does Aune point out that on his own evidence the evaluation of a prophecy in the OT period turns out to be an evaluation of the prophet himself, but that in the Pauline letters an evaluation of the prophecy uttered within the Christian community does not necessarily call in question the status of the prophet but only of that particular prophecy. There are, I think, some important entailments in these distinctions for our assessment of authority status in the early Church.

But these quibbles are not meant to detract from the immense learning found in this volume. No one can responsibly address the subject of early Christian prophecy without wrestling with this important work.

D. A. Carson

New Testament Books for Pastor and Teacher. By Ralph P. Martin. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1984, 152 pp., \$8.95 paper.

This brief bibliographic survey is designed as a companion volume to B. S. Childs' *Old Testament Books for Pastor and Teacher* (Westminster, 1977). Similar in purpose to its companion, it focuses on material likely to be of help to the pastor who has kept up his Greek. Martin admits a bias to English-language works, readily available books and recent studies. All but the last seem to be legitimate biases, considering the purpose of the volume. The format of the survey follows a prose style, so that books are mentioned in the course of a

discussion—a drawback from the standpoint of quick reference but a virtue from the standpoint of readability. In scope the volume includes a survey of English translations, bibliographies, exegetical tools, NT introductions and theologies and commentaries.

As a bibliography Martin's must be compared to the many others that are available to the NT student—some including NT material in a broader survey (cf. the Gormans' *Theological and Religious Reference Materials*), some devoted to the Bible generally (Danker), some focusing on the NT (Scholer), some restricted even to commentaries (Thiselton-Carson). In such a comparison Martin's survey tends to merge in with the crowd, offering little that is distinctive. On the other hand, it is valuable to have an evaluation of so many books from someone who has had so much experience studying and teaching the NT.

Inevitably some specific criticisms can be leveled. Bibliographic evaluation is always highly personal, the product often of one's own outlook and purposes. Still, I would argue that Godet should be included in any survey of the best commentaries on Romans, and it is surprising that Martin does not include the *Expositor's Bible Commentary* in his discussion of commentary series. He elsewhere offers a rather negative evaluation of the series (p. 72), but the series is surely more valuable to the pastor than, say, Fortress' Proclamation Commentaries, which is mentioned. More serious, it seems to me, is the overall thrust of the selections. Primary and reference sources receive little space, while commentaries take up almost two-thirds of the volume. Such an emphasis will only reinforce the tendency of the busy pastor to base his sermons on books about the text rather than on personal grappling with the text. Moreover Martin tends to be biased toward critical studies. He says on p. 24 that Greek concordances are "mainly for the academician," yet he stresses Hengel's *Judaism and Hellenism* and B. Meyer's *The Aims of Jesus* as virtually required reading for the pastor. As valuable as both volumes are, it is difficult to think they are less academic than a Greek concordance. Another example of this tendency is the recommendation that the preacher consult K. Stendahl, Bornkamm/Barth/Held, D. Hare, W. D. Davies and R. Guelich on Matthew. Important studies all, but I cannot envisage many pastors wading through them, nor would I be happy with the sermons that might be preached on the basis of them.

Douglas Moo

Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, Deerfield, IL

The Byzantine Text-Type and New Testament Textual Criticism. By Harry A. Sturz. Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1984, 305 pp., \$18.95.

At first glance, given the title and publisher, one might be tempted to dismiss this book as another in a series of Nelson publications in defense of the Majority text and thus indirectly of their so-called *New King James Bible*. However, such a dismissal in this case would be premature. A defense of the Majority text it certainly is—but it is a defense of a considerably different kind, in that Sturz is trying to make his case on more solidly historical grounds than do Pickering or Hodges-Farstad. Furthermore the tone and interaction with differing points of view are considerably more irenic than those of past defenders like Burgon, Hoskier and Hill or more contemporary ones like van Bruggen, Pickering and Farstad.

Sturz' thesis (basically a reworking of his 1967 doctoral thesis at Grace Seminary) is a relatively simple one. On the basis of some 150 "distinctively Byzantine" readings that are now supported in the early papyri (P⁴⁵, P⁴⁶, P⁴⁷, P⁶⁶, P⁷², P⁷³), plus other supporting arguments, especially against some of the positions of Hort, Sturz contends (1) that the Byzantine text-type as a whole is equally as old as, and relatively independent of, the other text-types, and (2) that its readings therefore "should be given equal weight, along with the Alexandrian and 'Western' texts, in evaluating external evidence for readings" (p. 130).

The arguments that bring Sturz to these conclusions are actually quite brief (110 pages in all, and very large print). In part one (four chapters) he analyzes "current attitudes toward the Byzantine text." In the second chapter he anticipates some of the Hortian arguments against the Byzantine text that he will address in part two, especially its "conflate" readings and "the silence of the Fathers." In chaps. 3 and 4 he examines the arguments in favor of the Byzantine text as primary and finds them wanting as well. The seventeen-year hiatus between thesis and publication is especially evident here, since the major portion of this analysis refutes E. Hills (whom no one has ever taken seriously), while only three concluding pages are devoted to the "variation or modification of the Burgon-Hills view . . . put forth by Zane C. Hodges and Wilbur N. Pickering" (p. 46). It is clear that Sturz is particularly after Westcott-Hort but that at the same time he hopes to distance himself as much as possible from the contemporary Majority text defenders.

Part two then takes up "reasons for considering that the Byzantine text is independent." His first concern here is to demonstrate that "Byzantine readings are old." One may trace this argument by simply listing the chapter titles: "Distinctively Byzantine Readings Are Found in Early Papyri"; "Byzantine-Western Alignments Go Back into the Second Century Independently and Originate in the East—Not in the West"; "The Silence of the Fathers Is Explainable and Therefore Is Not a Proof of Lateness"; "The 'Conflate' or Longer Readings Are Not a Proof of Lateness"; "The Composite Nature of the Byzantine Texts Attests the Early Existence of Its Readings Where Its Strands Unite."

In the final section Sturz musters some arguments to try to prove that "the Byzantine text is unedited in the Westcott-Hort sense." Basically these arguments are of a more speculative nature: that the Antiochian provenance of the text-type argues for special care in handling of the text that would have mitigated against drastic editing; that the *koïnē* character of the text is in its favor as early; that its users were basically conservative and would have resisted severe changes; that "silence" about such a revision argues against its having happened.

There follow a hundred pages of lists and tables, where the papyri support various combinations of MSS in relation to Westcott-Hort. These lists made up a considerable amount of the substance of the dissertation and are intended to support Sturz' basic thesis about the papyri giving evidence of the early nature of the Byzantine text-type. Finally there are 68 pages of bibliography, including subject and Scripture indexes to the bibliography.

Sturz is to be commended for this attempt to get some of us in textual criticism to take the readings of the Byzantine text-type more seriously than we are sometimes wont to do. Nonetheless it is questionable whether the book will have the "revolutionary consequences for the text of the Greek New Testament" that Kilpatrick suggests on the fly-cover. The question is whether Sturz has in fact finally demonstrated that the Byzantine is equally as ancient as, and therefore independent of, the Egyptian text-type and the majority of "Western" readings. The answer: Hardly.

What he has demonstrated is what we have known all along—namely, that many of the readings that eventually came together into this text-type are very early. But that is not the same thing as to demonstrate that the text-type as such (meaning all these readings together in collocation in the same piece[s] of evidence) also existed that early. It may have, but the arguments advanced in this book fall far short of carrying the day.

The primary thesis—that the various Egyptian papyri have a large number of formerly "distinctively Byzantine" readings that thereby argue both for the early date and independence of the Byzantine text-type to the others—simply has not been demonstrated. Of the five lists of variants in the appendices only list one, "Papyrus-Distinctively Byzantine Alignments," actually supports the thesis. (List three, e.g., "Papyrus-Byzantine-Alexandrian Alignments Followed by WH but Opposed by Westerns," besides being irrelevant is so incomplete as to be nearly meaningless.) Unfortunately list one is such a mixed bag that

it can scarcely carry the weight that Sturz wants to give it. For example: (1) Sturz tends to use the phrase "distinctively Byzantine" in a way that seems questionable. What is "distinctively" Byzantine about readings that are supported by all, the majority, or the earliest of the OL MSS? He has included 27 such variants in the gospels alone. And when one considers how many of the other variants are such textual trivia (spellings, add/omit the article, etc.) that they cannot even be translated into Latin, what value are such listings at all?

(2) Sturz lists the variants in their canonical order, so that the whole may seem quite impressive (13 pages in all). But when one breaks them down by papyrus there is a considerably different story. P⁷⁵, for example, is found to support the Byzantines 18 times. But of its 18 variants only one is genetically significant (Luke 15:21—add/omit *poiëson me hōs hena tōn misthōn sou*), and this one should not even be on the list since the shorter "Byzantine" reading now supported by P⁷⁵ is also the reading of the entire Western tradition except D. The other 17 variants are all textual trivia, nine of which do not even permit of translation into Latin or English. How can such evidence mean anything at all about the Byzantine text?

The same is generally true for P⁶⁶, for although it does pick up more "Byzantine" readings very few are genetically significant. Furthermore Sturz disregards my own analysis of P⁶⁶ in which it was argued that the MS reflects a kind of editing of the text that became predominant in the Byzantine tradition. The proof of this is that even though there are a significant number of these trivia that the scribe shares with the Byzantines he has even more of exactly the same kind that he does not share with them, thus indicating stylistic idiosyncracies of his own, not relationships with the Byzantine text-type.

(3) That leads to a final note as to the nature of the vast majority of readings that make up list one. Although Sturz has argued (pp. 65-66) that these 150 readings are not accidental agreements with the Byzantines, that does in fact seem more likely to be the case. What strikes one about list one is how few genuinely genetically significant readings one can find on it. Textual relatedness, which is the crucial point in Sturz' argument, must be based on two coincident phenomena: a very high incidence of agreement over a large portion of text, and agreement in those kinds of readings that can only be explained genetically and not accidentally. In Sturz' case quantity does not count, precisely because the vast majority of items on his list are the very stuff of independent copying and therefore accidental agreement. Indeed, the one list that is lacking, distinctively Byzantine readings that have no early support, is not only several times longer than Sturz' lists one and two but also has in it scores of genetically significant items. Sturz was apparently too enamored with quantity (and even his quantitative factor is thoroughly suspect) to have engaged in a qualitative analysis. This failure effectively undermines the entire enterprise.

Much the same must be said of many others of the arguments that are brought forward to support this first one. For example, it is true that the fathers offer somewhat "silent" evidence against the Byzantines since we have no early fathers from Antioch or Asia Minor who cite the NT. But the silence is not so thoroughgoing as Sturz would give out. What still causes one to wonder is this: If the Western text originated in the East, as Sturz holds, how is it that none of the "Western" evidence, including the Old Syriac, exhibits even hints of a distinctively Byzantine text? And why is it that when one does get close to Antioch—e.g., Caesarea—even there no trace of this text-type as text-type can be found in the early years (e.g. Origen and Eusebius, who must have used the standard Bibles available in that city)?

Furthermore the argument that the users of the Byzantine text were probably more conservative in their handling of the text than the Alexandrians flies full in the face of an enormous amount of evidence—on both sides. Origen, after all, has been demonstrated to be one of the most "conservative users" of his text in antiquity, whereas Epiphanius, whose conservatism and orthodoxy are bywords, is one of the most careless in all the history of NT citation.

Thus Sturz' case must be judged unproven. But one needs to ask again: If evidence were eventually forthcoming that the text-type itself, not just many of its readings, was a demonstrably second-century phenomenon, what would that mean for NT textual criticism? As Sturz argues (correctly), it should mean that the text-type received greater respect because of its antiquity. But otherwise for the most part one may assume that little would change, especially the actual appearance of our critical texts (Bover excepted). The readings peculiar to the Byzantine text-type are usually rejected for the same reasons that the unique readings of the Western text are rejected: On internal grounds they are demonstrably inferior in the vast majority of cases. Not always, of course. Occasionally even now one finds scholars opting for one of its readings on internal grounds (e.g. I. H. Marshall's preference for "filled his stomach with" in Luke 15:16 or my own argument for including "into the house" in Mark 13:15; *NovT* [1980] 20). One might expect more such decisions, but by and large this final Hortian argument for rejecting the Byzantine readings still holds.

Sturz anticipates this conclusion and attempts to respond to it in chaps. 11-16 (pp. 101-130). But these are easily the weakest chapters in the book. The only evidence brought forward is the *koinē* nature of the text-type and Kilpatrick's arguments that the Alexandrian text has suffered from Atticisms. But Kilpatrick has been rather thoroughly refuted on this matter by at least three different scholars (including the reviewer). And "*koinē*" or not, it must be noted that certain kinds of readings are demonstrably secondary (addition of the article with proper names in John, harmonizations, elimination of John's asyndetic style, certain word-order variations, genuinely conflate readings [this is another chapter that is only partially valid in Sturz]). At such variation units the Byzantine text has been shown to be secondary over and over again with an especially high ratio of error in comparison with the Egyptian text. Such an accumulation of errors scarcely builds confidence in its unique readings where internal evidence is more ambiguous. These readings are suspect simply by the company they keep.

One wonders, finally, for whom this book was intended. It has all the earmarks of trying to engage the specialist in serious dialogue. If so, it exhibits an unfortunate number of lacunae, selective use of evidence, and argumentation by generalization that tend to diminish its value for the specialist. On the other hand, it is precisely such arguments that can be made to look persuasive to the nonspecialist—especially the highly selective use of evidence. But it is difficult to guess whether the Hodges-Pickering school will find comfort here or not. Sturz seems to wish otherwise. In any case, *caveat lector*.

Gordon D. Fee

Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary, S. Hamilton, MA

Origins of Christianity: A Historical Introduction to the New Testament. By Schuyler Brown. New York: Oxford University Press, 1984, 169 pp., \$8.95 paper.

This work is an attempt by the associate professor of NT at the University of St. Michael's College in Toronto to present a historico-critical interpretation of early Christianity to a popular audience. Brown provides the foundation of his study with a discussion of history (the actual events) and historiography (their recording). He divides the NT into "historical affirmations" and "faith affirmations." While the latter may express what is actually true, only the former are objectively verifiable. Brown's approach is friendly with form criticism, although he would claim that Jesus is the historical source for a good deal of the gospel tradition. Genre studies that compare the gospels with ancient biographies offer the best opportunity for an understanding of the life of the historical Jesus.

Brown optimistically believes that he can reconstruct many areas of Jesus' life and teaching while retaining his historical skepticism. For example, he notes that the apostles believed that Jesus actually appeared to them after his crucifixion, although we cannot

confirm that God acted in history to raise Jesus physically from the grave. The appearance to five hundred brethren in 1 Cor 15:6 is probably a garbled recollection of the experience of glossolalia at Pentecost.

Brown devotes the last two chapters to the self-understanding and development of the early Church. He explains in depth the nature of apostolic authority and the role it played in the advancement of so-called early Catholicism.

Brown has a marked tendency to divide the early Church into clearly-defined factions. Thus Paul, Peter and James represented a spectrum of attitudes toward the Mosaic law. The Hellenists alone were able to initiate a Gentile mission. The "Matthean community" moved from Jerusalem to Syria in A.D. 70 and expressed misgivings about evangelizing Gentiles. The "Johannine community" formed its high Christology after it was expelled from the synagogue in 85. Relations between the factions were supposedly strained and resulted in thoroughgoing sectarianism, despite the NT notion of "one body." When one considers Brown's skepticism concerning other areas of NT history, it is surprising to watch him reconstruct the Church with such confidence.

The books in the Oxford Bible Series are written for a general readership, and this should make us even more cautious about recommending this book. Brown's attempts to deal with the relationship of faith and history only succeed in divorcing one from the other. We are left with a collection of faith assertions from the first century that have little or no discernible connection with God acting in human affairs. Brown purposes (pp. 15-16) to steer a course between "fundamentalism" and Bultmann's brand of "exaggerated skepticism" because he thinks both devalue history in favor of a *kerygma* as an object of faith. The reasons Brown gives for choosing such a direction are themselves vague and subjective, and his subsequent discussion belies his claim to being objectively historical.

Gary Steven Shogren

The New Testament Age: Essays in Honor of Bo Reicke, Volumes 1 and 2. Edited by William C. Weinrich. Macon: Mercer University, 1984, xii + 579 pp., \$44.95.

The thematic content of these forty-two essays reflects well the broad scholarly interests of the honoree, Bo Reicke of the University of Basel. Following an editorial preface by his former pupil the *Festschrift* is introduced with an appropriate "Zum Geleit" by O. Cullmann. The editor has arranged the contributions in alphabetical order. In the first volume these are: "Versuch einer Analyse des Diakonia-Begriffes im Neuen Testament" by S. Aalen (pp. 1-14); "The 'Cross of Herculaneum' Reconsidered" by L. Barnard (pp. 15-28); "Apollos and the Twelve Disciples of Ephesus" by C. K. Barrett (pp. 29-40); "Colossiens 2:2-3" by P. Benoit (pp. 41-52); "Two Unusual Nomina Dei in the Second Vision of Enoch" by M. Black (pp. 53-60); "'Called to Freedom': A Study in Galatians" by F. F. Bruce (pp. 61-72); "Son by Appointment" by G. B. Caird (pp. 73-82); "'Ah! Si tu peux! . . . 'Tbut est possible en faveur de celui qui croit' (Marc 9:23)" by J. Carmignac (pp. 83-86); "*ΕΚ ΠΙΣΤΕΩΣ* in the Letters of Paul" by B. Corsani (pp. 87-94); "1 Peter 3:19 Reconsidered" by W. Dalton (pp. 95-106); "Reflections on a Pauline Allegory in a French Context" by W. D. Davies (pp. 107-126); "La tunique 'non divisée' de Jésus, symbole de l'unité messianique" by I. de la Potterie (pp. 127-138); "Le Douzième Apôtre (Actes 1:15-26): A propos d'une explication récente" by J. Dupont (pp. 139-146); "Is Streeter's Fundamental Solution to the Synoptic Problem Still Valid?" by W. Farmer (pp. 147-164); "Lukas 9:51-56—ein hebräisches Fragment" by D. Flusser (pp. 165-180); "Die Einheit der Kirche nach dem Neuen Testament" by G. Friedrich (pp. 181-200); "A Note on Luke 1:28 and 38" by R. Fuller (pp. 201-206); "The Matthaean Version of the Lord's Prayer (Matt 6:9b-13): Some Observations" by B. Gerhardsson (pp. 207-220); "Rechtfertigung des Einzelnen—Rechtfertigung der Welt: Neutestamentliche Erwägungen" by E. Grasser (pp. 221-236); "Jude 5 to 7" by A. F. J.

Klijn (pp. 237-244); "The Testimony of Jesus Is the Spirit of Prophecy (Rev 19:10)" by G. W. H. Lampe (pp. 245-259); "Hat die Qumran Literatur das Neue Testament beeinflusst?" by R. Leivestad (pp. 259-270); "Slave and Son in John 8:31-36" by B. Lindars (pp. 271-286).

The same broad spectrum of interests concerning the NT age is continued in the second volume: "Eschatologie und Tradition im 2. Petrusbrief" by E. Lövestam (pp. 287-300); "*Ten agapēn hēn echei ho Theos en hēmin*: A Note on 1 John 4:16a" by E. Malatesta (pp. 301-312); "How to Solve the Synoptic Problem: Luke 11:43 and Parallels" by I. H. Marshall (pp. 313-326); "Paulinism and Polylingualism in Antiquity" by B. Metzger (pp. 327-334); "Der aufsteigende und herabsteigende Gesandte" by O. Michel (pp. 335-363); "The Relation of the Signs and the Discourses in John" by L. Morris (pp. 363-372); "Die Gemeinde des Lukasprologs" by F. Musser (pp. 373-392); "Some Guidelines for the Interpretation of Eusebius' *Hist. Eccl.* 3.34-39" by J. B. Orchard (pp. 393-404); "The Misinterpreted Mediator in Gal 3:19-20" by H. Riesenfeld (pp. 405-412); "How Small Was the Seed of the Church?" by J. A. T. Robinson (pp. 413-430); "Beobachtungen zum Gebrauch des Dekaloges in der vorkonstantinischen Kirche" by W. Rordorf (pp. 431-442); "Kritische Arbeit am Johannesprolog" by E. Ruckstuhl (pp. 443-454); "Im Leib oder Ausser des Leibes: Paulus als Mystiker" by K. Schelkle (pp. 455-466); "Zur Exegese von Eph 2:11-22: Im Hinblick auf das Verhältnis von Kirche und Israel" by R. Schnackenburg (pp. 467-483); "*APARCHÉ*. Note de lexicographie neo-testamentaire" by C. Spicq (pp. 493-502); "Realistische Jesusworte" by E. Stauffer (pp. 503-510); "The Historical Jesus: From the Perspective of a Theologian" by T. Torrance (pp. 511-526); "Héb 6:7-8 et le mashal rabbinique" by A. Vanhoye (pp. 527-532); "With All Those Who Call on the Name of the Lord" by W. C. Van Unnik (pp. 533-551).

These anniversary volumes conclude with a bibliography of the honoree's works and a comprehensive index of passages that enhance their usefulness.

Paul Elbert

Middle Georgia College, Cochran, GA

What Crucified Jesus? The Political Execution of a Charismatic. By Ellis Rivkin. Nashville: Abingdon, 1984, 124 pp.

The author contributes to the discussion of the political implications of Jesus' life and death by asking not *who* but *what* crucified Jesus—i.e., by reconstructing a broader historico-religious matrix. Within this matrix the divergent forms of Judaism "had committed themselves to two doctrines: the doctrine of the two realms to regulate their relationship to the state, and the doctrine of live and let live to regulate their relationship to one another" (p. 39). How could Jesus, who preached "render to Caesar what is Caesar's" and "judge not," fall into a mucilaginous web of political accusation and execution?

According to Rivkin a careful reading of Josephus yields three conclusions: (1) "The sound, the fury, and the tumult of the times cry out for a *charismatic of charismatics*" (p. 71), a prophet of action and vision, a teacher with authority, one capable of lifting the spirits of the outcasts (p. 79). (2) Pontius Pilate and Caiaphas would have cared nothing for the content of such teaching, but only for its potential to excite crowds to riot. A charismatic of charismatics would have been apprehended and dealt with as a revolutionary. (3) This process would have been initiated with Caiaphas bringing the individual before his Sanhedrin on political charges (p. 83). Rivkin concludes that a man such as Jesus would have been tolerated by religious authorities until he threatened the peace by invoking the political wrath of Rome.

The strengths of the work are its Jewish perspective, its motive and spirit. The presentation is engaging, asking important questions and offering interesting answers. Ultimately, however, the thesis is unconvincing. The alleged charismatic of charismatics cannot be convincingly deduced from Josephus. Too much of the argument lies unsupported from

either primary or secondary sources. Rivkin displays special distrust for whatever in the NT does not support the theory. Finally, it is not credible that Caiaphas' Sanhedrin could only and would only consider political charges with pure motive.

In an attempt to shift the focus from casting blame on persons to casting blame on time, place and circumstances Rivkin is to be commended. And in answer to the question "What crucified Jesus?" his answer, "It was the Roman imperial system that was at fault," is partly correct. Nevertheless, that the Jewish participants in the affair misused their authority as the gospels indicate still appears historically accurate (cf. John 11:45 ff.).

Robert W. Herron, Jr.

Institut zur Erforschung des Urchristentums, Tübingen

The Jewish Reclamation of Jesus: An Analysis and Critique of Modern Jewish Study of Jesus. By D. A. Hagner. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1984.

The path from Jewish disparagement to reclamation of Jesus, a path previously virtually impossible but now in vogue, is the path Hagner travels. In doing so he assesses the landscape, articulates boundaries and proposes a very carefully argued new path. What has been for this reviewer a mystery—why the continued, and even positive, study of Jesus by Jews?—has been clarified. The burden of Hagner's book is that Jewish scholarship has been able to reclaim Jesus from the overgrowths of centuries of Christian dogma by the emancipation of the Jew from the ghetto in the wake of the enlightenment and the product of that era, the skeptical approach to the reliability of the gospel records. Jewish scholars have, in short, reclaimed Jesus for Judaism by demonstrating unequivocally his thorough Jewishness and discarding all that is unacceptable to Judaism by characterizing such as theological reflection of the early Church, reflection absorbed in Hellenistic thought. Thus "to the extent that the Jesus of the Gospels is reclaimable, . . . the Gospel accounts are given credence; to the extent that he appears not to be reclaimable, the evidence is attributed to the theologizing of the post-resurrection church" (p. 251). In other words, Jewish scholarship "has been unduly influenced by dogmatic concerns" (p. 257). In a pointed conclusion Hagner says, "In the last analysis, the Jewish reconstruction of Jesus is no more faithful to the historical sources than is that of the old liberal lives of Jesus or the newer radical critical scholarship" (p. 270). This book is perhaps the single most important volume available today on the question of Jewish study of Jesus and provides the evangelical with an irenic handbook for the Jewish-Christian dialogue.

Following a carefully documented survey on the history of the Jewish study of Jesus (pp. 21-71), the author provides analyses of Jewish views on the authority of Jesus as seen in his view of the law, eschatology and ethics as formulated in Jesus' proclamation of the kingdom of God, humanity's relationship to God (e.g. grace and works, etc.) and, finally, how Jewish scholars label Jesus (Pharisee? prophet? Messiah? *et al.*). Included here are three valuable excurses: "The Use of Gospel Criticism," "First-Century Pharisaism" and "The Question of [Jesus'] Originality." He concludes by addressing such issues as the contributions of Jewish scholars to our understanding of the gospels and Jesus, anti-Semitism in the NT, and Judaism and Christianity. Hagner's method is clear: Though he is aware of the voluminous literature involved (his selective bibliography is nine pages), for each issue he centers on representative Jewish writers (C. G. Montefiore, I. Abrahams, J. Klausner, S. Sandmel, S. Ben-Chorin, D. Flusser, P. Lapide, G. Vermes) and summarizes their views on that topic. At the end of most sections he then gives a brief evaluation. Because of his consistent method, this volume serves not only as an historical study but as a handbook of Jewish opinion on various topics as well. I add here that even though this format could evolve into a "shopping list," Hagner's style is charming.

First, this book has the two qualities of being marvelously irenic in spirit as well as thoroughly evangelical. Whereas many studies today, both Protestant and Catholic (see his appendix discussing the recent Roman Catholic work by J. T. Pawlikowski), have eliminated the scandal of the cross to bolster dialogue, Hagner avoids this pitfall. Again and again the author states affirmatively and uncompromisingly the centrality of the person of Jesus as the crux of the issue. Though Jewish scholars reclaim various aspects of the teaching of Jesus, Hagner's line is that these cannot be reclaimed with integrity unless one accepts that Jesus proclaimed the advent of a new era in his person and ministry (cf. e.g. pp. 132, 170, 217-226, 257-271). To quote his conclusion: "If Jesus did make unparalleled claims [and many Jewish scholars admit this hesitantly] and did assert personal uniqueness, his teaching becomes coherent and meaningful. If, as Jewish scholarship asserts, he claimed no such uniqueness or was mistaken in doing so, his teaching to a large degree remains enigmatic" (p. 271). Furthermore Hagner does this in a manner that is not offensive. He offers a helpful distinction between anti-Semitism (racial prejudices against Jews), which is not evidenced in the NT, and anti-Judaism (religious disagreement in the context of debate), which emerges frequently. If Jewish scholars do not agree with Hagner on Jesus and his centrality, at least they cannot argue against his tone.

Second, the author offers to us some welcome (and well worth repeating) restatements of the Jewishness of Jesus. Though it still surprises some evangelicals, "Jesus and the Pharisees have much in common" (why else the intensity of debate?) and "the bulk, certainly, of Jesus' teaching is not innovative but shares the perspective of much of first-century Judaism" (p. 229). Again, we find the statements on Pharisaism (pp. 171-190) to be notable. Pharisees, contrary to what too many think, were not anxious, psychologically-burdened seekers of merit before God to gain them a place in heaven. In fact many are surprised to discover the sense of grace found in the rabbis. Hagner suggests that the gospels' acerbic attack on the Pharisees is directed against only a few and that hyperbole is occasionally involved (see e.g. p. 189). We owe this important corrective largely to Jewish scholars, and it has recently been fully documented by E. P. Sanders.

Third, I have but one criticism and, owing to the book's being a history and critique of Jewish studies, it should not be taken as damaging. I felt that Hagner could have taken up the apologetic task occasionally to offer a careful demonstration of his own evangelical view on issues. Thus whereas the centrality of Jesus is regularly asserted, one does not find development and demonstration of this at any one place—at least to the degree that Jewish scholars could be convinced (cf. e.g. pp. 168-170 for a criticism of Jewish views on the kingdom and ethics). In other words, we have here solid material for polemics (arguments against Jewish analyses), a powerful antidote (the centrality of Jesus' person), but not enough for apologetics (demonstrating the latter). But this probably oversteps Hagner's purposes.

All students need this volume—if only to discover that much of Christian apologetics claims too much for the uniqueness of Jesus in his milieu and stumbles into overstatement or misguided enthusiasm for the Lord we adore. Those who are looking for answers to Jewish studies on Jesus (I think of G. Vermes especially) and/or a guide to the Jewish-Christian dialogue will find in this book much food for thought.

Scot McKnight

Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, Deerfield, IL

The Expositor's Bible Commentary, Volume 8: Matthew, Mark, Luke. Edited by Frank E. Gaebelein. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1984, 1,075 pp., \$24.95.

In this large volume the expositor has at hand a major new commentary on the synoptics. The section on Matthew by D. A. Carson extends to 596 pages and is probably the best

commentary on the gospel to date. Two briefer but still valuable commentaries—Mark by Walter W. Wessel (192 pages) and Luke by Walter L. Liefeld (264 pages)—round out the volume. According to the general editor, pride of place in terms of space was given to the Matthew commentary to allow comprehensive interaction with current critical questions regarding the synoptics, Matthew in particular. The commentaries on Mark and Luke are more in keeping with what one might have expected in a project of this scope: sound and adequate for general expository use. However, one might truly characterize Carson's singularly impressive piece of work as epoch-making. It is written on a grand scale and could have stood on its own as one of the finer commentaries of our time.

Unlike R. Gundry's *Matthew: A Commentary on His Literary and Theological Art* (1982), which it nearly matches in length, the present commentary on Matthew interacts widely with other commentaries and critical articles and serves the useful purpose of exposing the general reader to present trends in scholarship as well as engaging the expert in sharp analysis and often compelling debate. It is also a true commentary in that it exegetes the setting and intent of each unit of text for the doctrinal theologian as well as the preacher, always with a sense of responsibility to the believing community and the inspired text. The author walks with his shoes off, as it were, conveying along with his toughness as an apologist a reverence for holy ground (a point that can also be made of the commentaries by Wessel and Liefeld).

Carson evidences a wide-ranging control of the literature with astute application of critical tools, making reference not only to grammatical and textual points but employing Jewish and Hellenistic background material to illuminate the text, rendering the commentary a veritable gold mine of information for research, preaching and teaching. Nearly every difficult problem one encounters in the interpretation of Matthew is wrestled with, alternative positions are examined, and the author's preferred interpretation is presented only after thorough analysis. This is good exegetical method and compares favorably to the technique used by C. E. B. Cranfield in his commentary on Romans.

As a basis for comparison of the gospels, Markan priority and the two-source hypothesis is adopted by all three authors as the most likely explanation of interdependence, but Carson healthily allows that the hypothesis is almost certainly too simple and does not warrant the degree of certainty assumed by radical redaction critics. Sagely he remarks that rarely are his own solutions offered "so dependent on the two-source hypothesis that a shift in scholarly opinion on the synoptic problem would irreparably damage them. The aim throughout has been to let Matthew speak as a theologian and historian independent of Mark, even if Mark has been one of his important sources" (p. 17). Carson is somewhat inexact as to the date of Matthew's composition but places it loosely in the decade of the 60s, assuming necessarily an earlier date for Mark, though the reader may wonder precisely where in the 60s Matthew might be placed, as Wessel dates Mark between 64 and 70 (p. 608) while Liefeld also vaguely suggests the completion of Luke's two works "somewhere in the decade of A.D. 60-70" (p. 809). One ought to be able to do better than that if Markan priority is assumed, in light of the fact that Luke abruptly concludes Acts probably no later than 63-64. The gospel of Luke would then have to be earlier than Acts, Matthew perhaps earlier, and Mark earliest of all—unless they all arose concurrently from common and complementary sources, in which case the 50s to early 60s would not be out of line. At least on good grounds the authors have resisted the temptation to follow mainline consensus and have refused to place Matthew and Luke in the shadowy depository of the 80s.

Because of the adoption of relatively early datings there is a high regard for historical authenticity in all three commentaries and an accompanying high Christology, reflecting their respect for the genuine voice of Jesus in the complementary portraits provided by the three synoptics. For example, after an extended discussion of the rich young man (Matt 19:16-22) Carson suggests that the young ruler's question was "Good teacher, what must I do to inherit eternal life?" and that Jesus' reply was "Why do you ask *me* questions regard-

ing the good? There is only one who is good, namely God" (p. 423), providing an historical basis broad enough to support reports of both Matthew and Mark-Luke with a reconstruction that illustrates the normal latitude the evangelists show in their reportage. Similarly, in a long excursus on the question of whether the Last Supper was a Passover meal, Carson assumes no discontinuity between the synoptic and Johannine accounts but finds answer in viewing the Johannine meal in light of the entire Passover festival: "It seems, then, that the fourth Gospel can be fairly harmonized with the Synoptics as far as the chronology of the Last Supper and Jesus' death are concerned Therefore we seem to be on safe ground in arguing that the Last Supper was a Passover meal" (p. 532). One has the feeling throughout the Matthew commentary that here is a scholar who knows his material, weighs the options carefully, and offers judicious conclusions as a genuine believer.

Indeed, though written on a less leonine scale the commentaries on Mark and Luke also evince solid scholarship with a believer's regard for the integrity of the text. Wessel is right on target in his discussion of the kingdom of God as it relates to Jesus in Mark 1:15 and to the present and future aspects of the kingdom: "It has drawn near *spatially* (in Jesus' person) and *temporally* (since it ushers in the events of the End)" (p. 625). The whole commentary expounds this principal theme of inaugurated eschatology in the ministry of Jesus and tackles the hard texts with sagacity and Scriptural fidelity. His remarks on Mark 4:11-12 are illustrative of his style: "Furthermore, it is not foreign to the teaching of Scripture that God in his wisdom hardens some (. . . I understand these to be 'persistent unbelievers') in order to carry out his sovereign purposes (cf. Rom. 11:25-32)" (p. 649). Regarding the ending of Mark and whether Mark intended to conclude his portrait at 16:8, Wessel adopts as the best solution the suggestion that Mark did write an ending to his gospel but that it was lost in the early transmission of the text, the endings we now possess being churchly attempts to supply what was obviously lacking (p. 793). While that will not satisfy everyone, it does give evidence of his sensitivity to the concerns of early Christian tradition—a commendable and general characteristic in his commentary on Mark.

Liefeld brings a number of little gems to light in his solid and mature exposition of the gospel of Luke. Commenting on the "suddenly" of Luke 2:13 he remarks: "Malachi had predicted the sudden coming of the Lord to his temple (Mal. 3:1). Now the angels suddenly announce his arrival at Bethlehem" (p. 846). One can envision from this suggestion a whole series of sermons on related passages that describe the sudden and unexpected activity of God. Or take his pithy comment on the meaning of Luke 9:27 ("some who are standing here will not taste death before they see the kingdom of God"), which he sees fulfilled in the transfiguration: "The Transfiguration is, among other things, a preview of the Parousia" (p. 924). Nice. Like the other two commentators in this series, Liefeld works from an exegetically sound base of inaugurated eschatology (see his remarks on Luke 11:14-28), giving the volume as a whole a continuity of perspective on the person of Jesus and his eschatological mission. Good scholarship is evident on every page, but of the three I found his commentary the most pastoral, affording a good balance of perspective among the three.

This is an important commentary, one that every pastor, teacher, school and church should have on their shelves, all the more so because it represents the best of evangelical scholarship and exegetical reflection.

Royce Gordon Gruenler

Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary, S. Hamilton, MA

The Passion of Jesus in the Gospel of Mark. By Donald Senior. Wilmington: Michael Glazier, 1984, 173 pp., \$7.95.

This work is the second in a series of four studies by the author on the passion of Jesus. The study on Matthew has apparently been completed (extra-Markan references favor Mat-

thew); Luke and John have not. The presentation is divided into three parts: a concise discussion of the material prior to the passion narrative; a thorough analysis of the passion narrative proper; a summary of Mark's message—i.e., major themes and implications.

Senior has captured the essence of the Markan narrative. First, Jesus' death is a theophany revealing God's power at work in weakness. The reader is prepared from the beginning to accept what the most intimate characters of the story cannot comprehend and from which the Hellenistic world of Mark's community recoiled. "Jesus is mocked as king and taunted for claiming to be the Christ as he hangs on the cross. But the reader knows that these mockeries are ironically true. The Passion is safe ground for proclaiming Jesus' act of loving service for humanity, the authentic meaning of his Messiahship" (p. 141). The ultimate revelation of God's love is not the miracles and wonders but the bloody and repulsive criminal execution of a Jew on a Roman cross.

Second, "the ultimate purpose of Mark's narrative is to give direction to his church" (p. 148). On this point, too, Senior is undoubtedly correct. He underscores what the original readers could not have missed: (1) Being on the inside does not exclude the possibility of apostasy; (2) being an outsider does not preclude acceptance; (3) the redemptive mission of the Church must mirror the passion of her Lord. The author also correctly notes that in a persecuted community heroics are not always the order of the day; "failure in discipleship was a reality of Mark's church" (p. 153). When read as a statement on apostasy and reconciliation, Mark's gospel assumes added dimensions.

Although the author occasionally refers to a passage that "smacks of the historical Jesus," or to Mark's incorporation of "pre-existing material," his concerns are not historical or form-redactional. Senior accepts "the account Mark has presented to us, lingering over the brush strokes in his bold portrayal of Jesus' passion and attempting to catch the message of his story" (p. 41). In other words, Senior's methodology (unfortunately never clearly stated) is literary-critical, the most recent acceptable way to "read" the gospels.

The Passion will give the nonspecialist an overview of Markan studies today, for Senior is clearly abreast of the issues. For the specialist, however, there is no new ground broken here. This would have been difficult to do given another of the author's stated objectives—namely, to relate Mark to life issues. It is always a tenuous process to apply technical conclusions to pastoral issues. Not that it should not be done! Nevertheless, anyone who has attempted it knows the challenge. The extent to which Senior has succeeded will depend largely on the expectations of the reader. I recommend the book as especially suited for the level and potential interests of seminarians.

Robert W. Herron, Jr.

Institut zur Erforschung des Urchristentums, Tübingen

Jesus in the Gospel of John. By Jacob Jervell. Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1984.

Jacob Jervell is known among NT students for his contribution in the study of Luke (*Luke and the People of God* [1972]). A professor of NT at the University of Oslo, Jervell originally penned the present work in Norwegian (appearing in 1978), and Augsburg has issued a lucid and serviceable translation.

Jesus in the Gospel of John is an introductory volume designed for the beginning student. Following a discussion of the historical peculiarities of John, the author canvasses the prominent theological themes of the gospel. Here Christology, realized eschatology, the nature of history and revelation, the passion of Jesus, the character of the Church, and the Spirit are each given attention. The volume ends with a summary of the probable life-setting of the gospel and a brief bibliography (much of which is in German).

While few new strides in Johannine study are found here, Jervell's descriptive analysis of the theology of John is helpful. But even here one senses that the scope of the book (or

the choices of the author) has omitted material that may be crucial. Hence the section on Christology does not examine the Johannine "*egō eimi*" or the "Son of Man." Some statements make the reader pause and desire fuller explanation: "It is a mistake to believe that the gospel of John makes Jesus into God, or identical with God." "Jesus is a man in the presence of God" (p. 21). Further, the discussion of eschatology provides no room for futurist explanation: "The second coming of Christ occurs immediately after his resurrection. He comes through his Holy Spirit and word" (p. 63). And the section on the Church fails to discuss the sacraments. Nevertheless there are strengths: The chapter on the Spirit is perhaps the best discussion of all.

But is this volume useful for the beginning student? I am reluctant to provide a recommendation. Jervell opens weighty subjects, provides a conclusion, and rarely gives the needed defense and explanation. In short, the aims of the book are too broad for the limited attention given to its subjects.

Those themes for which evangelicals hold a keen interest will inspire strong dissent. For instance, the gospels are declared not to be "historical documents as such" (p. 10). And, Jervell assures us, the fourth gospel is even less historical. He writes: "The author is not an historian . . . what he writes is not an objective presentation of the facts. It is useless for us to apply our sophisticated methods of scientific research as a means of validating the historicity of the events" (p. 15). But is this the only way to view this gospel? The traditional authorship is jettisoned ("No eyewitness could have written this gospel," p. 13)—but for implausible reasons. The hesitant reception of the gospel in the early patristic period does not stem from concerns about authorship (*contra* Jervell), but rather from abuses by assertive gnostic circles (which the author does not even mention).

While NT scholarship has commonly given a critical assessment of John's historicity, Jervell's agenda goes further. Chapter 4 explores the possibility that John may be giving "a radical reinterpretation of the historical Jesus." That is, John is not "historical biography"—and the gospel also possesses no interest in salvation history. The fourth evangelist, according to Jervell, promotes simply the existentialists' "Christ of faith." "Any other Jesus than the Jesus of faith does not exist" (p. 41). In short, the gospel provides us with "eternally valid truths" without any historical moorings. The historical Jesus is of no use to John or to us.

This view of Jesus is hardly new, and one can find more eloquent expressions of it from Bultmann, Käsemann and Mussner. But it remains to be seen how this book advances either this debate or general inquiry into the character and theology of the fourth gospel.

Gary M. Burge

King College, Bristol, TN