

BOOK REVIEWS

Israel's Messiah in the Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls. Edited by Richard S. Hess and M. Daniel Carroll R. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2003, 192 pp., \$17.99 paper.

This book is the publication of the papers delivered at a conference hosted in February 2001 by the Denver Institute for Contextualized Biblical Studies at Denver Seminary. The plan and layout of the book reflect its origin, even to the point of retaining a healthy degree of the usual give and take of such conferences on key issues of biblical theology. The book also reflects the wide spectrum of ideas and approaches represented at the conference. The editors of the book are to be commended for remaining faithful to the conference goals.

The book, as was the conference, is organized around four central papers, each reflecting the topic of “Israel’s Messiah” within its varied contexts: in the OT, in the Dead Sea Scrolls, in the NT, and in Latin American theology. One might think of other equally important contexts, but this selection proves well adapted to the topic and purpose of the conference and carries over nicely into the book. There is, in fact, a good deal of the chemistry of the conference itself preserved in the organization of the book. Each of these topics makes its own important contribution. Also contributing to the value of the book as a whole is the apparently conscious decision not to reedit the papers for publication. For the most part, the papers retain their original colloquial style and collegiality. That spirit of openness, as it turns out, allowed for the airing of a considerable degree of difference between the major papers and their respondents.

In the first section, on the “Messiah in the OT,” the main paper is that of Daniel I. Block. After briefly admonishing those who may, in Block’s opinion, see too much of the Messiah in the OT for their own good, Block turns to the main point of his paper, the question of how the writers (and original readers) of the OT “perceived” the Messiah when they were, in fact, thinking messianically. Though his point is principally to demonstrate that the Messiah in ancient Israel was chiefly understood as a future (Davidic) king, and not, as many have suggested, also a priest and a prophet, his respondents, J. Daniel Hays and M. Daniel Carroll R., eagerly take him to task not only on this main point but also on a number of other important issues (mostly hermeneutical) that call into question the importance, if not the legitimacy, of major parts of his argument. One quickly gets the impression that there is still much work to be done on both sides, and, happily, both sides appear to be genuinely listening.

I am tempted to revive here some of the helpful debate represented by the respondents in this first section. But, alas, the reader will have to explore that on his/her own. I cannot move on, however, without calling specific attention to M. Daniel Carroll R.’s one-page discussion on the Servant Songs of Isaiah (pp. 79–80). I found very helpful the way he has framed the issue, and the sense of what he says about it. His (and Daniel Hays’s and Karen Jobes’s) comments are typical of the high caliber of responses given throughout the book.

The second major section of the book is devoted to Craig A. Evans’s paper on the Messiah in the Dead Sea Scrolls. What can I say other than that here one finds a definitive paper on a central topic by one of the leading scholars in the field? The only missing element, which is not unique to this section, is somewhat of a lack of linkage

between it and the other sections of the book. Although it is not fair simply to ask for more of a good thing, it can be argued that there is a perceptible missing link between Evans's paper on the Dead Sea Scrolls material and the previous section on the Messiah in the OT. But here we are more likely getting into questions, not about the book and the papers, but about the structure of the conference. It would, for example, have been interesting to have planned a brief response to Evans's paper by the OT presenter. Richard S. Hess, in his response to Evans, wisely alludes to some of this material in the earlier sections, but as it is, the reader is for the most part left to himself/herself to tie together the loose ends.

In some respects the third section, Craig L. Blomberg's excellent and important paper on the "Messiah in the New Testament" is, in the case of this book, a missed opportunity. In his opening paragraph, Blomberg states that a biblical-theological "focus on the distinctive contributions of each NT author or corpus to the varied portrait of Jesus" has "been done repeatedly and accurately" and "requires more than one chapter of a book to accomplish in any detail" (p. 111). He thus decides not to do it but, instead, to "tackle" the specific question of whether the Greek word *Christos* is used in the NT as a proper noun or a title. That is quite a scaling down of objectives! Perhaps this is where the strong hand of an editor could have intervened by insisting he stick to the game plan of the book. In any case his conclusion is important, if still very tentative and of consequence to only a relatively small circle of the book's readership. He finds there is no unambiguous evidence to suggest that any of the 531 occurrences of "Christ" in the NT was ever understood as Jesus' last name. His respondent, William W. Klein, applies equal scrutiny to his own 529 occurrences of "Christ," amicably demonstrating along the way several methodological pitfalls in Blomberg's arguments. Both papers, which are of highest quality, should have been published in a NT journal, rather than in this book.

The fourth and final section, devoted to the Messiah in Latin American theology, consists of a paper by Gerardo A. Alfaro Gonzalez and a response by Karen H. Jobes. Gonzalez's paper is an assessment of the work on Jesus' messianism by the Latin American theologian Jon Sobrino, along with some of his own "hermeneutical observations related to the biblical text and our Latin American reality." Gonzalez's hermeneutical observations (pp. 168–69) are extremely insightful and profoundly stated—and they are applicable not only to Latin America. I found myself reading and rereading his comments in the final two pages of his paper.

I must admit, the title of the book, *Israel's Messiah in the Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls*, threw me off. It does not tell the real story of what the book is about. But I also have to admit that if the book had been given an appropriate title, something like *Messiah in Context*, I probably would not have read it and consequently would have missed out on a lively, varied, and insightful discussion.

This volume is to be welcomed as one of a growing number of books demonstrating the various ways evangelicals are currently seeking to establish their identity by means of their central theme, Jesus as Messiah. In addition to being a representative example, it is also exemplary. Much of what is at stake in the broader evangelical position is cast, in this book, in the form of a genuine and insightful dialogue arising out of a sincere desire of the participants to listen and learn from each other. We need more of that. If one were to characterize the volume as a whole, two primary features stand out: (1) the wide variations, not so much in the positions held, as in the approaches recommended for sorting out the details, and (2) the desire and willingness of the participants to listen to each other even though sometimes their criticisms strike home and send them back to the Bible for better answers.

John H. Sailhamer
Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary, Wake Forest, NC

Readings from the Ancient Near East: Primary Sources for Old Testament Study. By Bill T. Arnold and Bryan E. Beyer. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2002, 240 pp., \$21.99.

Arnold and Beyer's *Readings from the Ancient Near East* is the promised supplemental volume to their *Encountering the Old Testament* (JETS 45 [2002] 513–15). This latest in Baker's ongoing *Encountering Biblical Studies* collects 91 of the most significant of the primary source documents from the extra-biblical material into one handy volume.

These are selections from the standard collections (ANET, Roth, Beyerlin, Coogan, Kramer, Grayson, etc.), not new translations. But the arrangement of the pieces in canonical order rather than by category, language, or literary type is perhaps more useful for the intended audience. There are eighteen subsections arranged in four parts: Part 1 Pentateuch including (1) Creation and Flood accounts, (2) Babel, (3) Ancestral Customs, (4) Epic Literature, (5) Covenants and Treaties, (6) Law Codes, and (7) Cultic Texts; Part 2 Historical Books including (8) Royal Records from Mesopotamia, (9) Chronicles and Other Historiographic Lists, (10) Non-Hebrew Monumental Inscriptions, (11) Letters, (12) Other Hebrew Inscriptions; Part 3 Poetic Books including (13) Wisdom Literature, (14) Love Poems, (15) Hymns and Prayers; and Part 4 Prophetic Books including (16) Prophecies, Visions, and Apocalyptic, (17) Divination and Incantation Texts, and (18) Lamentations.

Most of the standard texts are included—Enuma Elish, Atra-khasis, the Baal Cycle, Merikare, Gilgamesh, Sinuhe, Aqhat, Hammurabi's Code, Inscriptions from Tiglath-pileser I and III, Shalmaneser's Black Obelisk, Sargon, Sennacherib, Cyrus, the Merneptah Stele, letters from El-Amarna, Lachish and Arad, the Gezer Calendar, the Siloam Tunnel Inscription, the Babylonian Theodicy, Ptahhotep, Merikare, Man and His God, Amenemope, the Hymn to Aten, as well as numerous other pieces drawn from less available collections.

The selections, for the most part, are reproduced in full, with a brief introduction to each one indicating its place in the historical and geographical contexts. These are useful, but I would like to see some explanatory notes like those in Thomas's *Documents from Old Testament Times* included in any future editions. These texts are difficult enough for undergraduates. They need all the help the teacher and textbook can provide.

The book includes an outline map of the ancient Near East identifying the peoples and the major sites. There are also about 20 photographs that do not reproduce very well on the soft paper. A dozen of these are pictures of the tablets or other artifacts. The balance are primarily of sites.

This new volume nicely complements their previous book.

G. Lloyd Carr
Gordon College, Wenham, MA

Introducing Biblical Hebrew. By Allen P. Ross. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2001, 565 pp., \$39.99.

The Preface to *Introducing Biblical Hebrew (IBH)* states: "The basic material of the grammar has been compiled with consistent references to and comparison with the standard works on the subject" (p. 9). This endeavor leads Ross to claim "a proven system of parsing verbs" in addition to an "intensive inductive review based on portions of Scripture" (p. 9). Ross has geared the grammar for "the development of the exegetical and critical study of the text of Scripture" and maintains the discussion is "much more than a beginning Hebrew grammar" (p. 9).

The 54 lessons cover three sections (Part 1: “Signs and Sounds,” Part 2: “Forms and Meanings,” Part 3: “Texts and Contexts”). The foundational elements of vowels, accents, and guttural letters are followed by the bulk of the lessons that comprise Part 2. Here Ross uses a *deductive* approach to cover the standard grammar of both the regular and irregular verbs. *IBH* follows *JBL* transliteration of consonants, only departing in minor areas. Part 3 addresses the Critical Apparatus, various noun patterns, and exposure to the Ancient Versions. To apply the grammar learned, Part 3 *inductively* takes the student through select BHS texts. A final Part 4 (pp. 425–557) is “Study Aids,” containing Lesson Reviews, Hebrew-English Glossary, paradigms, a list of accents, and a Subject Index.

In many chapters *IBH* exposes the student to rudimentary syntax related to a given grammatical point. Often included are brief overviews of translation values germane to that discussion (e.g. the construct, pp. 104–5). Footnotes are used for more technical comments. Before each exercise is a list of vocabulary divided between verbs, nouns, and “other forms.”

Most of the exercises begin with composition. Starting with chap. 25, exercises include portions from BHS. With the reduction of programmed sentences, the inductive analysis culminates with Genesis 12–15 and 2–3. These two portions are analyzed in 14 sections, stressing forms and syntactical constructions.

The “weak” verbs start with chap. 32, which in many ways is the pedagogical halfway-point of the grammar. At this juncture all seven major stems have been introduced in their regular forms.

The “Mechanical Parsing Method” (pp. 222–25) may be the most original element in *IBH*. This method divides the verbal system into five categories and identifies these verbal forms through a taxonomy of A, I, and U-Class vowels. This is intended to help students learn the dialectical variants faced in the Hebrew text. Since a greater concept of structure results when students are trained to think through vowel classes, the morphological peculiarities become more manageable.

Following the last chapter is a section entitled “Lesson Reviews” (pp. 425–78) that summarizes the essence of each chapter (i.e. “Lesson at a Glance”). The concluding Subject Index is fairly extensive.

Several strengths of this grammar are worth noting. First, Ross is not trying to spawn a new approach. The essence of *IBH* has been tested for over two decades in the “living laboratory.” So, while the packaging is “fresh,” the grammatical essence stands proven.

Second, the layout is pedagogically intentional and consistent—no small achievement when *IBH* covers 54 lessons! In addition, the 53 pages of concise “Lesson Reviews” comprise a valuable tool for the student. The numerical method of outlining expedites referencing with the Subject Index. The explanations in *IBH* move logically from the known to the unknown and from regular to irregular forms.

Third, the fonts used for both Hebrew and English are appropriate and not distracting. *IBH* has even included the primary accents throughout the sentences, including the programmed ones. The exercises use superscript letters as footnotes for specific observations. The English text is nicely spaced, with margins wide enough for the ambitious teacher and note-taker.

Fourth, the student is challenged with full parsing of verb forms in the exercises beginning with chap. 17 (the Imperfect). This maximizes parsing proficiency since the student is asked to parse in context and not in abstraction.

Fifth, the format used for each lesson is flexible enough for the teacher to supplement or diverge from as necessary. Exercises, in particular, are not so integrated with “contingent aids” so as to force the user to adopt the book in its entirety or use little at all. *IBH* is minimally stipulating, working as an aid to the teaching process, not commandeering the teacher’s role.

Sixth, Ross has done a commendable job of combining inductive and deductive approaches. A balance is struck between the immediate psychological satisfaction of the student's contact with the Hebrew text and the controlled saturation that results over time with programmed sentences. Deduction communicates the whole by teaching students the function of the parts within a larger scheme. *IBH* uses time-efficient deduction to guide the student through the critical mass of the grammar. At the same time it concludes with the positive psychology that a student cannot obtain from the teacher's analysis alone.

Though necessarily selective, some weaknesses and recommendations must be noted. First, 54 lessons are certainly a *tour de force*, possibly an unwieldy amount to cover. As such, it would be helpful to include occasional statements regarding what is *most* important for the overwhelmed student struggling to prioritize information. Similarly, switching to the smaller font for the numerous "Review of Grammar and Syntax" sections (chaps. 41–54) is awkward. If this is an integral part, what does the font of the footnotes communicate? Some visual icon(s) could point to what needs greater focus, especially since Ross routinely discusses finer points of morphology.

Second, while the subject index is helpful, it could be divided further. Other entries could include biblical references, abbreviated *sigla*, etc. The two excurses ("Writing the Consonants," p. 27; "The Tetragrammaton," pp. 60–61) would be better accessed in the table of contents. Similarly, other appendices could include vocabulary lists (given 39 units), glossary, basic exegetical tools, etc. While some of these may go "over the top" of some students, having no discussion on verbal aspect or the acknowledgment of discourse linguistic terminology does this generation of students a disfavor (cf. "perfective," "imperfective"; "completeness," "completedness" discussion in Waltke-O'Connor, 30.1d; 31.1.2a; pp. 147–48; Joüon, p. 356f). The qualification of "imperfect in a linguistic sense" is an inadequate acknowledgment of this debate and its implications—what does "linguistic" mean?

Third, while there is reference to recent texts such as that of K. Jobes and M. Silva (p. 312 n. 2), this and others on textual criticism (pp. 311–12 n. 1) deserve more formal discussion in light of the stated goal of preparing students for "exegetical and critical study of the text of Scripture" (p. 9). A brief bibliography could include reference grammars, modern lexica, concordances, syntax, theological dictionaries, and some quality software programs. The omission of such a bibliography is disappointing.

Fourth, given the 39 exercises that include choice composition and parsing, some sort of "answer key" seems appropriate for efficient use.

Fifth, some statement could be given regarding how the "Lesson at a Glance" could most effectively be used.

While some of these "weaknesses" represent the recommendations of this reviewer, they in no way discount the strengths of the grammar—it does deliver what is promised. *IBH* has set itself apart as an in-depth grammar, yet allows the teacher's role to be reemphasized.

Andrew J. Schmutzer
Moody Bible Institute, Chicago, IL

Basics of Biblical Hebrew. By Gary D. Pratico and Miles V. Van Pelt. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2001, vii + 476 pp., \$39.99.

Basics of Biblical Hebrew (BBH) is the counterpart to Zondervan's *Basics of Biblical Greek* by William D. Mounce. *BBH* also comes with a workbook and interactive CD-ROM. Written with the beginning student in mind, the authors have intentionally

“minimized the introduction of issues related to the historical development of the language or the area of comparative Semitic philology” (p. ix) in an attempt to distill the “basics” of phonology, morphology, and syntax for the student in ministry training.

The grammar contains 36 chapters divided into 5 sections: Writing (pp. 1–27), Nouns and Nominals (pp. 28–120), Verbs and the Qal Stem (pp. 121–85), Introduction to the Derived Stems (pp. 286–401), and Reading and Studying Your Bible (pp. 402–13). It concludes with 5 appendices: paradigms, diagnostic charts, endings on III-7 verbs, Hebrew-English lexicon, and subject index (pp. 416–76).

Using the numerical system of outlining, the typical chapter consists of 8–10 paragraphs (10+ pp.), some illustrative charts, a summary that bullets the key points of the chapter, a vocabulary list, a “biblical-theological reflection” (see “Table of Insights,” xii–xiii), and a final paragraph of Advanced Information (21 entries) that “is not required but often helpful and interesting” (p. 7 n. 1).

Pratico and Van Pelt have gone beyond the collective “tools” of a grammar, workbook, and CD; their pedagogical sensitivity clearly stands out in the way this material has been structured. It is this sustained didactic concern for the student that is the greatest strength of *BBH*. To my knowledge, no other Hebrew grammar has assembled this “tool set” and achieved this kind of educational intensity. Moreover, these tools interface well, enabling disciplined students to instruct themselves. The workbook contains a helpful variety of exercises and students are encouraged to “treat the exercises like a quiz” (p. 5). The diagnostic indicators in the CD are effectively accentuated by the colored vowels and consonants. Some sentences for translation are programmed and at times the student is directed to consult an English translation. The charts and answer keys can be printed for convenience.

Among other strengths, the grammar regularly cites statistical information from Accordance (Module HMT-T) to illustrate the significance or distribution of a given form. With helpful charts and constant diagnostic indicators, the grammar’s layout is designed to alleviate the need to memorize paradigms beyond the Qal by highlighting recurring structural patterns.

Reading through the chapters one senses an empathetic tone that anticipates the needs of the Hebrew neophyte: asking the student to “be patient” learning the vowels (p. 9), stipulating that the Qal perfect endings *must* be memorized (p. 139), and acknowledging that a student might be feeling “a bit overwhelmed” (p. 159). In this way, the text reads more like a tutor than a standard grammar, not assuming the student understands grammatical terms and concepts. Warning students that they should not proceed to the weak verb until the strong has been mastered (p. 150) is valuable guidance and such instruction is given often enough. Using both inductive and deductive approaches, the Qal stem is covered first and then the “derived stems” are addressed. Footnotes are used for specific information.

However, the grammar’s pedagogical forte is also its liability. The desire of the authors to provide a “language-accessible” grammar for the beginning student has also resulted in downplaying the historical foundation of biblical Hebrew. One unfortunate consequence of oversimplification is that the *mindset* of the language is not adequately communicated to the student.

While the authors acknowledge the discussion, the issue of the *wayyiqtol* in *BBH* illustrates this danger of oversimplification. The terminology of *converted imperfect* (p. 192) is outdated and inappropriate for a grammar attempting to be “groundbreaking” (see chap. 17, “Waw Conversive”). The authors state, “Despite its inadequacies, the terminology is descriptive for the beginning student and represents a helpful point of departure for the study of these very important but complex concepts” (p. 192 n. 1). But one need not be linguistically bound to be linguistically accurate. Verbal aspect is also important and complex, but it is discussed for the beginner (pp. 128–31, §12.11).

Placing pragmatic acquisition over accuracy distorts the balance between function and form. Both comparative Semitic and morphological studies of recent decades have shown that the preterite (or short prefixed form) is not an imperfect, but the retention of an historical verbal tense marked by the *waw* (see W. Randall Garr's comments on this construction in his introductory essay, "Driver's Treatise and the Study of Hebrew," in *A Treatise on the Use of the Tenses in Hebrew and Some Other Syntactical Questions*, by S. R. Driver [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998; 1874], lxxv–lxxxiii). Well established, then, through genres, discourse functions, and distinct conjugations, even beginning students should be taught this. However, in *BBH* the preterite has lost its independent status, is not adequately parsed (pp. 202, §17.8), does not fall under the author's *eight* stipulated conjugations (p. 137), and is even omitted from the paradigms (pp. 416–17).

Beyond this some minor criticisms and recommendations can be pointed out. Regarding vocabulary, it would be helpful to have some exposure to verbs before chapter 12; 177 nouns alone could be counter-productive. In addition, having the vocabulary keyed to the "lexicon" would be more useful for the student than listing a word's cognate frequency. Regarding paradigms, the omission of the cohortative and jussive from the paradigms (pp. 416–17) is complicating for the teacher and frustrating for the student. Regarding terminology, using "theme vowel" for the 2nd root radical vowel instead of "stem vowel" might alleviate some confusion since "stem" is also used for derived conjugations (Qal, etc.) and nouns from roots. Similarly, it would be more accurate to use "complete" for the perfect rather than "completed" (p. 129), just as "incomplete" is used for the "imperfect." Regarding stem functions, the Piel "iterative" and the more archaic "intensive" (pp. 307–8) would be better served under "pluralitive," addressing recurring action and multiple objects. Regarding transliteration, *BBH* adheres to *JBL* transliteration, though not for the fricatives and vowel names. Finally, in his "biblical-theological reflection" (pp. 284–85), Gordon Hugenberger unnecessarily takes a satirical interpretation of Prov 22:6, straining the wisdom genre that operates from the descriptive rule, not the exception. The paths of the wise and the fool are the sole options. The proverb envisions a youth "dedicated" (cf. 1 Kgs 8:63; *HALOT* 1:334) to the Lord by the parents in the formative years with an expected consequence of enduring righteousness. In this context, "his way" is the moral life he is obligated to achieve.

Many students now have a grammar designed for them. Given its parameters, *BBH* succeeds in "pitching to the beginner," but this comes at a cost. Issues of genre, clauses, accents, textual criticism, and subjects of discourse will need greater definition and coverage in the following year's study. *BBH* is possibly the best grammar available for students weak in principal grammatical categories, and for graduate programs seeking more student initiative.

Andrew J. Schmutzer
Moody Bible Institute, Chicago, IL

A Scripture Index to Charlesworth's The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha. By Steve Delamarter. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002, viii + 99 pp., \$24.95.

This handy volume is a welcome tool for study in James H. Charlesworth's *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (2 vols.; New York: Doubleday, 1983, 1985 [= *OTP*]). It indexes the 7,897 Scripture references in the margins and footnotes to both *OTP* volumes. A short preface (vii–viii) by the author recounts the history of the project, while an essay by James H. Charlesworth, "Biblical Stories and Quotations Reflected and Even Adumbrated in the Old Testament Pseudepigrapha" (pp. 1–6), briefly discusses

the relation of Scripture to his *OTP* corpus and methods employed by editors of *OTP* entries of citing them. Charlesworth's essay is followed by an "Introduction" (pp. 7–10) by Delamarter in which he summarizes the methods used in compiling the *Index*.

The *Index* itself is divided into two sections. The first section (pp. 11–51) is a full index for the first volume of *OTP* and the second section (pp. 52–99) for the second volume. That means that, though the *OTP* volumes are fully indexed, the indices are not collated (p. 9). Like the Charlesworth volumes, the *Index* is a hard-cover cloth volume of identical dimensions (aside from thickness) and similar color. The price, however, is a bit excessive for an index volume. The abbreviations, naturally, are identical to those employed in the *OTP* volumes.

A significant weakness of this *Index* is that it only references "the Protestant scriptures contained in the footnotes and in the margins of the *OTP*" (p. 7) and *not* the other texts found therein. Therefore, readers wanting to compare *T. Levi* 8 with *Jub.* 32, which are referenced in the *OTP* margins, will find no help from this volume. One wonders why Delamarter did not go "all the way" and include *all* references and not just canonical Scripture. Also, where a Scripture is referenced twice for the same text, Delamarter has noted it only once in the index. Simply noting the duplication with "(2x)" would have made it more complete. A final suggestion is that the *Index* should include volume and page numbers in its references to the *OTP*, as finding a specific text citation in those volumes can at times be cumbersome.

A note of caution is advised in using the *Index*. As Delamarter indicates (pp. 7–8), marginal citations occurring on a line in the *OTP* volumes frequently occur where one verse ends and another begins, thus leaving ambiguity as to which verse the citation refers. As a convention, Delamarter indexes the citation with the second verse which may at times be inaccurate. Users of the *Index* should look up the references; blindly citing cross references based on the *Index* itself is ill-advised.

Scripture citations in the *OTP* volumes are notoriously subjective, and though they provide a useful orientation to texts cited they should by no means be considered complete. While the present volume is a valuable tool, one can only hope it will not further solidify the near canonical status the texts in Charlesworth's *OTP* have already achieved. For a helpful essay pertaining to the use of caution in the place of "Pseudepigrapha" in NT interpretation, see Robert A. Kraft, "The Pseudepigrapha in Christianity," in *Tracing the Threads: Studies in the Vitality of Jewish Pseudepigrapha* (ed. J. C. Reeves; SBLEJL 6; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1994) 55–86. For comments particularly on the texts of the Charlesworth volumes, see Richard Bauckham, "The Apocalypses in the New Pseudepigrapha," *JSNT* 26 (1986) 97–117. Readers should note that an additional corpus of "Pseudepigrapha" is being edited for publication by Richard Bauckham and James R. Davila.

Though there is simply no substitute for knowing Scripture well and reading through the *OTP* volumes carefully, Delamarter's *Index* is a welcome and valuable tool for work in the fascinating field of Scripture in the Pseudepigrapha.

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

Deuteronomy. By Walter Brueggemann. Abingdon Old Testament Commentaries. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 2001, 306 pp., \$34.00 paper.

The AOTC series, under the general editorship of Patrick Miller, intends to provide a "compact critical commentary for theological students and pastors" that can also bene-

fit upper-level college and university students and others who teach in a congregational setting (p. 9). Each volume provides a brief introduction to the biblical book studied and commentary divided into three forms of analysis—literary, exegetical, and theological/ethical. This volume ends with an eight page bibliography and a subject/author index.

Brueggemann's introductory notes trace the development of the three major speeches of Deuteronomy. In his reconstruction, the middle speech (4:44–29:1) emerged in the eighth or seventh century BC as a foil to Judah's attempted covenantal agreements with Assyria, and reflected in vocabulary and form the treaties of that period. The first and third speeches (1:1–4:40; 29:2–32:47) originated in the sixth century BC and were directed to the exilic community. The total work, then, served to encourage a community out of the land regarding the possibility of a return, styled in a fictive account of an earlier entrance into the land. The material was then reused by the Ezra movement as the book took on its canonical shape and established "Judaism as a people of the Torah" (p. 20). For me, the scholarship of this section would have been strengthened if Brueggemann had at least mentioned that Deuteronomy shows some parallels with earlier Hittite treaty documents.

Regarding Deuteronomy's development, Brueggemann sees a process of the re-interpretation of earlier material for use by subsequent generations (e.g. Deuteronomy as a "second law" is not the same as that of Sinai, p. 22). The modern interpreter participates in this same process. For Brueggemann, "In the hands of imaginative, faithful interpreters, the text always 'means again' and 'means differently'" (p. 23). This notion of an ongoing, interpretative process might explain Brueggemann's ability to see in the "call for obedience in order to receive blessings in the land" passage of Deuteronomy 11 a natural opening for a discussion of the dangers of agribusiness that drains the land of its productivity, or of the denuding of the South American rain forests to the detriment of the world's climate (p. 140).

Following the form of the Abingdon series, Brueggemann provides introductory structural observations. These occasionally go beyond a simple outline of the paragraphs. The exegetical sections are not technical, but do provide some helpful observations. The theological and ethical section is sometimes suggestive only, especially in the discussions after Deuteronomy 11 where the pace of the comments picks up. The discussion of Deuteronomy 1–11 occupies almost one-half of the book.

In his theological and ethical comments, Brueggemann displays his method and advances his concerns. Some of his observations illustrate the principle of a text that "means again." For example, the laws given to Israel show that the community of faith is called to display a "contrast society," with its rejection of the idolatry of Canaan. Brueggemann's observation that this speaks again today against an embracing of modern icons in a commercialized society (pp. 59–62) is, I think, quite helpful. Today we sometimes worship things rather than God. Brueggemann's assessment that Commands 6–9 reveal there are no autonomous agents and that they show God's governance over every area of life hits a current target.

But according to Brueggemann, in some cases the text "means differently" for us. Deuteronomy's laws are not to be interpreted along the lines of a "settled literalism" (p. 23). So, for example, this giving of the "second law" validates a process that favors a liberal interpretation in American constitutional law, speaking against a "strict constructionism" (pp. 79–80). Laws regarding "life for life" capital punishment give rise to a "bloodthirsty passion for capital punishment in the United States" (p. 206). Laws concerning things under the ban are "troublesome" for our pluralistic society (p. 101).

The nasty snag, however, in an interpretative process that is at once "faithful" and then "imaginative" is, "By what criterion does one decide when something means again or means differently?" Brueggemann shows a process that would leave the text at the mercy of the interpreter's perspective on the world; what does not fit might be ignored.

Brueggemann is always worth reading. He often states his interpretations in fresh language showing keen insight. For me he opens avenues of application in the psychological, social, and political implications of Scripture I often do not see at first. One weakness of the commentary is that there are few examples of application for the workings of the present day Church as a corporate community of faith. Certainly, for example, the texts that speak of “we versus them” have something to say about doctrinal purity in the organized Church.

Chip McDaniel

Columbia Biblical Seminary, Columbia, SC

Deuteronomy 1:1–21:9. By Duane L. Christensen. WBC 6A. Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 2001, cxii + 458 pp., \$34.99; *Deuteronomy 21:10–34:12*. By Duane L. Christensen. WBC 6B. Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 2002, li + 456 pp., \$39.99.

The initial issuance of this work appeared in 1991 with the publication of just Deuteronomy 1–11 as Volume 6A. Subsequently the publisher elected to undertake a greatly expanded section edition that brought the first up to date and added to it the remaining text of Deuteronomy up to 21:9. In the following year Volume 6B appeared, completing the whole book of Deuteronomy.

Readers familiar with the 1991 edition are well aware of Christensen’s approach, one that features—indeed, is dominated by—exhaustive prosodic analysis of the Hebrew text at both a macro- and micro-analytical level. The result is a prodigious interaction with Deuteronomy as literature that is unequaled in the history of Deuteronomy scholarship. Having said that, it remains to be seen (1) whether or not the scrutiny of the text offered here conforms to Deuteronomy’s intended reality; (2) if the exegetical process is furthered by this kind of approach; and (3) what kind of theological insight and justification are apparent as a result of the literary-analytical method that everywhere informs the work.

Before these matters and others are addressed it is important to draw attention to the lengthy introductions to both volumes (112 and 51 pages respectively). Here Christensen, in line with the practice of the Word Biblical Commentary in general, provides exhaustive bibliographies of commentaries on Deuteronomy as well as related studies; an introduction to the biblical book that includes attention to text criticism, a review of critical research, and a detailed outline of the book; and several excursions that should not be overlooked if one hopes to understand Christensen’s overall approach. These address (1) law, poetry, and music in ancient Israel; (2) Deuteronomy in the canonical process; (3) the triennial cycle of Torah readings in Palestinian Judaism; (4) the *Numeruswechsel* (alternation of second person singular and plural forms) in Deuteronomy; (5) Deuteronomy as a numerical composition; (6) travel notices in Deuteronomy 1–3 and 31–34; and (7) Holy War as celebrated event in ancient Israel. Most pertinent to Christensen’s unique slant are points (1) and (3) above. Since (1) is especially crucial to his whole enterprise it deserves some attention at the outset.

As to the matter of poetry and music, Christensen goes so far as to suggest that the entire book of Deuteronomy is poetic in form and was sung on the occasion of the Feast of Booths (Deut 31:9). His major support for this contention is the antiquity of the Masoretic accentual system, which, he maintains, antedated the period of the Masoretes by a millennium or more (p. lxxxi). He adds to this his observations about the length of individual lines (mora count) and the distribution of accentual stress units as marked by disjunctive accents. He concludes that “the Hebrew text in its present form . . . is a

musical composition" (p. lxxxv), "poetry in the broadest sense" (p. lxxxvi). Beyond this, Christensen proposes that the concentric structural features of the book also abet its poetic character since, as an epic, such structure lends itself to the liturgical use for which the book had been composed.

While it is refreshing to engage a work that takes seriously the unity of the composition of Deuteronomy in its earliest stages and that also makes a case for even such details as phonetically short or long syllables (i.e. *morae*) being original to the text, the historical evidence for the latter is wholly lacking. Appeal to the work of Suzanne Hait-Vantoura (*The Music of the Bible Revealed* [Berkeley: BIBAL, 1990]) counts for little since she makes only the case for the Masoretic accents as indicators of musical notation. This has little or nothing to do with length of tonality. In the end Christensen must depend on the Masoretic tradition of long and short vowels, a tradition that cannot be shown to antedate the Christian era. In fact, the only scholar he cites is J. Kurylowicz (*Studies in Semitic Grammar*, 1973) whose contribution was limited to a study of the distribution of accentual stress units. By setting his own system of *morae* count alongside Kurylowicz's syntactic accentual method Christensen has found they complement each other. The question is whether it is a natural, self-evident complementation or one contrived to make a case.

Lest it appear that this critique of Christensen's method seem overly lengthy and disproportionate to other aspects of his work, one should note his own assessment of its significance: "The system of counting *morae* is foundational to the present analysis of the Hebrew text of Deuteronomy. It is by this means that the prosodic units were determined as well as the boundaries between them. [*Morae* counting and the accentual analysis of Kurylowicz] constitute a system that is the basis of a structural analysis of the entire book of Deuteronomy" (p. lxxxiii). One can see how the shape of Christensen's exegesis and even his theology are determined by the structure—no matter how convincing it might be—that he imposes on the text.

Having said that, these volumes offer a gold mine of literary ways of looking at texts that have eluded previous generations of scholars. A few examples must suffice. The Decalogue of 5:6–21 is enveloped by two parallel accounts of Yahweh's covenant and theophany (5:1–5 and 5:22) and the whole is further encased in a fitting introduction (4:44–49) and conclusion (5:23–6:3). This yields an axis in a chiasmic structure centered on 5:15—remember your deliverance from slavery in Egypt (p. 107). This is clearly a central theme in this rendition of the Decalogue, one evident from the literary pattern of the pericope itself.

Another example is Deut 11:10–25 (correct from 10:10–25, p. 212). By noting the occurrence of *'eres* (land) nine times in the passage, Christensen finds the focus in the fifth unit—"It is a land that YHWH cares for" (p. 211). From another angle, and by use of a so-called "menorah" (i.e. seven-branched) pattern, the passage yields another center—"keep 'these my words' before you and do not serve other gods" (p. 212). In the one case the emphasis is on the land as a fulfillment of promise and in the other it is the basis on which the promise can come to pass, namely, by obedience to the covenant requirements. The "menorah pattern" (a term originating with C. J. Labuschagne) receives attention in a number of other places as well (cf. 1:1–6a; 1:32–2:1; 2:2–12; 2:13–25, etc.). In fact, Christensen argues the whole book is structured in terms of a six-branched candelabrum with the central post being the law codes themselves (chaps. 12–26). A particularly apt connotation of the term "menorah pattern" is its use in outlining the book in terms of the lectionary cycle of weekly readings from the Torah (p. xciv).

Christensen's preoccupation with pattern and form stultifies his exposition and theological synthesis to some extent. On the other hand, he is aware of and makes use of a rich secondary literature, especially when dealing with matters of historical and cultural interest. This enhances the value of the rather brief and even superficial

treatment of texts that deserve more full attention in a work of this length and helps to offset that deficiency. But this is not enough to justify the skimpy treatment of such pivotal and theologically rich texts as 6:4–5, the so-called Shema. In barely two pages this greatest of the commandments is passed over with virtually no recognition of its centrality to the whole purpose and message not only of the book of Deuteronomy but of the entire OT. Happily this is not the case with the Decalogue. Here Christensen provides an unusually rich and insightful penetration of the corpus as a whole and all of its parts. Even here, however, he fails to address such matters as the combining of the first two commandments into one and the dividing of the tenth into two in line with certain Jewish and Christian traditions.

On balance, this impressive work exhibits a masterful command of the essence of Deuteronomy and all the pertinent literature relative to it. Despite its imbalance in favor of form and style over detailed exegesis and synthetic theology it is a stimulating and provocative approach to Deuteronomy, arguably the key text for understanding the central message of divine revelation. Serious students of the Bible will do well to access and make regular use of this asset.

Eugene H. Merrill
Dallas Theological Seminary, Dallas, TX

1 Enoch 1: A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch Chapters 1–36; 81–108. By George W. E. Nickelsburg. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2001, xxxviii + 617 pp., \$58.00.

The first installment of George W. E. Nickelsburg's long-awaited commentary on *1 Enoch* represents the most comprehensive treatment of this important pseudepigraphic writing since the work of R. H. Charles in the early decades of the last century. Nickelsburg has already produced a substantial body of scholarship on *1 Enoch*, and the present volume constitutes a rich archive of study, reflection, and erudition from one of the foremost scholars of Second Temple Judaism living today. The distinctive features and format of the Hermeneia series are effectively utilized in this volume and include an extensive introduction, a fresh translation, a full text-critical treatment of each passage, detailed commentary, and a complete bibliography. In keeping with the author's literary-compositional analysis, *1 Enoch 1* treats The Book of Watchers (1–36), The Two Dream Visions (83–90), The Testamentary Narrative (81:1–82:3), The Epistle of Enoch (92–105), The Noahic Birth Narrative (106–7), and other literary fragments. The Parables and the Astronomical Book will be covered in volume 2, which will be completed with James VanderKam. Nickelsburg also supplies a generous assortment of excursuses on significant topics such as the watchers, Jewish prayers, sacred geography, angelic mediators, and even "The Image of the Plant in Israelite Literature."

The introduction lays out in considerable detail the textual and theoretical groundwork for the commentary and includes a helpful synopsis of the corpus as a whole. In section 3 of the introduction Nickelsburg outlines his understanding of the evolution of the composite document we call *1 Enoch* and offers his rationale for classifying this work as a testament rather than an apocalypse. Sections 4 and 5 present the worldview and theology of the Enochic literature, while section 5 identifies the primary social and historical tributaries that give rise to these variegated Enochic traditions. More substantive is the *Wirkungsgeschichte* presented in section 7, in which Nickelsburg details the history of influence of *1 Enoch* in Judaism and Christianity. While not all of his alleged allusions are compelling, and many, such as the son of man sayings, might be more convincingly traced to Daniel or Ezekiel, it remains true that *1 Enoch* was widely

read in the early centuries and explicitly quoted by at least one biblical author (Jude 14–15). The fact that it has retained authoritative status in segments of the Ethiopian church is attestation of its ancient and contemporary significance. Nickelsburg's introduction concludes with a summary of *1 Enoch* in current research and a brief prospectus for further study (section 8).

The commentary proper, as one would expect, is comprehensive and detailed. Nickelsburg's sensitivity to the literary dimensions of the text is evident on a number of levels. Poetic material is set off through indentation, and the author provides paragraph and sectional titles throughout. This serves to guide and orient the reader and is a significant improvement over Black's 1985 commentary. The introduction to each segment includes a discussion of the various forms and genres in use, which Nickelsburg exploits fully in his interpretive and exegetical comments. Yet Nickelsburg's literary analysis will no doubt be seriously scrutinized, particularly in regard to his complex reconstruction of the formation of the Enochic corpus and in his genre classification of *1 Enoch* as a testament. A full statement of Nickelsburg's view on the genesis of *1 Enoch* is not possible here and indeed requires several elaborations in the commentary itself (pp. 22–26, 169–70, 291–92, 334–37, 414, 421–22, 426). Nickelsburg eschews (rightly, in my view) the hypothesis of Milik (1976) that the present form of *1 Enoch* represents a deliberate redactional attempt to replicate the fivefold structure of the books of Moses—an Enochic Pentateuch, so to speak. While appealing in some respects, this theory is far too convenient and contrived to account for the complexities of the textual tradition. Yet Nickelsburg's account is equally strained in that his elaborate reconstruction and restoration of the text rests on such a ponderous number of conjectures and assumptions that it appears to be neither verifiable nor falsifiable. Nickelsburg's conclusions are certainly plausible, well informed, and well articulated, but the convoluted nature of much of this reconstruction left me wondering whether the murky depths of the historical and textual data can ever be fully plumbed.

Intricately connected to Nickelsburg's textual assessment is his genre classification for this material as a testament. According to Nickelsburg, the pre-final form of *1 Enoch* was essentially testamentary in character, which the later additions of the Astronomical Book and the Parables obscured. More typically, of course, *1 Enoch* is characterized as an apocalypse, and certainly much of chaps. 1–36, 83–90, 91, 92–95 is revelatory-apocalyptic in content and tone. Given the composite nature of this document, and the manifest diversity of the constituent parts, it is perhaps unnecessary to argue for one overall classification for the present form of text. Yet if I were forced to choose between apocalyptic or testamentary, the preponderance of evidence would incline me decisively toward designating *1 Enoch* as an apocalypse. The apocalyptic genre is often an admixture of historical reviews, heavenly journeys, revealed mysteries, and other intrusions, including testamentary fragments (e.g. *Jub.* 22), and the evidence put forward by Nickelsburg for his redesignation is not entirely compelling.

Nickelsburg's treatment of the rebellion of the Watchers (*1 Enoch* 6–11) provides a good specimen for more detailed examination in that it is crucial to the Enochic tradition and Second Temple Jewish literature generally, and also fundamental to the worldview of NT writers. Nickelsburg begins his discussion with a useful outline of these chapters and includes in brackets material that he believes is "secondary to the earliest recoverable form of the myth" (p. 165). Nickelsburg's determination of what constitutes a later accretion is not based on text-critical evidence but on what he deems to interrupt the flow of thought and appears to be a narrative intrusion. I often found myself wanting more justification for these judgments, especially where alleged seams in the storyline were difficult to discern (e.g. 7:1; 8:1–3). Nickelsburg carefully compares the material in *1 Enoch* with Genesis 6, exploring verbal and conceptual correspondences, and rejects

the odd view of Milik that Genesis is dependent on *1 Enoch*. Observing that the message of the Enochic author-compiler is to be found in his modifications and transformations to Genesis, Nickelsburg suggests that the material has been shaped to address the wars of the Diadochi, Alexander's successors. Nickelsburg makes a number of interesting connections between the text and the assumed historical events, and the suggested setting does allow the Enochic material to be heard with more urgency and less abstraction. Such identifications, however, are notoriously difficult, and the encoded figures could easily be ciphers for other historical personages, which Nickelsburg himself acknowledges. Still, the author's bold suggestions and imaginative reconstructions underscore the important point that this literature did not emerge in a historical vacuum, and they equally stress the need for good historiography.

Nickelsburg's excellent commentary will prove invaluable for students of Second Temple Judaism and should be required reading for students of apocalyptic literature. Within the Enochic corpus we find references to a preexistent messianic figure, the "son of man," descriptions of heavenly ascents similar to those of Paul (2 Corinthians 12) and John (Revelation 4), depictions of an impending "new creation" (cf. Gal 6:15; Rev 21:1–5), and other matters that considerably illuminate facets of the NT. George W. E. Nickelsburg has produced the definitive treatment of this important pseudepigraphic writing, and one can only hope that volume 2 will shortly follow.

Moyer Hubbard
Talbot School of Theology, La Mirada, CA

Jesus and Israel's Tradition of Judgement and Restoration. By Steven M. Bryan. SNTSMS 117. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002, xv + 278 pp., \$60.00.

Jesus and Israel's Traditions of Judgement and Restoration is a work that began as a Ph.D. thesis for the author's study at Cambridge University. Dr. Bryan is now Dean of Studies and Instructor of New Testament at the Ethiopian Graduate School of Theology where he has been involved in theological education since 1992.

This work attempts to break new ground in the often asked question of the degree to which Jesus' eschatology can be considered "realized." Bryan does this by considering "Jesus' expectations regarding key constitutional features of the eschaton: the shape of the people of God, purity, Land and Temple" (p. i). The work is divided into seven chapters. Following the introduction, Bryan attempts to examine the eschatological views of Jesus in terms of national restoration, the Scriptures of Israel, the restoration traditions of Israel, the purity of Israel, and the eschatological temple.

Bryan begins with two "guiding principles." These are that Jesus must be seen within first-century Palestinian Judaism (hardly controversial at this stage in Jesus research) and that the intentions of Jesus are substantially accessible (more controversial, though here Bryan cites the seminal *The Aims of Jesus* by Meyer). After setting out these principles Bryan attempts to answer the question "What were Jesus' intentions in relation to key constitutional features of the eschaton as anticipated by Jewish restorationism?" (p. 3).

N. T. Wright has argued strongly that Jesus' mission was to bring restoration to the new Israel. This restoration was, according to Wright, the "Victory of God." Bryan argues that while Wright is essentially correct in many ways, he has allowed the other half of Jesus' message (i.e. judgment) to recede almost completely (p. 4). Jesus, Bryan argues, must be seen as bringing both a message of restoration and judgment. Bryan has other differences with Wright; the most significant is that while Wright has proven

the hope for restoration within Second Temple Judaism, he has not shown that just because one hopes for restoration this necessarily means the exile is ongoing.

Two questions become immediately apparent when one argues that Jesus brought both judgment and restoration. First, what is the evidence for understanding Jesus' mission as including both of these factors? Second, how does one relieve the tension between a message of judgment and a message of restoration?

Bryan offers a good deal of evidence for the judgment strand of Jesus' teaching. He points out the prophetic criticism inherent in many of the parables. Bryan, who is willing to admit that there are allegorical elements in Jesus' parables, chooses to focus primarily on two parabolic themes: the vineyard and the great banquet. Bryan argues that these two motifs may be the most indicative of a national dimension in Jesus' pronouncement of judgment. He rightly points out that these images could serve as both symbols of judgment and restoration, thus postulating that the wideness of the diversity in the vineyard and banquet motif may require referential inconsistency. Jesus, argues Bryan, believed that God has the right to determine who is the true Israel. As a result, Jesus calls for both national and individual repentance.

Bryan may push the envelope a little when he sees Jesus' table fellowship as an acted parable, perhaps stretching the limits of parabolic license. It must be pointed out, however, that his work here is solid, although he misses the excellent *A New Vision for Israel*, where Scot McKnight's work on table fellowship is very enlightening (in his defense, Bryan does cite McKnight elsewhere). From an evangelical standpoint, it is interesting to see that Bryan defends the idea that Jesus may have told the same parable in several different ways, thus accounting for different versions in the Synoptics. Bryan also argues for a dependence of Thomas on the Synoptics, rather than the other way around.

Using several pieces of evidence, Bryan goes on to argue that while the Jewish expectation was likely a restoration of Israel and a judgment of the Gentiles, in reality Jesus anticipated not just a restoration of Israel, but a judgment as well. How is it possible that Jesus is bringing both restoration and judgment? Bryan argues that Jesus presented the traditions, both of judgment and restoration, in unconventional ways.

As an example of this unconventionality, Bryan sees the temple action of Jesus as a (now widely accepted) parabolic action. He sees this not as an attack on one area of temple function or practice, but as directed against the operation of the temple as a whole, thus an act of judgment. When the temple has been destroyed one must realize that a better temple either has or will come, thus an act of restoration.

While there are the inevitable areas of disagreement, these are minor. The book is full of good analysis and helpful information relating to the work and mission of Jesus. This review has only touched the surface of this clearly written and well-organized work. Those who are Jesus scholars or who would like a fresh look at the question of the restoration of Israel will want to give it careful attention.

Samuel Lamerson
Knox Theological Seminary, Ft. Lauderdale, FL

The Gospel of Matthew. By Rudolf Schnackenburg. Translated by Robert R. Barr. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002, vii + 329 pp., \$24.00 paper.

During the last two decades there has been a proliferation of study on the Gospel of Matthew filling a void for good exegetical and background material. A new book on Matthew must break new ground on some specific issue, incorporate the gains that

have been already accomplished, or explain to a lay audience the discoveries of the past. Doing none of the above, this book speaks to a lay audience without giving sufficient attention to these discoveries.

This commentary by Rudolf Schnackenburg is intended for a non-technical reader and makes an attempt to summarize the conclusions of form and redaction criticism in an interpretation of the text of Matthew. The introduction of thirteen pages attempts to quickly summarize issues of sources; *Sitz im Leben*; the relationship between Israel, Judaism, and the church; and brief treatments of some additional theological themes in the Gospel. The commentary offers a translation which ignores text-critical options. The translation at times is unique without defense, and the following commentary may actually contradict the translation. The commentary discussion, divided by the paragraphs of the text, offers the author's insights into each paragraph without observations on the overall argument of major sections.

The approach involves source, form, and redaction criticism, none of which is explained to the reader. It assumes that the lay audience is familiar with critical titles for the sources behind the Matthean text: i.e. Q, "sayings source," M, Mark. However, there is no defense of the approach or explanation. The underlying assumption is that the text must be divided into its various layers of sources before the reader knows what was important to the Matthean community. Editorial changes that were made to previous sources are attributed to the final author and to his community. Although this is the overall approach, the book offers no comprehensive picture of the nature of the Matthean community. The method fails to recognize that all of the material contained in the text (not just the final editorial process) had pastoral importance to the author and his community. Schnackenburg emphasizes the sources and the editorial process of the text but fails to treat adequately the final message.

Schnackenburg asserts, without making a strong case, that the Matthean community is mainly Jewish Christian with Gentiles present. However, he maintains that Matthew is anti-Jewish and that the new community has replaced Israel to the extent that there is no future for the "ancient people of God" (Matt 2:3-4; 8:11-12; 13:54-58; 21:18-22; 23:37-39; pp. 7, 13, 23, 83, 137, 204, 205, 235). This anti-Jewish interpretation of Matthew has many adherents, but it is unacceptable to argue that Jewish Christians in the first century were anti-Jewish and did not identify themselves as the true Israel in continuation with the Israel of the past. Instead, Matthew is in conflict with the Jewish leadership of the first century rather than with Judaism or Israel, and Matthew's community considered itself the true extension of historical Israel.

The commentary is skeptical in its treatment of the historical reliability of many of the events in the text (e.g. Matt 1:18-25; 2:13-15; 4:18-22; 9:9; 27:62-66; pp. 18, 20, 24, 42, 88, 292). The assumption is that events presented with heavy theological motives imply a lack of historical veracity. Such an approach fails to appreciate that Matthew depends upon reliable tradition and that the theological motives of any author are not a valid test for historicity.

The commentary is weak in its interpretations of difficult passages, failing to give credit to viable options and failing to justify adequately the options taken (e.g. Matt 5:17-19; 15:21-28; 18:15-20; 23:1-7; pp. 52, 150, 151, 177, 228, 229). There are passing references to the interpretations of others, but a great void of documentation. There is a lack of good explanations and definitions of key concepts in the Gospel (e.g. Israel, kingdom, parable, "those with little faith"). Also, the salvation-historical approach often taken is not adequately explained (e.g. Matt 4:12-13, 17; pp. 39, 41).

The commentary often ignores key Jewish sources that shed light on the text, such as the failure to use Mishnaic passages as background to the divorce controversy (Matt 5:32; p. 57). Also, the commentary is weak in its approach to Jewish apocalyptic literature as background to the eschatological passages. Although Matthew is understood

within the milieu of Jewish apocalyptic literature, there is a denial of the chiliasm (the belief in an intermediary kingdom) of that milieu (Matt 19:28; 20:20–23; 24:3–8; pp. 190, 195, 237, 238). Overall, there is a lack of appreciation for the Jewish understanding of key issues (e.g. Matt 22:41–46; 24:3–8; 25:19–30; 26:14–16, 36–46; pp. 224, 225, 238, 254, 264, 271). The treatment of the messianic banquet, the Jewish Passover, and Qumran is particularly weak (Matt 25:19–30; 26:14–16, 36–46; pp. 254, 264, 271).

The back cover of this book states: "This highly original commentary . . . follows Matthew . . . carefully explaining the text against both its primitive and current horizons." Actually, there is nothing either original or careful. There is nothing new; there is a lack of thorough treatment of primitive Judaism or Christianity; and there is a void of interaction with current scholarship, application, or readings of the text.

Daniel S. Steffen

Seminario Teológico Centroamericano, Guatemala, Centroamérica

In Search of a Context: The Function of Scripture in Mark's Narrative. By Thomas R. Hatina. JSNTSup 232. Studies in Scripture in Early Judaism and Christianity 8. London: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002, xii + 428 pp., \$125.00.

As the subtitle suggests, Hatina is attempting to assess properly the function of Scripture in Mark's narrative. As the fore-title suggests, he finds the contexts usually proposed inadequate, or at least incomplete. The first objective of this revised University of Bristol Ph.D. dissertation is to provide "an evaluation of the various contexts that have been proposed by historical critics for reading Mark's quotations and allusions" (p. 1). Not surprisingly, he concludes that the inadequacy of each of the approaches (from *Sitz im Leben* to *Leben Jesu* to redaction criticism, and others) is "the lack of consideration given to the narrative of Mark's Gospel as the primary context within which the quotations and allusions are embedded" (p. 2). "The second objective of this study is to propose a model for reading scriptural quotations and allusions that is sensitive to both the narrative of Mark's Gospel and the historical setting within which it is written" (p. 3). His answer is to focus on "the context of the story world," à la the arena of literary criticism and narrative criticism (p. 1).

I agree with the author about the importance of the primacy of the biblical text. I, too, have been influenced and persuaded by literary and narrative criticism. I agree that "an approach that primarily considers the story world, with its plot and ideological points of view, preserves the creativity and concerns of the evangelist along with the genuineness and uniqueness of the story" (p. 375). However, one possible criticism of using the narrative of the story world as the starting point in determining the function of Scripture is determining with accuracy and precision "the cohesive feature within the story" (p. 3). Hatina argues that "the hermeneutical key is found in the ideological point of view, shared by Jesus and the narrator, that the kingdom of God has come in and through Jesus" (p. 3).

Yet is it not clear that another reader might identify another equally valid hermeneutical key? While Hatina agrees that using an external context such as *Sitz im Leben* or *Leben Jesu* or any historical-critical method to discern Mark's use of Scripture can be instructive, he nevertheless insists that "the narrative as context often takes a subordinate position in the exegetical task" (p. 2). "Both contexts are important," he admits, "but the order of enquiry should begin with the latter [i.e. the narrative context] if at all possible" (p. 2). However, in the end one cannot escape the subjective nature of reconstructing even the narrative and that elusive "cohesive feature within the story."

Hatina's identification of the hermeneutical key as "the ideological point of view, shared by Jesus and the narrator, that the kingdom of God has come in and through Jesus" (p. 93) is subjective. It may also be correct.

I think Hatina is right to say that the narrative context should be considered first and strongly before looking to any external context. However, I also think he has not fully grappled with the perennial challenge of all readers of Scripture, namely, the subjectivity of the reader. The only way I can think to mollify the strictures of any one approach is to remain in dialogue with others and to submit one's conclusions to the criticism and conclusions and questions of other approaches and methodologies. A multidisciplinary approach continues to be the best safeguard against error, and the spirit of Hatina's book indicates his willingness to do this.

The reader must know that this is a revised Ph.D. dissertation. Most of us have written them, and all of us have read them. This is graduate level research, and it is quite specific and detailed. Most of the ancient texts are quoted in Hebrew and Greek, although always translated, and he refers to a plethora of modern sources in their original language.

I would recommend this book for a graduate level seminar in Mark or in biblical criticism or for a similar context. The author's high view of Scripture also commends his work.

Robert Herron
Southeastern College, Lakeland, FL

Narrative Dynamics in Paul: A Critical Assessment. Edited by Bruce W. Longenecker. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2002, vi + 253 pp., \$24.95 paper.

The ubiquity of the use of "narrative" in theology and in the specifically narrative portions of the Bible has resulted in the appropriation of narrative analysis for Pauline studies. The impetus of this approach to Paul goes back to the (recently reprinted) 1983 monograph by Richard Hays, *The Faith of Jesus Christ: An Investigation into the Narrative Substructure of Galatians 3:1-4:11*. Since Hays's work, however, relatively little has been done to advance the discussion. While a number of scholars have attempted to cast their work in a narrative frame, there has been a surprising lack of discussion concerning method of the same caliber as that of Hays, and quite often works which purport to engage Paul through narrative simply restate older findings using narrative terms (a notable exception is the work of Tom Wright, especially his *New Testament and the People of God*).

Into the void comes this new work edited by Bruce Longenecker, which contains contributions from twelve British NT scholars. This book is the result of a project in which five individual "stories" within Paul's writings were isolated and assigned to five scholars in order to analyze how Paul utilized these stories within two of his letters, Galatians and Romans. These five essays were then critiqued by five other scholars and a discussion was held in the autumn of 2001. Present at this consultation and responding to the project as a whole were James Dunn and Francis Watson. The five scholars who wrote the initial essays are Eddie Adams (the story of God and creation), Bruce Longenecker (the story of Israel), Douglas Campbell (the story of Jesus), John Barclay (the story of Paul), and Andrew Lincoln (the story of predecessor and inheritors). The five respondents are Barry Matlock (responding to Adams), Morna Hooker (responding to Longenecker), Graham Stanton (responding to Campbell), David Horrell (responding to Barclay), and Howard Marshall (responding to Lincoln).

Among the benefits of the work is the overview by Longenecker, tracing the wider cultural and intellectual trends that have given rise to an interest in narrative analysis of Paul (chap. 1). Also helpful is the fact that the volume is not an attempt to advocate a narrative approach, covering over its more troublesome features, but is rather a critical engagement in order to assess its validity while the approach is in its infancy (p. 11). Because of this, the reader comes away with a sober view of the prospects of a narrative approach to Paul.

Regarding the potential benefit of a narrative approach, a few writers (Longenecker, p. 83; Lincoln, p. 202) mention that this lies mainly in the area of the contemporary appropriation of Pauline texts, especially given the current widespread employment of the category in theology and theological ethics (e.g. the work of Stanley Hauerwas). More prominent at this point is an awareness of the problems with the approach, most of which are methodological. First, there is the problem of defining the level of analysis: Is narrative to be employed as a tool to get “behind the text” in an attempt to uncover the narrative sub-structure of Paul’s argumentation? If so, this inevitably becomes a subjective exercise in constructing Paul’s inner thoughts when all we have are his letters and the theological arguments which he employed in contingent situations (Adams, p. 42; Matlock, p. 52; Dunn, p. 221). If narrative is employed as a “within the text” tool, analyzing the stories constructed by Paul, it is not entirely clear that this is a gain over previous interpretive methods (Longenecker, p. 83; Lincoln, p. 198). Other problems include the possibility of NT scholars employing outdated or inappropriate models and the problem of how to relate the isolated stories to each other and to one overarching story (i.e. is it appropriate to conceive of one grand story with sub-plots, or of a number of distinct stories which touch at various points?).

Highlights of the volume itself include the interaction between the contributors, which is almost always lively and engaging (the possible exception being Stanton’s response to Campbell). An example is the interchange between Barclay and Horrell. Barclay argues that the narrative in Galatians 1–2 is not strictly a defense of his apostleship, but rather a testimony (or, “story”) of the grace of God as it is active in his life. In fact, Barclay would go further and claim that this narrative is not merely one that *illustrates* the grace of God, but rather *is itself* the grace of God—i.e. the grace of God cannot be known apart from the narratives in which it is actualized.

In his response, Horrell takes Barclay to task for not really engaging a narrative approach, arguing that his work is quite distinct from Hays’s attempt to penetrate through Paul’s letter to the narrative sub-structure of Paul’s theologizing. However, it does appear that Barclay’s essay falls within the parameters set out for the project, which include analyzing the substructures of Paul’s arguments or narratives found within the letters themselves (Longenecker, pp. 14–15). Not only are both essays excellent and powerful, but they are also instructive for how the discussion over narrative contours in Paul relates fairly directly to the debate between a “salvation-historical” reading of Paul vis-à-vis an “apocalyptic” reading (Barclay being a proponent of the latter, and Horrell reflecting more of the former).

Two writers specifically engage the issue that was central to Hays’s 1983 work, the issue of the phrase *pistis Christou* in Galatians and Romans. The debate involves whether this phrase should be read as an objective (“faith in Christ”) or subjective genitive (“the faith/faithfulness of Christ”). This issue relates closely to the discussion of narrative in Paul because Hays argued that Paul’s depiction of the faithfulness of Christ was to be read on top of the story of the commission of Israel to be the light of the world and how the failure of Israel is made up for in the faithfulness of Jesus Christ to the mission given him by the Father. Campbell’s discussion (pp. 120–23) grows naturally out of his essay, and he speaks to the issue of the genitive construction as it relates to narrative. Matlock’s discussion (pp. 54–57), however, seems quite out of place in the

book. Instead of relating his discussion of the issue specifically to the narrative project, he seems to shift gears quite dramatically and answers Hays's recent discussion on semantic grounds, and his tone becomes quite personal to the point of being jarring. It would have been more appropriate in a separate review of the reprint of Hays's work.

A superficial reading may leave one with a negative impression of the potential of narrative in understanding Paul. However, the book's real value is its highlighting the demand for methodological rigor in any future work along this line of approach. Future work in this area will need to take into account this work and the concerns it raises.

Timothy Gombis
University of St. Andrews, St. Andrews, Scotland

New Creation in Paul's Letters and Thought. By Moyer V. Hubbard. SNTSMS 119. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002, xiii + 293 pp., \$60.00.

This work, a revision of Hubbard's Oxford dissertation, examines the meaning of the "new creation" motif in Paul's writings. Hubbard is Associate Professor of New Testament at Talbot School of Theology, Biola University. Hubbard's purpose is to argue for the soterio-anthropological understanding of "new creation" in Paul, emphasizing that the believer has been made new. In the twentieth century, a cosmological understanding of the phrase, emphasizing a new and renewed world, has displaced the anthropological view. Käsemann's emphasis on the priority of apocalyptic and more recently the writings of J. C. Beker on the centrality of apocalyptic in Paul's thought have helped give popularity to the cosmological view.

Hubbard focuses his view of new creation in the OT on Isaiah 40–66 and portions of Jeremiah and Ezekiel. Following von Rad, Hubbard sees that creation is background and secondary to redemption in this section of Isaiah. Jeremiah and Ezekiel speak of "new covenant," "new heart," and "new Spirit," which refer to God's work within the individual.

Hubbard next examines the new creation motif within the Jewish writings of *Jubilees* and *Joseph and Aseneth*. In contrast to many interpreters who focus on the cosmic aspects of *Jubilees*, Hubbard finds both cosmological and anthropological renewal present. In *Joseph and Aseneth*, the key passage 8:1–19 contains a number of verbs with the sense of renewal or regeneration, although the phrase "new creation" is not found in this section.

Hubbard's chapter examining insights from cultural anthropology argues that a foundational context of the new creation statements in Paul is drawn from Paul's "death-life" imagery. Anthropologists find "death-life" and transformation ideas to be common in initiatory and transitional rites.

In a short survey of Paul's thought in Romans 6 and 7, Hubbard finds in Rom 6:1–11 repeated uses of the death, suffering, and transformation themes. Rom 7:1–6 stresses the newness of the work of the Spirit, contrasted with the oldness of the letter, as well as developing new covenant ideas.

Hubbard argues that both 2 Cor 5:17 and Gal 6:15 are to be understood anthropologically. He skillfully reconstructs the situations in Corinth and Galatia and analyzes Paul's responses. Hubbard further develops a relationship between new creation and the role of the Spirit and connects new creation with Adam and image concepts. He also sees death-life imagery in the context of both passages. Finally, Hubbard points to a number of parallels between 2 Cor 5:17 and Gal 6:15.

Despite many strong elements in this work, I was not persuaded that the anthropological view is correct. Failure to consider evidence that might weaken his position, poor definition of what constitutes “new creation” language, and an aversion to the manner in which the apocalyptic motif has been used by interpreters of the last century all reduce the persuasiveness of Hubbard’s thesis. These weaknesses will be discussed in more detail in the following paragraphs.

Hubbard’s exploration of the motif of new creation in the OT is inadequate. Not all of Isaiah 40–66 equates creation and redemption; some passages, such as Isa 44:24–28, cite God’s creative work as evidence of God’s ability to accomplish great tasks, usually of national restoration. The creation motif in the OT also is used doxologically or apologetically in the Psalms in many places, including Psalms 19, 89, 102, 104, and 136. In the OT, creation is not always synonymous with or even subordinate to redemption, and these other uses of the creation motif are left unexplored in Hubbard’s work. One also wishes that explicitly cosmological language, such as “new heavens and new earth,” had been given more prominence in his study of new creation in the OT and NT.

Hubbard must defend his use of statements of “new covenant,” “renew,” “new heart,” “regeneration,” and similar terms as new creation terms. His failure to do so is especially telling when the phrase “new creation” itself is absent from the passage being studied, as in *Joseph and Aseneth*. It is not self-evident why these passages should be considered as new creation texts.

In Hubbard’s treatment of 2 Cor 5:17, some of the specific arguments advanced against the cosmological view are not persuasive. For example, Hubbard narrows the possible interpretations of the cosmological view to make it unpalatable, citing a statement from Furnish, “if someone is in Christ, then the creation ‘has been totally refashioned’” (p. 179). Equally possible and far more plausible would be, “if anyone is in Christ, he enters into a new creation.”

There are also difficulties with Hubbard’s view of Gal 6:15. While Hubbard criticizes J. Louis Martyn and others who see apocalyptic in many places, Hubbard fails to acknowledge the strongly apocalyptic character of Gal 4:4, “when the fullness of time came, God sent his son. . . .” He also does not accept the relevance of Rom 8:18–24 to the discussion, arguing that all of creation groans while waiting for the still future new age.

Nevertheless, this work is useful to scholars exploring the theology of Paul. It is well worth reading. There are many useful insights into Paul’s thought, and the reconstructions of the situations in Corinth and Galatians are valuable. Hubbard has done excellent research in secondary literature, as the extensive references demonstrate.

Calvin D. Redmond

The International School of Theology-Asia, Manila, The Philippines

Ephesians: An Exegetical Commentary. By Harold W. Hoehner. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2002, xxix + 930 pp., \$54.99.

The cover quotes Fuller Professor Hagner, “A tour de force.” The dust jacket cites numerous other luminaries who laud Professor Hoehner’s new commentary. Let me join the throng. Clearly reflecting decades of reading and research on Ephesians by the long-time professor of New Testament at Dallas Seminary, this book tops the list of important new works on the crucial Epistle to the Ephesians. After a too-long hiatus, the last dozen or so years have witnessed an impressive production of excellent commentaries

on Ephesians: Lincoln, Best, O'Brien, and Muddiman. Yet none can challenge the erudition and sheer quantity of research that Hoehner demonstrates in this commentary. And though it has been long in the making, readers will see that he is up-to-date in his citations all along the way—even to the point of including references to *both* BAGD and BDAG in his word studies. Virtually no source has been neglected or overlooked; no exegetical issue is addressed without recourse to other published works on the problem. The list of commentaries consulted runs to 125! The footnotes are numerous and extensive, including both ancient and modern sources. If one desires a handy 9¼ by 6½ by 2½ inch file cabinet of virtually all the research ever done on Ephesians, get this book.

The subtitle underscores that Hoehner has written a commentary based on the Greek text, so that in scope it parallels what one finds in the NIGNT, the ICC, or the WBC series. At the same time, Hoehner carefully translates all his citations of Greek texts so that a reader without Greek, or whose Greek is a bit rusty, can still find great profit and follow the essential arguments. However, the author does not shy away from technical discussions of morphology and syntax, though he relegates his detailed and technical discussions of text critical issues to the footnotes. The writing style is clear and precise for the most part. The commentary follows Hoehner's detailed and precise outline verse-by-verse and then clause-by-clause or phrase-by-phrase, with explanations followed by concluding summaries. The reader can turn to any verse and discover not only what Hoehner concludes about its meaning, but can locate the sources, see the options available, and follow the reasoning that helped him shape his judgments. Beyond the commentary on the text itself, Hoehner includes at the appropriate points eight excursions on crucial topics in the epistle including: in Christ, election, *plērōma*, mystery, household code, and slavery. These are substantial essays in themselves (e.g. the one on slavery runs to five pages of very small font size). Of course, the book's sheer size may give some teachers pause when they decide upon texts for courses in Ephesians. However, as a reference resource for all things Ephesians, it will be neglected only to the reader's peril.

Going against the current critical consensus, Hoehner adopts the traditional view that Paul authored the letter we call Ephesians. In typical fashion, he employs three charts over twelve pages and catalogues scholars' position on this question from 1519 (Erasmus) to the present. Hoehner shows that the traditional position of Pauline authorship is not the minority view that some scholars today allege (pp. 9–20). Then in painstaking detail for sixty pages (plus seventeen pages of bibliography) he takes on all the objections to Pauline authorship and provides a comprehensive and convincing defense of this traditional position. He investigates the external and internal evidence. He reviews the unanimous, early attestation for Pauline authorship and the number of lexical and linguistic distinctives of the letter that appear in the undisputed letters of Paul. He shows that the early church did not accept pseudonymity as a valid category for authoritative texts. While not breaking new ground in the discussion, he does amass all the arguments in one place and shows how convincing and likely the early church's view is that Paul wrote the letter. He includes the other typical issues of introduction: structure, genre (it is a typical and actual Hellenistic letter), historical setting (not a circular letter but one written to the church in Ephesus; against most scholars Hoehner accepts the reading in 1:1 in which the words "in Ephesus" were part of the original letter Paul wrote), the historical setting of the letter in Paul's career (adopting the traditional view that Paul wrote the letter from prison in Rome in AD 61–62), purpose (to promote "love" in the church), and theology. In all, 130 pages of introduction set the stage for what follows.

Several other general comments are in order. Hoehner provides us with a laudable model for doing word studies: not merely summarizing what others have concluded, for

important words he traces their uses in all relevant literature and their ranges of meanings (almost mini-summaries of *TDNT* or *NIDNTT*) and draws his own conclusions of Paul's intended sense in the context in Ephesians. Likewise, Hoehner is thorough in his attempt to identify the grammatical significance of the features in the Greek text. If there is a genitive (or other) case, Hoehner surveys the possible ways Paul might intend its use and arrives at his conclusion. He exercises the same thoroughness in his analysis of participles, verb tenses, and moods all along the way. Concerning verb tenses, however, in a few places he falls into the subtle trap of identifying a particular *use* of the tense as if that *is* its form rather than Hoehner's interpretation of the use in that location (e.g. he says, "It is a consummative aorist stressing . . ."; p. 836). Theologically, readers will also detect hints along the way of what appears to be Hoehner's dispensational preunderstanding as when he avers in various places that nothing of the OT applies to the Christian and the church unless the NT specifically repeats it (e.g. pp. 376, 447). Or he insists that since the canon of Scripture is closed, "the gift of prophecy does not seem to be operative today" (p. 546). Many would disagree with both these assertions. At the same time, he counters the excesses of those he terms "hyper dispensationalists." On text critical issues he appears more attracted to the readings of the majority text tradition than most modern interpreters of Ephesians. Besides the inclusion of "in Ephesus" in 1:1, Hoehner prefers the majority text reading against the one favored by the UBS⁴ and NA²⁷ in several places: e.g. the inclusion of *hypotassesthe* (submit) in 5:22 or the longer and obscure reading "out of his flesh and out of his bones" in 5:30 (for other examples see on 1:14; 3:14; 4:32). He adopts none, however, without a careful consideration of the evidence.

What about a few specific points? Almost as much as E. Best, Hoehner acknowledges the corporate nuances of the letter. Where too many others see Paul's teachings only to individuals, Hoehner recognizes the community implications throughout. With many, he sees a local meaning to the "heavenlies" (1:3 etc.) where both believers are positioned with Christ and from where the Satanic powers exert their influence. The "mystery" (1:9 etc.), hidden but now revealed in the gospel, encompasses the union of Jew and Gentile into one body as equals. As to the disputed *kephalē* (head), Hoehner concludes that its essential meaning is "neither 'source' nor 'authority over' or 'leader' but 'preeminence'" or prominence (p. 286). As such, in specific contexts it means "ruler" or authority (in 1:22 and 5:23), but also implies "source" (in 4:15). Paul deploys the "middle wall of partition" in 2:14 as a metaphor for the division between Jew and Gentile engendered by Jewish attitudes of superiority that resulted in mutual hostility. Hoehner assesses all the references to "baptism" including the "put on, put off" citations and other water references, but in no instance finds a reference to water baptism, including at 4:5. Surely he has it wrong in this one instance, and possibly in some of the others. In the conundrum of 4:8–10 Hoehner thinks that Christ's descent is his incarnation, not the descent of Christ at Pentecost when he distributed gifts through the Spirit. Probably Paul's citation of Psalm 68 was a kind of paraphrase from memory, not a careful quotation of an unknown version or a Targum. Nothing in this text suggests Christ's descent to Hades. Hoehner makes a concerted effort, though not an entirely successful one, to show that Paul refers to functions and not offices in the list of persons in 4:11: ". . . with no hint of reference to an office" (p. 544). Surely by the early 60s offices were in place, and "apostle" could denote an office (2:20).

In 5:11 he makes a good case that the unfruitful works of darkness that need to be exposed are those that their fellow Christians are committing, not unbelievers. In 5:18 Hoehner argues that the filling is "by" not "with" the Spirit, and the subsequent participles point to the results when one (or the church) is so filled. He concludes that in 5:21 Paul teaches that "mutual submission" is the final of the five results of the filling by the Spirit (conveyed in the series of participles). Yet as to the meaning of mutual

submission (5:21), Hoehner seems uncertain. In one place he opines that it means “one is willing to submit to those who have authority” (p. 717). Does mutual submission mean only that the underlings submit to their superiors? Later he indicates that believers ought to demonstrate this quality “in daily life whenever and wherever they [believers] meet” (p. 719) so that it means “submission is to one another, that is, in the midst of the body of believers” (p. 733). Now does he hint that even those in authority need to submit to those under their leadership? I am not sure. Yet Hoehner is convinced of “male headship” in a marriage; a husband is never instructed to submit to his wife (nor parents to a child nor a master to a slave). Hoehner believes that Paul’s explanation of the sacrificial love a husband needed to exhibit for his wife struck a counter-cultural blow against the Roman idea of *patria potestas*, the absolute authority of men over wives, children, and slaves. The concluding section on the full armor of God presents the believer and the church in a defensive posture—to be able to stand their ground in the face of the enemies’ onslaughts.

This is a commentary for serious students of Ephesians. It presents a model of careful exegesis from which any serious reader can profit—a model both in the use of careful methods and in the judicious assessment of the evidence to arrive at likely conclusions. One may not always agree with Hoehner, but the reader will see why he came to his conclusions and be able to follow the trail of evidence and reasoning. Is it an inspiring commentary? I would have to demur. It inspires me to be a careful exegete and to work methodically and rigorously—not to accept traditional viewpoints or conclusions even if time-honored. Yet having said that, there remains a kind of sterility about this book. It is so workmanlike. I wish that Hoehner had exhibited more excitement about Paul’s message. I wish he had showed us more of the theological significance of Paul’s teaching in this exquisite letter. I wish we could see more of the startling implications that grow out of an epistle intent on promoting love within the church and a unity that transcends all barriers. Perhaps Hoehner would respond to this appeal with the entirely appropriate reply, “But the book is already too long.” Alas, we cannot have it both ways. So when I wish to direct my students to the technical details and sources on a point of interest, I will urge they open up Hoehner or (almost as comprehensive) Best. They will be richly rewarded. However, when we wish more life and theology, I will suggest we then turn to O’Brien, Yoder Neufeld, or Snodgrass.

William W. Klein
Denver Seminary, Denver, CO

Revelation. By Grant R. Osborne. BECNT. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2002, xx + 869 pp., \$49.99.

In his first major commentary, Grant Osborne, Professor of New Testament at Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, has taken on the challenge of the perennially controversial Apocalypse. Several aspects of Osborne’s publishing background have prepared him to offer a significant work: (1) if his book *The Hermeneutical Spiral* is a fair indication, few are better prepared in regard to the knotty interpretative issues encountered in Revelation than Osborne; (2) if his controversial study of the great commission employing redaction criticism in *JETS* and his later volume *The Resurrection Narratives: A Redactional Study* are any indication, Osborne knows how to “push the envelope” in areas sensitive to evangelicals; and (3) since he is currently editor of two NT commentary series, he certainly well understands the practical necessity of writing readable, usable, and yes—at least in the case of pastors and students—reasonably affordable commentaries.

In regard to contents, it is not necessary to recount the various features of the Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament series, given the warm reception to the previous volumes, Schreiner's *Romans* and Bock's volumes on *Luke*. Suffice it to say here that Osborne's section on introductory questions is admirably measured, though crowned with a surprisingly full-orbed treatment of the theology of the Apocalypse. The commentary itself is, section-by-section, almost quasi-sermonic in its setup. Like an airplane flight, the material for each passage begins with a "take-off" introductory portion and, after the sectional commentary, "lands" with concluding summary and contextualization. The bibliography of "Works Cited" and a number of helpful indexes complete the volume.

In terms of strengths, Osborne's volume has too many to mention. Just a few of the most meaningful for one who has long taught and written on Revelation are the following: (1) It is unexpectedly clear, concise, and readable. I begin here because, sadly, this is too often not the case with major commentaries (those by Aune and Beale being recent examples of Revelation commentaries that did not make it easy on the reader). (2) Not unrelatedly, because it is not of an overly excessive length or price (compare, again, Aune and Beale), Osborne's volume will prove realistically usable and affordable for wider classroom use and the needs of the average pastor. (3) All things considered, Osborne is wise to take an eclectic hermeneutical approach to Revelation. As opposed to Beale's idealist-slanted eclecticism (which proves to be the wide-open hermeneutical front door for his amillennial conclusions), Osborne judiciously opts to allow the futurist element to have the upper hand in the mix. (4) Even if the commentary does not contain a lot of jump-off-the-page examples of fresh, highly-creative exegesis, it does provide a whole host of examples of careful, measured exegetical thinking, far too numerous to mention. Since the purpose of exegesis is simply to "read out" the meaning of the text, not to create newness, splashiness, or controversy, Osborne is to be commended for doing his job faithfully and not going for the easy sensationalism or polemicism that is far too common in volumes on Revelation. (5) Happily, Osborne chose to make available a solid middle-sized bibliography. This is a notable exception to the normal extremes of either a short (highly) "Selected Bibliography" or an exhaustive (and exhausting) bibliography (that is never needed unless you are writing a dissertation, a bibliography volume, or a major commentary yourself, and even then is outdated almost as soon as the ink is dry on the manuscript).

On the other hand, there simply are no obvious problems or glaring weaknesses in Osborne's *Revelation*. However, in my considered opinion, the following areas are worthy of being registered as stated concerns: (1) Osborne's eclectic approach becomes a two-edged sword at points. Though he states that the futurist element is the most prominent in the mix, it appears that the idealist element is in control at certain key junctures. (2) Osborne unwisely dismisses all larger chiasmic structurings related to Revelation as being untenable. While it is certainly true that many purported chiasmic structures are forced, Osborne's own affirmation that meaning is being communicated in different ways, and on different levels, in the Apocalypse should have caused him to proceed with less dogmatism. Since so many different chiasmic understandings (of parts and the whole) of Revelation continue to be propounded by so many reputable scholars, it would seem that, where there is that much smoke, it is likely that there is some fire. (3) As well done as Osborne's overall essay on the theology of Revelation is generally, it, oddly, largely dodges a formal treatment of eschatology, one of the (if not *the*) paramount theological aspects of the book. In addition, given the views expressed at a number of points in regard to God's people, it is strange that Osborne did not develop a direct ecclesiology. (4) At certain points, Osborne's normally commendable exegetical-theological restraint is too restrained. He fails to follow certain prominent exegetical-theological threads far enough (e.g. the interaction of fairly clear parallel structural elements at

many points, the interactive nature of the seven blessings, and the wider significance of the relationship of the “earth-dwellers” and Babylon the Great, on the one hand, versus the “heaven-dwellers,” on the other).

Before my conclusion, and directly related to my recommendation in regard to Osborne’s commentary, some theological perspective on how it fits within, and contributes to, a perceptible trend among selected recent wider evangelical volumes on Revelation may prove helpful. While Thomas was staunchly dispensational premillennial, Beale was staunchly amillennial, and Aune largely avoided the issue, Michaels and Mounce both opted for what could be called an “agnostic premillennial” position. What this means is their understanding of the sequence of events surrounding the second advent is a conventional premillennial one, but they hold that it is not possible to know whether “1,000 years” means an actual 1,000 years or is symbolic of a long period of time. What is worth noting here is that Osborne generally follows Michaels and Mounce in this approach and, in my opinion, argues his case more plausibly. While I do not concur with certain aspects of Osborne’s understanding at this point, it is highly likely that the way he has expressed his view will, so to speak, send exegetically-based theological ripples across the expanse of the premillennial pond.

From a “wider-lens” theological vantage point, Osborne’s approach appears to be yet another instance of a mediating (“eclectic” in most respects) mood in certain sectors of evangelicalism. For example, the progressive dispensational understanding of Blaising, Bock, and others blunts the perceived vulnerability of more traditional dispensational approaches through positions carefully adjusted into “middle-ground.” The resulting views maintain dispensationalism’s strengths and minimize its weaknesses. Similarly, Osborne’s hybrid premillennialism maintains what he considers the strength of the premillennial *sequence* and essentially jettisons what he considers the weakness of its understanding of the focal *symbolism* (i.e. how to understand “1,000 years”).

The bottom line is: If you have any significant exegetical or theological interest in the Apocalypse at all, you should have Osborne’s *Revelation* on your shelf. Because it has the feel of being long enough without being too long (i.e. covering everything that needs to be addressed without going on *ad infinitum*) and because it is not as unabridgely self-absorbed as Aune or as “in-your-face” theologically as Thomas or Beale, this is the most balanced and, in a number of ways, the best of the generally quite helpful spate of Revelation commentaries of the last decade. Although I disagree with Osborne at quite a number of points, I highly recommend his volume both as an excellent commentary in its own right and for what will likely prove to be its wider ongoing theological significance within evangelicalism.

A. Boyd Luter
Criswell College, Dallas, TX

Divorce and Remarriage in the Bible: The Social and Literary Context. By David Instone-Brewer. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002, xi + 355 pp., \$26.00.

Apart from Craig Keener’s . . . *And Marries Another* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1991), David Instone-Brewer’s book is the most paradigm-challenging study of the NT divorce texts that I have encountered. Since the whole book is available at his website (<http://www.instone-brewer.com/>), my goal here is merely to entice the reader to wrestle with the implications Instone-Brewer’s interpretive grid has not only for the immediate topic, but for our approach to other NT subjects as well.

Instone-Brewer’s goal is to overturn the highly impractical “traditional Church interpretation” (pp. ix, 304) of the NT divorce texts. This no remarriage, but two-grounds-

for-separation view could only have emerged outside the literary and social context of first-century Judaism. Provocatively, Instone-Brewer identifies two additional biblical grounds for divorce based on Exod 21:10–11, a text that states a husband must give a wife food, clothing, and “marital love/duty.” Rabbinic sources classified these under two headings: material neglect and emotional neglect (p. 102). Both the rabbis and Paul applied these equally to the wife and the husband (cf. 1 Cor 7:3–5, 32–34), and the three provisions of Exod 21:10–11 “became the basis for the vows in Jewish marriage contracts and in Christian marriage services via the reference in Ephesians 5:28–29” (p. 275). This, to be sure, is the unique contribution of this study. In Instone-Brewer’s own words, “The interpretation of [the words in Exod 21:10–11] by first-century Jews is the most important consideration for this present study” (p. 100).

What are Instone-Brewer’s working assumptions? First, I believe he would say it is inappropriate merely to do a grammatical-historical exegesis of OT texts and see how exegesis fits hand-in-glove into its NT context (p. x). Intertestamental Jewish interpretive traditions and the Greco-Roman environment must be considered when reading the NT. For example, where Deut 24:1 is concerned, it is impossible to decide what “something indecent” (NIV) referred to originally; all we need to know is how first-century teachers understood it.

Second, just as rabbinic debates were summarized for oral or written transmission, so was Jesus’ teaching on divorce. Instone-Brewer illustrates the principles of abbreviation that the rabbis used and how they are paralleled in the longer and shorter reports of Jesus’ teaching in the Gospels with a discussion of the various accounts of the Hillelite-Shammaite divorce dispute in the Mishnah (cf. Matthew 19/Mark 10) (p. 162), *Sifre* (when we unpack Matthew 19/Mark 10 exegesis) (pp. 163–64), and Jerusalem Talmud (cf. Matt 5:31–32; Luke 16:18) (pp. 164–65). To be specific, the phrases “for any matter” (Matt 19:3) and “except for (a matter of) indecency” (Matt 19:9) are omitted from Mark 10:2–12 because they were obvious to the original audience. Matthew added these “phrases that encapsulated the positions of the Hillelites and Shammaites respectively,” not because he wanted to soften Jesus’ absolute prohibition of divorce (as in the older critical view), but because he could no longer assume his readers would automatically supply what was originally present (p. 134).

Most mentally assume exceptions to sayings of Jesus like those found in Matt 5:22 (“without cause”) and 5:28 (“except for his wife”) (p. 153). When it comes to the core form of Jesus’ divorce saying, “Whoever divorces his wife and marries another commits adultery,” the only assumption first-century readers would bring to make sense of it “is to assume that the divorce was invalid” (p. 149). Matthew’s addition of “except for (a matter of) indecency” makes this assumption explicit.

Instone-Brewer provides the most satisfactory explanation to date for the two different forms of Matthew’s exception. Exegetes have long recognized that the phrase in Matt 5:32 is the virtual semantic equivalent of the Shammaites’ transposition of the corresponding Hebrew phrase in Deut 24:1 (*m. Git.* 9.10). However, the Shammaite position was summarized in the rabbinic literature in *two* similar forms, the second of which is semantically identical with the phrase in Matt 19:9 (*Sifre Deut.* 269; *y. Sota* 1.2 [16b])! Was adultery the *only* ground for divorce allowed by Jesus? Probably not, because the focus of the controversy was the meaning of Deut 24:1. However, the Shammaites also allowed other divorces on the grounds of Exod 21:10–11 (p. 186), and Jesus presumably would, too.

Just as Jesus condemned the no fault Hillelite “any matter” divorce as invalid, so Paul condemned the Greco-Roman no fault “divorce by separation” as invalid (1 Cor 7:10–11). In the case of 1 Cor 7:15, rather than technically argue for neglect, Paul gave a pragmatic solution (cf. the rabbinic phrase “God has called us to peace”) to a difficult situation. If people had been divorced against their will and could do nothing to reverse it, Paul says they should be regarded as validly divorced and free to remarry (p. 204).

Instone-Brewer wants us to know, however, that “Paul did not even mention the use of these obligations as grounds for divorce. Instead, he was keen to emphasize the duty of each partner to fulfill these obligations that had been promised in the marriage vows” (p. 197). Neither Jesus nor Paul is a legalist.

Though pastoral advice is limited, here is a plausible defense of four grounds for permitting divorce when (1) marriage vows have been violated, (2) extensive forgiveness has been extended in view of genuine repentance (Luke 17:3–4), and (3) the vow-breaker stubbornly refuses to repent of their actions. Hosea “showed that God did not end the relationship until it was already totally destroyed” (p. 36). The viability of this new approach depends on whether or not the reader is persuaded that Instone-Brewer’s interpretive grid better comprehends all the biblical data than the one they have always brought to these texts. One will have to read the whole to feel the full force of his case.

William A. Heth
Taylor University, Upland, IN

The Word of God in English: Criteria for Excellence in Bible Translation. By Leland Ryken. Wheaton: Crossway, 2002, 336 pp., \$15.99 paper.

Leland Ryken, professor of English at Wheaton College, identifies his work as a “wholehearted defense of essentially literal translation in the King James tradition” (p. 18). The book is a thoroughgoing challenge to dynamic equivalence as a translation theory (the author prefers the older term “dynamic equivalence” to “functional equivalence”). Ryken decries dynamic equivalence for destroying the literary quality of the text, oversimplifying its meaning, removing theological terminology, modernizing ancient contexts, and removing the ambiguity, majesty, mystery, and beauty of the original. He considers the influence of Eugene Nida—the father of dynamic equivalence—to be “on balance, negative, depriving current Bible readers of the Bible they need” (p. 14).

The book has five parts. After an introductory chapter on the translation debate, part one draws lessons for translation from literature (chap. 1), ordinary discourse (chap. 2), and the history of translation (chap. 3). Part two describes common fallacies related to translation. These include fallacies about the Bible (chap. 4), about translation (chap. 5), and about Bible readers (chap. 6). Part three deals with theological, ethical, and hermeneutical issues and part four identifies problems of modern translation. These include ignoring the literary qualities of the Bible (chap. 9), obscuring the world of the original text (chap. 10), destabilization of the biblical text (chap. 11), and reductionism (chap. 12). The fifth part summarizes the book with five criteria for excellence in an English Bible: fidelity to the words of the original (chap. 13), effective diction—clarity, vividness, connotation, and ambiguity (chap. 14), respect for the principles of poetry (chap. 15), effective rhythm (chap. 16), and exaltation and beauty (chap. 17). After Ryken’s conclusion, an appendix by C. John Collins, Old Testament professor at Covenant Theological Seminary, is included entitled “Without Form, You Lose Meaning.”

Ryken is strongest when he is dealing with the literary features of the biblical text. Many important cautions are raised for translators. The best translation will not cater to the lowest level reading public, simplifying the text at the expense of accuracy. Translators should preserve the genre and distinct literary styles of the authors, not flatten the text to stale prose. Translators should challenge readers to rise to the level of the text, not lower the text to suit the reader. The translation should accurately reflect the historical and cultural setting of the original and should preserve the “otherness” of the biblical context. Inter-textual allusions should be reproduced. A translation

should conserve the beauty, artistry, and majesty of the original. This is particularly important in poetry, where modern idiomatic translations sometimes change concrete metaphors into abstractions (e.g. "God is a rock" becomes "God is strong"). Ambiguity and multiplicity of meaning should be preserved.

These are important cautions, and should be considered by translators. However, Ryken's apparently simple solution—a return to essentially literal translation—underestimates the differences between languages and flies in the face of almost all linguistic and hermeneutical research over the past half century. While strong on literary features, Ryken is weakest when discussing translation theory, linguistics, and Greek grammar. His basic thesis, repeated dozens of times throughout the book, is that a Bible translation should preserve what the Bible *says*, not merely what it means (its "ideas"). The claim is that literal translation tells us directly what the Bible says, while functional equivalence inappropriately *interprets* the meaning. In chap. 5, "Seven Fallacies About Translation," Ryken rejects as fallacious that "we should translate meaning rather than words" (fallacy 1), and that "all translation is interpretation" (fallacy 2). He claims that by focusing on meaning, dynamic equivalent versions are "translating what they *interpret* the meaning of the original to be *instead of* first of all preserving the language of the original" (p. 79). But how can you "preserve the language of the original" when the source language is different than the receptor language? Every English translation changes *all* the words of what the Bible "says." Ryken seems to assume the literalist fallacy that the words and syntax of one language have exact counterparts in another, so that meaning transfer occurs automatically. He tries to avoid this obvious fallacy by allowing for "linguistic interpretation" but not "thematic interpretation" (pp. 85–87). But what he means by "linguistic interpretation" is limited to "decisions regarding what English words best express Hebrew or Greek words" (p. 85). This is too narrow a definition since languages differ radically not only in word meanings, but also in collocations, syntactical functions, idioms, connotations, and a host of other ways. Direct translation without interpretation is impossible since every word, phrase and clause must first be understood (= interpreted) in the source language before equivalent words, phrases, and clauses can be found in the receptor language.

Ryken argues that it is impossible to communicate ideas without words, so we must reproduce the words of the original (p. 80). This logic is fallacious. Nobody is arguing that we can translate ideas without words. But different languages use *different* words, phrases, idioms, and collocations to express the *same* meaning. Simply translating words without recognizing the different functional roles of phrases and clauses always risks mistranslation.

Throughout much of the book, Ryken seems to forget that he is talking about translation rather than transcription. In chaps. 2 and 3 he argues for the importance of retaining exact words in English literature (like Dickens) and in daily life (everything from recipes to newspaper reports). This is well and good, but misses the point of translation, where there are no exact words, only equivalent meanings.

Ryken's conclusions also suffer from an inadequate knowledge of lexical semantics and Greek grammar. For example, he assumes the lexical fallacy that *sarx* "literally" means "flesh" and so should be translated that way (pp. 180–81). He repeatedly argues that the literal meaning of the genitive is "of + NOUN" and that dynamic equivalent versions wrongly "interpret" it otherwise (pp. 81–82, 86–87, 194, 209). He criticizes the NIV for rendering Rom 1:17 as "righteousness *from* God" instead of "righteousness of God," claiming only the latter "is translation; all others are interpretation" (p. 87). But the Greek *theou* is a genitive (not a prepositional phrase) with dozens of potential functions and meanings. English does not have a genitive case form so a "literal" translation is impossible. Whether the prepositional phrase "of + NOUN" is an accurate translation is an interpretive call translators must make in each individual case.

Unfortunately, these kinds of linguistic errors permeate Ryken's discussion, marring an otherwise important call for greater attention to the literary features of the text. The book is also marred by a somewhat cranky tone, selective use of evidence, and attacks on straw men. In chap. 5 Ryken lists five fallacies about the Bible (it is uniformly simple; it is a book of ideas rather than concrete particulars; it is a modern book; it needs correction; it is devoid of mystery and ambiguity). While these are indeed fallacies, I know no linguists or Bible translators who believe them, or who translate under their assumptions. It is certainly true that some dynamic equivalent versions change metaphors into abstractions and clarify cultural issues. These versions are intentionally geared to remedial readers, to children, or to those with little Bible knowledge (see TEV, CEV, NCV, NIRV, etc.). While these versions sometimes lose nuances of meaning, they also open up the meaning of the Bible—albeit in simplified form—to those for whom it is otherwise inaccessible. Literal versions are often guilty of the opposite error, obscuring texts which were clear and understandable to the original audience. Both kinds of versions have their problems and both have an important place in Bible study. There are certainly benefits to formal equivalence (retaining formal verbal allusions, etc.), but Ryken's claim that essentially literal versions are the *only* truly accurate ones cannot be sustained. Furthermore, the simplification of the text Ryken criticizes is by no means a necessary consequence of functional equivalence. All English versions lie on a continuum between form and function. Versions like the NIV, TNIV, REB, NAB, NJB, NRSV, etc. are geared for older audiences and rarely concretize metaphors or mute cultural differences. Ryken inappropriately lumps all these versions together, assuming that dilution of meaning is unavoidable unless the text is translated literally.

Much of what Ryken considers to be the exalted literary style of the Bible represents his preference for the rhythm and style of the KJV. But while this style has made a profound impact upon the English-speaking world, it does not necessarily reflect the diverse styles of the biblical writers, which sounded to the original readers like normal idiomatic language, not like "Greek-lish," an artificial mimicking of Greek syntax.

Important critiques of dynamic equivalence are taking place today, especially in recent calls to supplement code theory of language with more comprehensive communication models (see for example the application of relevance theory to Bible translation by Ernst-August Gutt). Unfortunately, Ryken does not engage with this scholarly literature, instead attacking dynamic equivalence from a populist and (for the most part) linguistically naïve perspective. This is unfortunate since some readers may dismiss the book and so miss the important cautions Ryken does raise concerning the need to pay closer attention to the literary qualities of God's Word.

Mark L. Strauss
Bethel Seminary, San Diego, CA

The Imaginative World of the Reformation. By Peter Matheson. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2001, xiii + 153 pp., \$15.00 paper.

Perhaps the biggest challenge facing the reader or reviewer of this book is finding an appropriate category or genre in which to place it. It is a social history of Reformation themes, viewed through the lens of a thesaurus. It is intellectual history using largely the thought of the forgotten, the inarticulate, and the obscure. It is cultural history with a sharp eye peeled for the powerful force of metaphors generated by the Reformation. It is a literary journey with numerous references to the German Reformation(s) and the Radical Reformers through time, space, and word.

Professor Peter Matheson believes that we need a new approach to teaching and understanding the Reformation. It is simplistic and pedestrian to explain the Reformation in moralistic terms as a reaction against the corruption of the late medieval Church. He wishes to move beyond the predictable doctrinal approach on the one hand and what he calls "social reductionism" on the other hand. Matheson proposes that we can understand the Reformation by examining the imaginative world it spawned. At its core the Reformation provided a catalyst for changing the imaginative world of the sixteenth century. Priests and pastors preached with new powerful metaphors. The pulpit became the forum for prompting new dreams, new visions, and new possibilities, giving hope to peasants as never before. Common people dreamed of taking their place among the privileged classes in the new City of God. It orchestrated new songs, ballads, choruses, and poetry. New art, architecture, woodcuts, and pamphlets were all expressions of the new mental furniture of the Reformation. Religious expressions of late medieval Europe had generated their own metaphors and encouraged the creation of their own imaginative tapestries. The iconoclastic activity of the Reformation, however, was an immense cultural wrecking ball and produced a vacuum of imagination filled by the Reformers and their followers. Matheson puts it succinctly: "When your metaphors change your world changes with them" (p. 7). In the metaphoric shower storm of the Reformation, every city became Jerusalem, every river the Jordan, and every nation the certain home of the new millennial kingdom. As the message spread listeners heard what they wanted to hear and painted their own canvases, drawing from the colorful pallet of biblical and poetic imagery. The Reformation was the fountain; it was the trumpet blast, the new wine, the dawn of the utopia, the dance. It promised a deliverance from Egypt led by new prophets of God to the promised land. Each metaphor held a potent story. Each was exploited thousands of times to tell the story of the gospel to a new generation. Whether humanist by training or by default, each Reformer pointed *ad fontes*—to the sources: the Bible, the apostles, and the Christ. For the Reformers, "the way forward is back" (p. 34). The people then retranslated these messages, creating their own imaginative world.

Matheson describes with great eloquence his lament for the stripping of the altars by the Protestants. The late medieval world of indulgences, relics, and the veneration of Mary and the saints all came under attack, through the biting satire of Erasmus and bludgeoning of Protestant rhetoric. It appears Matheson admired the late medieval religious world not for its theology but for the rich imaginative tapestry it provided. He considers replacement of the aesthetic for the moralistic in the Reformation as something "uncouth, if not totalitarian" (p. 15). He hints that, aesthetically speaking, the Reformation had the net effect of giving the keys to the Louvre to the Philistines. He forgets or ignores, however, that the Reformation was not at its root a moralistic movement. The genius of the Reformation was its recovery of the NT and Pauline teaching of the doctrine of grace.

Readers and reviewers may, I fear, give the author a free "pass" because of the unique nature of his text—it is not wholly narrative nor strictly interpretive. Where Matheson's metaphors abound, imprecision doth much more abound. Readers may not know exactly what they are reading, nor how to assess it with anything approaching precision. The extended use of metaphors aid and abet the author to persuade (and or manipulate) both the text and the reader. I had the recurring sense that the screen writer for the movie *Being There* was the ghost writer of this script. A well-placed metaphor can provide the mistaken impression of brilliance.

Every revisionist argues that the previous interpreters got it wrong in their simplistic monocausal explanation. The pallet of the revisionist is always more colorful, the textures more variegated, the subtleties more complex. Matheson's genuine insights, however, serve in their own way as an iconoclastic force. He leaves readers without a

place to stand. Matheson removes our solid footing and anchors us firmly in mid-air, unable to touch anything substantial. On those occasions when we regain our footing, we are forced to wrestle with a host of metaphoric angels hoping for Jacob's blessing before we release the angel. One blessing is to arrive at the end of our literary journey, generally unscathed, perhaps wiser, but largely bewildered about how we might describe our abduction. We thought we were on the interstate to Geneva, Wittenberg, Munster, and Canterbury. Matheson's roadmap is more like a scavenger hunt without the assurance that we will arrive back at base camp for the comfort of the campfire and marshmallows. On Matheson's tour bus, we bypassed the capitals, slowed down to admire the revisionist scenery, and moved toward the shining city on the hill called postmodernism. In the end everyone is left to give their own meaning to this highly imaginative journey.

Professor Matheson warns us at the start of our journey that "it would be a brave or foolish person" who ignored the roadmaps issued by earlier cartographers. Matheson's route through the Reformation may in fact be the best route. At times, he is a convincing tour guide, filled with local knowledge. Almost he persuadeth me. It is fitting that more passengers join him on this literary journey. He will expand their mental horizons and show them things they have never seen nor imagined before. It is left to each passenger, then, to decide whether this is a colorful dream filled with fantastic and highly suggestive images or a nightmare of fragmented deconstruction.

Dale Walden Johnson
Erskine Theological Seminary, Due West, SC

The Reformation Theologians: An Introduction to Theology in the Early Modern Period.
Edited by Carl Lindberg. Oxford: Blackwell, 2002, xiii + 396 pp., \$36.95 paper.

The Reformation Theologians is the third piece of Blackwell Publishers' *Great Theologians* series, with each work presenting major figures of a particular era. This edition features twenty-five reformers—from Luther and Zwingli to Teresa of Avila and Menno Simons. The wide spectrum of selections reaches beyond "Protestant-only" and "male-only" conceptions of early sixteenth century Christian activism. It includes two humanists, seven Lutherans, eight Reformed scholars, four Roman Catholics, and four members of the Radical tradition. The approach is welcome, but it is a trade-off strategy that leaves some notable gaps of coverage, given what one might expect from the principal title. More will be said about this below.

The contributors are mainly recognized specialists although a few less-well-known scholars are included in the mix. The articles all maintain a good balance between the main task of providing an essential introduction of the particular theologian while still engaging in some interpretive nuance. Each contribution offers endnotes and a brief bibliography that includes primary and secondary sources. The length of each entry is about 6000 words, thus allowing much greater coverage and depth than entries on the same figures in recently published resources such as the *Oxford Encyclopedia of the Reformation* or the *Dictionary of Historical Theology*. In each article a regular use of headings helps to display the structure of presentation. Lindberg also offers introductory and concluding sections, a six-page glossary and a cumulative index for the full volume.

The essay selections invite some additional comments. The time-frame for all the selections overlap Luther's lifetime—thus, mainly the first half of the sixteenth century. Lindberg, in his acknowledgments, explains that two planned articles—on Martin Bucer and John Fisher—were omitted because contributors failed to meet the publica-

tion deadline. These omissions, as he notes, leave gaps of coverage for the Reformed and Roman Catholic traditions. There are other omissions as well. The broad scope of the volume, its size restrictions, and the editorial commitment to provide relatively expansive contributions, requires that many significant figures be left aside. Thus, while the inclusion of three women—Argula von Grumbach, Katharina Schütz Zell, and Teresa of Avila—offers a laudable reminder that the activists of this era included more than formally-educated men, only Teresa rises to the level of a widely-influential figure in her own day and beyond. While I cheer these selections for reaching across the gender divide, others might prefer more traditional selections measured strictly by social or ideological influence. Nor are all the other entries equal in substance to some who are overlooked. For instance, at least one of the Lutherans in the work, Urbanus Rhegius, was arguably more of a second-tier consolidator than a seminal figure. Another weightier Lutheran—I think of the controversial Andreas Osiander for one—would be more welcomed for educational purposes. Of course many readers will have their own favorites that “should have been included.” I would also add John Knox of the Reformed camp and Johann Eck of the Roman Catholics to such a list.

The essays are, without exception, satisfying as competent introductions to the theologies of the figures under review. It must be underscored that it is their theology more than specific historical-biographical features of the subjects that are emphasized throughout the work. The reader who has at least a moderately mature awareness of sixteenth century history and religious controversies will be most rewarded by it. Some of the studies are more insightful than others. Oswald Bayer's piece on Luther, for one, is refreshingly effective in unfolding the Reformer's theology within a set of pastoral values (seeking to offer the Word of address that creates faith) and a more trinitarian and relational framework. Peter Newman Brooks also offers an alert and carefully measured presentation of Thomas Cranmer's development as England's first reformed archbishop. Yet—and this illustrates the emphasis on theology in the volume as a whole—such a basic biographical feature as Cranmer's execution under Mary Tudor's regime is not mentioned.

The contributors often reflect their close engagement with their subjects; this can be both a strength and a limitation. To the degree that scholars bring a personal or confessional advocacy to their presentation, the reader can be assured of a thorough exposure to the merits of their given concern. But alternative views may be washed out in the process. A comparison of Heinz Scheible's sympathetic portrayal of Philip Melancthon's theology, and Oliver Olson's adjacent presentation of Melancthon's theological opponent, Matthias Flacius, illustrates this tendency as the contributors each offer a nuanced advocacy of their subject's views—with a clear tension of viewpoints evident between the two pieces. A bit of bias is also evident in Richard Muller's article on Theodore Beza when Muller suggests that his subject's scholasticism is mainly a methodology. This is certainly true if Beza's procedures are allowed to be isolated. But for sixteenth-century Protestant students, the scholastic method was normally accompanied by extensive exposure to Aristotle's works, read within scholasticism's rather inclusive dialectical-synthetic methodology. It was just such a package—shaped by Aristotle's basic theological assumptions and terminology—that a few decades earlier led Luther to call for the philosopher's *Metaphysics* and *Ethics*, among other writings, to be dismissed from university studies. Perhaps the most striking example of a confessional bias is Gregory Miller's claim in his presentation of Huldrych Zwingli that “Anabaptists reverse the divinely instituted order by requiring faith before inclusion in the church” (p. 162).

Any weaknesses in subject selection or presentation, however, are very modest in comparison to the benefits the volume offers. It provides a moderately technical resource that is certain to be very useful to students in their early-to-middle stages of

study in Church history and historical theology. The contributions, although few in number, all offer relatively strong summative exposures to the theology of their subjects. It receives a solid commendation.

R. N. Frost
Multnomah Biblical Seminary, Portland, OR

Love in Hard Places. By D. A. Carson. Wheaton: Crossway, 2002. 207 pp., \$14.99 paper.

We have come to expect from Carson diligent, careful exegesis of Scripture, theological concern, contemporary cultural as well as academic awareness, and warm, penetrating pastoral care in his writings. Such a balance is rare and admirable among academics. Most recently, within the space of a year, Carson has published (co-edited) a weighty scholarly tome on *Justification and Variegated Nomism* and the present volume on Christian love. A slightly earlier, complementary volume entitled *The Difficult Doctrine of the Love of God* (Wheaton: Crossway, 2000) focused on God's love (summarized briefly in chap. 1), while the present piece addresses the nature and practice of Christian love. The main substance of the volume was originally presented in the 2001 Oak Hill College (England) lectures, but these have been expanded for the present work (e.g. references to Osama Bin Laden, 9/11 were added after the original manuscript was presented).

Anyone who has attempted to give a serious account of Christian love quickly discovers that "Christian love soon embroils us in reflection on justice, revenge, war, the authority of the state, forgiveness, hate, and much more" (p. 10). Carson attempts to give a brief treatment of these and other related ethical themes within these pages. Although this volume begins with a careful look at the double commandment to love God and to love one's neighbor, it is not about Christian love in general but more narrowly about love in the hard places. There are many helpful insights on how the first hard place—our own hearts and lives—needs to be squarely faced. I found this first chapter refreshingly practical.

In the second chapter, Carson discusses the portion of the Sermon on the Mount dealing with oaths, the *lex talionis*, and the love of the enemy (Matt 5:43–48). These teachings of Jesus are understood as corrections to false Jewish teachings and are related to personal not legal or political areas. As to the love of enemies, Carson distinguishes between "little enemies" (Christian enemies) and "big enemies" (persecutors of Christians). Little enemies are to be treated with no harm or retaliation (Rom 12:17; 1 Thess 5:15; 1 Pet 3:9–12) in forbearance but also with a willingness to confront according to the instructions in Matt 18:15–17. This approach of love is commanded of all Christians not only that blessing may come to them personally but also that the communication of the gospel with full effectiveness may come to others. Yet what about Christian love and disputes over the truth of the gospel? There is bad unity and good unity. Unity is not intrinsically good. "Those who deny the fundamentals of the gospel that John lays out are everywhere regarded as outside the locus of this fold" (p. 63). However, "flawed as the church is, the unity for which Jesus prayed is nevertheless real, deep, and partially realized this side of the consummation. Despite substantial differences over important issues, genuine believers reach across cultural, linguistic, organizational, denominational, racial, and economic barriers, and by their love they promote the gospel of Jesus Christ" (p. 63).

The attacks of big enemies (persecutors) may take the form of mental, emotional, and intellectual as well as physical or violent forms of persecution. Carson believes that the

church may grow as a result of persecution, but it may also suffer serious damage. Christians who walk in love should try not to “fight back with a nasty anti-intellectualism, a ‘circle-the-wagons’ mentality that is neither loving nor evangelistic but merely defensive” (p. 66). What should be the response to those who are enemies because they are “other”; “those who belong to a different race, a different party, a different country or a different socioeconomic group—in short, to a different ‘tribe’” (p. 68)? Here Miroslav Volf’s *Exclusion and Embrace* (Nashville: Abingdon, 2001) is cited as helpful in understanding how we tend to identify our self by whether we see another as “like” us and therefore to be embraced into our identity or as one who is different and “other” and therefore to be excluded, despised, and even hated. Hatred then breeds violence, and violence in turn causes more violence in an endless cycle. Only authentic forgiveness can break the cycle of violence. However, can we forgive Osama Bin Laden? Carson devotes 70 pages (two long chapters, over one-third the total length of the book) in an attempt to deal with various aspects of this issue of Christian forgiveness of enemies.

Because it is a misunderstood and neglected aspect of Christian love, we are treated to a whole chapter that examines the basics of Christian love and forgiveness (chap. 3). Forgiveness and reconciliation are to be distinguished in that forgiveness is an obligation of love for all Christians, whereas reconciliation, while the desired end, can only be realized by the repentance of the offending party. Therapeutic forgiveness (only the offended party forgives the unrepentant offender) is not stressed in the Bible but it can have an acceptable place in Christian forgiveness based on Luke 23:34 and Acts 7:60—“Father, forgive them for they do not know what they are doing” and “Lord, do not hold this sin against them.” The case seems weak to me at this point since in both situations it is an appeal for God to forgive, which is not quite the same as the person directly forgiving unrepentant sinners. However, it could imply a *willingness* to forgive—the actual forgiveness being extended if there is repentance. Christian love must also recognize, Carson argues, that God’s justice may involve his punishment without any forgiveness (Matt 25:41; Rev 6:9–10). A further example of this is the execution of punishment (justice) by the state. While Carson pleads that “we must not pit justice against forgiveness but humbly attend to both of them,” one still senses that in Carson there may be too much dichotomy between justice and love to fit the biblical concept of justice, which seems to be more a *loving-justice*: “judgment without mercy will be shown to anyone who has not been merciful. Mercy triumphs over judgment” (Jas 2:13).

Part 2 of forgiveness (chap. 4) is the application of forgiveness to two hard cases: racism and Osama Bin Laden. I found the discussion on love and race to be quite helpful. Not only in the church’s interracial mix but in evangelistic outreach the path of love “may look a little different in different parts of the country, in different parts of the world, in different cultures and subcultures” (p. 99). The discussion on forgiveness and Bin Laden takes Carson into an extended attempt to defend the just war tradition against Christian pacifist views. Following Aquinas (who followed Augustine), Christians should see a “just war” as a possible expression of Christian love. Yet are we not to love Bin Laden also? Carson responds by telling us that we should first be concerned with the victims of 9/11 not with the perpetrators. The “enemy” we are to love apparently does not include Bin Laden unless by Christian love we include the just war killing of not only terrorists but also the “collateral damage” of noncombatants: “War is savage; it is not pretty. More than the bad guys get hurt. But facing the alternatives squarely means that most of us will conclude that sometimes it is still the *just* thing to do, the *loving* thing to do” (p. 134). More disturbing to me is the linking of such love killing to the central teaching of the Christian gospel: “But the crucified Messiah is also the exalted Lord who metes out punishment at the end. While the God and father of this crucified Messiah insists that vengeance is his (Rom 12:17–20), he also assigns the sword to the state (Rom 13:1–7). In other words the crucified Messiah is also the Lord

of history who demands justice. And it may be an act of self-sacrifice even to the point of death, that engages in a just war to prevent massive, violent injustice. In such sacrifice there is at least a pale echo of Jesus' self-sacrifice . . . it is but following Jesus at a distance" (p. 119). Besides the question of parallelism (did Jesus give his life *and* kill his enemies at the same time?), there is the moral and theological question of how such an assertion could possibly be supported by NT teaching. Miroslav Volf's position in *Exclusion and Embrace* (which Carson rejects) is that "if one decides to put on the soldier's gear instead of carrying one's cross, one should not seek legitimization in the religion that worships the crucified Messiah," and those who give in to this temptation "should forego all attempts to exonerate their version of Christian faith from complicity in fomenting violence" (quoted on p. 118). Volf's conclusion seems to me to be more profoundly Christian. Though sincere and consistent, Carson's case at this point is in my opinion not convincing and relies on a number of well-worn arguments that have been effectively answered in the better Christian pacifist treatments (unfortunately not mentioned by Carson, e.g. Macgregor 1954; Lasserre 1962; Yoder 1972; Hays 1996). Hopefully the debate will continue without demeaning or marginalizing either view.

The final two chapters of the book deal with love and the denial of the gospel (chap. 5) and love and the intoxication of the diligent routine (chap. 6). Both discussions are filled with helpful and penetrating insights and practical suggestions on church discipline and error and lessons from the church at Ephesus on how to keep our love from dying in our diligent routine that replaces our relationship to Christ.

Despite the above difference in viewpoint with the author on love and lethal violence, I want to warmly commend this book to pastors and laypersons alike. It is filled with exegetical insights and breathes with deep pastoral love and concern. Carson addresses a real and neglected need, both to understand and to live out the wide implications of our responsibility to walk in Christian love throughout our life's journey.

Alan F. Johnson
Wheaton College and Graduate School, Wheaton, IL

Time and Eternity: Exploring God's Relationship to Time. By William Lane Craig. Wheaton: Crossway, 2001, 272 pp., \$25.00 paper.

In *Time and Eternity*, Craig continues to provide philosophical arguments to support his enduring thesis: "God is timeless without creation and temporal since creation." The apparent dichotomy in this statement alone is intriguing enough to invite further investigation by scientists, theologians, and philosophers alike. As one would expect, the majority of the discussion and rationale relies heavily on philosophy rather than science or theology. The arguments presented require careful thought and consideration and can become tedious when the work is not viewed as a whole. Given the complexity of the subject matter, however, the necessity for a complete historical and analytical discourse is understood and appreciated.

The role of philosophy with respect to God's relationship to time is unabashedly presented in the preface of the book, in which Craig quotes from his previous work, *The Only Wise God*, "that someone desiring to learn more about God's attributes of omniscience would be better advised to read the works of Christian philosophers than of Christian theologians." He then states that "not only was that remark true, but the same holds for divine eternity" (p. 11). His insistence on philosophical deductive reasoning as the primary focus for understanding this subject matter is the major weakness of this book. This viewpoint stands in stark contrast to other popular authors on this topic,

such as John Polkinghorne, who view the current debate as a useful forum for new insights and ideas and less as an academic pursuit of definitive conclusions.

Craig begins by providing two views of divine eternity along with his biblical and scientific bases. He quickly dismisses Stephen Hawking's concept of "imaginary time" or "quantum physical time" (p. 22) as not being time at all, but provides no explanation for this exclusion. Next, he nicely outlines the lack of biblical data available for a definitive understanding of divine eternity. Again, this is used to support the role of philosophical theology in the elucidation of a Christian doctrine of time. To answer the question of why this is important, he offers two reasons. First, he maintains that without a coherent doctrine of divine eternity, the biblical concept of God is open to attack. Second, he contends that there has been "a great deal of careless writing on this subject." In reality, very little has been written from a Christian viewpoint regarding either quantum mechanics or relativity, without question the major accomplishments of twentieth century physics and significant threats to biblical theism.

To highlight the first reason, Craig cites the opinions of two popular authors and celebrated theoretical physicists, Paul Davies and Stephen Hawking. Davies outlines the paradox of God's transcendence versus his immanence as a major question that requires an answer from a Christian perspective that presently offers no persuasive solution. On the other hand, Hawking's use of imaginary time is an apparent attempt to eliminate the singularity associated with the big bang, which also eliminates the need for a creator. Craig addresses Davies concerns directly, but the exclusion of "imaginary time" from his definition of time leaves Hawking's challenge unanswered. Admittedly, Hawking's arguments are somewhat peripheral to Craig's thesis and also remain highly speculative, even among physicists. Even atheists such as Quentin Smith argue that quantum gravity cosmology as promoted by Hawking does not eliminate the big bang singularity.

Returning to his second reason dealing with "careless writing on the subject," Craig cites two popular Christian authors, Philip Yancey and Hugh Ross. His analysis of both authors is condescending and unduly critical. His primary objection seems to be their use of extra dimensions in a biblical interpretation of time and eternity. He goes so far as to suggest that according to Ross, our time becomes "circular, which contradicts the Judeo-Christian conception of time" (p. 26). Anyone familiar with Ross and his numerous works would realize that this is certainly not his view and represents a misinterpretation of one of his illustrations, a common problem when more than three dimensions are illustrated based on any theory or concept. Craig seems to reject any possibility of extra dimensions in the same way that a "god of the gaps" has been traditionally rejected. However, one needs to be careful and thoughtful in this regard. Numerous theories depend on additional dimensions and have valid mathematical justifications as possible solutions to these equations. Ten or eleven dimensions are required for mathematical solutions to the standard theory of particle physics. String theory in any form is entirely dependent on additional dimensions. In Craig's defense, however, he is not alone in his skepticism. Surprisingly, Hawking has been reluctant to believe in extra dimensions. Describing himself as a positivist like Einstein, Hawking maintains that extra dimensions have no meaning. In contrast to Craig, the realization of dualities or unexpected relationships between all five string theories at least provides a possibility of extra dimensions, according to Hawking. Craig ends his first section by stating that any theory of divine eternity will be tentative based on science and philosophy, but changing views on theology is apparently not a consideration.

In the next section, Craig discusses divine timelessness. Beginning with Thomas Aquinas's argument for a timeless God based on simplicity and immutability, he dismisses it as not persuasive. The next discussion of relativity theory from Newton to Einstein is detailed and well documented. Here, he thoughtfully presents the challenge

that Einsteinian relativity presents to a biblical concept of God. His answer to this is a Poincare-Lorentzian alternative interpretation of the special theory of relativity. His statement on this needs to be carefully considered: "Lorentzian relativity is admitted on all sides to be empirically equivalent to Einsteinian relativity. . . . A Lorentzian view may be preferable in light of recent discoveries" (p. 54). It must be clearly understood that a Lorentzian interpretation is technically ambiguous and therefore unnecessary with respect to any solution to the field equations. Because a Lorentzian view lacks any experimental evidence, it is not embraced by the majority of physicists, analagous to Hawking's skepticism of extra dimensions. Because this is the central component of Craig's philosophical argument for a dynamic concept of time versus a static concept of time, its importance to his overall thesis is crucial. Very recent developments in physics have significant implications for any interpretation of relativity. Paul Davies and others have recently made a proposal in the journal *Nature* that, based on experimental evidence, the speed of light may not be a constant but may have slowed over time. The implications of this are not well understood, but it opens up the possibility of alternative explanations for a number of quantum events that have been viewed as simultaneous yet in fact may not be. Craig's next discussion of "cosmic time" (p. 59) as absolute time also needs to be re-examined in light of this. The addition of quantum mechanics needs to be included in Craig's discussion but in fact is conspicuously absent. He would be well served by incorporating quantum field theory, since this combines quantum mechanics with Einstein's special theory of relativity and is the basis of elementary particle physics. This inclusion would serve a wider scientific audience and the philosophical implications are numerous as well.

In the next section Craig discusses divine temporality. He points out the impossibility of atemporal personhood. The discussion then turns to God's relationship to the world and tensed facts as an introduction to static and dynamic concepts of time. He uses tensed facts as his argument for a dynamic concept of time. As always, Craig is meticulous in his historical analysis and presentation of traditional arguments against a dynamic concept of time, including McTaggart's paradox and the myth of passage. He then turns to a discourse on static time, the dominant view of many physicists and philosophers. Relativity theory is analyzed with emphasis on Minkowski's space-time concept. Craig correctly and astutely points out that this interpretation of relativity is a construct only. Einstein adapted this view because it allowed for a model to explain gravity, an explanation that was previously unavailable. The fact that this is a construct has gradually been forgotten and the impediment it has created with respect to a greater understanding of problems in modern physics is noted. The next discussion of the mind dependence of becoming is rejected as not convincing. The analysis of arguments against a static conception of time are possibly the most difficult to follow in this book, mainly due to incomplete definitions and incomplete concepts. Craig makes his strongest pronouncement against a static conception of time based on a theological doctrine of *creatio ex nihilo*. Before scientific and philosophical considerations can be entertained, any theory that is theologically unacceptable is deemed false. He argues that a static conception of time is unacceptable and therefore *creatio ex nihilo* requires a dynamic theory of time.

Craig concludes with a discussion of the beginning of time and God's existence as it relates to creation. He curiously quotes Davies and Hawking in defense of an actual beginning of time. He then argues against the possibility of infinity using similar philosophical reasoning as he employed in his previous work, *The Kalam Cosmological Argument*. He finally introduces another theological argument by asking the question: "Why did God not create the world sooner?" He ends the section with perhaps the only discussion truly pertinent to the first part of his thesis, namely, God's timelessness without creation. He clarifies his position by pointing out the distinction between *without*

creation as opposed to *before* creation. His analogy of the big bang singularity not being a part of time, but a boundary to time with God's timeless eternity as a boundary of time, is useful.

In addition to expanding his scientific discussion, Craig could also consider additional theological considerations that impact this topic. The current discussion among scientists and theologians concerning a kenotic view of creation has implications for time and eternity which have not been explored philosophically. Would Craig consider the creation of the universe as a kenotic act of God who subjects himself to the temporality of time? How would Craig view the following thought experiment: If God could choose to destroy the universe (could he?) and also time (temporality), is he then timeless? God's role in creating and subjecting himself to time has significant theological and philosophical implications.

In the appendix, Craig discusses divine eternity and God's knowledge of the future. He admits that his thesis raises numerous implications with respect to God's omniscience. Theological and philosophical grounds for affirming divine foreknowledge are discussed as well as philosophical objections. His conclusion is that "God simply possesses essential knowledge of all truth including truths about future contingents" (p. 265). Once again the inclusion of quantum physics would enhance his discussion. In his book, *The Frontiers of Science and Faith*, John Jefferson Davis notes that Craig's arguments concerning human contingency are parallel to arguments raised by quantum contingency as it relates to divine omniscience.

In conclusion, *Time and Eternity* is a must read for anyone seriously concerned with God's relationship to time and eternity. This is best considered a work in progress, but both scientists and theologians will be challenged with respect to their current view of this important topic.

Merrit Quarum
Portland, OR

The Free Church and the Early Church: Bridging the Historical Divide. By D. H. Williams, ed. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002, xiii + 183 pp., \$24.00 paper.

The essayists of *The Free Church and the Early Church* lament the theological and spiritual fragmentation within evangelical Protestantism and uniformly aim to engage the patristic era in order to be "doctrinally balanced" and "exegetically faithful" (p. xi).

Frederick W. Norris's informative "The Canon of Scripture in the Church" recognizes how modern biblical scholarship shapes questions of canonicity and strongly encourages evangelicals to "change the ways in which [they] describe the development of the church" (p. 15). Norris sharply addresses the critical and thorny issues of OT and NT canonization and concludes that despite some consensus for certain books, inspiration fails as a sole criterion for determining authentic from spurious Scripture. Norris convincingly argues that simplistic Protestant sentiment that pits Scripture over and above tradition obscures important tensions that are part of canonization discussions. Nevertheless, Norris wisely observes, "[k]nowing the church's interpretations of Scripture in each age deepens our sense of biblical truth" (p. 24).

D. Jeffrey Bingham's splendid "Evangelicals, Irenaeus, and the Bible" offers a corrective for individualistic Bible reading. Bingham sternly indicts evangelicalism with "individual solipsism," a thick spiritual individualism that exalts the private and personal self. This trend, Bingham astutely points out, is related directly to "communitarian solipsism," an individualistic reading of the Bible consumed with the present

and impervious to tradition. Bingham's corrective for such evangelical solipsism comes from the second-century Church father Irenaeus, who heroically defended orthodox Christianity against gnosticism. Within this response Bingham finds a reading of Scripture that is both dependent on the apostles (and OT prophets) and the Holy Spirit. "Evangelicals in their Bible reading need the influence of the community past and present," Bingham concludes, "because there the Spirit resides" (p. 46).

In "The Correction of the Augustinians: A Case Study in the Critical Appropriation of a Suspect Tradition," Gerald W. Schlabach offers several innovative ways in which free church Protestants can engage the corrective tradition of Augustine and thus thoughtfully apply it themselves. Schlabach carefully considers Augustine's well-known just war theory and suggests that when this is read against the larger backdrop of his theology, "Augustine's support for military participation fits . . . far less securely than interpreters have historically assumed" (p. 71). Likewise, a narrow reading of Augustine minimizes the necessity of good works, but as Schlabach carefully shows, "continence . . . must recognize itself as God's gift" (p. 72). The current free church tradition, Schlabach contends, selectively following Augustine's lead, must attempt to love rightly and thus both offer and accept correction.

Phyllis Rodgers Pleasants's illuminating "*Sola Scriptura* in Zurich?" uses a sixteenth-century controversy over the nature of baptism to explore how Huldrych Zwingli, Conrad Grebel, and Balthasar Hubmaier used the Reformation dictum "Scripture alone" in the life of faith. Largely from correspondence Pleasants clearly shows that despite uniformity in application of *sola Scriptura*, all three Reformers embraced different conceptions of baptism, as Zwingli (infant baptism) argued his case from both the Old and New Testaments while Grebel and Hubmaier (believer's baptism) used solely the NT. Furthermore, all three Reformers referenced patristic writings (which were always subordinate to Scripture) in varying degrees to justify convictions, although such "similarities did not lead to a consensus on interpretation" (p. 88). Pleasants also discusses the urgency of messages for reform and what each Reformer thought should constitute a magisterium. Pleasants insightfully demonstrates that a discursive glance at this baptismal controversy shows that *sola Scriptura* is as difficult to uphold today as it was in the sixteenth century.

In the thoughtful and engaging "Scripture, Tradition, and the Church: Reformation and Post-Reformation," the book's editor D. H. Williams maintains that the hinge upon which the Reformation turned was not Scripture against tradition, but was rather "at root a conflict with the Roman Church over the discernment between (human) traditions and the catholic Tradition, or between 'false' and 'true' tradition(s)" (p. 106). Williams masterfully observes that early Reformers like Tyndall, Hus, Luther, Melancthon, Calvin and Bullinger upheld the necessity of tradition, but when conflicts arose between Catholic Church officials and their own authority, they held that Scripture reigned supreme. Later Reformers, notably Chemnitz, Turretin, Wollebius, and Wistus, modified this position and diminished tradition in order to highlight the sufficiency of the written Word and thus respond directly to the Council of Trent's subversion of Scripture to Church tradition.

Everrett Ferguson examines ecclesiology in "The 'Congregationalism of the Early Church'" and attentively argues that despite the suspicion that many free church adherents harbor against the strict hierarchy of the early church, a closer look reveals that much contemporary practice is compatible with early church models. Ferguson strikingly shows that the local congregation had relative authority as decisions of major councils of bishops required local reception, approval, and implementation. Furthermore, he solidly demonstrates that discussions on matters of faith and practice were exchanged through detailed correspondence by which *church* communicated with *church*. Ferguson then carefully shows that local ministers were selected or elected locally, not

always through formal conciliar decision, and that ministers ordained in a certain locale were expected to maintain a ministry in that location only. While clearly not denying the hierarchical developments in the early church, Ferguson keenly proves that overall “the church preserved a basically congregational consciousness of its organization and ministry” (p. 138).

In “The Authority of Tradition: A Baptist View,” E. Glenn Hinson cogently explores the degree to which Baptists might assent to the notion of tradition as articulated in Vatican II’s *Dogmatic Constitution on Divine Revelation*. Hinson argues that Baptists will find much to embrace, especially the pronouncements on the uniqueness and finality of divine revelation. Similarly, Baptists will find reason to concur with a conception of tradition and Scripture in which both keep each other in check—what Hinson calls a “reciprocal relationship” (p. 110). On the other hand, Baptists will find problematic any notion of infallible tradition. In the end Hinson finds that Baptists (and other Protestant bodies) can find meaning in official church proclamations from ages past (e.g. Nicea and Chalcedon) but “*final* authority” should fall “under the search light of the Word of God” (p. 161).

In “Alexander Campbell and the Apostolic Tradition,” William Tabbernee brilliantly summarizes Campbell’s knowledge and use of patristic literature to define his outlook and ministry in the context of heresy trials. While Campbell believed “creeds” (e.g. *Apostles’ Creed*) are subordinate to the Bible, rumination on topics like communion, preaching, baptism, and ministry in the *Millennial Harbinger* regularly made reference to the Church fathers. Tabbernee finds that a more careful reading of Campbell displays a healthy ecumenism that sought to “incorporate both the primary witness of Scripture and the corroborative and even ‘germinative’ testimony of the Church Fathers” (p. 180).

The contributors to *The Free Church and the Early Church* honestly and bravely confront contemporary Protestant aversion to the patristic witness and in the process successfully bridge the gap between the saints of an earlier era and the faithful of today. For those concerned with the health and future of evangelicalism, this seminal collection of essays provokes thought and inspires action.

Phillip L. Sinitiere
University of Houston, Houston, TX

Blessed One: Protestant Perspectives on Mary. By Beverly Gaventa Roberts and Cynthia L. Rigby, eds. Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 2002, xii + 168 pp., \$19.95 paper.

Historically, Mary has occupied a sacred but secluded space in Protestant thought. The essayists of *Blessed One* move Mary from the margins of Protestantism to a more central and relevant position in the life and mind of the church.

Joel Green considers Mary’s place in Lucan discourse and labels her the “accessible exemplar”—one who responded to God’s call and one to whom the faithful can look for exemplary spirituality. Mary’s response has a transformative and winsome power, Green attentively observes, and it is within this context that the faithful of today can live a “life . . . that runs counter to the world of normal perception” (p.18).

Katharine Doob Sakenfeld focuses on the ways in which Mary’s presence among the OT women in Matthew’s genealogy “challenges ordinary human expectations and values” (p. 21). The women, Sakenfeld keenly asserts, are marginalized for a variety of reasons but considered within the context of Mary’s life and witness, marginalization is reversed and the key role each woman played in God’s redemptive plan comes forth.

E. Elizabeth Johnson, from Mark's gospel, shows how Mary first reveals "domestic disorientation" (p. 33) as a "rejected mother" when Jesus seeks fellowship with his supporters. This disorientation is "reoriented" when Christ mystifies the residents of Nazareth. The Nazarenes subsequently balk at Jesus' claims to divinity and thus embrace his family. In another Markan moment, Johnson concisely observes, Jesus challenges domestic boundaries in an apocalyptic light by making references to his hour of death. Finally, the domesticity of Jesus' family is restored as his mother and his siblings become disciples of the resurrected Christ.

Beverly Roberts Gaventa carefully explores the role of Mary in the Gospels to show that she embodies devotion in John, is engaged in oneness with her Son at the cross in Matthew, and acts as a "disciple, prophet, and mother" (p. 53) in Luke. The varying visions of Mary, Gaventa instructively demonstrates, direct the faithful to reflect on the scandal of the cross.

Nancy Duff fashions Mary from a Reformed perspective such that the incarnation reveals an obedient Mary, a faithful woman who responded to God's call and thus engaged in transformative discipleship (p. 65). Duff carefully rejects Mary as "ideal woman" and convincingly argues that the Reformed concept of vocation creates space where pastoral identification with Mary occurs and where the "reversal of power" (p. 68) at the manger and the cross is observed.

Cheryl Kirk-Duggan constructs a twenty-first century Mary by fostering a unique and innovative dialogue between scholarship and popular culture. Kirk-Duggan uses the lyrics of Tina Turner's song "Proud Mary" to begin discussion of a Mary who is concerned with development and survival (p. 77). Kirk-Duggan innovatively draws on the work of Leonard Boff and Andrew Greeley to suggest how Mary might "move us to action, then contemplation" (p. 78). Finally, to observe Mary in film (*Eve's Bayou*, *Soul Food*, *Down in the Delta*) from a liberationist-womanist perspective creates "a collage of inner beauty, strength, and good will" (p. 81). Kirk-Duggan makes a compelling case for "Proud Mary . . . a sociocultural figure who symbolizes the embodiment of a vibrant, wise woman with maternal and earthy instincts" (p. 71).

Nora Lozano-Diaz uses the Virgin of Guadalupe as a "cultural symbol" (p. 93) to show, negatively, how Latin Protestants have obfuscated and ignored Mary and to suggest, positively, that the same virgin offers both freedom and liberation. According to Lozano-Diaz, Protestants have ignored Mary in the "naming ritual" and a "Protestant view of culture" (p. 88) leaves Mexican and Mexican-American Protestants unaware of Mary. Only through an "alternative feminist" (p. 93) approach to the Bible, Lozano-Diaz artfully claims, are Mary's "liberating qualities" of a "strong will" and "social consciousness" seen.

Bonnie Miller-McLemore views Mary "from the perspective of feminist maternal Protestant theology" to explore ways in which she shapes motherhood and suggest how the process of mothering can transform sentiment about Mary. Mary's "pondering" in Luke, Miller-McLemore contends, reveals the "attention, anguish, and amazement" (p. 107) of the one who not only gave birth to the Son of God, but mothered and raised him as well. Miller-McLemore offers a winsome challenge as Mary's "pondering suggests fresh ways of embodying faith in the act of mothering" (p. 111).

Daniel Migliore creates a Reformational Mary who consents to God's election and models genuine faith. By faith Mary participates in the poverty of the poor through which God's righteous concern for the poor emerges. In several "fallible" moments, Migliore intriguingly asserts, Mary reveals the concept of *semper reformanda*. Finally, Migliore lucidly observes, Mary models ministry as she tends to Jesus at the foot of the cross and shows the vitality of prayer by her own prayers for the execution of God's will.

Lois Malcom examines Luther's 1521 *Commentary on the Magnificat* and perceptively shows that Luther upholds Mary as an ideal example of faith. Yet, as Malcom

carefully argues, Luther's reading of Mary also opens a window through which one can understand God's "bare goodness" (p. 132). Through Mary, according to Luther, God exalts the lowly and thus prefigures the same reversal that will take place in heaven.

Cynthia Rigby focuses on the joint participation of God and Mary in the incarnation, which, like the intrinsic and extrinsic forces that inspire artists, eliminates the idea of choice (on Mary's part) so that obedient participation emerges. Mary's participation in the incarnation is scandalous, and if one grasps the participatory nature of the incarnation, Rigby astutely points out, one "recognize[s] that God has entered into our existence to draw us into existence with God" (p. 155).

The unique Protestant perspectives offered in *Blessed One* converge to give voice to a silenced Mary and offer constructive ways to honor and bless the one who gave us the Word.

Phillip L. Sinitiere
University of Houston, Houston, Texas