Andrews University
SEMINARY
STUDIES

Andrews University Press

A refereed journal, ANDREWS UNIVERSITY SEMINARY STUDIES provides a
scholarly venue, within the context of biblical faith, for the presentation of
research in the area of religious and biblical studies. *AUSS* publishes research
articles and brief notes on the following topics: biblical archaeology and history
of antiquity; Hebrew Bible; New Testament; church history of all periods;
historical, biblical, and systematic theology; ethics; history of religions; and
missions. Selected res .rch articles on ministry and Christian education may also
be included.

The opinions expressed in articles, brief notes, book reviews, etc., are those of the
authors and do not necessarily represent the views of the editors nor those of the
Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary.

ANDREWS UNIVERSITY SEMINARY STUDIES

CONTENTS

MAY 2 ' 1997

* * * * * * * * * * * *

The articles in this journal are indexed, abstracted, or listed in: *Elenchus of Biblica;*
Internationale Zeitschriftenschau für Bibelwissenschaft und Grenzgebiete; New
Testament Abstracts; Old Testament Abstracts; Orientalistische Literaturzeitung;
Religion Index One, Periodicals; Religious and Theological Abstracts; Seventh-day
Adventist Periodical Index; Theologische Zeitschrift; Zeitschrift für die
alttestamentliche Wissenschaft.

THE TRANSJORDANIAN ALTAR (JOSH 22:10-34) ACCORDING TO JOSEPHUS (*ANT.* 5.100-114) AND PSEUDO-PHILO (*LAB* 22.1-8)

CHRISTOPHER BEGG
Catholic University of America
Washington, DC 20064

In the extended dénouement of the book of Joshua (chaps. 22-24), there occurs a final moment of tension sparked by the Transjordanian tribes' building themselves an altar, 22:10-34.[1] In this article, my focus is not, however, on the biblical Transjordanian altar story as such. Rather, I wish to examine two approximately contemporaneous *relectures* of the episode, i.e., those of Josephus in *Antiquitates Judaicae (Ant.)* 5.100-114[2] and Pseudo-Philo's *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum (LAB)* 22.1-7.[3] For both authors I shall attempt to ascertain how, why, and with what effects they have reworked the source account. By way of conclusion I shall present some comparative remarks on the two *relectures.*

Josephus

1. Introduction (Josh 22:10-15// Ant. 5.100-105a).

In my consideration of Josephus' altar story, I note first that it has the same immediate context as its biblical counterpart: it stands between Joshua's dismissal of the two and a half tribes (Josh 22:1-9// *Ant.* 5.93-99) and his farewell address(es) at Shechem (Joshua 23-24// *Ant.* 5.115-116).[4]

---

[1]See references to previous literature in J.S. Kloppenborg, "Joshua 22: The Priestly Editing of an Ancient Tradition," *Bib* 62 (1981): 347-371.

[2]I use the text and translation of H. St. J. Thackeray, R. Marcus, A. Wikgren, and L. H. Feldman, *Josephus* LCL (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1926-1965). *Antiquities* 5.100-114 appears in 5: 47-53, where translation and notes are by Marcus.

[3]I use the text of *LAB* edited by D. J. Harrington and J. Cazeaux, *Pseudo-Philon: Les Antiquités Bibliques* I (SC 229; Paris: Cerf, 1976 [for 22.1-7, see pp. 176-181]) and the translation of this by D. J. Harrington, "Pseudo-Philo," in *The Old Testatment Pseudpigrapha* II (ed. J. H. Charlesworth; Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1985), 297-377, pp. 331-332. On *LAB* overall, see recently F. J. Murphy, *Pseudo-Philo: Rewriting the Bible* (New York-Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993).

[4]Josephus' version conflates (while also greatly reducing) the two separate and extended discourses of Joshua 23 and 24. It likewise provides (5.115a) a more flowing transition between the end of the altar episode and Joshua's farewell discourse. This reads: "Thereafter, having dismissed the multitude to their several provinces, Joshua himself abode at Sikima.

Overall, Josephus faithfully reproduces the basic story line of Josh 22:10-34 in 5.100-114. At the same time, his version exhibits expansions, abridgements, and modifications of the source account. These rewriting techniques already surface in Josephus' introduction to the episode in *Ant.* 5.100-105a. Josh 22:10 leaves readers in suspense regarding the Transjordanians' intent in constructing their altar. Anticipating the builders' later words (22:24-28), Josephus clarifies the point immediately: "they erected an altar . . . *as a memorial to future generations of their relationship to the inhabitants on the other side.*" [5] Having introduced this clarification, Josephus then goes on to explain why, as Josh 22:11-12 relates, the other Israelites upon "hearing" of the Transjordanians' initiative, assembled "for war" against them. The Israelites did this, *Ant.* 5.101a informs us, because they lent credence to a "calumny" (διαβολήν) that the altar was erected "with designs of sedition [νεωτερισμῷ] and the introduction of strange gods." Josephus likewise expatiates at length on the bare notice of Josh 22:12 about the Israelites coming together "to make war." In 5.101b-102 this datum gets worked up as follows:

> They sprang to arms, with intent to cross the river and be avenged on those that had erected the altar and to punish them for this perversion of the rites of their fathers. For they held that they should take no account of their kinship[6] or of the rank of those thus incriminated, but of the will of God and the fashion in which He delights to be honoured. So, moved by indignation [ὑπ' ὀργῆς], they prepared to take the field.

Conversely, however, Josephus leaves aside 22:12's specification concerning the site of the Israelites' assembly, Shiloh, perhaps supposing that readers would supply this item on their own, given his repeated previous mentions of that city as Israel's headquarters in the period following the subjugation of the land (*Ant.* 5.68, 70, 72, 79).

The sequence of Josh 22:12-14 appears somewhat curious: The Israelites gather "for war" against the Transjordanians, but instead of marching forth, they dispatch a delegation to them. Josephus (5.103) elucidates the sudden change of plans with an insertion that highlights the role of the leaders in calming popular passions: "But Joshua[7] and Eleazar

---

Twenty years later, in extreme old age, having sent for the chief notables of the cities . . . he recalled to them . . .".

[5]Italics indicate elements of Josephus' presentation which lack a parallel in the Bible.

[6]Note the irony: The altar was a built as a "a memorial to future generations of their [the Transjordanians'] relationship to the inhabitants on the other side." Upon hearing of the construction, those "on the other side" respond, however, by resolving to "take no account of their kinship."

[7]Joshua is, curiously, nowhere mentioned in MT Josh 22:10-34; he is cited in LXX 22:34 as the one who names the Transjordians' altar. Josephus' version provides him with a

the high priest and the elders [ἡ γερουσία] restrained them, counseling them first to test their brethren's mind by a parley, and should they find their intent mischievous then and only then to proceed to hostilities. They therefore sent ambassadors to them." In Josh 22:13 the delegation comprises Eleazar's son Phineas plus ten chiefs, one from each of the Cisjordanian tribes. In Josephus, Phineas' entourage consists simply of "ten others highly esteemed among the Hebrews." At the same time, he introduces a specification concerning the purpose of the mission that itself echoes the previous advice of the leaders: "To discover what they [the Transjordanians] could have meant by erecting that altar on the riverbank." Josephus likewise elaborates the minimalistic transitional notice of 22:15 ("they came to the Reubenites, etc., in the land of Gilead and they said to them") with his "so the embassy having crossed the river and reached these people,[8] an assembly was convened,[9] and Phineas arose and said that . . .". In this formulation Josephus highlights the stature of Phineas: he alone speaks, rather than doing so simply as one among an eleven-man delegation.

2. *The Exchange (Josh 22:16-31// Ant. 5.105b-113).*

The long central segment of our episode relates the verbal exchange between the Transjordanians and the delegation. This opens (22:16-20// *Ant.* 5.105b-110) with the delegation's speech to the supposed miscreants. The biblical speech is formulated throughout in direct address; Josephus' parallel employs indirect address initially (5.105b), but then reverts to direct address (5.106-110).[10] In 22:16-18 the delegation's word starts off with a *Botenformel* ("thus says the whole congregation of the Lord"), followed by two accusatory questions, of which the second contains a

---

prominent role in the episode such as one would expect him to exercise given his importance in the context.

[8]Josephus lacks the specification of Josh 22:15 about the site of the encounter ("the land of Gilead"). Recall his earlier nonreproduction of the mention of Shiloh as the place where the Israelites assemble for war in 22:12.

[9]Josephus' inserted reference to the "convening of an assembly" might reflect the influence of such Hellenistic historians as Dionysius of Halicarnarsus, in whose *Antiquitates Romanae* popular assemblies are regularly convened in the face of problems requiring deliberation. On the point, see W. C. van Unnik, "Josephus' Account of the Story of Israel's Sin with Alien Women," in *Travels in the World of the Old Testament: Studies Presented to Prof. M. A. Beek on the Occasion of his 65th Birthday*, ed. M. S. H. G. van Voss et al. (Assen: Van Gorcum, 1974), 253.

[10]On Josephus' tendency to substitute indirect for biblical direct address, as well as his occasional mixing of the two forms in a single speech, see C. T. Begg, *Josephus' Account of the Early Divided Monarchy (AJ 8.212-420)*, BETL 108 (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1993), 12-13, n. 38; 123-124, n. 772.

reminiscence of the Baal-Peor episode(s) (see Numbers 25). These questions, in turn, lead into a statement about the potentially negative consequences of the Transjordanians' deed for all other Israelites ("and if you rebel against the Lord today, He will be angry with the whole congregation of Israel tomorrow"). The greatly amplified opening segment of Phineas' speech according to Josephus (5.105b-109a) exhibits only tenuous links with its biblical *Vorlage* but does pick up on various earlier features of the historian's retelling of our episode. Specifically, the Josephan Phineas commences with a statement that highlights the gravity of the situation: "Their sin was too grave to be met by verbal reprimand and an admonition for the future." He then goes on, without biblical basis, to explain why, nevertheless, the Israelites have dispatched an embassy to the offenders. They did this, Phineas avers, so as not to make themselves guilty of rash recourse to arms, and, more positively, in view of their existing "kinship" (τὸ συγγενές) and in hopes that even yet "words might suffice to bring them to reason (σωφρονῆσαι)."

Switching now (5.106) to direct discourse, Phineas informs his hearers that the delegation has come to ascertain the Transjordanians' "reason" for building their altar (compare 5.104, "To discover what they could have meant by erecting that altar"). Here, one might recognize a faint echo of the question posed in Josh 22:16, "What is this treachery you have committed . . . by building yourself an altar?" Josephus' priest speaker then explains that by making such a preliminary inquiry, the Israelites are "covering themselves" for all eventualities. Should, in fact, the Transjordanians have "some pious motive" in building their altar—a possibility nowhere envisaged by the biblical delegation—the Israelites will not be liable to the charge of "precipitate" action against them. Conversely, if the response received confirms their suspicions, they will be justified in undertaking "righteous vengeance," a threat without parallel in Joshua 22 where only divine, not human, retribution is threatened by the delegation (see v.18b). Phineas goes on to say (5.107, again without biblical basis) that the Israelites' inquiry is appropriate, given how inconceivable it was that, after their past exposure to God's demands and their recent settlement in their divinely allotted "heritage," the Transjordanians "could have straightaway forgotten Him, and abandoning the tabernacle and the ark and altar of our fathers, introduced some strange gods[11] and gone over to the vices of the Canaanites." Even if, however, his hearers are guilty of such apostasy, they will not, Phineas assures them, be held liable if only they will repent, cease their "madness"

---

[11]ξενικοὺς θεοὺς ἐπιφέρειν; compare *Ant.* 5.101: The Israelites hear that the altar was built "with designs of . . . the introduction of strange gods."

and evidence their adherence to the ancestral laws. Otherwise, however, they face the same fate as the Canaanites (5.108b; see 106 *fine*). Phineas further reinforces this threat by reminding the Transjordanians that given God's ubiquity there is no escaping "His authority and His vengeance."

After this free variation on the delegation's words (Josh 22:16-18), Josephus (5.109b) "reconnects" with the source's v. 19. In that biblical text the Transjordanians are first admonished that if their land is "unclean," they should resettle "in the Lord's land." Josephus too represents Phineas as invoking the possibility of a move west by the Transjordanians. At the same time, however, he motivates this possibility differently, just as he adds a statement about what would then happen with their present territory. His version of 22:19a thus reads: "But if ye regard your coming hither [to Transjordania] as a hindrance to sober living [τοῦ σωφρονεῖν, see σωφρονῆσαι, 5.105], there is nothing to prevent us from making a redistribution of the land and abandoning this district to the grazing of sheep."

Apparently, the delegation does not intend its proposal in 22:19a all that seriously, since in v. 19b there is an immediate switch to a more general, concluding appeal, that the Transjordanians not "rebel" against the Lord nor implicate the entire people in their sin, as had happened with Achan's offense (v. 20; cf. Joshua 7). Josephus' version ends with Phineas warning his hearers, "Ye would do well to return to sanity [σωφρονήσαντες] and to change you ways while your sin is still fresh." The appeal is made, not with reference to the Achan episode (so 22:20), but with a final word of warning that plays up the danger for the Transjordanians and their loved ones should they disregard it (5.110b).

In 22:21 the two and a half tribes answer the delegation *en bloc*; Josephus differentiates: His respondents are "the presidents of the assembly [προεστῶτες τῆς ἐκκλησίας, see ἐκκλησία, 5.105] and the whole multitude." The biblical Transjordanians begin (v. 22a) by twice invoking "The Mighty One, God the Lord!" Thereafter, they call down upon themselves the retribution of both the Israelites (v. 22b) and God himself (v. 23) if they have done wrong with their altar building. Josephus replaces this opening with a series of negative assertions by the speakers: "They began to disclaim the crimes wherewith they were charged, saying that neither would they renounce their kinship [συγγενείας],[12] nor had the altar any revolutionary intent [νεωτερισμόν]."[13] He has them

[12]This term echoes Phineas' reference to the Israelites' "looking rather to their kinship" at the start of his speech in 5.105.

[13]This term harks back to the phrase used in Josephus' account of the false report the Israelites hear concerning the purpose of the Transjordians' altar building, i.e., ἐπὶ νεωτερισμῷ (5.101).

continue with a double positive confession, whose content he draws from
the opening and closing words of their response in 22:22-29: "They
recognized but one God [see the acclamation of v. 22a] . . . and the brazen
altar before the tabernacle whereon the sacrifices should be offered" (see
the concluding phrase of v. 29, "the altar of the Lord . . . that stands
before his tabernacle").

The core of the tribes' answer (22:24-28) is an extended explanation
of what they did and did not intend with their altar building. Josephus'
version (5.112b) omits the Transjordanians' initial statement (vv. 24-25;
see also 27b) concerning their "fear" that some day their descendants
would be denied a part in the Lord's worship by the Israelites on the
grounds of the Jordan's constituting the God-given limit of the holy land.
Such a statement, Josephus may have surmised, would not serve to
ingratiate the speakers with their audience. Instead, he has them
immediately affirm that their "suspect" altar was not erected "for worship"
(22:26, "not for burnt offering, nor for sacrifice"). Shifting thereafter from
indirect to direct discourse (see 5.106), Josephus represents the
Transjordanians as adducing a twofold, positive motivation for their
initiative. First, the altar is meant "as a symbol and token for eternity of
our kinship [οἰκειότητος] with you" (compare "a witness between us and
you," 22:27aα, 28bβ). In addition, the altar bespeaks the Transjordanians'
"obligation to think soberly [σοφρονεῖν][14] and to abide by the laws of
our fathers [τοῖς πατρίοις ἐμμένειν]"[15] (compare 22:27aβ, where the
altar attests that "we do perform the service of the Lord"). Accordingly,
the altar is not at all "a beginning of transgression as you [the Israelites]
suspect" (compare 22:29a, "far be it from us that we should rebel against
the Lord").

The Transjordanians conclude (5.113a) their explanation of the altar's
legitimate purpose with a solemn invocation of the Deity: "And that such
was our motive in building this altar be God our all-sufficient witness
[μάρτυς]." This avowal anticipates the wording of 22:34, where the
Transjordanians[16] designate their altar as a "witness . . . that the Lord is
God." Having thus appealed to God, Josephus' Transjordanians conclude
their reply with an appeal to their fellows which has no parallel in the
source as such. This runs:

[14]Cf. 5.109, where Phineas alludes to the possibility that residence in the Transjordan
could be "a hindrance to sober living (τοῦ σωφρονεῖν)." The Transjordanians are here
affirming that their altar is, in fact, envisaged as a help to such living.

[15]Cf. 5.108, where Phineas urges the Transjordanians to show that they "revere and are
mindful of the laws of" their fathers. In 5.112 they respond that precisely by their building
their controverted altar they have manifested their attachment to the ancestral code.

[16]Thus MT; in LXX it is Joshua who so designates the altar.

> Wherefore, have a better opinion of us and cease to accuse us of any of
> those crimes, for which we would justly deserve to be extirpated who,
> being of the stock of Abraham (τοῦ ᾿Αβράμου γένους ὄντες),[17]
> embark on new-fangled [νεωτέροις, see νεωτερισμόν, 5.111] ways that
> are perversions of our customary practice.

3. Dénouement (Josh 22:30-34// Ant. 5.114).

Up to this point, Josephus has consistently expanded the source's
altar story. His parallel to the story's conclusion, vv. 30-34, by contrast,
is limited to a single, brief paragraph (5.114). Specifically, 22:30-31 first
notes that the delegation was "well pleased" with the Transjordanians'
response and then records a speech by Phineas in which he acknowledges
their innocence which has "saved the whole people from the hand of the
Lord." Josephus compacts this whole sequence into a transitional phrase:
"Phineas, having commended them for this speech . . .". Next, 22:32
recounts the return of Phineas and the chiefs to the Israelites to whom
they render a report. Josephus' parallel focuses attention on the two
Israelite leaders: Phineas "returned to *Joshua* (see 5.103) and reported their
answer to the people." This focus continues in the historian's version of
22:33. In the biblical verse "the people of Israel" are the ones who,
"pleased" by the delegation's report, "bless the Lord" and renounce the
idea of "making war" (22:12) on the Transjordanians. Josephus, on the
contrary, speaks only of a reaction by Joshua. Israel's leader, "rejoicing
that there was to be no need to levy toops or to lead them to bloodshed
and battle against kinsmen [συγγενῶν, cf. the cognate forms in 5.103,
105],[18] offered sacrifices of thanksgiving to God for these mercies." On this
note Josephus concludes our episode, leaving aside the reference in 22:34
to the naming of the altar, having already anticipated this in 5.113.

In concluding on Josephus' version of the altar story, I would call
attention to a number of overarching emphases and concerns which may
have influenced him to incorporate the story and to elaborate upon it.[19]
For one thing, Josephus' version insistently highlights a contrast that
permeates his writings, i.e., between reprehensible "innovation"
(characteristically designated by terms of the νεω- stem, see 5.101, 111,
113) and laudable adherence to "ancestral" (5.101, 107, 108, 112) ways in

---

[17]With this self-designation the Transjordanians echo the statement made by Joshua in
his farewell speech in *Ant.* 5.97: "We are all of Abraham's stock (᾿Αβράμου . . . ἐσμεν)."

[18]This notice might be seen as a concretization of the reference in 22:33 to the Israelites'
"blessing God."

[19]Several of these factors are touched on by L. H. Feldman, "Josephus's Portrait of
Joshua," *HTR* 82 (1989): 351-376.

religious matters.[20] Already the biblical story offers Jewish readers an ideal of unity and fraternity: Both branches of the people share a common respect for God's demands and a solicitude for the maintenance of their ties. The Josephan reworking, with its many references to "kinship" (5.102, 105, 112, 114) and to Joshua's "rejoicing" at not having to take military action against the Transjordanians (5.114), accentuates, as do many other contexts of *Ant.*, this ideal. It does so undoubtedly in reaction to the horrendous civil strife Josephus had personally experienced during the Jewish War.[21]

The preceding emphases in Josephus' altar story seem intended primarily for his Jewish readership. There is, however, a further distinctive feature which he likely introduced with the interests and literary culture of his Gentile audience in mind. Josephus goes beyond the Bible in highlighting the role of the individual leader (Phineas, Joshua) in the happy resolution of the altar affair. More specifically, he represents Joshua as taking the lead in pacifying the Israelites' war fever (5:103), just as he depicts Phineas as sole speaker, successfully calling on the Transjordanians to "be reasonable" (5.105, cf. 5.109). Such a presentation—also operative in Josephus' account of Moses' dealings with the people—would promote Gentile readers' identification with and appreciation of the heroes of Jewish history given its echoes of Thucydides' and Virgil's portrayals of leaders calming popular passions.[22]

In sum, Josephus seems to have recognized the biblical altar story's potential for inculcating points he wished to make to both his "publics" and set about reworking the story so as to make those points stand out even more clearly.

Pseudo-Philo

Pseudo-Philo's altar story (*LAB* 22.1-7)[23] gives it a new context vis-à-vis both the Bible and Josephus. Specifically, he places the story immediately after his parallel, in 21.7-10, to Josh 8:30-35 (cf. Deut 27:1-7), which relates various cultic-legal initiatives undertaken by Joshua at Gilgal and Mount Ebal. *LAB* 22.1-7 (// Josh 22:10-34) itself is followed directly, not by Joshua's[24] first farewell discourse as in the Bible (Josh 23) and

[20]On the point, see A. Schlatter, *Die Theologie des Judentums nach dem Bericht des Josefus*, Beitrage zur Forderung Christlicher Theologie 26 (Gütersloh: Bertelsmann, 1932), 51-52.

[21]On this feature, see Feldman, "Joshua," 372-373.

[22]See Feldman, "Joshua," 356, 361-362.

[23]On this passage, see C. Perrot, *Pseudo-Philon: Les Antiquités Bibliques*, Sources Chrétiennes 230 (Paris: Cerf, 1976), 141-143; Murphy, 104-107.

[24]In *LAB* 21.7 Joshua builds his altar at "Gilgal," a site not mentioned in either Josh 8:30-35, where the altar is constructed rather on Mt. Ebal, or Deut 27. In 21.7 Joshua erects "large

Josephus, but by a series of notices on the legitimate cult places Shiloh and Gilgal in 22.8,[25] which lack any biblical parallel as such. Only thereafter does Pseudo-Philo present his version of Joshua 23; see *LAB* 23. The implications of this new context for the interpretation of Pseudo-Philo's altar story will be considered below.

Pseudo-Philo commences (22.1) his version of the story with a parallel to Josh 22:11, the Israelites' "hearing" of the Transjordanians' initiative.[26] Already here, Pseudo-Philo diverges from the source. Among the "hearers" Joshua (absent in MT 22:10-34) is singled out by name. The report that reaches the Israelites is also different: The Transjordanians have not merely built an altar; they are also offering sacrifices upon it and have instituted a priesthood.[27]

In Josh 22 the Israelites react to what they hear by assembling at Shiloh (v. 12), whence they dispatch to "the land of Gilead" a delegation led by Phineas (v. 15). Here again, Pseudo-Philo drastically reworks things, eliminating any mention of a delegation or role for Phineas.[28] In its place he mentions the consternation of the Israelites at what they hear, as well as the coming of the Transjordanians themselves to Shiloh, where the ones to address them are "Joshua and the elders."

LAB 22.2 is Pseudo-Philo's loose parallel to the delegation's address in Josh 22:16-20. It comprises: an opening accusatory question (cf. 22:16); invocation of an earlier admonition by Moses to the Transjordanians (apparently inspired by Num 32:6, 14-15)[29] about not "growing corrupt in their deeds"; and reference to the consequences of their disregard of that

---

stones" on Mt. Ebal as directed in Deut 27:4 (in Josh 8:30-32 the "stones" in question would seem to be those of the altar itself rather than a distinct construction).

[25]The renewed mention of the altar at Gilgal in 22.8 appears problematic in the context of the verse which otherwise focuses on Shiloh. Some authors propose eliminating the reference by emending to "Shiloh." See Perrot, 143-144.

[26]Pseudo-Philo thus has no parallel either to 22:1-9 (Joshua's dismissal of the two and a half tribes) or to 22:10 (statement about their erecting an altar).

[27]Conceivably, Pseudo-Philo's "inspiration" for this elaboration of the Transjordanians' offense is 1 Kgs 12:31-33, which mentions Jeroboam's institution of a reprobate priesthood and offering of sacrifices upon the altar earlier erected by him in Bethel. Very frequently in *LAB* a biblical event is retold in terms reminiscent of a happening elsewhere in Scripture; see Murphy, 23.

[28]The nonmention of Phineas anywhere in *LAB*'s version of Joshua 22 is rather surprising, given the priest's subsequent prominence; on Pseudo-Philo's Phineas, see Murphy, 243.

[29]The concluding words of the Mosaic admonition, as cited by Joshua in 22.2, "(beware that you) destroy all this people," likewise echoes Josh 22:18b, "If you rebel against the Lord today, he will be angry with the whole congregation of Israel tomorrow."

admonition, i.e., the Israelites' "enemies" threatening to destroy them. In this reformulation of the speech of 22:16-20 all explicit mention of the offending altar disappears. Also passed over are the "invitation" of v. 19a (the Transjordanians might abandon their possibly "unclean" land and move west), as well as the biblical allusions to Peor (v. 17), and Achan's sin (v. 20).

Like Josh 22:21-29, Pseudo-Philo gives the Transjordanians an extended speech of self-defense in 22.3-4, albeit quite different in content. His version starts with a rather obscure elaboration of the speakers' affirmation about the Lord's "knowing" (22.3a). This elaboration, which speaks of God's communicating his own "light" to humans, incorporates language drawn from the hymn of Dan 2:22 ("he knows what is in the darkness, and the light dwells with him"). It likewise makes use of the terminology of "enlightenment," characteristic for *LAB* as a whole.[30] In Josh 22:22b-23 the Transjordanians invoke both human and divine punishment upon themselves if, in fact, they have built their altar for sacrifical purposes. Pseudo-Philo, who has already had the Israelites learn of their fellows' sacrificing upon the altar (22.1), now portrays the Reubenites as simply asserting that God "knows" their deed was not done "out of wickedness."

Josh 22:24-28, as noted above, is the core of the Transjordanians' speech of self-defense. Here, they explain that their altar-building reflected a concern lest their children be excluded from participation in worship at the one legitimate sanctuary. Also Pseudo-Philo's Transjordanians attribute their initiative to concern about the religious welfare of their posterity. The threat to that welfare, as Pseudo-Philo formulates it (22.3b), would, however, emanate, not from later, exclusionarily minded (Cisjordanian) Israelite generations, but from the Transjordanians' descendants themselves. In particular, their fear is that their children would feel themselves so "far from the Lord," given their lack of an altar like that available to their counterparts across the Jordan, as to be unable to "serve" him. To counteract the emergence of such sentiments among their posterity, the Transjordanians have, they assert, constructed their altar to promote their own "zeal for seeking the Lord."

The biblical Transjordanians' speech ends in Josh 22:29 with their reaffirming the nonsacrificial character of their altar, which thus is no rival to the one before the tabernacle. By contrast, in Pseudo-Philo, the speakers, having explained their motivation in establishing an actual altar of sacrifice, conclude by placing themselves in the Israelites' hands. They

[30]See M. Philoneko, "Essénisme et Gnose chez le Pseudo-Philon: Le symbolisme de la lumière dans le *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum*," in *The Origins of Gnosticism*, ed. U. Bianchi (Leiden: Brill, 1967), 401-408.

do this confiding in their hearers' "knowledge" of two realities, i.e., "that
we are your brothers and that we stand guiltless before you." Thus in
Pseudo-Philo the Transjordanians admit to the "crime" of which they are
(falsely) suspected in the Bible, even while maintaining their
"guiltlessness."

Josh 22:31 records Phineas' brief speech approving the response of the
Transjordanians. Pseudo-Philo, in 22.5-6, greatly amplifies the answer
made to the altar-builders, attributing it rather to Joshua. Unlike the
biblical Phineas, Joshua finds nothing to commend in the
Transjordanians' words. He begins his response (22.5) with a pointed
rhetorical question: "Is not the Lord . . . more powerful than a thousand
sacrifices?" He then asks why they have not taught their sons "the words
of the Lord" that they themselves had learned "from us." Their failure to
do so has had seriously negative consequences: lacking the Law to
meditate upon, those sons of theirs were "led astray after an altar made by
hand (sacrarium manufactum),"[31] just as Moses' people went astray into
idolatry when left to themselves during his stay on the mountain.[32] It is
only because of God's mercy that the Transjordanians' "foolishness"
(insipientia) had not led to the people's "assemblies" (synagogē) being
"derided" and their sins made public.

In LAB 22.6 Joshua passes from accusation to injunction: The
Transjordanians are forthwith to "dig up" their "altars" (sacraria, note the
pl.) and teach their sons the law and constant "meditation" thereon,[33] so
that God may be their lifelong "witness [testimonium][34] and judge."
Thereafter, having invoked the Lord as "witness and judge" also between
himself and them, Joshua concludes by setting out the alternative fates
awaiting the altar-builders, depending on their true motivation. This
reads: "If you have done this act out of cunning because you wished to
destroy your brothers,[35] I will be avenged upon you; but if you have done
it out of ignorance, as you say, because of your sons, God will be merciful

[31]On this phrase in relation to similar formulations in turn-of-the-era Judaism, see
Perrot, 142.

[32]The reference here, of course, is to the Golden Calf episode of Exodus 32, which
Pseudo-Philo retells in LAB 12, while Josephus passes it over completely.

[33]Pseudo-Philo's wording here ("have them meditate upon it day and night") echoes the
Lord's directive that Joshua "meditate on the book of the law day and night" in Josh 1:8.

[34]Pseudo-Philo "reapplies" the "witness language" used of the altar in Joshua 22 (see vv.
27, 28, 34) to the Deity himself.

[35]This phrase echoes the Transjordanians' appeal to their status as the Israelites'
"brothers" in 22.4.

to you."[36] Pseudo-Philo rounds off the "exchange segment" of the episode with a notice on the popular response to Joshua's discourse: "All the people answered, 'Amen, amen.'"[37]

The sequels to the "exchange," as narrated by Pseudo-Philo in 22.7, completely diverge from the concluding segment of the source story in Josh 22:32-34. That they do so is only to be expected, given that the source passage's reference to the return, the report of the delegation, and the naming of the altar, which is permitted to remain, do not accord with Pseudo-Philo's own previous presentation, in which no delegation is mentioned and Joshua demands the altar's "destruction." In place of the biblical data, Pseudo-Philo first has Joshua and the Israelites offer sacrifices for the pardon of the Transjordanians, pray for them, and finally dismiss them "in peace." The Transjordanians, in turn, "destroy" their altar, as directed by Joshua, and then join their sons in "fasting and lamenting." Their lament opens with an appeal to God's "knowing" (*tu scis*) that their "ways" were not inspired by "wickedness" (*in iniquitate*).[38] It then proceeds to a final reaffirmation of innocence on their part: "We have not strayed from your ways, but all of us serve you for we are the work of your hands." Earlier the Transjordanians had claimed to "stand guiltless" before the Israelites" (22.3); here, Joshua's intervening censure not-withstanding, they continue to make that claim, now with God himself as the addressee. Such confidence in their own rectitude does not, however, deter them from ending up their lament with the plea: "Now have mercy [*miserere*][39] on your covenant with the sons of your servants."

As is obvious from the foregoing comparison, Pseudo-Philo's "altar story" diverges markedly from the biblical one in numerous respects (context, role of Joshua, absence of Phineas, site of the exchange, purpose of the altar, and its ultimate fate). What is not so obvious is the situation being addressed by *LAB*'s "revised edition" and its intended message(s) for

[36]With this formulation Joshua leaves the determination of the Transjordanians' guilt or innocence (and corresponding fate) in God's hands. Thereby, he exemplifies that readiness to subordinate one's thoughts and actions to God which is a key ideal of Pseudo-Philo. See Murphy, 237.

[37]Is there a reminiscence here of the recurrent formula of Deut 27:15-26, "All the people shall [answer and] say 'Amen'"? In 21.7-10, the passage immediately preceding his altar story of 22.1-7, Pseudo-Philo seems to draw, not only on Josh 8:30-35, but also on Deut 27:1-8. In any case, the same double acclamation by the whole people recurs in *LAB* 26.5 in response to the curse Kenaz pronounces over the sinners he is about to put to death.

[38]The Transjordanians' affirmation harks back to their statement in 22.3: "The Lord our God knows (*scit*) that none of us . . . have done this act out of wickedness (*in verbo iniquitatis*)."

[39]Note the echo of Joshua's closing statement in 22.6: "If the Transjordanians have indeed acted in good faith, God will be merciful (*misericors*) to you."

that situation. I confine myself to a few observations on the matter.

1. When read in context, *LAB* 22.1-7 presents an illegitimate altar/cult which stands in contrast to the legitimate ones cited in what precedes and follows (Gilgal, Shiloh, Jerusalem). As such, the altar episode in Pseudo-Philo's version exemplifies a failure, by some of his hearers, to heed Joshua's immediately preceding exhortation in 21.10 ("The Lord grant . . . that you do not depart from his name. May the covenant of the Lord remain with you and not be broken, but may there be built among you a dwelling place for God"). In light of that failure, the rightfulness of the divinely authorized cultic initiatives taken at Gilgal, Shiloh, and Jerusalem, as related in the context of 22.1-7, stands out all the more.[40]

2. A second point is closely related to the first. The Transjordanians act out of genuine religious concern; they do what they deem necessary to ensure that their descendants will continue to worship the Lord. In so doing, however, they disregard the Lord's law regulating the establishment of cultic sites; see Deut 12. Their disregard for the law is sharply censured by Joshua, who (22.5) affirms that the Lord is "more powerful than a thousand sacrifices" (i.e., is quite capable of seeing to the continuation of his worship in the future and has no need of presumptuous human initiatives designed to guarantee this). Pseudo-Philo's Joshua likewise holds out to the Transjordanians a positive alternative to their well-intentioned but illicit endeavor taken on their children's behalf: They should inculcate a constant attention to the divine law in their children.[41]

3. In the course of the opening speech he ascribes to Joshua in 22:2, Pseudo-Philo has him refer to "our enemies abounding" due to the Transjordanians' self-corruption and predict that "those gathered against us will crush us." This prediction is never explicitly revoked even when the Transjordanians eliminate their offending altar. In this connection one might note also Joshua's statement in 22.5 that, were it not for God's mercy, the Transjordanians' "foolishness" would have led to *all* the people's assemblies ("synagogues") being "derided" and *all* their sins "made public." Here, the formulation suggests that the people, thanks to the Transjordanians' offense, have already suffered a certain derision by the disclosure of their wrongdoing to some unspecified party. One is left wondering who Pseudo-Philo has in mind when introducing such "enemy references" into Joshua's words.

[40]Perrot raises the possiblity that *LAB* 22.1-7 may be intended as an implicit polemic against postexilic sanctuaries other than Jerusalem (141).

[41]Human presumptuousness in religious matters, sincere but nevertheless culpably misguided, is a recurrent theme throughout *LAB*; see Murphy, 231, 248-252.

4. Joshua reckons with the possibility that God may "be merciful" to the offenders (22.6; cf. 22.5). Subsequently (22.7) Pseudo-Philo devotes a long and biblically unparalleled paragraph to describing the appeals made for such mercy both by the other Israelites and by the Transjordanians themselves. What is noteworthy, however, is that the outcome of these appeals is not reported; we are not told that God did in fact forgive or have mercy on the law-breakers. The matter is simply left open.

What might these distinctive features of Pseudo-Philo's altar story—the last two in particular—indicate about the situation he is addressing and his word for that situation? I suggest that those features can readily be correlated with a widely proposed setting for *LAB*, i.e., the decades immediately after the catastrophe of A.D. 70,[42] when the Roman enemy had "crushed" (22.2) the Jewish rebels, leaving the "synagogues" open to "derision" by the pagan environment. To the survivors of the catastrophe Pseudo-Philo's altar story suggests an explanation of why things had ended as they did, in punishment for their disregard of the Law, however well-intentioned this may have been. On the other hand, the story as retold by Pseudo-Philo has something positive to offer the survivors. They and their children have lost the possibility of sacrifice; an effort to revive the practice on their own initiative elsewhere than in Jerusalem would be radically misguided. Of even greater worth than sacrifice is, however, "meditation" on God's law. This "higher way" is still open to the survivors, and through the voice of Joshua, Pseudo-Philo calls them to teach it to their children. In addition, while Pseudo-Philo's story makes no definite promises of restoration, it does hold out the possibility of eventual divine mercy and pardon for the Jewish War's survivors and invites them to appeal for such, as their ancestors had done. In sum, I suggest that the concern to respond to the contemporary situation of his people had a major impact on Pseudo-Philo's reshaping of the biblical altar story.

Conclusions

I conclude with some summary, comparative remarks on Josephus' and Pseudo-Philo's approximately contemporary retellings of the altar story of Joshua 22. First of all, the two postbiblical historians' versions do evidence some "minor agreements" against the source: their highlighting the role of Joshua, who is associated with "elders" (5.103; 22.2) and offers sacrifices at the end of the episode (5.114; 22.7). The two versions likewise have in common their explicit use of kinship/brotherhood language (see

[42]On the dating of *LAB*, see Murphy, 6; he himself opts for a pre-70 date.

5.102, 111, 112, 114; 22.3, 4)[43] and the pejorative terminology they employ
in reference to the Transjordanian altar, i.e., "madness" (5.108) and
"foolishness" (22.5).

On the other hand, Josephus and Pseudo-Philo go their own ways in
relating the altar story. Josephus retains the biblical context of the episode
and reproduces the source's basic story line. In so doing, he introduces
clarifications and highlights various features already present. Pseudo-Philo,
on the contrary, adopts a much freer approach to his source, not
hesitating to set it within a new context or to openly "contradict" it. How
are these differences to be explained? Josephus' relatively "faithful"
retelling of the biblical episode is in line with the pledge made at the
beginning of *Ant.*: "The precise details of our Scripture records will . . . be
set forth, each in place, as my narrative proceeds, that being the procedure
that I have promised to follow throughout this work, neither adding nor
omitting anything" (1.17). Pseudo-Philo (whose work begins *in medias res*
with the genealogy of Adam) makes no such pledge and obviously feels
himself at liberty to alter, not simply the wording, but also the content
of the scriptural record. In addition, the difference in primary intended
audience of the two works has to be considered. As the Proemium of
Antiquities makes clear, Josephus is writing primarily for Gentiles.
Recognizing the biblical altar story's potential to interest cultivated
Gentile readers, he takes over the substance of the narrative, even while
accentuating its depiction of Phineas as the persuasive orator and crowd-
calmer in the manner of the great leaders of Greco-Roman history.
Pseudo-Philo, it would appear, was writing mainly (if not exclusively) for
Jewish readers, possibly those who had recently experienced (or were
imminently facing) an all-encompassing political and religious trauma. In
attempting to provide some orientation to such readers, Pseudo-Philo
ventures to drastically recast the source story along the lines indicated
above.

The foregoing proposals are based on a comparison of a single
narrative in Josephus and Pseudo-Philo. Accordingly, they would require,
of course, to be refined by similar comparisons of other parallel passages
in the writings of the two authors.[44]

[43]The accentuation of the theme of the people's unity, endangered but ultimately
maintained, in both Josephus' and Pseudo-Philo's altar stories corresponds to the concern for
intra-Jewish harmony evident throughout *Ant.* and *LAB* (on this, see Murphy, 259-260). That
concern may reflect a shared background for the two works, i.e., the Jewish divisions during
the war against Romans and their disastrous consequences.

[44]For a survey of the numerous agreements and disagreements on points of detail
between Josephus and Pseudo-Philo, see L. H. Feldman, "Prologomenon," in *The Biblical
Antiquities of Philo*, ed. M. R. James (reprinted New York: KTAV, 1971), lviii-lxvi.

A USS presents a memorial issue:

Gerhard F. Hasel

Volume 34:2 Autumn 1996

~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~

Including the following:

A Complete Bibliography of Hasel's writings
A Life Sketch

DOUKHAN, JACQUES. Radioscopy of a Resurrection:
    The Meaning of *niqqfpû zō 't* in Job 19:26

KAISER, WALTER C., JR. Biblical Theology and the
    Interpretation of Messianic Texts

KING, GREG A. The Message of Zephaniah:
    An Urgent Echo

MARTENS, ELMER A. Accessing Theological Readings of a
    Biblical Book

MULZAC, KENNETH. The Remnant and the New Covenant
    in the Book of Jeremiah

PFANDL, GERHARD. Interpretations of the Kingdom
    of God in Daniel 2:44

RODRIGUEZ, ANGEL MANUEL. Leviticus 16:
    Its Literary Structure

SHEA, WILLIAM H. The Tomb of David in Jerusalem

STRAND, KENNETH A. Thiele's Biblical Chronology as a
    Corrective for Extrabiblical Dates

WALTKE, BRUCE. Does Proverbs Promise Too Much?

~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~

**To receive a copy of this issue at the reduced
price of $8.00, please contact our office.**

THE ROLE OF ASSYRIA IN THE ANCIENT NEAR EAST DURING THE REIGN OF MANASSEH[1]

ROY GANE
Andrews University

Introduction

Under Sennacherib (704-681 B.C.), Esarhaddon (680-669), and Ashurbanipal (668-627),[2] Assyria played a dominant role in the ancient Near East during the long reign of Manasseh, king of Judah (c. 696-642).[3] While the Assyrian kings were not without challenges and even setbacks, expansion of the Neo-Assyrian empire reached its zenith in this period.

The present article explores from an Assyrian point of view the relationship between the kingdoms of Assyria and Judah during the time of Manasseh. The primary question here is this: What was the significance of Judah to Assyria during this time? My main sources of information are selected Assyrian texts, which can be divided into several categories:

1. Assyrian historical texts which explicitly refer to Manasseh, king of Judah,

2. Assyrian historical texts which imply the involvement of Manasseh by referring to the collective kings of Syria-Palestine,

3. A tribute payment record which mentions Judah and appears to date from the time of Manasseh,

4. The treaty of Esarhaddon establishing the succession of Ashurbanipal.

---

[1]This article is a slightly revised version of a paper presented at a Society of Biblical Literature/American Schools of Oriental Research panel on "The Age of Manasseh" in San Francisco, 1992.

[2]On the chronology of the last kings of Assyria, including Ashurbanipal, see, e.g., J. Oates, "Assyrian Chronology, 631-612 B.C.," *Iraq* 27 (1965): 135-159.

[3]E. Thiele dates Manasseh's reign 696-642 B.C., including a coregency with Hezekiah 696-686 (*The Mysterious Numbers of the Hebrew Kings* [Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1983], 176). J. H. Hayes and P. K. Hooker date Manasseh's reign 698-644 B.C., without a coregency (*A New Chronology for the Kings of Israel and Judah* [Atlanta: John Knox, 1988], 68, 80).

*I. Assyrian Historical Texts Explicitly Referring to
Manasseh, King of Judah.*

In extant Assyrian texts, Manasseh and his kingdom of Judah are explicitly mentioned only in lists of subservient kings or states.[4] This fact itself is important: For the half-century in question, Judah functioned as a cog in the great Assyrian wheel, not carrying out any independent activity worthy of mention by the Assyrian scribes.

*A. Building Materials Delivered to Nineveh for
Esarhaddon's Arsenal.*

In a prism inscription of Esarhaddon (Nin. A, V, 55ff.),[5] Manasseh is listed among the 12 kings of Syria-Palestine and 10 kings of Cyprus who were forced by Esarhaddon to provide corvée labor in order to deliver timber and stone from the West for the rebuilding of the royal arsenal[6] at Nineveh. The year in which this event occurred is not specified,[7] but the fact that Sidon is not included in the list suggests that the date is not earlier than the revolt of that city and its destruction by Esarhaddon in 677/676.[8] Some implications of the text are as follows:

1. Assyria exploited resources, including manpower, from western territories under its control for the enrichment of the Assyrian homeland. ·

2. Judah was treated as a firmly controlled vassal state rather than a more independent satellite, which it was during Hezekiah's reign before the invasion of Sennacherib in 701.[9]

3. Manasseh was only one of 22 western kings called upon to do the bidding of the Assyrian overlord. In this text Manasseh appears as *me-na-si-i šar* ᵘʳᵘ*ia-ú-di*, "Manasseh, king of the city, i.e., city-state, of Judah." It is tempting to suggest that this reference to Judah as a city-state

---

[4]J. M. Miller and J. H. Hayes, *A History of Ancient Israel and Judah* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1986), 365.

[5]For translit. and Germ. trans., see R. Borger, *Die Inschriften Asarhaddons Königs von Assyrien*, Archiv für Orientforschung, Beiheft 9 (Graz: Im Selbstverlage des Herausgebers, 1956), 60. "Me-na-si-i" = Manasseh is found here in line 55. For Eng. trans., see *ARAB* = D. D. Luckenbill, *Ancient Records of Assyria and Babylonia* (Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1927), 2:265, and *ANET*, 291.

[6]In line 40, *É.GAL ma-šar-ti* = "arsenal" (*CAD*, 10/1:358).

[7]Esarhaddon's inscriptions are not arranged chronologically (see, e.g., A. Spalinger, "Esarhaddon and Egypt: An Analysis of the First Invasion of Egypt," *Or* 43 [1974]: 296).

[8]H. Tadmor suggests that the corvée work for the royal arsenal was performed in the same year as the attack on Sidon ("Philistia under Assyrian Rule," *BA* 29 [1966]: 98).

[9]See Miller and Hayes, 371.

emphasizes the territorial insignificance of Judah within the Neo-Assyrian empire. However, the determinative URU, "city," is applied to all of the western states listed here (lines 55-71), so Judah is not singled out. Furthermore, in a number of versions of the same text[10] and in Column I of Ashurbanipal's Cylinder C,[11] "Judah" and the names of all the other western states are preceded by the determinative KUR (= *mātu*), "country" (lines 24-45). In reality, the western states were a mixture of city-states—e.g., those of Philistia and Phoenicia—and larger states which could be called countries. However, in the historical lists just mentioned, careful distinctions between city-states and countries are not made; all of the states are simply lumped together as one or the other. In any case, it is clear that Judah is only one of many western vassals.

4. In spite of the rebellion of Hezekiah against Sennacherib, which prompted the latter's invasion, Judah continued as a kingdom to be passed on to Manasseh; it was not turned into an Assyrian province as was the northern kingdom of Israel. We cannot be sure what status Sennacherib would have imposed upon Judah had he captured Jerusalem in 701. However, the overall Assyrian policy toward western states was to allow them to retain their respective identities as vassals, except for cases in which there were compelling reasons to do otherwise. The kingdoms of Israel and Damascus are examples of such exceptions. These may have been reorganized as Assyrian provinces due to their proximity to the Assyrian heartland. Here, tight control would rule out the possibility that the security of Assyria itself could be threatened from the West.

For Assyria, several advantages of maintaining vassals can be suggested:

a. While tighter provincial control would more effectively have prevented the development of revolts—and, in fact, Eph'al points out that "we hear almost nothing about provincial uprisings"—imposing provincial rule on an expanding empire was affected by practical constraints. Running a province required far more Assyrian effort and personnel than were necessary for keeping a vassal ruler in line through intimidation and other forms of manipulation.

b. Preexisting administrative and commercial systems were valuable for maintaining healthy economies which could be exploited through taxation and payment of tribute for the benefit of Assyria.[12] Thus, for

[10]On variants in line 55, see Borger, 60.

[11]For translit., see M. Streck, ed., *Assurbanipal und die letzten Assyrischen Könige bis zum Untergange Niniveh's* (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1916), 2:138, line 25. Cylinder C will be discussed further below.

[12]J. N. Postgate observes: "The economic structure of any empire will consist of the

example, Esarhaddon and earlier Assyrian kings encouraged private trade in various parts of the empire.[13] The commercial systems of the Phoenician and Philistine city-states were especially vital to the Assyrians. In fact, the Assyrians were to a considerable degree incapable of dominating the rich Mediterranean trade without the cooperation of the Phoenicians and Philistines, whose maritime skills and special trade links were essential to that enterprise.[14]

c. The states of southern Palestine—i.e., the Philistine cities, Judah, Ammon, Moab, and Edom—may have retained vassal status partly because they could serve as buffers against Egypt.[15] Indeed, the building activity of Manasseh recorded in 2 Chr 33:14 may have been permitted or encouraged by Assyria in order to counter an Egyptian threat.[16]

The persistence with which the Assyrian policy toward western states was retained by the Assyrian kings is remarkable. Rebellion by a western vassal would result in his punishment or even his replacement for a time by a puppet ruler, but the state would not be turned into an Assyrian province.[17] In fact, the Assyrian kings were known occasionally to pardon vassals who plotted against them. For example, the Rassam Cylinder tells how Ashurbanipal reinstalled Necho as a king in Egypt after he and other appointees of Esarhaddon had left their offices in view of an uprising led by Taharqa, the Kushite king (690-664) who had been defeated by

imposition of an administrative pattern upon underlying and largely unchanging economic realities" ("The Economic Structure of the Assyrian Empire," in *Power and Propaganda: A Symposium on Ancient Empires*, ed. M. T. Larsen, Mesopotamia: Copenhagen Studies in Assyriology 7 [Copenhagen: Akademisk Forlag, 1979], 214).

[13]Postgate, 206-207.

[14]S. Frankenstein, "The Phoenicians in the Far West: A Function of Neo-Assyrian Imperialism," in *Power and Propaganda*, 272, 286; I. Eph'al, "Assyrian Dominion in Palestine," 287; M. Elat, "Phoenician Overland Trade within the Mesopotamian Empires," in *Ah, Assyria . . .* , ed. M. Cogan and I. Eph'al, Scripta Hierosolymitana 33 (Jerusalem: Magnes, 1991), 24-25.

[15]See B. Otzen, "Israel under the Assyrians," in *Power and Propaganda*, 256.

[16]M. Cogan, *Imperialism and Religion: Assyria, Judah and Israel in the Eighth and Seventh Centuries B.C.E.* (Missoula, MT: Scholars, 1974), 70; cf. E. Nielsen, "Political Conditions and Cultural Developments in Israel and Judah during the Reign of Manasseh," in *Fourth World Congress of Jewish Studies* (Jerusalem: World Union of Jewish Studies, 1967), 104; R. Nelson, "*Realpolitik* in Judah (687-609 B.C.E.)," in *Scripture in Context II: More Essays on the Comparative Method*, ed. W. W. Hallo, J. C. Moyer, and L. G. Perdue (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1983), 181. I. Eph'al, on the other hand, takes the position that Manasseh's building activity was anti-Assyrian (*The Ancient Arabs* [Jerusalem: Magnes, 1982], 159).

[17]B. Otzen, 255, 257-258. Cf. H. Tadmor, "Philistia under Assyrian Rule," 97, on Sennacherib's lenient policy toward the Philistine cities of Ashkelon and Ekron: "a change of rulers, usually within one dynasty, sufficed the Assyrians; the frequently rebellious cities were not annexed as provinces nor was their population exiled."

Esarhaddon.[18] Subsequently, however, Necho and the other Egyptian vassal kings broke their oaths to Ashurbanipal and plotted to expel the Assyrians from Egypt with the help of Taharqa. When Assyrian officers got wind of the plot, they arrested the kings "and put them in iron cuffs and fetters." They were brought alive to Ashurbanipal in Nineveh, where all of them were put to death except Necho, who was pardoned and reinstalled as king in Sais with a more favorable treaty than before.[19]

There is striking similarity between Necho's treatment and the description of Manasseh's experience in 2 Chr 33:11-13.[20] According to this biblical passage, at some time during his reign Manasseh was captured by Assyrian officers, bound with fetters, and brought to Babylon, apparently to the Assyrian king. The exact nature of his offense is not stated, but it is likely that Manasseh had plotted against Assyria or was at least suspected of doing so. Verse 12 refers to his being in distress, alluding to the uncertainty of his fate. The fact that he was allowed to return to Jerusalem as king (verse 13) indicates that he was pardoned and reinstalled by the Assyrian monarch.

While the Chronicles account of Manasseh's capture and release is in harmony with what is otherwise known about Assyrian treatment of western vassals,[21] attempts to precisely locate the context of this episode within the framework of Assyrian history have yielded inconclusive results.[22] So the historicity of the Chronicles account is plausible but lacks direct extrabiblical corroboration.[23]

[18]For Eng. trans., see *ARAB* 2:293-294 and *ANET* 294. Cf. A. Spalinger, "Esarhaddon and Egypt," 324-326.

[19]*ARAB* 2:295; *ANET* 295.

[20]See M. Elat, "The Political Status of the Kingdom of Judah within the Assyrian Empire in the 7th Century B.C.E.," in *Investigations at Lachish: The Sanctuary and the Residency (Lachish V)*, ed. Y. Aharoni (Tel Aviv: Gateway, 1975), 66-67.

[21]See Elat, 68.

[22]The range of suggestions is summarized by Miller and Hayes (374, 376): "the rebellion of Sidon in 677/676 B.C.E., during the reign of Esarhaddon, the treaty-swearing conclave held in 672 B.C.E., the rebellion of Baal king of Tyre in 668/667 B.C.E. against Ashurbanipal (ANET 295-96), the period of major Assyrian trouble with the Arabs in the 640s (ANET 297-98), the rebellion in Babylon of Ashurbanipal's brother Shamash-shum-ukin in 652-648 B.C.E., or the troubles with Elam in 654-646 B.C.E."

[23]See W. Schniedewind, "The Source Citations of Manasseh: King Manasseh in History and Homily," *Vetus Testamentum* 41 (1991): 452, n. 11.

B. Ashurbanipal's First Campaign against Egypt

According to the Rassam Cylinder (I, 68-74),[24] in the course of his first campaign against Egypt (c. 667-666 B.C.), Ashurbanipal received renewed allegiance and gifts from the 22 western kings, whom he then obliged to provide logistical support for his campaign. Cylinder C (I, 24-45)[25] supplements the Rassam Cylinder at this point by listing the 22 vassal kings, including *mi-in-si-e šar* ^(kur)*ia-u-di,* "Manasseh, king of (the land of) Judah" (line 25). Implications are as follows:

1. In the Rassam Cylinder (col. I, line 70), the designation of Manasseh and the other kings as *ardāni dāgil panīya,* "servants who are my subjects," explicitly refers to their status as vassals.[26]

2. Assyria exploited its western vassals for the support of its military campaigns against Egypt. The goal of Ashurbanipal's first campaign was the reconquest of Egypt, which had been subjugated under Esarhaddon in 671, but had rebelled under Taharqa, who had reestablished himself in Memphis. The texts reflect two factors which called for the involvement of Judah and other western states in Assyria's plan for subduing Egypt:

a. The long route to Egypt lay through or near a number of Syro-Palestinian states. Safe passage for the Assyrian army depended upon the attitude of these states to Assyria. Ashurbanipal required renewed allegiance to Assyria at this time because he needed the assurance that his flanks would not be attacked and his return from Egypt would not be blocked. While the coastal road passed through Philistine rather than Judean territory, the proximity of Judah to that vital artery meant that her pacification was important for its security.

b. Moving a large army from Mesopotamia into Egypt involved overcoming formidable logistical obstacles. Supplying such a force far from home was a sufficient challenge, but in addition, the inhospitable Sinai region had to be traversed on land or bypassed by sea. Therefore, assistance from vassals in the form of provisions, reinforcements, and means of transportation—i.e., animals and ships—was vital to ensure that sufficient troops would reach Egypt in fighting condition.[27]

---

[24]For translit. and Germ. trans., see Streck, 2:8-9. For Engl. trans., see *ARAB* 2:293 and *ANET* 294.

[25]For translit. and Germ. trans., see Streck, 2:138-141. For Eng. trans., see *ARAB* 2:340-341 and *ANET* 294. On the historical value of this list, see Cogan, 68, n. 17.

[26]Frankena, 151.

[27]See I. Eph'al, "Assyrian Dominion in Palestine," 280. Cf. Eph'al, *The Ancient Arabs,* 137ff., on the indispensability of the Arabs and their camels for this operation.

*II. Assyrian Historical Texts Referring to the
Collective Kings of Syria-Palestine.*

A. Building "Port Esarhaddon" after the Destruction of Sidon.

A prism of Esarhaddon published by Heidel[28] states that the kings of Syria-Palestine were obliged by Esarhaddon to provide corvée work for the building of "Port Esarhaddon" at Sidon after the Assyrians suppressed a revolt and destroyed the city (677-676 B.C.). Implications are as follows:

1. As in the inscription dealing with the rebuilding of Esarhaddon's arsenal (see above), this account shows control over and exploitation of western vassals, including Manasseh, by the Assyrian overlord for a building project.

2. Involving the vassal kings in a project at Sidon, which had just been destroyed because of its rebellion against Assyria, would increase the effectiveness of that destruction as a deterrent to additional rebellions in the West.[29]

3. The new port was part of an Assyrian design to dominate Mediterranean trade.[30] Since the port of Sidon refused to serve Assyrian interests, it was eliminated and replaced.

B. Pacification of Syro-Palestinian Kings by Esarhaddon in Connection with His Successful Campaign against Egypt.

The Nahr El Kelb Stele, near Beirut, commemorates the victory of Esarhaddon over Taharqa in 671 B.C. Lines 31-35 of the fragmentary inscription read as follows: "Ashkelon . . . which Taharqa to their fortress . . . Tyre . . . 22 kings . . . " Implications are as follows:

1. It appears that some of the 22 western states had joined an anti-Assyrian conspiracy with Taharqa, whose vigorous policies threatened Assyrian domination of Syria-Palestine and the lucrative commerce based there. The need to counter this threat motivated the invasion of Egypt by Esarhaddon.[31]

[28]For translit. and Eng. trans., see A. Heidel, "A New Hexagonal Prism of Esarhaddon," *Sumer* 12 (1956): 12 (lines 31-34), 13. For this event, cf. *ARAB* 2:211 and *ANET* 290.

[29]Nelson, 179-180.

[30]See Tadmor, 98.

[31]See G. Smith, *The Assyrian Eponym Canon* (London: Samuel Bagster and Sons, 1875), 169; and Spalinger, "Esarhaddon and Egypt . . . ," 298-300. Cf. A. Spalinger, "The Foreign Policy of Egypt Preceding the Assyrian Conquest," *Chronique d' Ægypte* 53 (1978): 22, 33, 36, 42-43.

2. Due to the broken nature of the text, we do not know whether or to what extent Manasseh was implicated. In any case, it is likely that the extensive Assyrian military activities in Palestine connected with this and other Egyptian campaigns would have dampened enthusiasm in Judah for the contemplation of independent action.

3. The Assyrian conquest of Egypt in 671 further inhibited independent action on the part of Judah by removing the only potential superpower support for an anti-Assyrian movement by the Palestinian states.

III. A Tribute Payment Record Which Mentions Judah.

A text from Nineveh reports tribute payments by Judah and its neighbors to an Assyrian king,[32] probably Esarhaddon or Ashurbanipal. The Ammonites paid two minas of gold, the Moabites one mina of gold, and the Judeans ten minas of silver, etc. Pfeiffer comments on the implications of the report:

> The nations seem to be ordered according to the amount paid, beginning with the largest. The sums are surprisingly small and must represent payments of annual tribute rather than war indemnities. The fact that Judah pays less than the Moabites and less than half of the amount sent by the Ammonites, sanctions the inference that this report should be dated after 701 B.C., when Sennacherib had materially reduced, impoverished, and depopulated the kingdom of Hezekiah. It is safe to assume that the payment was made either to Esarhaddon . . . or to Ashurbanipal . . . by Manasseh . . . .[33]

Thus, this record most likely reflects the economic conditions prevailing in Judah during at least part of Manasseh's reign. The factors which created these conditions deserve further comment:

1. Pfeiffer refers to the effects of Sennacherib's invasion. In his annals, Sennacherib claims to have taken 46 fortified cities of Judah, as well as many other settlements, deporting a large number of people and reducing Judah's territory by giving portions of it to the Philistine city-states,[34] apparently to establish a more equal balance of power between Judah and Philistia.[35] The territorial reduction and depopulation of Judah, along

---

[32]For translit. and Eng. trans., see R. H. Pfeiffer, "Three Assyriological Footnotes to the Old Testament," *JBL* 47 (1928): 185. For Eng. trans., see *ANET* 301.

[33]Pfeiffer, 185.

[34]For translit. and Eng. trans. of the Oriental Institute Prism, col. III lines, 18-34, see D. D. Luckenbill, *The Annals of Sennacherib* (Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1924), 32-33. Cf. *ANET* 288.

[35]N. Na'aman, "Sennacherib's "Letter to God" on his Campaign to Judah," *BASOR* 214

with an increase in various kinds of payments imposed by Sennacherib,[36] would have drastically affected the economic well-being of the country.

2. During Manasseh's reign, Judah controlled neither the coastal nor the Transjordanian caravan routes, which passed from Egypt and Arabia to Mesopotamia via Palestine and Syria. These were in the hands of the Philistine and Transjordanian states (including Moab and Ammon) as well as Arab tribes. Therefore, Judah's economic plight could not be mitigated by a flow of middlemen's income from the most lucrative trade arteries.[37]

In spite of these significant disadvantages, it is possible that Judah could have enjoyed a measure of financial prosperity in the course of over half a century of relative peace and fairly stable trade relations with other countries, including Assyria. Seventh-century Palestinian pottery found at Nimrud and Assyrian pottery of the same period found in Palestine testify to the existence of commercial relations between Israel-Judah and Assyria.[38] I have not found clear evidence as to the kinds of Judean products which were in demand by the Assyrians, but Ezek 27:17 lists exports from Judah and Israel which were traded to Tyre at a slightly later period, including a kind of wheat, along with honey, oil, and resin.[39] Unlike Tyre, Assyria had extensive agricultural land for producing its own food, especially grain.[40] This factor, plus the distance between Judah and Assyria, would limit Assyrian imports of Judean agricultural products to items regarded as luxuries.[41]

Archaeological evidence for an extensive mid-seventh-century royal building program in Judah suggests that significant economic recovery had been accomplished by the latter part of Manasseh's reign. At this time

(1974): 35-36; Otzen, 258.

[36]Oriental Institute Prism, III, lines 35-36; see Luckenbill, *The Annals of Sennacherib*, 33. Cf. *ANET* 288.

[37]A. Rainey, "Manasseh, King of Judah, in the Whirlpool of the Seventh Century B.C.E.," public lecture, Berkeley, California, Feb. 10, 1992.

[38]R. Amiran, *Ancient Pottery of the Holy Land* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers Univ. Press, 1970), 291. E. Nielsen believes that in spite of obligations to the Assyrians, Manasseh's reign was a period of prosperity (106).

[39]For discussion of economic implications of this passage, see M. Liverani, "The Trade Network of Tyre According to Ezek. 17," in *Ah, Assyria . . .* , 72-75.

[40]Postgate, 197.

[41]As evidence of Judean trade with Mesopotamia, M. Cogan refers to the following: "A sale of wheat, transacted in Nineveh in the spring of 660, was measured *ina* GIŠ.BAR *ša mät Iaudi*—'according to the Judahite *sütu*" (*Imperialism and Religion . . .* , 92). However, with the translit. and Germ. trans. of this document by J. Kohler and A. Ungnad, see their note on the identity of *Iaudi*: "In Nordwest-Syrien, nicht Juda!" (*Assyrische Rechtsurkunden* [Leipzig: E. Pfeiffer, 1913], 210).

fortifications were constructed and a number of sites such as Arad VII, Horvat 'Uza, and Radum were established. Tatum sees this building program reflected in 2 Chr 33:14, which describes how Manasseh added to the walls of Jerusalem and stationed military commanders in fortified cities.[42] Tatum recognizes that if this identification of archaeological data with 2 Chronicles 33 is correct, it would support at least one aspect of the historicity of the biblical chapter, which presents the building initiatives of Manasseh in connection with reforms which he made following his return from capture by the Assyrians.[43]

IV. The Treaty of Esarhaddon Establishing the Succession of Ashurbanipal.

In 672, Esarhaddon established the succession of his son, Ashurbanipal, through a long and detailed treaty imposed upon at least some of his vassals.[44] Divine witnesses to the treaty include a number of Mesopotamian deities (lines 13-40) and especially Aššur, who is called "father of the gods, lord of the lands" (line 25). In fact, a vassal is commanded thus: "In the future and forever Aššur will be your god, and Assurbanipal, the great crown prince designate, will be your lord" (lines 393-4). Implications are as follows:

1. According to Frankena, the treaty ceremony would have been attended by Esarhaddon's western vassals, including Manasseh,[45] but Tadmor finds no clear evidence that such a treaty was ever actually imposed upon Manasseh.[46]

2. If this treaty or another formal loyalty oath similar to it had been imposed upon Manasseh, he would have been obliged to accept Aššur as his god in the sense of acknowledging the supremacy of Aššur along with the lordship of Ashurbanipal.[47]

3. The treaty does not impose cultic regulations. McKay and Cogan

---

[42]L. Tatum, "King Manasseh and the Royal Fortress at Horvat 'Usa," *Biblical Archaeologist* 54 (1991): 136-145.

[43]Ibid., 137.

[44]For translit. and Eng. trans., see S. Parpola and K. Watanabe, eds., *Neo-Assyrian Treaties and Loyalty Oaths* (Helsinki: Helsinki Univ. Press, 1988), 28-58.

[45]Frankena, 151.

[46]H. Tadmor, "Treaty and Oath in the Ancient Near East: A Historian's Approach," in *Humanizing America's Iconic Book*, ed. G. Tucker and D. Knight (Chico, CA: Scholars, 1982), 151. Cf. M. Cogan and H. Tadmor, *II Kings*, AB 11 (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1988), 272.

[47]Frankena, 151.

have argued that Neo-Assyrian treaties and other sources do not convincingly attest imposition of religious practices upon vassal kingdoms, and therefore the religious practices carried out in Judah under Manasseh, as described in 2 Kgs 21:3ff. and 2 Chr 33:3ff., did not result from Assyrian imposition.[48] Spieckermann, on the other hand, argues that vassal kingdoms such as Judah, like Assyrian provinces, were subject to interference by Assyria in the area of religion.[49] His most direct pieces of evidence are Assyrian royal inscriptions. For example, Tiglath-pileser III claims to have seized the gods (images) of Gaza and to have set up images of Assyrian gods in the palace there,[50] and Ashurbanipal claims to have established in Egypt regular offerings to Aššur and other Assyrian gods.[51] However, even if Assyria did at times impose its cultic practices on vassals, 2 Kings 21 and 2 Chronicles 33 do not mention such imposition by Assyria.

Conclusion

As a vassal state within the Assyrian empire, Judah under Manasseh continued to carry on a political and economic life of her own. At the same time, Judah was controlled by the Assyrian overlords for their economic, political, and military benefit as part of their policy for exploiting western Asia. Thus, there were ongoing economic obligations to Assyria as well as duties to provide whatever special assistance the Assyrian king should demand.

Judah was useful to Assyria in the sense just described and also as a minor trading partner, but the fact that the coastal road to Egypt and the Transjordanian caravan routes did not pass through Judean territory made her less significant for Assyrian political and commercial interests than states such as Philistia and Phoenicia. With regard to Assyrian interests at this time, M. Cogan refers to Judah's "non-strategic geographic location." But Judah's position was not completely nonstrategic. A loyal Judah could help to counter an Egyptian incursion from the South; and, on the other hand, reemergence of Judean power and expansionism could threaten both the coastal and Transjordanian routes. Thus, it was to

---

[48]See J. W. McKay, *Religion in Judah under the Assyrians 732-609 BC*, Studies in Biblical Theology, 2d series, vol. 26 (Naperville, IL: Alec R. Allenson, 1973), 60-66; and Cogan, 42-49; cf. 56, 60-61.

[49]H. Spieckermann, *Juda unter Assur in der Sargonidenzeit* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1982), 307-372.

[50]Ibid., 326.

[51]Ibid., 338.

Assyria's best interests to keep Judah strong enough to serve as an effective buffer against Egypt, weak enough so that she would not threaten her neighbors, and above all, to keep her loyal.

Manasseh's lack of independent action does not imply that his personal inclinations were "pro-Assyrian." His country was reduced, impoverished, weakened, and firmly in the Assyrian grip, with Assyrian military garrisons probably stationed near Jerusalem.[52] Thus, his ability to accomplish effectively anything anti-Assyrian in nature was severely limited.[53] Lest Manasseh should forget the consequences of rebellion, which Judah under his father had learned firsthand in 701, the extensive western military activities of Esarhaddon and Ashurbanipal would have refreshed his memory.

[52]See, e.g., Elat, 63-64, 69; R.A.S. Macalister, *The Excavation of Gezer* (London: John Murray, 1912), 1:22ff.

[53]See Nielsen, 105.

A SEMANTIC ANALYSIS OF ARAMAIC OSTRACA OF SYRIA-PALESTINE DURING THE PERSIAN PERIOD

GERALD A. KLINGBEIL
Universidad Peruana Unión
Lima, Peru

1. Introduction

This study investigates the semantics of the Aramaic ostraca of Syria-Palestine during the Persian period. It attempts a structural system of classification on the basis of the analysis of the meaning of each individual word of the corpus of inscriptions, as ascertained by studying the context of each word within the specific inscription. Here only the results of this analysis are presented.[1] The structural system was adapted from Louw and Nida's semantic domains.[2]

According to Louw, semantics is "the study of the relationship between meaning (defined as the content of what people intend to communicate) and the linguistic signs used to express such meanings."[3] A "semantic domain" describes areas of meaning, structured in a specific pattern. For example, all terms relating to *possess*, *transfer*, and *exchange* are grouped together; subdivisions of this semantic domain are such ideas as *earn*, *pay*, and *give*. H. Donner suggests that the main emphasis of Aramaic lexicography should be in the area of comparative Semitic philology/lexicography, which forms a part of the study of semantics. However, before the study of comparative philology can be attempted, one must grasp the full meaning of a term as it exists in a given time

---

[1]This study is partly based on my M.A. thesis, "The Aramaic Epigraphical Material of Syria-Palestine During the Persian Period with Reference to the History of the Jews" (Department of Ancient Near Eastern Studies at the University of Stellenbosch, 1992). I wish to thank the Centre of Science Development for financial assistance, and my promoter Dr. P. A. Kruger, and my internal examiner Prof. W. T. Claassen for reading this manuscript and providing helpful suggestions. The bulk of my thesis discusses each term with reference to its morphology, semantics (main and subdomains), syntactical function within the inscription, and reference to specific terminology, including military, sacrificial, and administrative terminology. For example, the discussion of the 13-word Arad 1 inscription takes up more than four pages (108-111).

[2]J. P. Louw and E. A. Nida, *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament Based on Semantic Domains*, 2 vols. (Cape Town: Bible Society of South Africa, 1988).

[3]J. P. Louw, "Semantics," *ABD*, 5:1078.

period, language corpus, and geographical unit.[4]

The study of semantics partly concerns lexicography and is most important in the search for the meaning and significance of an inscription. Lexicography includes sub-disciplines such as etymology, comparative linguistics, and semantics. In the past the field of semantic studies has been widely neglected.[5] Standard Aramaic grammars commonly lack a separate section on the theory and application of semantics and are predominantly concerned with morphology, phonology, orthography, and—to a certain degree—syntax. Most lexicons and dictionaries seem to pay more attention to etymology and comparative linguistics and do not "concentrate on showing the use that Biblical writers make of the Hebrew [and Aramaic] vocabulary."[6] This can also be seen in Kutscher's programmatic review article on Aramaic, which contains only sections on phonology, morphology, and syntax.[7] In recent years, however, there seems to be a new trend towards the integration of semantic studies and lexicography.[8]

---

[4]H. Donner, "Aramäische Lexikographie," in *Studies on Semitic Lexicography, Quaderni di Semitistica, 2* (Florence: Istituto di Linguistica e di Lingue Orientali Universita de Firenze, 1973), 127-143, esp.131, n. 7.

[5]J. P. Louw maintains that "earlier writings on semantics were even more restricted; they were concerned merely with the historical development of words and their meanings" ("Semantics," *ABD*, 5:1078). Luis Alonso Schöckel provides the rationale for the theoretical basics of the new Diccionario Bíblico Hebreo-español project: "At the present time there is a general agreement that neither etymology nor comparative linguistics is the proper approach to determine the meaning of a word" ("The Diccionario Bíblico Hebreo-español," *ZAH* 4 [1991]: 76).

[6]Alonso Schöckel, "DBHE," 76. See also Luis Alonso Schöckel, V. Morla, and V. Collado, eds., *Diccionario bíblico hebreo-español* (Madrid: Trotta, 1994), 7-17; J. Barr, *The Semantics of Biblical Language* (Oxford : Oxford University Press, 1961), 206-262. For a review of the history of linguistics, see M. F. Rooker, "The Diachronic Study of Biblical Hebrew," *Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages* 14 (1988): 199-214; C.H.J. van der Merwe, "Recent Trends in the Linguistic Description of Hebrew," *Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages* 15 (1989): 231-234.

[7]Although it represents a cursory overview of some lexicographic studies, with no attempt to systematize the findings, the only section that could be considered to involve a semantic analysis is the section on lexicography.

[8]Louw sees a changing paradigm in the study of semantics: "During the 20th century, however, etymology became restricted to the mere history of words and their change of meanings, while semantics emerged as the study of the relationship between meaning (defined as the content of what people intend to communicate) and the linguistic signs used to express such meanings" ("Semantics," *ABD*, 5:1078). The basic methodological considerations on semantics—although 30 years old—are contained in James Barr, *The Semantics of Biblical Language* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1961). Although it contains no specific section on semantics, Waltke and O'Connor's work has a quite comprehensive list of references to semantics in its index (B.K. Waltke and M. O'Connor, *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax* [Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1990]). Muraoka's revision of Joüon's classic grammar lacks any reference to semantics in its index (P. Joüon, *A Grammar of Biblical*

My study seeks to contribute to this trend.[9]

Since the point of departure of the semantic analysis is the system of semantic domains developed for NT Greek, my viewpoint should be explained. While it is important to keep in mind that the classification of semantic domains is not universal and that similarities of different bodies of literature in different languages might be coincidental, it is nevertheless possible to utilize both the methodological and the structural framework (in terms of organization of the analysis) of semantic analysis in another language. The fact that not all domains that are proposed by Louw and Nida occur in the semantic analysis of the Aramaic epigraphical material of Syria-Palestine has to be understood in light of this consideration. Furthermore, the source material is limited. This article does not comprehensively cover the whole Aramaic material of the Persian period or even of Imperial Aramaic. It is rather a pilot project seeking to apply the principles of Louw and Nida's work to the limited corpus of the epigraphical material from Syria-Palestine on hard surface (i.e., ostraca).

My study is designed as follows. First I will give an overview of the main principles of Louw and Nida's work which form the methodological basis of the study. Next I will introduce the sources. Then I will deal with the actual list of the semantic domains discovered in the corpus of inscriptions; a concise translation has been included with each word. An analysis will follow, evaluating the findings of the semantic domains with respect to the possibility of defining *genre* borders in regard to the employed semantic domains. Finally, a summary of the findings will be presented.

2. Semantic Principles Involved in This Study

The following principles, taken from Louw and Nida, form the basis of the dictionary: (1) There are no synonyms; thus no two lexical items have the same meaning; (2) "Differences in meaning are marked by context, either textual or extratextual"; (3) "Meaning is defined by a set of distinctive features"; (4) "Figurative meanings differ from their bases with respect to three fundamental factors: diversity in domains, differences in the degree of awareness of the relationship between literal and figurative meanings, and the extent of conventional usage"; (5) "Both the different

---

Hebrew, trans. and rev. T. Muraoka, 2 vols., Subsidia Biblica [Rome: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1991]).

[9]Work on a semantic-domain dictionary of the OT began in 1985 (J. P. Louw, "A Semantic-Domain Dictionary," in *Proceedings of the First International Colloquium, Bible and Computer: The Text* (Paris: Champion, 1986), 261. Rainey's analysis of the semantics of seal impressions is a further example of careful work (A. F. Rainey, "Private Seal Impressions: A Note on Semantics," *IEJ* 16 [1966]: 187-190). See also A. F. Rainey, "Royal Weights and Measures," *BASOR* 179 (1965): 34-36.

meanings of the same word and the related meanings of different words tend to be multidimensional and are only rarely orthogonal in structure—that is to say, the different meanings tend to form irregularly shaped constellations rather than neatly organized structures."[10]

My work has applied these principles to the field of Semitic epigraphy. The end result should be a more comprehensive understanding of certain terms or discovering specific patterns. When implemented, these principles helped to put words into their main and subdomains, thereby filtering out the specific meaning of a word in a specific context.

3. The Sources

The inscriptions included in this study share the following similarities: They all consist of Aramaic material from Syria-Palestine during the Persian period (538-332 B.C.) and are all written on hard surfaces (thus excluding material on parchment or papyrus). The provenance of one inscription (Jericho ostracon) is not absolutely clear, although the arguments seem to favor a Palestinian origin for the sherd.[11] For the Lachish ostracon, a new reading has been suggested, since the official excavation report labels the sherd as "illegible."[12]

The following table is a concise list of the relevant inscriptions in alphabetical order with their bibliographic reference to the *editio princeps* of each.[13]

[10]Louw and Nida, 1:xvi-xviii.

[11]See A. Lemaire, "Un nouvel ostracon Araméen du Vᵉ siècle av. J.-C.," *Sem* 25 (1975): 94-96.

[12]Compare O. Tufnell, *Lachish III (Tell ed-Duweir): The Iron Age. Text and Plates* (London: Oxford University Press, 1953), pl. 49:2 and remarks there; see Gerald A. Klingbeil, "The Aramaic Ostracon from Lachish: A New Reading and Interpretation," *AUSS* 33 (1995): 77-84.

[13]For a more detailed list of the Aramaic inscriptions and bibliographical references to the most relevant studies on each, see Klingbeil, "Aramaic Epigraphical Material," 30-33.

NAME OF INSCRIPTION	NUMBER	BIBLIOGRAPHY
Arad ostraca	45 published 42 utilized[14]	J. Naveh, "The Aramaic Ostraca from Tel Arad," in *Arad Inscriptions*, ed. Y. Aharoni, Judean Desert Studies (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1981), 153-176. Y. Aharoni and R. Amiran, "The first season of excavations at Tel Arad," *BIES (Hebrew Yediot)* 27 (1963): 227-229; pl. VIII:2.
Ashdod ostracon	1	J. Naveh, "An Aramaic Ostracon from Ashdod," in *Ashdod II-III: The Second and Third Seasons of Excavations 1963*, 1965, ed. M. Dothan, 'Atiqot IX-X (Jerusalem: The Department of Antiquities and Museums/Ministry of Education and Cultures/Holy Land Exhibition Fund/Ashdod Expedition, 1971), 200-201; pl. 13:1.
Beer-Sheba ostraca I excavation of 1969-71	27 excavated 17 legible (numbers 1-17)	J. Naveh, "The Aramaic Inscriptions," in *Beer-Sheba I: Excavations at Tel-Beer-Sheba 1969-1971 Seasons*, ed. Y. Aharoni (Tel Aviv: Tel Aviv University/Institute of Archaeology, 1973), 79-82; pls. 35-38.
Beer-Sheba ostraca II excavation of 1971-76	45 excavated 28 are legible[15] (numbers 18-45)	J. Naveh, "The Aramaic Ostraca from Tel Beer-Sheba. Seasons 1971-76," *Tel Aviv* 6/3-4 (1979): 182-198; pls. 24-31.
Beth Pelet ostraca	2[16]	A. Cowley, "Two Aramaic Ostraka," *JRAS* (1929): 111-112; pl. V. A. Cowley, "Aramaic Ostracon," in *Beth-Pelet II*, ed. by J. L. Starkey and G. Lankester-Harding (London: British School of Archaeology in Egypt, 1932), 29; pl. 61:3.

[14]Naveh has suggested readings for 45 ostraca (153-176). My study analyzes only 42 from Arad, since inscriptions 44 and 45 bear Herodian and Nabatean scripts, respectively, and thus do not fall into the time for this study. Naveh's inscription 42 was not included because it did not render an intelligible reading, although individual letters were legible. Consequently Naveh's number 43 is my number 42.

[15]Since only 17 of the total 27 inscriptions of the first found corpus of inscriptions could be deciphered, the second batch was numbered sequentially, from 18 to 45. (Naveh started his numbering from 27.)

[16]The classification of Beth-Pelet ostracas nos. 1 and 2 was arbitrary, with no. 1 corresponding to Cowley's 1932 publication and no. 2 corresponding to Cowley's 1929 publication.

NAME OF INSCRIPTION	NUMBER	BIBLIOGRAPHY
Heshbon ostraca[17]	2[18]	F. M. Cross, "An Ostracon from Heshbon," *AUSS* 7 (1969): 223-229; pl. 25, fig. 13. F. M. Cross, "Heshbon Ostracon II," *AUSS* 11 (1973): 126-131; pl. 16, fig. 10.
Jericho ostracon	1	Lemaire, 87-96; pl. 5.
Lachish ostracon	1	Tufnell, *Lachish III*, 145-146; pl. 49:2.[19]
Nebi Yunis ostracon	1	F. M. Cross, "An Ostracon from Nebi Yunis," *IEJ* 14 (1964): 185-186; pl. H.

4. List of Semantic Domains

The *genre* which appears to be involved in these inscriptions is undoubtedly the category of business and administrative texts. Because the Aramic epigraphical material of Syria-Palestine during the Persian period seems to represent a rather compact body of inscriptions in terms of its context, purpose, and *genre*, the semantic analysis of this spectrum of inscriptions renders a survey of semantic domains used in this specific *genre*. The list will be structured according to the following pattern and will be sorted according to Louw and Nida's list of main domains.[20]

MAIN DOMAIN

Subdomain (with at least one reference from the corpus)
Number—Word in Aramaic → contextual translation → one reference[21]

[17]The language of these ostraca is disputed. Cross noted that the script was Aramaic, but the dialect was either Ammonite or Hebrew ("Ostracon from Heshbon"). Aufrecht includes them in the corpus of Ammonite inscriptions (*A Corpus of Ammonite Inscriptions*, Ancient Near Eastern Texts and Studies, 4 [Lewiston: Edwin Mellen, 1989], 174-176, 199-201). His interpretation has not been universally accepted.

[18]The numbering of the Heshbon ostraca corresponds to the original numbering of the excavators used in the *editio principes*.

[19]A photograph is published, but no reading is suggested; a note states that the ostracon is illegible.

[20]For this reason the numbering of the main domains is not consecutive. Only the main domains found in the corpus of inscriptions are given. The numbering system is the one used by Louw and Nida.

[21]The reference includes the following information: (1) name of the ostracon, (2) number of the ostracon in the corpus from the specific site, and (3) the line in the inscription

1. GEOGRAPHICAL OBJECTS AND FEATURES

H. Depressions and holes[22]

    1.1. מערה – cave – Arad 38:1

O. Pastures and cultivated land

    1.2. חקלא – field – Beth-Pelet 1:1

3. PLANTS

C. Plants that are not trees

    3.1. שערן – abbreviated ש – barley – Arad 1:2

    3.2. חנטין – abbreviated ח – wheat – Arad 13:2

    3.3. כרס – vineyard – Ashdod 1:1

4. ANIMALS

A. Animals

    4.1. סוסה – mare – Arad 1:1

    4.2. חמר – donkey – Arad 1:2

    4.3. בני רכש – colts – Arad 6:1

    4.4. גמל – camel – Arad 24:1

5. FOODS AND CONDIMENTS[23]

A. Food

    5.1. שערן – abbreviated ש – barley – Arad 1:2

    5.2. חנטין – abbreviated ח – wheat – Arad 13:2

    5.3. קמח – flour – Arad 28:1

    5.4. עבור – corn – Beer-Sheba 5:2

6. ARTIFACTS

B. Instruments used in agriculture and husbandry

    6.1. פדנא – plough – Heshbon 2:1

K. Money and monetary units

    6.2. כסף – silver – Arad 41:1 obverse and reverse

    6.3. רבען – abbreviated ר – quarter – Arad 41:6, 8, 9 obverse

    6.4. תשקל – abbreviated ש – sheqel – Nebi Yunis 1:1

    6.5. מעהמנה – abbreviated מ – weight or small coin(?) – Beer-Sheba 28:1

(separated by a colon). Thus Arad 1:2 indicates the second line of the first ostracon from Arad.

[22]As may be noted in this entry, the first subdivision of geographical objects and features, *Depressions and holes*, starts with the letter H. In Louw and Nida other subdivisions precede *Depressions and holes*.

[23]It seems important to note that "barley" שערן and "wheat" חנטין are not merely plants (as found in main domain no. 3), but are also descriptive of food and condiments and should therefore also be included in this group. On the other hand, the term קמח is clearly processed food and cannot be included in the plant main domain.

M. Images and idols

    6.6. נשבא – stele, statue – Samaria 3:1

P. Containers

    6.7. חסף – earthen vessel – Beer-Sheba 13:1

    6.8. גרב – abbreviated ג – jar – Ashdod 1:2

    6.9. שפיאן – pitchers – Tell el-Kheleifeh 2:1

    6.10. בפק – pitcher – Samaria 5:1

R. Adornments

    6.11. חרז – bead – Arad 41:8 obverse

    6.12. רקמא – embroidery – Arad 41:9 obverse

S. Plant products

    6.13. חמר – wine – Tell el-Kheleifeh 2:2, 3

W. Miscellaneous

    6.14. נצבא – stele, sign to remember, statue[24] – Samaria 3:1

7. CONSTRUCTIONS

B. Buildings

    7.1. מתבנה – straw-shed – Arad 38:2

    7.2. ביח – house[25] – Arad 38:3

H. Building materials

    7.3. אריא – beam (presumably of wood) – Beer-Sheba 41:1

8. BODY, BODY PARTS, AND BODY PRODUCTS

B. Parts of the body

    8.1. יד – hand – Beer-Sheba 3:1

9. PEOPLE

B. Males

    9.1. גברן – men (pl.) – Arad 7:2

10. KINSHIP TERMS

A. Groups and members of groups of persons regarded as related by blood

    10.1. ביח – house[26] – Beth-Pelet 2:2

---

[24]Since the meaning of the stele is not clear from the inscriptions, the term can have several meanings: a religious gift, a sign to remember a political decision, a business contract, etc.

[25]The exact contextual meaning of this term depends on the reading of the next word. Naveh reads ובית תנבה, "and his house of straw" ("Aramaic Ostraca from Arad," 166). J.C.L. Gibson reads ובית תורה, "and his ox-stable" (Textbook of Syrian Semitic Inscriptions, vol. 2, *Aramaic Inscriptions* [Oxford: Clarendon, 1975], 152); Y. Aharoni and R. Amiran read תנבה ובית, "and its house of fruit," a strange translation, since the 3 sg. m. suffix appears on a well-attested male name ("Excavations at Tel Arad: Preliminary Report on the First Season," *IEJ* 14 [1964]: 141-142).

[26]The following word is אמרך, which could refer to either a proper name or to "your workman." Therefore, in this context ביח indicates some kind of kinship and not a building.

11. GROUPS AND CLASSES OF PERSONS AND MEMBERS OF SUCH GROUPS

D. Ethnic-cultural

11.1. ערביא – Arab (as an socioethnic tag) – Beth-Pelet 2:6

F. Artistic-economic[27]

11.2. אמנך – workman (or personal name)[28] – Beth-Pelet 2:3

12. SUPERNATURAL BEINGS AND POWERS

A. Supernatural beings

12.1. יה – hypocoristicon of יהוה – YHWH – Samaria 2:1

15. LINEAR MOVEMENT

J': Ride[29]

15.1. פרשי – horsemen – Arad 7:1[30]

15.2. חמר – donkey-drivers – Arad 12:1[31]

19. PHYSICAL IMPACT

E. Press

19.1. דקיר – to crush (crushed) – Arad 7:2

23. PHYSIOLOGICAL PROCESSES AND STATES

L. Ripen, produce fruit, bear seed

23.1. זרע – to sow – Beth-Pelet 1:1

33. COMMUNICATION

B" Swear, put under oath, vow

33.1. נדר – to vow – Samaria 3:1

37. CONTROL, RULE

D. Rule, govern

37.1. מדינת – city-state, province – Arad 12:1

43. AGRICULTURE

A. Produce, fruit

43.1. חנבה – fruit – Arad 38:3

53. RELIGIOUS ACTIVITIES

I. Roles and functions

---

[27]This subdivision is not included in Louw and Nida's list.

[28]In view of the suffix, "workman" seems to be more probable.

[29]This subdomain does not appear in the NT and is therefore not in Louw and Nida's list.

[30]It may be possible to understand this term as depicting a specific office, thus placing it under main domain 87.

[31]In Arad 12:1, חמר was used for "donkey-riders." This term might also be understood as a title and thus placed under domain 87.

53.1. כהן → priest → Samaria 1:1

55. MILITARY ACTIVITIES

C. Army

55.1. דגל → military and socioeconomic unit[32] → Arad 12:2

F. Bodyguards[33]

55.2. טבחיא → bodyguard → Arad 37:3

57. POSSESS, TRANSFER, EXCHANGE

H. Give

57.1. יהב → to give → Arad 5:1

57.2. נתן → to give → Arad 14:2 obverse

57.3. אסיקו → to bring up → Beer-Sheba 5:2

57.4. דשנא → donation → Nebi Yunis 1:2

L. Pay, price, cost

57.5. נפקה → expenses → Beth-Pelet 2:2

57.6. יד → hand (indicating change of ownership) → Beth-Pelet 2:7

N. Tax, transfer, exchange

57.7. קרפלנס → tax-gatherer[34] → Tell el-Kheleifeh 2:1

P. Earn, gain, do business

57.8. תגר → merchant → Beer-Sheba 38:1

Q. Lend, loan, interest, borrow, bank

57.9. נצא → to give a loan/take a loan → Arad 41:1 obverse and
reverse

T. Keep records

57.10. גנזבר → treasurer → Arad 37:1

58. NATURE, CLASS, EXAMPLE

F. Different kind or class

58.1. אחרתא → other (field) → Beth-Pelet 1:3

---

[32]In view of the material from Elephantine, the military hierarchy during the Persian period included the following: *degel* (ca. 1,000 men) → *century* (ca. 100 men) → *decarchy* (ca. 10 men). See B. Porten, *The Archives of Elephantine: The Life of an Ancient Jewish Military Colony* (Berkeley: Univ. of California Press, 1968), 29-32. A. Temerev stresses that *dgl* was not only a military unit but functioned also as a socioeconomic unit ("Social Organizations in Egyptian Military Settlements of the Sixth-Fourth Centuries B.C.E.: *dgl* and *m't*," in *The Word of the Lord Shall Go Forth: Essays in Honor of David Noel Freedman on His Sixtieth Birthday*, ed. C. L. Meyers and M. P. O'Connor [Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1983], 523-525).

[33]This subdomain is not included in Louw and Nida's list, but no other seemed to fit the semantic range of "bodyguard."

[34]Most probably a Greek loan word, possibly from καρπολόγος, "tax-gatherer"; see Glueck, "Ostraca from Eilath," 9.

60. NUMBER[35]

    B. One, two, three, etc. · Cardinals → Arad 1:1, 2

    C. First, second, third, etc. · Ordinals → Arad 1:3

63. WHOLE, UNITE, PART, DIVIDE

    B. Unite

        63.1. מקשר → to bind together → Beer-Sheba 13:1

67. TIME

    I. Definite units of time: year, month, week, day, hour

        67.1. תמז → Tammuz (name of month) → Beer-Sheba 1:1

        67.2. שנת → year → Beer-Sheba 1:1

        67.3. סיון → Siwan (name of month) → Beer-Sheba 3:1

        67.4. כסלו → Kislev (name of month) → Beer-Sheba 5:1

        67.5. אלול → Elul (name of month) → Beer-Sheba 6:1

        67.6. אב → Ab (name of month) → Beer-Sheba 9:1

        67.7. מרחשון → Marheshwan (name of month) → Beer-Sheba 20:1

79. FEATURES OF OBJECTS

    W. Shapes

        79.1. סכת → tip → Heshbon 2:1

83. SPATIAL POSITIONS

    C. Among, between, in, inside

        83.1. ב → in → Beth-Pelet 1:1

    E. At, beside, near, far

        83.2. קרבתא → near → Beth-Pelet 1:2

    F. In front of, face to face, in back of, behind

        83.3. קדם → before → Arad 41:7 obverse

86. WEIGHT

    B. Pound, talent - Specific units of weight

        86.1. סאה → abbreviated ס → seah (unit of weight) → Arad 1:2

        86.2. קב → abbreviated ק → qab (unit of weight) → Arad 1:2

        86.3. כר → abbreviated כ → kor (unit of weight) → Beer-Sheba 1:2

        86.4. פלג → abbreviated פ → peleg (unit of weight) → Beer-Sheba 3:2

        86.5. אבם → stone (unit of weight) → Beer-Sheba 3:3

        86.6. פרס → abbreviated פ → peras (unit of weight) → Beer-Sheba 30:1

    C. Liquid weight[36]

        86.7. לג → log (unit of liquid weight) → Samaria 1:1

---

[35]Because the numbers in the Aramaic epigraphical corpus of Syria-Palestine are graphic signs, no further subdivisions were made.

[36]This subdomain does not appear in Louw and Nida.

87. STATUS

A. Position, rank[37]

87.1 פרשי – horsemen – Arad 7:1

87.2 חמר – donkey-drivers – Arad 12:1

E. Slave, free

87.3. עבד – servant – Tell el-Kheleifeh 1:1

89. RELATIONS

C. Derivation

89.1. מן – from (in connection with a specific place) – Arad 12:1

D. Specification

89.2. ב – in, on – Arad 1:3

Q. Addition

89.3. ו – and – Arad 22:1

90. CASE

A. Agent, personal or nonpersonal, causative or immediate

90.1. ל – for (indicating purpose) – Beth-Pelet 1:1

C. Source of event or activity

90.2. ל – on (with date) – Beer-Sheba 1:1

I. Benefaction

90.3. ל – for (in connection with a person) – Arad 5:1

90.4. על – in (in connection with change of ownership) – Beer-Sheba 3:3

92. DISCOURSE REFERENTIALS

F. Relative reference

92.1. זי – who – Arad 25:1

92.2. כזי – when – Arad 41:5 obverse

93. NAMES OF PLACES AND PERSONS[38]

A. Persons – Arad 1:1, 3; etc.

B. Places – Heshbon 2:3

---

[37]On this subdomain see notes on main domain 15. From the context, either option is possible.

[38]For a complete list of the names included in the Aramaic inscriptions of Syria-Palestine during the Persian period, see G. Klingbeil, "The Onomasticon of the Aramaic Inscriptions of Syro-Palestine during the Persian Period," *Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages* 18 (1992): 67-94.

5. Interpretation and Analysis of the Data

The semantic analysis of the Aramaic epigraphic material of Syria-Palestine during the Persian period exhibits a definite lack of abstract terms, such as feeling, sensing, or thinking. There are only five abstract terms in four different main domains: *19. Physical impact, 23. Physiological processes and states, 33. Communication*, and *37. Control, rule.*

Altogether, the semantic spectrum of the corpus includes only 87 different terms, excluding the differing numbers and names of persons and places. Because more than one-quarter of the total number of words found in the inscriptions are personal names (165 of 651 words), the second largest group of referents are *unique referents*, referring to one person only and having distinctive semantic features not shared with any other term or person. By far the largest contingent of word referents is the so-called *class referents*, which are subdivided into common words that designate a class of entities, events, or abstracts. In the corpus studied more than 85 percent of the class referents refer to entities or objects; only twice is the class referent described as being abstract.[39]

Class referents referring to events appear nine times,[40] amounting to roughly 10 percent of the total referents. In view of the predominance of business and administrative texts, these numbers should be expected, since in receipts, accounts, and orders the amount of some specified article, object, or entity is normally stated. The purpose of a written text evidently influences the semantic spectrum used in a document.[41]

Combined, the four largest domains amount to more than 43 percent of all terms, with the following distribution. Following *artifacts*, domain *57. Possess, transfer, exchange* is the largest—to be expected, since the texts mainly deal with business transactions.

---

[39]In Arad ostracon 37:1 the term נוזבר, "treasurer," occurs; it cannot be analyzed as either "event" or "object/entity," but rather as being an abstract official title. In Samaria ostracon 4:1, the verb נדר, "to vow," appears; it could be understood as either an abstract or an event class referent.

[40]Cf. the imperative הב in Arad 5:1, פרש in Arad 7:1, רקיד in Arad 7:2 (and some ostraca following this one), פרש in Arad 11:1, נתן in Arad 14:2 obverse, נצא in Arad 41 (2 times), מקשר in Beer-Sheba 13:1, הבוה in Beer-Sheba 16:1, and לורע in Beth-Pelet 1:1.

[41]W. R. Tate correctly observes that "there is an intimate relationship and interconnectedness between form and content. Hermeneutics must concern itself not only with content, but also with the form of the text. This concern entails understanding conventions of the generic systems. This is true because different *genres* involve different literary codes and conventions [and also specific vocabulary and syntactic style]" (*Biblical Interpretation: An Integrated Approach* [Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1991], 63-65).

Name of main domain	Number of subdomains	Number of terms	Percentage
6. Artifacts	7	14	16 %
57. Possess, transfer, exchange	6	10	11.4 %
67. Time	1	7	8 %
86. Weight	2	7	8 %

6. Conclusions

The corpus of inscriptions investigated in this article is most definitely to be understood as business texts. The pattern of semantic domains contains very few abstract terms; the two largest domains are "artifacts" and terms regarding "possess, transfer, and exchange." These constitute, of course, typical business terminology. The purpose of a text evidently influences the terminology used. The *genre* of Aramaic inscriptions on hard surface of Syria-Palestine during the Persian period must be identified as business and administrative texts, comprising lists of persons, receipts, and order forms.

Customarily, *genre* identifications are predominantly based upon presuppositions and axioms of turn-of-the-century biblical scholarship.[42] Both form and content need to serve as the basis for *genre* identification. In this context, my work may provide a possible alternative in identifying *genres* based upon the semantics *and* their content. Thus by analyzing the occurrences of semantic domains (and sometimes the absence thereof) in a specific corpus of inscriptions (or textual corpus as found in the Bible), it may be possible to rectify this subjective approach.

It does appear that the semantic approach of Louw and Nida to lexicography—while still in its beginning stages and beset with certain restrictions—may contribute to the often neglected study of the semantics of ancient Near Eastern texts as well as the OT texts themselves. In future studies it may be possible to assign a specific text to a certain *genre* on the basis of the analysis of the semantic domain of each word included in the text.

---

[42]For example, the categorization of the Psalms by H. Gunkel and S. Mowinckel. An evaluation of these classifications is provided by M. G. Klingbeil, "Yahweh Fighting from Heaven: God as Warrior and as God of Heaven in the Hebrew Psalter and Ancient Near Eastern Iconography" (D. Litt. dissertation, University of Stellenbosch, 1995), 143-155. J. Barton maintains that "there is obviously a danger in inferring the existence of a *Gattung* from very few examples, since it is always possible that a single text is anomalous" ("Form Criticism [OT]," *ABD*, 2:840).

EL CONCEPTO VERDAD EN SUS DIMENSIONES GRIEGA Y HEBREA

MIGUEL ANGEL NUÑEZ
Universidad Adventista de Chile
Chillán, Chile

The Greek thinking on truth has to do with the cognitive, with ideas and concepts. On the other hand, in the Hebrew mindset, truth has a religious and relational aspect. The Greek idea has to do with present; the Hebrew, with the future. Jesus' statement, "I am the truth," implies an experiential encounter with a person, and thus fits the biblical, Hebrew model of thinking.

Introducción

El concepto VERDAD, asi como el uso del término, es constante en el lenguaje teológico, filosófico y científico. No obstante, se hace poco énfasis en la dimensión profunda de la expresión y de las connotaciones que tiene. Su correcta comprensión es de vital importancia para el estudio teológico pues utilizamos el término para referirnos a ideas que no necesariamente están de acuerdo con el contexto bíblico. Es fundamental entender con exactitud su significado porque la cuestión sobre la esencia de la verdad está, como dice el teólogo alemán Wolfhart Pannenberg, «conectada con la profunda crisis no sólo de la teología, sino de las iglesias cristianas y de la fe cristiana en el presente».[1]

La pregunta que hiciese Pilato, ¿«Qué es la verdad»? (Juan 18:38), ha estado gravitando en occidente cada vez con mayor énfasis desde la época de la Ilustración cuando se le preguntó a los cristianos sobre sus pretensiones de poseer una fe que abarcase la realidad total.[2]

Hay por lo menos dos dimensiones históricas distintas respecto a la verdad: el significado griego y el sentido hebreo. Estos dos puntos de vista han estado presentes en la cultura occidental modelando las ideas que nos hacemos de Dios, de la naturaleza, de las personas y de nosotros mismos. Resulta esencial realizar una arqueología del concepto con el fin de aclarar cómo esta historia de la comprensión de la verdad se relaciona con su

---

[1]Wolfhart Pannenberg, *Cuestiones Fundamentales de Teología Sistemática* (Salamanca: Sígueme, 1976), 53.

[2]El filósofo francés. F. M. Voltaire (1694-1778) se pregunta irónicamente qué habría pasado si Pilato se hubiese detenido a escuchar la respuesta de Jesús, evidentemente creyendo que no habría de tener una respuesta certera. Ver Voltaire, «Verdad», *Diccionario Filosófico* (Buenos Aires: Ediciones Araujo, 1938).

esencia misma. La idea que nos hemos formado de este concepto ha determinado la historia entera de su comprensión en occidente hasta el día de hoy.

Nos proponemos en este ensayo sentar las bases fundamentales para entender estas dos perspectivas y su desarrollo en el pensamiento occidental, para así poseer elementos de juicio suficientes para diferenciar claramente cual es la concepción que la Biblia nos da al respecto.

La Dimension Griega de la Verdad

El Término: Alētheia

La palabra griega *alētheia*, ha sido entendida —a partir de la propia interpretación griega— como una voz derivada del verbo *lanthanō*, que significa encubrir, ocultar o esconder. Al anteponérsele la partícula privativa *a* llega a significar lo contrario, es decir, «lo que no está oculto o escondido, lo que está patente, manifiesto, descubierto o desvelado»,[3] todo entendido dentro de un proceso de descubrimiento. Por el contrario, la falsedad, el *pseudo*, es el desarrollo del acto de ocultar la evidencia verdadera.[4]

En el pensamiento griego existe la idea que las cosas tienen una realidad esencial. Desde esta perspectiva, «verdad es, en griego, patencia o descubrimiento de las cosas, es decir desvelamiento o manifestación de lo que son».[5] De allí que el griego cuando piense en la expresión verdad estará reflexionando fundamentalmente en lo que las cosas son y sólo secundariamente en lo que se dice de la cosa, en el *logos*.[6]

En este sentido, la idea griega de verdad carece de carácter histórico. Originalmente tiene el sentido de sacar algo a la luz, permitir que se vea tal como es. Siguiendo esta idea la realidad que es verdadera es descubierta mediante el *logos* que «muestra, es decir, deja ver, la *alētheia* de las cosas».[7] De esta idea se deriva que una aseveración sea verdadera en la medida en que está de acuerdo con el decir (*logos*) y descubre una realidad.

En el Pensamiento Antiguo

Ya desde los más antiguos griegos se percibe la dificultad que implica

---

[3]Julián Marías, *Introducción a la Filosofía* (Madrid: Alianza, 1985), 93.

[4]Viene del verbo *pseudomai*, esconder la verdad, decir falsedad o mentira.

[5]Marías, 94.

[6]Algo que se dice, un tópico de un discurso, razonamiento.

[7]H. G. Link, «Verdad», *Diccionario Teológico del Nuevo Testamento*, ed. Lothar Coenen, Erich Beyreuther, Hans Bietenhard (Salamanca: Ediciones Sigueme, 1984), 4:332.

desentrañar lo que está encubierto. Anaxágoras (ca. 499-428 a.C) plantea que los sentidos nos impiden discernir lo verdadero, lo cual es velado por lo aparente.[8] Así nace, desde muy temprano, una convicción que llegaría a ser importante para el pensamiento griego posterior y que se asentaría de manera decisiva en el inconsciente colectivo occidental: la certeza de que sólo al pensamiento racional le es accesible lo oculto, es decir, la verdad original de las cosas.

Para Parménides (nac. ca. 540/539 a.C.) el ser verdadero era permanente e imperecedero, y por lo tanto uno y único. Todo esto se contrapone a los fenómenos cambiantes. El ser es estable tras el devenir (frag. 2). Es lo que perdura inamovible frente al cambio. Es lo «inmóvil y eterno»; el ser es (frag. 8).[9]

Como afirma von Soden, «la pregunta sobre la verdad es la pregunta sobre aquello que permanece y garantiza permanencia, sobre aquello que se halla preservado y preserva contra la caducidad».[10] En este punto, comparte un rasgo característico con la concepción hebrea que al fundarse en Dios mismo no cambia.

La verdad *alētheia* no acontece, es. Es «en identidad consigo misma, como lo oculto y velado tras la cambiante apariencia sensorial, como lo que solamente a un percibir en el logos se desvela».[11] El griego asume la posibilidad de llegar a abrirse a la plenitud de la verdad por medio del conocimiento (del *logos*),[12] concepto que los hebreos entienden de manera distinta.

El desarrollo posterior de la idea de verdad está ligado con el pensamiento griego, especialmente con el cristianismo contagiado de helenismo, tal como se da en autores como San Agustín (354-430) o Santo Tomás de Aquino (1225-1274).

En la etapa inmediatamente anterior a la Edad Media, para autores como Agustín de Hipona, «La verdad es Dios».[13] Sin embargo, esta idea esconde una concepción griega al afirmar que el carácter fundamental de la verdad reside en que el ser se revela, el ser ilumina la razón humana con

[8]Anaxágoras, *Fragmentos* (Buenos Aires: Aguilar Argentina, 1973). Literalmente dice en el fragmento 20: «A causa de la debilidad [de los sentidos] no somos capaces de discernir la verdad» (*Sexto empírico adv. math.* 7.90), 64.

[9]Roger Verneaux, *Textos de los Grandes Filósofos: Edad Antigua* (Barcelona: Herder, 1982).

[10]Hans von Soden, «Was ist Wahrheit»?, 1927; citado por Pannenberg, 57.

[11]Ibíd., 56.

[12]Por lo menos en la opinión dogmática.

[13]Nicolás Abbagnano, *Historia de la Filosofía* (Barcelona: Montaner y Simón, 1978), 1:279.

su luz y le suministra la norma de todo juicio, la medida de cualquier valoración. «En esta revelación del ser hecha al hombre en su interior, en este valor suyo para el hombre como principio que ilumina su investigación, consiste la verdad».[14] Hay aquí lo que se llama una concepción «inmanente» de la verdad.[15]

Edad Media

En esta época nos encontramos con uno de los personajes más trascendentes para el pensamiento cristiano posterior, Santo Tomás de Aquino, cuya filosofía se basa en determinar en forma precisa la relación entre la razón y la revelación. Siendo que el hombre es un ser finito y proclive de error es necesario que el hombre sea instruido por la revelación divina. Siguiendo la interpretación aristotélica Santo Tomás formula el adagio: *«veritas est adaequatio rei et intellectus»* (la verdad es la coincidencia entre lo que se piensa y la realidad).[16]

Hasta allí el discurso de Santo Tomás no parece contradictorio al concepto bíblico, sin embargo, luego afirma lo que se ha llegado a conocer como la autonomía de la razón.[17] La revelación no anula ni inutiliza la razón. Tomás afirma que «la gracia no elimina la naturaleza, sino que la perfecciona».[18] Esto abre la puerta para encontrar «verdades naturales», lo que después derivó en la llamada «teología natural».[19]

Para evitar esta digresión que efectivamente luego se dió, Santo Tomás tuvo la precaución de señalar que si alguien descubre una verdad, siendo que Dios es el autor de la naturaleza humana, esa verdad «nunca puede ser opuesta a la verdad revelada: la verdad no puede contradecir la verdad».[20]

[14]Ibíd.

[15]Justo González lo expresa del siguiente modo: «Puesto que la mente humana es incapaz de conocer las verdades eternas por sí misma o mediante los sentidos, recibe ese conocimiento por una iluminación directa de Dios. Esto no quiere decir en modo alguno que la mente contemple las verdades eternas en la esencia de Dios, ni quiere decir tampoco que Dios sencillamente ilumine esas verdades para que la mente pueda conocerlas. No, sino que Dios —el Verbo de Dios— inspira en la mente del hombre el conocimiento de las ideas que existen eternamente en Dios mismo». Justo González, *Historia del Pensamiento Cristiano* (Buenos Aires: La Aurora, 1972), 2: 39.

[16]*Summa Theologica* 1.16.a.1 y 1.21.a.2.

[17]Francis A. Schaeffer, *Huyendo de la Razón* (Barcelona: Ediciones Evangélicas Europeas, 1969), 13.

[18]Abbagnano, 1:458.

[19]Concepto que el filósofo Jasinowski llama «verdad bigradual», la separación de las verdades de fe y las verdades de razón. Bogumil Jasinowski, *Renacimiento Italiano y Pensamiento Moderno* (Santiago: Universidad de Chile, 1968), 181.

[20]Abbagnano, 1: 459.

En este caso, la fe se convierte en «la regla del recto proceder de la razón».[21]

Época Moderna

En épocas posteriores, queda en evidencia que para sustentar una verdad subjetiva es necesario una base objetiva. De allí que surja la necesidad de algo que no cambia. Esto es claro en el pensamiento de René Descartes (1596-1650), G. W. Leibnitz (1646-1716) e incluso Emmanuel Kant (1724-1804), donde el soporte de la verdad es Dios. «Sin el presupuesto de Dios, la verdad como conformidad no resulta ya pensable».[22]

Para René Descartes las ideas que representan a las cosas naturales y a los otros hombres no contienen nada tan perfecto que no pueda ser reproducido por un ser humano. Sin embargo, respecto a la idea de Dios, que es una «sustancia infinita, eterna, omnisciente, omnipotente y creadora, es difícil suponer que pueda haberla creado yo mismo».[23] La idea de Dios es tan perfecta, que —según Descartes— es imposible que haya nacido en mi como ser humano pues posee perfecciones que como hombre no tengo. Para el pensamiento cartesiano la causa de una idea debe siempre tener al menos tanta perfección como la representada por la idea. En esta línea de pensamiento Descartes afirma la existencia de Dios con el argumento que «la simple presencia en mi de la idea de Dios demuestra la existencia de Dios».[24] En este sentido entonces, Dios se convierte en garante de la verdad toda vez que el hombre no puede ser creador de una idea infinita.[25]

En el caso de Leibnitz la situación es más o menos similar. Este autor busca una causa libre en el universo. Llega a la conclusión que existe sólo una causa sin contingencia y esa no está en el mundo tal como lo conocemos sino fuera de él; la única sustancia necesaria es Dios.[26]

El caso de Kant, si bien más complejo, refleja la misma línea de pensamiento. El noumeno, que contiene lo inmutable, lo que no cambia y aquello de lo cual no se puede dar razón suficiente,[27] es el ámbito de la

---

[21]*Contra Gentiles* 1: 7.

[22]Pannenberg, 68.

[23]Abbagnano, 2: 173.

[24]Ibíd.

[25]Joseph Moller, «Verdad: Naturaleza de la verdad», *Sacramentum Mundi*, ed. Karl Rahner (Barcelona: Herder, 1976), 6: 830.

[26]Abbagnano, 2: 258-259.

[27]Kant considera a Dios como aquel ser que siendo todo, «no es cognoscible ni demostrable en el pensamiento sobre El». Kurt Rossman, *Inmanuel Kant: Un Filósofo Alemán*

divinidad[28] que sustenta el fenómeno, que es la dimensión donde sí se puede dar razón y hacer ciencia.[29]

En esta época —además— se hace evidente el problema de la historicidad de la verdad. Los griegos ya se habían visto enfrentados a la aporía de tener que considerar a la verdad en proceso de descubrimiento, aún cuando lo entendiesen como lo permanente tras el cambio. G.W.F. Hegel (1770-1831) aportó el ensayo de solución más interesante al problema; para este autor alemán, «La verdad es la totalidad». Al final del proceso dialéctico está el «espíritu absoluto», la verdad total. En este sentido, la verdad es reafirmada como algo que se da en «progresión gradual». Sólo al final se obtiene la síntesis total y se llega a lo definitivo que para él significa «Dios absoluto».[30] O tal como lo expresa Abbagnano: «El reino del pensamiento puro es la verdad, tal como es en sí y por sí, sin velo. Esto se puede expresar diciendo que es la exposición de Dios, tal como es en su eterna esencia».[31]

Desarrollo del Concepto Griego de Verdad en el Mundo Contemporáneo

En la época contemporánea la verdad deja de ser, en la línea del pensamiento griego, una cuestión encubierta y permanente y «pasa a ser expresión tan sólo del hombre mismo, de su situación y de su libertad creadora».[32] En este sentido, y especialmente bajo el alero del existencialismo se busca «la verdad propia»,[33] no la verdad como tal.[34]

(Bonn: Inter Nationes Bonn-Bad Godesberg, 1974), 3.

[28]Haciendo un análisis del pensamiento de Kant al respecto, F. Copleston afirma que en Kant «el concepto de Dios no es el concepto de algo que aparece, pero considerado aparte de su aparecer. Pues no puede decir que Dios aparezca». De allí que la divinidad sea circunscrita exclusivamente al noumeno. Frederick Copleston *Historia de la Filosofía* (Barcelona: Herder, 1981), 6: 259.

[29]En varios aspectos Kant, si bien piensa en Dios como un elemento de fundamentación y sustento, es un ilustrado en el sentido de convertir a la razón en el único tribunal válido de la verdad. Immanuel Kant, *Filosofía de la Historia* (Buenos Aires: Nova, 1958), 426ss.

[30]Es interesante notar que de esta concepción surgen líneas de pensamiento ateas, políticas y filosóficas; ejemplos elocuentes son Ludwig Feuerbach (1804-1872), Karl Marx (1818-1883) y J. P. Sartre (1905-1980).

[31]*Ciencia de la lógica*, 1: 32, citado por Abbagnano, 3: 102.

[32]Pannenberg, 63-64.

[33]Esto comienza a gestarse en la Epoca Moderna, cuando los autores de la modernidad empiezan a sustentar paulatinamente la verdad en el hombre mismo, proceso que se inició poco a poco con el *cogito* cartesiano. En la época moderna —nos dice Krings— «el principio de la verdad es el principio de razón suficiente; su criterio, la deducción lógica rigurosa; su fundamento, la unidad del sistema lógico. Por otra parte, se llega a un acercamiento extremo de empiría y verdad (empirismo, positivismo, pragmatismo). La experiencia es el fundamento

Incluso, en el ámbito de la fe —nos dice Pannenberg— la verdad «se la buscará únicamente como expresión existencial, como realización suya que los cristianos lleven a cabo, y no ya como aquello en lo que la fe cree».[35] Es éste el aspecto básico para entender muchas corrientes teológicas actuales.[36] Hay aquí una subjetivación de la verdad que —según Martín Heidegger (1889-1976)— comienza con los mismos griegos toda vez que al pensamiento se lo hizo escala y patrón de lo verdadero. En algún sentido hay una resucitación del pensamiento griego de la corriente sofista, especialmente de Protágoras (481 a.C), quien afirmaba que «el hombre es la medida de todas las cosas».[37] Con esto Protágoras estaba sosteniendo que cada cual determina lo que es verdadero o falso, de acuerdo a su propio parecer, lo que lleva irremediablemente a la negación de un saber común.   Eso lleva a algunos autores contemporáneos a afirmar, en consonancia con el pensamiento de Protágoras, que la verdad depende, en suma, de los fines y circunstancias del que habla, y aún de la audiencia al cual se dirige. Así las cosas, la verdad termina siendo algo totalmente relativo.

La Dimensión Hebrea

El Término: Emunah

Para referirse a verdad los hebreos usaban el vocablo *emet*, de la misma raíz de la expresión *emunah* (fe). El verbo que se halla en la base de

---

absoluto de la verdad; su criterio es la observación, que puede ser elevada por medios lógicos a la objetividad y validez universal». H. Krings, «Verdad (Filosofía)», *Conceptos Fundamentales de la Teología*, ed. Henrich Fries, 2da ed. (Madrid: Cristiandad, 1979), 2: 860-861.

[34]La raíz de esta idea es posible encontrarla en Martín Heidegger. El análisis que hace éste filósofo de la verdad como el «descubrimiento» del Ser sigue la línea de pensamiento griega; sin embargo, su análisis del Ser (Dasein) en términos de nuestro propio ser-en-el-mundo tiende a confinar la verdad en el ámbito del propio descubrimiento, que es a la postre la autenticidad de sí mismo, lo cual nos lleva a una subjetivación de la verdad. Es posible ver la influencia de Heidegger en autores como Paul Tillich (1886-1965), Rudolf Bultmann (1884-1976) y en J. P. Sartre (1905-1980), por ejemplo. Martin Heidegger, *Ser y Tiempo* (México: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 1968), cap. 4.

[35]Pannenberg, 64.

[36]Un botón de muestra se encuentra en un texto de G. Angelini, que se titula «El desarrollo de la teología católica en el siglo XX: Breve reseña crítica», que contiene una sección titulada «Teología y pensamiento antropocéntrico», y donde se analiza a dos influyentes teólogos contemporáneos, Karl Rahner de la llamada «escuela heideggeriana católica» y Edward Schillebeeckx, fundador de la revista teológica internacional *Concilium*. *Diccionario Teológico Interdisciplinar*, ed. L. Pacomio y otros (Salamanca: Sigueme, 1983), 4: 767-777.

[37]Platón, *Cratilo*, 385 E, citado en Protágoras, *Fragmentos y Testimonios* (Buenos Aires: Aguilar, 1973), 74.

esta voz es *amen,* que denota algo firme, sólido e inquebrantable en una cosa o en una palabra.[38] En general el término tiene dos connotaciones. Es, por una parte una expresión legal y por otro, un concepto religioso.

Connotación Jurídica

En el ámbito jurídico describe la «verdad actual de un proceso o causa».[39] Esta acepción se encuentra, por ejemplo, en Deut 22:20, donde la fórmula jurídica dice: «más si resultare verdad . . .». Al mismo tiempo, señala la certeza de una investigación: «Inquirirás, y buscarás y preguntarás con diligencia; y si pareciere verdad, cosa cierta . . .» (Deut 13:14). La misma idea aparece en otro pasaje que señala que «después que oyeres y hubieres indagado bien [y] la cosa pareciere de verdad cierta . . .» (Deut 17:4). Aquí se ve la verdad vista como producto de un proceso de indagación y búsqueda.

También se usa la palabra para pedir validez o seguridad ante una promesa, por ejemplo: «Os ruego pues, ahora, que me juréis. . .» (Jos 2:12). También se emplea para referirse a un reporte válido: «Y fueron enviadas cartas . . . con palabras . . . de verdad» (Est 9:30). Finalemente, para probar si lo que se dice es válido o no, como en el caso de Gén 42:16, cuando José «prueba» la validez de las palabras de sus hermanos.

La expresión *emet* también está asociada a la veracidad de las normas o principios (Rut 3:12), a la validez de las conductas (Gén 24:49) y al cumplimiento de promesas (2 Sam 7:28). La verdad es relacionada con la misericordia (Gén 47:29),[40] con la justicia (Neh 9:13; Isaías 59:14) y con la sinceridad (Jos 24:14).

La expresión *emet* también implica la justicia de Dios. El salmista afirma «los juicios de Jehová son verdad, todos justos» (Sal 19:9). Según G. Bromiley, hay en este uso de la expresión un doble sentido. «Lo que Dios demanda es correcto; él establece y garantiza una norma justa. Pero Dios también juzga la conducta humana en una forma que corresponde a la realidad».[41] Nuevamente el mismo significado que venimos considerando: «Dios es aquel en quien se puede confiar plenamente, sobre quien se puede edificar la vida propia con toda seguridad»,[42] porque él no varía.

Cuando se aplica al ser humano, la palabra significa lo que caracteriza su conducta o sus palabras. «La palabra de un hombre es verdadera en la

---

[38]Gottfried Quell, «*alētheia*», *TDNT,* 1: 232.

[39]Ibíd.

[40]Concepto que también está presente en el NT, por ejemplo en Juan 1:14, 17.

[41]Geoffrey W. Bromiley, «Truth», *ISBE,* 4: 926.

[42]J. Gnilka, «Verdad: Sagrada Escritura», Fries, 863.

medida en que expresa llanamente, sin reticencias, lo que piensa; un hombre es veraz en la medida en que es capaz de mantener de modo efectivo el compromiso que ha adoptado».[43]

Connotación Religiosa

En el ámbito religioso esta locución es usada como parte del lenguaje metafórico. Por ejemplo, en Sal 51:6: «He aquí tu amas la verdad en lo íntimo, y en lo secreto me has hecho comprender sabiduría».

En el concepto bíblico se entiende que Dios es la fuente de la verdad y su palabra y la ley son para el hombre no sólo «la verdad», sino también el *fundamento* de la verdad. «La suma de tu palabra es verdad» (Sal 119:160), nos dice el salmista, con la convicción de que la verdad no es un atributo que reside en el hombre sino que es revelado desde Dios. En este sentido, todo acto divino es verdadero. «Los juicios de Jehová son verdad, todos justos» (Sal 19:9): justicia y verdad son homologadas.

Hacia una Definición

En síntesis, la verdad en el pensamiento hebreo «encierra una referencia personal: se trata de la verdad en el sentido de la confianza; el Dios verdadero es, ante todo, el que cumple lo que promete».[44] Es la idea del amigo con quien se puede contar, un amigo falso no es alguien inexistente, sino una persona que nos falla. No es casual que Dios, en el AT fundamentalmente, sea concebido como un padre pues es la imagen que mejor refleja la fidelidad.

Es fácil constatar que la dimensión hebrea es alusiva fundamentalmente al futuro. «La voz *emunah* remite, pues, a un cumplimiento, a algo que se espera y que será».[45]

La verdad en el pensamiento hebreo no es algo que esté ya plenamente concluído, algo que posea un valor desconectado del tiempo. Por el contrario es algo que va aconteciendo y se gesta de manera permanente. Haciendo alusión a esto Hans von Soden señala que «la verdad no es algo que, en cierta forma, se halle por debajo o por detrás de las cosas y deba ser encontrada mediante una penetración en la profundidad, en el interior de ellas; verdad es aquello que se pondrá de manifiesto en el futuro».[46] Esta idea la deja traslucir de algún modo Pablo en 1 Cor 13:12.

Hay además, como hemos dicho, un carácter experiencial. La fidelidad

---

[43]J. Giblet, «Aspectos de la Verdad en el Nuevo Testamento», *Concilium* 83 (1973): 340.

[44]Marías, 94.

[45]Ibíd.

[46]Citado por Pannenberg, 55.

se da siempre en el contexto de una relación comunitaria. «Significa que una persona o cosa que tenga como característica suya la fidelidad, es también para los demás merecedora de confianza».[47]

Esta experiencia, a diferencia de la concepción griega, no se da exclusiva o fundamentalmente en el plano cognitivo. Dicho de otro modo, no hay aquí la pretensión de alcanzar el saber «total» de la verdad. Para el hebreo, verdad es la confianza en la fidelidad de Dios. Aquel que se abandona en Dios y busca a la divinidad tiene permanencia y seguridad. «Si vosotros no creyereis,[48] de cierto no permaneceréis» (Isa 7:9).

Este creer se basa en la seguridad que se ha incrementado en ese Dios que permanece y no cambia (Mal 3:6). La plena satisfacción de esta confianza está siempre en el futuro y el discernimiento que se tiene de Dios es contingente; en este entendido es revelación. Tal como sostiene Pannenberg, «el que Dios permanezca y sea fiel, es algo que ha ido mostrándose hasta el presente en una serie de manifestaciones totalmente concretas y seguirá mostrándose también en el futuro mediante esas concretas manifestaciones».[49] Esa verdad que se manifestará en el futuro, tal como lo hizo en el pasado, no está determinada por ningún *logos*, lo que marca la diferencia con la postura griega.

Por otra parte, para el hebreo, la verdad de Dios es toda la verdad. Cualquier «verdad» que se piense debe estar en referencia al Dios que permanece. Aquel Dios cuyas obras son ciertas (Salmo 111:7), ese Dios es el único que puede ofrecer seguridad plena en el futuro; su fidelidad (verdad) es «escudo y adarga» (Salmo 91:4).

En este sentido, todo lo permanente, sea en las leyes naturales, «en la vida de los pueblos, o en la de los individuos, se halla abarcada por la verdad de Dios y tiene en ella su fundamento».[50]

Dos Contrastes

La experiencia hebrea tiene una profundidad con amplitud eterna. En constraste, la dimensión griega se nos aparece como reducida a las capacidades finitas del logos humano.

Estas dos ideas nos ofrecen contrastes distintos. Es innegable que las raíces idiomáticas esconden una visión de mundo opuesta. El gran problema del asunto es que estos conceptos han llegado a estar ligados íntimamente en la voz «verdad» que usamos en el mundo occidental.

[47]Ibíd., 57.

[48]Se usa la expresión *heʾmin*, la cual deriva del mismo tronco de *emet*.

[49]Pannenberg, 57.

[50]Ibíd., 60.

Las dos dimensiones hacen referencia al tiempo. La verdad como *alētheia* afecta a lo que las cosas son, es decir, tiene una dimensión actual, y de allí deriva la concepción de la ciencia que es siempre presente. La *episteme* griega enuncia lo que las cosas son ahora, de allí la ilusión de llegar a concebir lo que la cosa sea.

En cambio, la verdad en el pensamiento hebreo *(emunah)*, apunta hacia el porvenir, al futuro, a lo que viene. Examinado de este modo, la forma de saber con exactitud corresponde a la profecía y a la revelación.

No obstante lo anterior, de un modo evidente en la idea hebrea también está implícita la dimensión de presente y pasado. «Hoy» confirmo la convicción que tengo acerca de Dios y que ha sido reforzada anteriormente por la permanencia fiel de Dios que «no cambia» (Mal 3:6).

Es importante, también, entender que la expresión verdad que se usa en el NT está parcialmente teñida con la concepción hebrea de verdad e impregnada con los usos griegos y helénicos del concepto *alētheia*, lo que demanda la necesidad de un verdadero esfuerzo intelectual para decantar el sentido más correcto en relación al contexto en el que se estudie. Sin embargo, tal como Bromiley lo señala, el uso del término «verdad» en el NT está determinado más por el concepto del AT que por el desarrollo secular del término.[51] Esto se observa, por ejemplo, en Juan quien es el autor que más usa la expresión *alētheia*. Su comprensión de la verdad no procede del uso griego sino de la connotación hebrea. Por esa razón «el significado de *alētheia* en Juan no puede ser completamente apreciado aparte del significado del sustantivo[52] hebreo *emet*».[53]

Esta última parte nos mueve a una reflexión. Cuando decimos «conoceréis la verdad y la verdad os hará libres» (Juan 8:32), muchas veces pensamos en el concepto griego, es decir, énfasis en el *logos*, en el contenido, en el aspecto cognitivo. Sin embargo, tal como lo ha dejado en evidencia Lindsay,[54] la verdad pensada por los escritores neotestamentarios tiene una connotación ligada a la visión de mundo del AT; es decir, su

---

[51]Bromiley, 926.

[52]En rigor hay autores que presentan una postura ligeramente distinta. Por ejemplo J. Gnilka sugiere que el concepto neotestamentario de *alētheia* refleja la riqueza de contenido que tiene en su prehistoria (en el judaísmo y helenismo) y afirma que sería erróneo traducir siempre en el NT *alētheia* por «verdad». «Dentro de la diversidad de significaciones que encierra este vocablo, en algunos casos sugiere una idea de veracidad, fidelidad, rectitud, que se identifica con el hebreo *emet*». Concordamos con el autor y pensamos que el problema se suscita a la hora de olvidar el contenido contextual de la expresión siguiendo el contexto global del libro en cuestión y de la Biblia en general. Fries, 865.

[53]Dennis R. Lindsay, «What is Truth?: *alētheia* in the Gospel of John», *Restoration Quarterly* 35 (1993): 130.

[54]Ibíd.

énfasis está puesto en el «conocer a Dios», no en su aspecto cognitivo
solamente, sino también en la esfera relacional o experiencial.

Tal como la Biblia entiende el concepto verdad, la verdad está ligada
a Dios. Muchas veces olvidamos que nuestras habilidades cognitivas son
«creación divina» y que lo que vemos en la naturaleza tiene sentido y todo
ello, nuestro intelecto y el orden natural, es testimonio de la sabiduría de
Dios. Si bien esto no nos resulta difícil de aceptar, nos cuesta entender que
el conocimiento que Dios mismo posee es «arquetípico» y el de nosotros
«modelo o copia», como dice A. F. Holmes.[55] Eso implica que cuando
nosotros declaramos que algo es verdadero, sólo afirmamos algo que está
de acuerdo con el conocimiento verdadero y perfecto de Dios. Sin
embargo, nuestro modelo de verdad es «contingente, limitado, y
provisional».[56] Nosotros «conocemos en parte» (1 Cor 13:12). En
constraste, la verdad de Dios es absoluta. La verdad «humana» tiene que ser
descubierta y en ese sentido es dinámica. La verdad de Dios es permanente
y completa. Esto significa que es fundamental estar conscientes de nuestras
limitaciones cuando afirmamos que algo es verdad o que «tenemos la
verdad», expresión muy común, pero que entraña un gran riesgo, toda vez
que el ser humano es finito por naturaleza. En su limitación tiene acceso
a la verdad, pero, siempre en términos de aproximación.

Conclusión

Cuando afirmamos tener la verdad sólo en sentido cognitivo, estamos
pensando como griego, toda vez que cuando el griego pregunta sobre la
verdad «apunta al conocimiento del ser verdadero en sentido absoluto».[57]
Cuando decimos conocer la verdad en la acepción de relación, seguridad
y experiencia con Dios, además del aspecto cognitivo, estamos pensando
como hebreo y por ende bíblicamente.

T. F. Torrance, haciendo un estudio de la LXX sugería que al traducir
los setenta sabios la expresión *emet* por *alētheia* no estaban pensando en
«una verdad abstracta o metafísica, sino aquello que se apoya sobre la
fidelidad de Dios, es decir, la verdad considerada no como algo estático,
sino como una realidad activa, eficaz, la realidad de Dios en la relación de
alianza».[58] Es decir, querían asegurar que el fundamento de toda verdad es

---

[55]A. F. Holmes, «Truth», *Zondervan Pictorial Encyclopedia of the Bible* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1976), 5: 828.

[56]Ibíd.

[57]Link, 333.

[58]T. F. Torrance, «One Aspect of the Biblical Conception of Faith», *Exp Tim* 68 (1957): 114.

únicamente el encuentro con la fidelidad de Dios.

En el mismo sentido, y en una proyección más amplia, J. Blank (oponiéndose a la interpretación de R. Bultmann) ha dejado claro que la verdad —desde el punto de vista bíblico— «nunca se deja reducir a una posibilidad inmanente del ser humano».[59] El ser humano está en condiciones de comprender la verdad —al menos parcialmente. Pero siempre el fundamento de esa comprensión radica, finalmente, en la verdad misma, no en el hombre. Aquí es donde adquiere la revelación una importancia radical, toda vez que se convierte en un medio de certeza, en la forma de acercarnos a grandes verdades que nacen de Dios, por ejemplo, la certeza de la condición humana y la seguridad de la salvación obrada por y en Dios, por y en nosotros.

En Juan es claro que la verdad no puede ser pensada al margen de Jesús y eso ratifica lo que venimos diciendo en relación a que la verdad tiene un carácter experiencial. No se trata de acercarnos sólo a un contenido, sino también a una persona: Jesucristo (Juan 14:6; 8:32, 36).

Todo esto implica —tal como dice Gnilka— que «la cuestión de la verdad se reduce en definitiva, a la cuestión sobre la persona de Jesús».[60] En ese sentido, el «Yo soy . . . la verdad» (Juan 14: 6) es la culminación de la verdad anhelada por el pensamiento hebreo, es la verdad encarnada, reconocible, absoluta. Visto así, es posible tener mucha información sobre la verdad, pero a menos que tengamos un encuentro personal, revelador y experimental con Jesucristo nunca tendremos la verdad, al menos en los términos en que la Biblia la presenta.

La verdad, en términos bíblicos, es una experiencia, por una parte con un conocimiento objetivo: la verdad revelada. Por otra parte tiene que ver con una persona real: Jesucristo. Sólo en esta conjunción encontramos la dimensión equilibrada.

[59]Gnilka, 866.

[60]Ibíd, 867.

REVIEW OF *HANDBOOK FOR BIBLE STUDY*

KENNETH A. STRAND
Andrews University

Gugliotto, Lee J. *Handbook for Bible Study: A Guide to Understanding, Teaching, and Preaching the Word of God.* Hagerstown, MD: Review and Herald, 1995. 462 pp. $39.95.

> This book, written by an alumnus of the SDA Theological Seminary, Andrews University, was awarded the Evangelical Christian Publishers' Association Gold Medallion for 1996.

Lee Gugliotto's large, hard-cover *Handbook for Bible Study* carries a very modest title and subtitle in view of its comprehensiveness. It not only presents a superabundance of handbook-type material, but also provides a vast number of working tools. Indeed, it is both an encyclopedic handbook and a practical manual for personal Bible study and public presentation of Scripture.

This volume was produced as a result of its author's keen interest in providing training for Christian laity, but the book can well serve also as a good refresher and resource for seminary-trained professionals. Gugliotto holds graduate degrees from the seminaries of several denominations; has taught seminary classes in biblical studies, church history, and theology; and has given many years of pastoral service in congregations of various denominations. He is currently the senior pastor of the Canadian Union College Seventh-day Adventist Church in College Heights, Alberta, Canada. Into the present volume he has put the very best of his extensive experience and ongoing biblical, theological, and historical research.

The publication's main text contains two major parts. The first is very modestly entitled "Survey" and contains six chapters treating the basics of Scripture analysis and presentation: "Contextual Analysis" (25-32), "Structural Analysis" (33-48), "Verbal Analysis" (49-71), "Cultural Analysis" (72-119), "Theological Analysis" (120-139), and "Homiletical Analysis" (140-169). Part two is entitled "A Closer Look." Its chapters 7-16 carry the following titles: "A Grammar for English Bible Study" (173-198), "Categories of [Greek and Hebrew] Verbs" (199-214), "Informed Sources" (215-260), "Typology" (261-290), "Be Logical" (291-305), "Jewish

Institutions and the Spiritual Condition of Israel in the Time of Jesus" (306-312), "Is the King James the Most Accurate Version of the New Testament?" (313-346), "How Did We Get the New Testament?" (347-351), "Where Did Matthew, Mark, and Luke Get Their Gospels?" (352-361), and "Biblical Data for the Four Gospels" (362-373).

The volume also contains two helpful appendices: "Exegesis Aids and the Book of Jude" (377-411), which presents a case study in the use of the six types of analysis discussed in part one; and "Reproducible Blank Exegesis Aids" (412-439), containing numerous worksheets. These are followed by an extensive "Selected Bibliography" (441-460) and a "Directory of Bible Study Software" (461-462). There are no indexes (which would have been useful, but massive). This lack is not serious, however, for the eight-page "Contents" table is very detailed (7-14).

Gugliotto's presentation throughout every chapter is logically sequenced, practical, and user-friendly. A quick overview of chapter 2, "Structural Analysis" (one of the shorter chapters), will serve as a sample: Gugliotto first provides a brief introduction to the general topic (33-34) and then describes the nature and function of the three basic parts of a written narrative (introduction, body, and conclusion), adding a broad summary statement of clues for ascertaining the overall syntactical structure (34-35). Next, in a subdivision entitled "Identifying the Type of Literature," he discusses five basic literary types found in the Bible: prose, poetry, narrative, wisdom, and apocalyptic (35-41). Then, after five short paragraphs on the importance of grammar (41), he concludes with a detailed "Strategy for Structural Analysis" (41-48).

The subsection on "Poetry" will be particularly helpful to persons unfamiliar with the nature of Hebrew poetry. Gugliotto first points out that poetic literature "makes up almost one third of the Old Testament and frequently appears in the New Testament, especially in the gospels." He indicates that the "dominant feature" of Hebrew poetry "is the way it arranges two (a couplet), three (a triad), and even four (a quatrain) lines in parallel" (36).

Then, under the headings of "Grammatic," "Semantic," and "Rhetorical," he lists and illustrates "synonymous parallelism," "antithetic parallelism," "climactic" structuring, "synthetic" parallelism, "chiastic" presentation, "comparative" parallelism, "merismus," "paronomasia," and "ballast-variant" (36-40). A recognition of these types or formats is obviously important if we are to read biblical poetry correctly and with depth of understanding.

In the final subdivision of chapter 2, we find an excellent sample of the "how-to" sections of this volume. After a few general remarks about

procedure, Gugliotto presents five steps: "Scan the Text," "Prepare a Structural Draft," "Prepare a Paragraph Map," "Prepare a Structural Analysis," and "Convert Your Structural Analysis into a Structural Diagram." Under each of these steps, whose titles are highlighted by the use of bold italic type, there are multiple questions, procedural steps, and/or guidelines. These are easy to spot because they are placed within boxes, appear in enumeration form, or are set in italic typescript. Some subsections utilize two or all three of these devices. In this section of the chapter there are also six tables, charts, or diagrams (figures 12-17), plus some in-text diagramming.

A few observations concerning materials elsewhere in the book are now in order. Chapter 3, dealing with verbal analysis, is especially rich in its notation of reference tools that will be useful for Bible students in studying the Hebrew and Greek vocabulary that underlies renditions in English translations. For instance, concerning "word forms" some 12 books and 10 computer packages are mentioned (50-51) and concerning "etymology" approximately 50 titles are noted (65-69). The references are not simply listed, but are incorporated into the discussion, with notation as to the specific kind of help each gives. This same chapter also categorizes, describes, and illustrates a considerable number of the more common types of figures of speech encountered in the Bible (52-57).

In other chapters of this volume we find such items as Rabbi Hillel's rules of interpretation, the use of which is illustrated by Rabbinic and NT examples (125-128); comprehensive lists of extrabiblical source materials relating to the OT period, intertestamental times, the NT period, and a portion of the early-church epoch (215-260); and a table that sets forth chronologically in one column major events or developments in biblical history and in a parallel column certain important features of the contemporary secular history (90-93).

We should note, as well, that the chapter entitled "Is the King James the Most Accurate Version of the New Testament?" goes far beyond what that title implies. Not only does this chapter trace important aspects in the history of the English Bible, but it also describes processes of textual criticism with which Bible translators must be familiar. Moreover, it includes lists of *both* Hebrew and Greek manuscripts of Scripture. Among these lists are a "Catalogue of Texts and Witnesses" to the OT, containing some 200 items (333-337), and a table of the principal NT witnesses to the "Gospels," "Acts," "General (Catholic) Epistles," "Paul and Hebrews," and "Revelation," as represented (in order) in the papyri, uncials, minuscules ("if any"), versions, and church fathers (338-340).

This publication is remarkably free from typographical and other

errors—particularly so in view of its overwhelming amount of detail. However, a few items that should be corrected in a further edition may be noted: On the 7th line from the bottom of p. 338, "Atharasius" should be "Athanasius"; in lines 18 and 24 of col. 2 on p. 91, "Phonecean" should be "Phoenician"; and in the 3d line from the bottom of col. 2 on p. 90 and again in the 6th line from the top of col. 2 on p. 91, "Mittianite" should be "Mitannian," since the name of the Hurrian Empire was Mitanni. Although "Achamenian" and "Achaemenian" are both acceptable spellings for the Persian dynasty founded by Achaemenes, the latter form, which appears twice on p. 92, is preferable and should be substituted for the former in its four occurrences on p. 91. In fact, it is questionable that the Achaemenian dynasty should be referred to at all on p. 91, especially in its first three occurrences, inasmuch as that dynasty probably did not arise until at least two centuries after the disruption of Israel's United Monarchy, rather than being contemporary with that era in Israel's history and with the preceding Conquest and Judges periods. Also, for consistency it would be well to change the 930 date given on p. 91 for the beginning of Rehoboam's reign to 931, the date given on p. 92, or vice versa; or perhaps better still, simply indicate "931/30." (Let me reiterate that for the massive detail set forth in this *Handbook*, the flaws are surprisingly few, and as far as I can tell, they are of negligible import.)

In closing this review I must add a few remarks about the use of this *Handbook*. First, I would recommend a careful reading from beginning to end of each of the six chapters in Part 1, for they are basic. Although I have barely mentioned the chapters that treat cultural, theological, and homiletical analysis, they are, in my opinion, among the most vital in the volume. They contain materials which will enhance the reader's appreciation of the biblical text and the world in which it arose, provide safeguards against faulty interpretation, and give useful "know-how" on ways to communicate biblical truth effectively and competently in the world of today.

Second, the chapters in part two should, in contrast, be considered for the most part as a resource to be used as needed. The reader would be benefited, however, by glancing through each of these chapters to learn what they contain and by reading in entirety some chapters such as 10, which deals with typology; and 11, which lists and explains a large number of logical fallacies that too often occur in religious writing and preaching.

Third, the profusion of special helps which Gugliotto provides in tables, lists, charts, diagrams, etc., should be noted and then utilized to their fullest when needed. The main text contains 119 numbered "figures"

and Appendix A another 15, but in addition there are many further "special-help" items that are not numbered. Also, many of the chapters and Appendix A are profuse with biblical examples of the matters being discussed, often with supplementary lists of Bible passages that provide even further illustration. All such Scripture examples and references are vitally important, giving the reader a deepened understanding of and better "feel" for the essence of the Bible and its message of salvation.

Gugliotto's publication is a practical tool that should be owned and used by all persons interested in serious Bible study—especially persons who share Scripture with others, whether in the home, from the pulpit, or in the classroom. Indeed, I can envisage this *Handbook for Bible Study* being used as an effective textbook for pastoral training of the laity in the basic principles of biblical exegesis, interpretation, and communication. And it can also serve well as a textbook for seminarians.

RECURSION AND VARIATION IN THE "PROPHECY" OF JONAH: ON THE RHETORICAL IMPACT OF STYLISTIC TECHNIQUE IN HEBREW NARRATIVE DISCOURSE, WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO IRONY AND ENIGMA

ERNST WENDLAND
United Bible Societies
Lusaka, Zambia

Part One

1. Methodology:
The Interaction of Rhetorical and Stylistic Analysis

This study is based on a prior "text-analytical" study and translation of the entire book of Jonah.[1] The methodology involves a systematic investigation of such macrostructural properties as "demarcation" (an internal segmentation of the text), "conjunction" (textual cohesion and coherence), "projection" (the foregrounding or highlighting of focal information), "progression" (the development of syntagmatic sequences and paradigmatic sets), and "inclusion" (the hierarchical integration of all discourse constituents into a unified whole).[2] The result provides an overview or exposition of a biblical text's larger organizational framework and, perhaps more important, its associated (albeit assumed) functional operation as a unique instance of theological *and* literary communication, whether in the original event or during subsequent oral and written rehearsals in different contextual settings.

I now wish to build upon the previously applied discourse examination by concentrating on the form and function of what appear to be the two most prominent stylistic techniques in the Jonah text: recursion and variation. These are related by mutual complementation. Both similarity (recursion) and difference (variation) are necessary for the production of verbal meaning in general and poetic effect in particular.

[1]Ernst R. Wendland, "Text Analysis and the Genre of Jonah: What can the Discourse Structure Tell Us About a Unique Prophetic 'Word of the LORD'?" *JETS* 39 (1996): 191-206.

[2]For a detailed exposition and application of this methodology in relation to prophetic texts, see Ernst R. Wendland, *Demarcating the Compositional Units of Hebrew Prophetic Discourse: A Rhetorical-Structural Approach, as Exemplified in the Oracles of Hosea and Joel*, Text and Studies Series (Lewiston, NY: Mellen Biblical Press), 1995.

"Style" concerns the *how* (or manner/means) of transmitting the content (the *what*) of a certain message. It refers to the sum total of literary and linguistic characteristics that serve either to distinguish one text *from* another, or to relate one text *to* another. Two other important, and closely related, artistic devices in Jonah involve the use of "quotation" (intertextual as well as intratextual citation) and "interrogation" (real and rhetorical questions), but these will be treated under the more general categories of recursion and variation. The use of any given stylistic feature will normally not be textually distinctive in and of itself. But the selection and arrangement of such items, within a single composition and situational context, to convey a particular message to an intended audience, will inevitably be text-specific in terms of both form and function.

Any consideration of functional significance will normally engage an analyst with the rhetorical dimension of discourse. A study of "rhetoric" investigates the aim or intention of a certain text in relation to both the primary and secondary receptor groups. Rhetoric is the art of argumentation; it takes up where stylistics leaves off and examines the utilization of a specially shaped and organized verbal composition for the purposes of receptor persuasion. How did the original Hebrew author endeavor to employ content coupled with a skillful manipulation of form to marshal the thinking, mold the opinion, move the emotions, and motivate the will of his audience—in short, to adopt a divinely-shaped ideology and point of view? Following this discussion of function, I will focus upon the diverse operation of two prominent rhetorical techniques in Jonah, namely, irony and enigma. These effects are frequently generated by or embodied in the pair of stylistic means mentioned above, recursion and variation.

In this article I propose to survey the major formal and functional features which distinguish the text of Jonah, with special reference to recursion, variation, irony, and enigma. The first two topics pertain largely to narrative style and are considered in Part One. Part Two will then take up the wider functional dimension of this discourse, though it is impossible to separate form and function completely in any meaningful analysis. In Part Three irony and enigma are described and illustrated from the text of Jonah. These four poetic and rhetorical resources are crucial components of the "artistic code" in which the book was first written and hence are also keys to its contemporary interpretation.[3] In the course of this investigation I hope to demonstrate why the short narrative

---

[3]V. Philips Long, *The Art of Biblical History*, Foundations of Contemporary Interpretation, vol. 5 (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1994), 35.

work of Jonah has often been characterized as a "masterpiece of rhetoric," an excellent example of artful, affective religious communication.[4] The principal reason for paying such careful attention to artistic form has been well stated by V. Philips Long: "An increased appreciation of the literary mechanisms of a text—*how* a story is told—often becomes the avenue of greater insight into the theological, religious and even historical significance of the text—*what* the story means."[5] A brief overview of Jonah's main theme(s) or "message" validates in turn the book's classification as a "prophetic" discourse; that is, it manifests a hortatory purpose to other texts found among minor prophets. In a subsequent article, I present some thoughts on the practical implications of this study in relation to both the theory and the practice of Bible translation, communicating the "word of the LORD" persuasively (i.e., rhetorically) to God's people today in an appropriate *genre* and an idiomatic style of language.[6]

2. Recursion in Biblical Hebrew Narrative Discourse

The extraordinary recursion of linguistic form in terms of both quantity (amount/variety) and variety and quality (elegantly constructed patterns and combinations) is perhaps *the* most important attribute of artistic rhetorical discourse in literary traditions, both oral and written. In biblical Hebrew poetry such restatement is manifested most clearly and distinctly in the multifaceted technique known as "parallelism," which normally permeates all verbal levels of a text. Formal recursion is not quite so obvious in biblical works that are more prosaic in nature, but this difference is, in the final analysis, more a matter of degree than of kind, for beneath the apparent surface of most narrative discourse, for example, an elaborate virtual edifice of iterative construction waits to be concretely realized or activated by the attentive ear or eye, and profitably applied to the message at hand.

The superficially simple story of Jonah's mission to Nineveh furnishes an outstanding instance of this, as has been noted in a number of recent commentaries and monographs.[7] In the following discussion I

[4]Herbert Chanan Brichto, *Toward a Grammar of Biblical Poetics: Tales of the Prophets* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1992), 68.

[5]Long, 43.

[6]This article, "On the 'Relevance' of Jonahic Rhetoric and Style for Bible Translation," will appear in *The Bible Translator* (New York: United Bible Societies).

[7]Three prominent examples are: Jonathan Magonet, *Form and Meaning: Studies in Literary Technique in the Book of Jonah* (Sheffield: Almond, 1983); Jack M. Sasson, *Jonah: A New Translation with Introduction, Commentary, and Interpretation*, AB (New York: Doubleday, 1990); and Phyllis Trible, *Rhetorical Criticism: Context, Method, and the Book of*

will summarize and develop some of the principal insights of these studies, with particular emphasis on those features of recursion that are of special significance in conveying the book's essential meaning (semantic content plus pragmatic intent). This presentation is arranged according to an eclectic set of primary analytical distinctions made in the study of recursion in any literary discourse, and Hebrew "theological-prophetic" narrative in particular.

Linguistic Nature

The linguistic nature of recursion is most evident in the reiteration of phonological or lexical material. Lexical reiteration always includes some degree of phonological reiteration with morphosyntactic reduplication as well, which is not nearly as apparent to the listener unless it actually incorporates some prominent similarity of sound or corresponding vocabulary, as in the "cognate accusative" (better, "adverbial complement") construction. For example, "And *it was evil* to Jonah a great *evil*" (4:1), is balanced by a similar form having the opposite meaning near the onset of the next narrative subunit: "And Jonah *was happy* over the castor plant a great *happiness*," for it helped to ameliorate his "evil" (i.e., discomfort, 4:6; cf. also 1:10, 16; 3:2).[8] Since there is so much extended lexical recursion in Jonah, it is not necessary to point out instances of the less conspicuous morphosyntactic variety. It is sufficient simply to note that this stylistic resource is also present to augment the overall repetitive nature of the text as a whole and to enhance its larger rhetorical function.

A number of examples of *phonological* recursion appear to operate either independently or in conjunction with instances of lexical correspondence. Most subtle, and hence easy to miss, are the occasional rhythmic-accentual patterns which serve to reinforce the content being conveyed. Sasson, for example, points out that in addition to a repetition of vocabulary, Jonah's "angry" reiterative reply to God's question in 4:9 reproduces its basic "punctuation" (accentuation) as well, thus highlighting the ironic contrast between the two utterance-final phrases, "over the castor plant" and "unto death."[9] Wolff observes that Jonah's psalm of chapter two "consists exclusively of five-stress lines," thus rhythmically unifying the entire piece.[10] The repetition of selected vowels (assonance)

Jonah, Guides to Biblical Scholarship (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1994).

[8]Unless indicated otherwise, all translations are my own rather literal renderings.

[9]Sasson, 307.

[10]Hans Walter Wolff, *Obadiah and Joel: A Commentary*, trans. Margaret Kohl (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1986), 129. Ironically, this so-called *qinah* meter [3+2] is often found in psalmic laments.

or consonants (alliteration) in certain words functions to place the concepts concerned in the foreground. For example, a sequence of /ā/ vowels in 1:2b seems to extend from the initial command *qěrā'* "cry out," intensifying the solemn import of the LORD's message. In 4:6 a string of /l/s is intertwined with /ô/ vowels to reflect the "shade" (*sēl*) of "deliverance" (*lěhassîl*) that Yahweh "caused to grow over" (*wayyaʿal mēʿal*) his irate messenger. A little later, however, a renewal of Jonah's feeling of "anger" (*ḥārāh*; 4:9) is preauditioned, as it were, by a series of terms that feature the sounds /ḥ/ and /r/: "dawn," "on the next day," "at its rising," "wind," "scorching" (vv. 7, 8).

Similar examples serve to punctuate selected moods and meanings throughout the book. In addition, several instances of evocative onomatopoeia, for example, *hiššēbāh lěhiššābēr* in 1:4, "captures the sound of planks cracking when tortured by raging waters."[11] There is also some rhyming, such as the commonly co-occurring pair *ḥannûn wěraḥûm*, "gracious and compassionate" (4:2, cf. the subsequent *wěniḥām* "and relenting"). The presence of rhyme in Hebrew is a debatable issue due to its ubiquitous pronominal suffixes, but certain concentrations seem more than fortuitous. As Jonah and the sailors dialogue in 1:10-13, for example, "the sounds, positions, juxtapositions, and preponderance of twelve pronominal objects dot the wordscape as they interrelate the characters."[12] Just the opposite is the case in Jonah's complaint of 4:2-3, however, where only a single pronoun reference is devoted to God ("you"), whose merciful attributes—now so obnoxious to Jonah—are surrounded by two strings of self-centered personal references (*-î* "I/me/my"). A similar denotative disparity characterizes Jonah's song of thanksgiving in the second chapter, e.g., v. 3: "I called out (*-tî*) in [the] distress of mine (*lî*) unto YHWH, and he answered me (*-nî*); from the belly of Sheol I cried (*-tî*), and you heard my cry (*-lî*)."

Various passages utilize significant sound patterns to play one sense against another, to rhetorically heighten the discourse. Such punning, or paronomasia, periodically appears to artistically unify the account and to accent its essential content. For example, the sudden and unexpected "believing" of the people of Nineveh (*wayyaʾămînû*) in 3:5 calls to mind what in 1:1 seemed to be the extraneous name of Jonah's father (*ʾămittay*). Thus, "the unstable 'calling' of the son of Belief (Amittai) elicits belief in God."[13] Much more elaborate phonological linkage helps to bridge the transition from Jonah 3 (scene 5) to chapter 4 (scene 6):

[11]Sasson, 96.

[12]Trible, 145.

[13]Trible, 181.

·   When God saw (*wayyar'*) their *deeds*, that they turned from their wicked
    way (*hārā'āh*), God had compassion concerning the disaster (*hārā'āh*)
    that he said [he would] *do* to them, and he did not *do* it. And it was
    displeasing (*wayyēra'*) to Jonah a great displeasure (*rā'āh*), and it burned
    (*wayyihar*) to him. (3:10-4:1)

Another prominent play on words at the end of the book spotlights the
contrast between Jonah's incongruous, "pitiful" attitude towards the
castor plant, which he did "not cause to become great" (to grow, *lō'
giddaltô*, 4:10), as compared with the "great" (*haggĕdôlāh*) city of Nineveh
(4:11). To be sure, "Nineveh the great city" is much "greater" now in the
ears of the listener than it was, either at the beginning of the story or at
the onset of its second "cycle" (1:2/3:2—a double *inclusio*), for a strongly
favorable divine perspective has been superimposed (cf. 3:3). In addition
to underscoring key aspects of the message, such deliberate phonic
enhancement, a feature that pervades the Jonah text, also acts to augment
the dramatic impact or the ironic effect that is being created.

Degree of Formal Correspondence

The degree of formal correspondence that is involved in any instance
of recursion ranges between the two poles of verbatim repetition and the
loosest type of synonymous paraphrase. In Jonah the *exact* form of
reiteration is predominant, especially in the sets of corresponding verbs
and related qualities that carry the action forward from beginning to
end.[14] A skeletal summary of the entire narrative plot may be derived
from this sizable corpus of lexical duplicates alone; for example: arise, go,
call out, [be] great, descend, fear, perish, throw, appoint, say, know, [be]
angry, turn, do, have pity, [be] evil, be good, die. As the three main
paradigmatic participant groupings (i.e., YHWH < = Jonah = > pagans)
interact via these concepts, the crucial twofold conflict of the central story
line is developed, and the book's thematic nucleus is correspondingly
formulated: Merciful YHWH judges/delivers pagan peoples through his
unwilling messenger, Jonah.

The feature of *lexical* synonymy is foregrounded most notably and
noticeably in expressions used to refer to the Deity: god[s], [the] God,
YHWH, and YHWH God. The variation here appears significant in
terms of the divine relationship to Jonah as well as to the heathen peoples
with whom this reluctant prophet comes into contact. By means of these
designations the narrator would suggest, on the one hand, different
degrees of knowing the true YHWH, and on the other (especially in chap.
4), God's manifestation of mercy coupled with discipline in relation to his
offended (and offensive) ambassador. The most concentrated instance of

[14]Magonet provides a sorted listing of these verbs in Hebrew (14).

synonymy in the book is realized in the "covenantal catalogue" of 4:2, where Jonah finally acknowledges the divine attributes which apparently drove him to distraction upon receiving the call of the LORD to Nineveh: "gracious, and compassionate, slow of anger, and abundant [in] steadfast love, and relenting over evil [i.e., a just punishment]." In this case, a collection of significant theological designations that fall within the same semantic domain are utilized in concert by way of analogy to give the fullest possible description of a personal Being who is fundamentally indescribable in human language and categories of thought. Coming from the lips of Jonah, however, this apparently admirable profession of faith is contradicted by the incredible irony of his present situation: He could simply not bring himself to apply these wonderful words to the willing masses all around him.

Size and Scope

The category of size and scope concerns the relative amount and the extent of lexical material reiterated. This may range from a single root, such as *g-d-l* "[be] great," to full clauses or even complete utterances, "And the word of the LORD came to Jonah." The former appears in all four chapters (a total of 15 times), while the latter is found only twice (1:1 and 3:1). As Timothy Wilt points out in his helpful study of lexical repetition in Jonah, which focuses on the individual word level of recursion (verbs and adjectives): "The repetition of phrases and clauses is [a] feature that has not been given much attention."[15] In my own examination of discourse-level restatement in Jonah, I draw attention to the several specific, compositionally-related functions that these larger sequences perform in the narrative.[16] I will not go into detail on this aspect of recursion, but will mention a few interesting features associated with it.

As far as the repetition of individual words is concerned, one observes a number of distinctive *triadic* occurrences, that is, lexical and syntactic reiteration in closely spaced sets of three. Such patterning, like all of the recursion in Jonah, does not appear to be especially symbolical in import ("three days and three nights," 1:17; cf. "a journey of three days," 3:3), nor is it some stylistic quirk or merely a literary embellishment. Rather, the device is purposeful; in other words, on one level of the discourse and its telling, the several clearly functional examples suggest a specific rhetorical intent. A triple reference to "Tarshish" within the single sentence of 1:3, for example, progressively heightens the disjunction between Jonah's

[15]Timothy L. Wilt, "Lexical Repetition in Jonah," *Journal of Translation and · Textlinguistics* 5 (1992): 260. Magonet and Sasson include considerable treatment of this subject.

[16]Wendland, "Text Analysis."

intended destination and where the LORD actually wanted him to be. An opening parallel set of three *waw*-initial action clauses in 1:5a reinforces the contrast between the sailors' strenuous activity (cf. that of the Ninevites in 3:5) and Jonah's seemingly oblivious lack of it, summarized by a closing trio of verbs (5b). Somewhat later, three *kî* ("because/that/indeed") clauses at the end of 1:10 serve to emphasize the *cause-effect* relationship uppermost in the mariners' minds as they interrogate their suspicious shipmate.[17] A triad of verbs extolling Jonah's acts of "thanksgiving" (2:9) ironically echoes three adverbial complement constructions that recount the pagan crew's pious acts of devotion (1:16). The antanaclastic use of a lexical triad occurs at the close of the king of Nineveh's proclamation (3:8b-9). Here the verbal root *šûb* ("turn") is first employed with reference to the people's repentance and then in terms of the hoped-for response from the LORD, a "turning" towards "compassion" and away from "anger." These outstanding divine attributes, as ruefully recalled by Jonah, are typical of YHWH, whom Jonah bitterly addresses three times in his confessional complaint of 4:2-3. A threefold mention of "city" (*'ir*) in 4:5 no doubt reflects the chagrined prophet's obsessive preoccupation with Nineveh's fate. A threesome of divine "appointments" triggers the temporary rise and subsequent fall of Jonah's spirit (4:6-8) and leads up to the LORD's final lesson for him, expressed, appropriately, in two syntactic sets of three (4:10-11). These are only some of the more obvious examples of meaningful recursion in terms of three, over and above possible numerical signification in the Scriptures, i.e., "to enhance [some noteworthy act] or to bring it to full effect."[18]

Another important effect of such exact lexical recursion may be seen in the diachronic bands of *resonance* that develop synchronically as one "repetend" echoes off another during the story's forward progression in plot and time. This is not a matter of deficiency, of lacking an adequate vocabulary either with regard to the language as a whole or the author of this particular narrative. Rather, it is the product of deliberate choice and the adoption of a rhetorical strategy best suited for accomplishing his didactic-hortatory purposes. The scope of this cohesive reiterative technique may be limited to a single verse, as we see in the threefold use of the verb root *n-p-l* in 1:7. The first two instances (in the causative *hiphil*) refer to the mantic practice of casting lots. On the third

---

[17]A similar sequence motivates Jonah's lament in 4:2-3. Causal relationships, both fulfilled and frustrated, permeate the discourse and give it a progressive, but not necessarily predictable, character.

[18]Sasson, 153.

occurrence, however, the chosen form[19] shifts to *qal* and the climactic outcome is reported: "The lot *fell* upon Jonah!" Several other key verbs having a special theological significance, but a relatively restricted spatial range, appear in peak positions in the second half of the book, e.g., *n-ḥ-m*, "have mercy on" (3:9-10; 4:2), *šûb*, "[re]turn, repent" (3:8-10), and finally *ḥûs*, "have pity on" (4:10-11), to underscore the correspondence between Nineveh's hope (as expressed by her king) and the LORD's response. Thus the dynamic interaction among the narrative's major participants is highlighted as they are brought into syntactic contact via such marked sets of verbal likeness.

The Jonah text is permeated by several, much longer, single-word sequences as well. Naturally, these have a proportionately greater semantic (if not always corresponding thematic) effect in terms of the "meaning field" that is thereby generated. Such a resonant string of signifiers is created because every time the term in question appears, it is cumulatively imbued with additional semantic overtones which accrue from its new lexical collocation and plot-related context. The scope of a word like *q-r-'*, "cry/call out," for example, extends through the first three chapters and accentuates the contrast between Jonah's two missions—the first undone, the second undertaken, but both having ironically similar results as far as the surrounding heathen were concerned.

Thus Jonah is sent by YHWH to "call out" against Nineveh (1:2). He flees on a ship destined for Tarshish, but is discovered by its captain during a severe storm and is told to "cry out" to his God (1:6). Before casting the peccant prophet into the raging sea, the sailors "cry out" to YHWH for forgiveness (1:14). Later, in the belly of the great fish (and in the midst of the two panels of penitentially-oriented repetition), Jonah too "calls out" to the LORD for help (2:2). The second series occurs in chap. 3: once again YHWH sends Jonah to "call out"—now *unto* Nineveh (3:2). This time he obeys and "cries out" his short sermon of doom (3:4). The conscience-stricken Ninevites "call" for a fast (3:5) and their king commands them all to "cry out" to God for mercy (3:8). In this transparent but highly effective manner, the divinely initiated means-result process, which underlies the overt side of the central message of Jonah, is both unified and foregrounded: Sinners invariably verbalize their repentance in prayer as they respond to a prophetic testimony and proclamation of judgment, no matter how grudgingly delivered.

A number of recursive phrases and constructions of larger scope also play an important part in the author's rhetorical strategy. In the first chapter, for instance, the incongruity, impropriety, and impossibility of

[19]These possibilities are surveyed in Wilt, 253.

Jonah's flight is tacitly stressed by means of the repeated expression, "away from the face of YHWH" (1:3). It is only fitting, therefore, that this phrase should figure prominently in the judicial-religious "case" of the ship's crew against Jonah. In fact, the guilty prophet indicted and clearly condemned himself by these very words (1:10). Jonah's persistently ambiguous relationship to the LORD comes to the fore in the closing stages of the story through the emphasis created by another sequence, this one exhibiting a mixed (exact plus synonymous) sort of iteration. In 4:6 it is reported that "*YHWH-God* provided [*mnh*]" some welcome relief for Jonah in the form of a castor plant. Shortly thereafter, however, "[*the*] *God* provided" a worm to destroy that same plant (4:7). Then, to add insult to injury, as it were, "*God* provided" a scorching sirocco corresponding to the psychological "heat" that his prophet was feeling (4:8). These variations in the divine name may reflect the decreasing relative proximity in their personal relationship and/or the nature of God's dealing with Jonah, whether in compassion (as *YHWH*, cf. also 2:1) or in chastisement (as '*ĕlōhîm*).[20]

Another interesting instance of mixed (mostly synonymous) recursion occurs in chap. 1 with reference to the increasing intensity of the life-threatening storm. First, we hear of YHWH hurling "a great wind upon the sea" (1:4). This terrifying phenomenon is later described in personified terms as "the sea getting rougher and rougher" (1:11, NIV; lit., "the sea walking and raging"), and then when almost all hope was lost, as "the sea getting rougher and rougher *against them*" (1:13). The ultimate instance is paradoxically used for contrastive effect when all of a sudden it is reported that "the sea ceased from its furious raging" (1:15, *z'p* being more graphic than *s'r* [vv. 11,13]) as it receives the body of Jonah in apparent appeasement. In this example of the so-called "growing phrase" in Jonah,[21] the effect of the iteration is probably both qualitative (intensive) and quantitative (augmentative) in character.

As is stylistically typical of this narrative, the repetitive sequence just described is complemented by another, diachronically parallel pattern which serves to enrich its thematic implications. Thus in a progressively perceptive response to the LORD's revelation of himself by means of the storm and also the words of his prophet, the sailors are said to manifest a growing reverential "fear" (*yr'*): First, "they feared" (and proceeded to "cry out" to their god; 1:5); then "they feared with a great fear" (upon hearing about "YHWH" from Jonah; 1:11); and finally, "they feared *YHWH* with a great fear" (as they observed the word of his prophet come

---

[20]For further discussion on this issue, see Sasson, 291, and Magonet, 37.

[21]Magonet, 31.

true before their very eyes; 1:16). All this stands in ironic contrast to the pious, but perfunctory "fear" that is professed by Jonah himself (1:9) after being indicted by lot. A second, less overt parallel to the raging storm sequence occurs in the final chapter, where we hear about the increasing "anger" (ḥrh) and "evil" (rʿh) of Jonah (the former is a visible manifestation of the latter) in reaction to the LORD's compassionate sparing of Nineveh (4:1, 4, 6, 9).

Distribution Pattern

The distribution of any set of recursive items may be either "significant" or "random." A *significant* mode of repetition develops when the various repetends are positioned in such a way that a key spatial pattern or focal point in the discourse is highlighted. A structural pattern results from a placement of the reiterated words on two or more boundaries such that a larger compositional unit is demarcated. The most obvious instance of this device is the division of the text into two "halves" by means of the extensive lexical recursion found in 3:1-3a (cf. 1:1-3), a pericope which accordingly leads off the second portion with a *"re-*commissioning" of Jonah by the LORD. Emphasis upon a particular "point" in the text is the product of a special concentration of repeated elements which thereby helps to distinguish a thematic and/or emotive peak of some type. The climax of chap. 1 (scene two), for example, occurs near its close in v. 16, a passage that is marked by four pairs of exact reduplication that links "YHWH" (2x) with the "fear" (2x), "sacrifices" (2x), and "vows" (2x) of the heathen, foreign sailors. The latter are referred to simply as "the men" (hā ʾănāšîm), and the collocation of this word with "fear" (yrʾ) in turn forms a structural *inclusio* with v. 10, thus delimiting the second half of scene two. Similarly, the high point of chap. 3 is reinforced as God "repents" (nḥm, 3:10) in terms that echo the king of Nineveh's indirect appeal for forgiveness (3:8-9; cf. also 1:6).

A *random* dispersion of repetends includes all those that do not give evidence of performing any special demarcative purpose in the discourse, though they do contribute greatly to its overall cohesive quality. Their importance is thus primarily thematic in nature, that is, they cumulatively outline or underscore a certain theological or moral point which the author is trying to make. We have seen several instances of this already (the sharp contrast between the sailors' "fear" of YHWH in chapter 1 and Jonah's "anger" against God in chapter 4), but it may be helpful to mention another noteworthy example. The prophet's professional and spiritual "descent" from the LORD is metaphorically reflected in a deliberate repetition of the verb y-r-d, "go down," at the beginning of the account. Thus after receiving the initial command from YHWH, Jonah

immediately "goes down" (and in the opposite direction) to the port of Joppa (v. 3b) and, upon finding a suitable vessel, proceeds to "go down" on board it (v. 3c). Sometime later he "went down" into the very bottom of the boat, perhaps so that he would not attract undue attention to himself (v. 5c), and soon thereafter "fell [down?] into a deep sleep" (*YēRaDam*; v. 5d).

The *y-r-d* lexical set is artistically overlapped with another random sequence in chap. 1: a fourfold reiteration of the verb *tûl*, "throw, hurl." This may be regarded as semantically supplementary to the preceding in that it further stresses the prophet's continual downward descent. Accordingly, YHWH "hurls" a storm down (from "heaven"; cf. 1:9) upon the sea (v. 4), and the sailors try to save their ship by "hurling" its wares overboard (v. 5). Later, after the "falling" (*n-p-l*) of the lots has "fallen" upon him (v. 7), Jonah reveals that the only way to ensure deliverance is to "hurl" him down into the raging waters (v. 12). Finally, when all else has failed, the crew acquiesces and prayerfully "hurls" the LORD's prophet into the sea (v. 15). Jonah ultimately (but now figuratively) "bottoms out" on the ocean floor, and his pathetic plight—internal as well as external—is accentuated in the words of his psalm by yet one more occurrence of *y-r-d* (2:6)—an appearance that stands out by virtue of its contrastive juxtaposition with the word "bring up" (*'-l-h*, 2:7).

Textual Relationships

The final set of recursive distinctions involves pertinent textual relationships which may be either "intratextual" or "intertextual." All of the previous examples, as well as most of those which follow, are instances of the *intratextual* variety, so nothing more needs to be said about them, except to call attention to one further qualification made by Meir Sternberg, namely, the difference between "verbal" and "non-verbal" repetition:[22] *Verbal* recursion, as the term suggests, is constructed out of actual speech acts, direct or indirect, external or internal ("cognitive" discourse), individual (a monologue) or dialogic. *Nonverbal* recursion, on the other hand, consists of repeated references to some object, entity, event, happening, situation, or circumstance. This category includes the occurrence of "significant silence," where no report of speech or action is given when it might reasonably be expected (e.g., Jonah's lack of a verbal response to God in 1:2-3, 3:2-3, and 4:4-5; cf. 4:2, 9b). "Mixed" discourse forms are also possible where, for example, a certain segment of direct speech is later reflected in the corresponding narrative action (e.g., God's reaction to the king of Nineveh's prayer, 3:8-9/10), or vice-versa (e.g.,

[22] Meir Sternberg, *The Poetics of Biblical Narrative: Ideological Literature and the Drama of Reading* (Bloomington, IN: Indiana Univ. Press, 1985), 402.

Jonah's subsequent complaint about YHWH's compassionate and forgiving behavior, 4:2). The significance of this twofold form, according to Sternberg, concerns the expectation about the nature of the recursion that follows: a verbatim repetend in the case of human speech but a variable one elsewhere.[23] Any variation that occurs, especially in direct discourse, usually introduces the additional important hermeneutical factors of a different thematic perspective and possible personal bias.

Divergencies or "variations" from the verbal/nonverbal principle may also be utilized as a means of creating some special literary effect. For example, a shift in character viewpoint and/or the narrative tone or point of view may be intensified by the appropriate form of recursion or the lack of it. Normally, when a "real" (as opposed to "rhetorical") question is asked, a certain amount of reiteration is expected or desired in the reply to fully explain the answer required. In his response to the anxious queries of the sailors (1:8; note the insistent *mah* + /*m-*/ alliterative alternation), Jonah seems to evade the issues on which they demanded clarification (1:9). He directly answers only their last question, concerning his ethnic origin. His subsequent formulaic creedal confession sounds somewhat out of place, although it is in fact an indirect way of replying to their first question, regarding who was responsible for causing the storm. Jonah's solemn invocation of "YHWH," the "God of heaven" (*haššāmayim*), "maker of the sea" (*'āsāh 'et-hayyām*), whom he "feared," however, reflects back ironically upon the last mention of the divine personal name, a nonverbal narrative statement of Jonah's plan to flee (by sea) to Tarshish (*taršîšāh*), far away from YHWH (1:3d).

Intertextual recursion is a stylistic feature of paramount exegetical importance throughout the Hebrew Scriptures. In form, such text-amplifying and illuminating reiteration ranges along a continuum from a more or less exact reproduction of direct speech (citation), through a partial reduplication of either verbal or nonverbal material (paraphrase), to a covert, but still recognizable, reference to some important event or situation (allusion). In Jonah 1:9, for example, Jonah paraphrases a number of passages that laud the LORD's creation of and sovereign control over the "heaven," the "earth" (or "dry land"), and the "sea" (cf. Pss 69:34; 95:4-5; 146:6). In a similar coerced confession after the Ninevite episode, Jonah utters a more extensive listing, this time of YHWH's gracious attributes (4:2). While not an exact citation of any specific biblical text, this passage does pull together many of the items included in similar covenantal catalogues (cf. Ps 86:5, 15; Exod 34:6-7; Deut 4:31; Neh 9:17).[24]

---

[23] Sternberg, 402, 406.

[24] Sasson, 280; the Jonahic wording in turn appears to provide the basis for Joel 2:13 (cf.

The various allusions—or "reminiscences," as Magonet terms them[25]—are much less conspicuous (hence often debatable), but a number are rather obvious instances. The predicted "overturning" (*h-p-k*) of Nineveh (3:4) for its "evil" (*rā'āh*) and "violence" (*hāmās*, 3:8), for example, harks back to Genesis and the "evil" coupled with "violence" of the wicked preflood generation (Gen 6:6, 11, 13) and the later archetypal "overturning" of a corrupt Sodom and Gomorrah (Gen 19:25). The LORD's subsequent "relenting [*n-h-m*] from the evil he said he would do" to Nineveh (3:10) is strongly and ironically reminiscent of YHWH's similar "relenting" in relation to "his own people," Israel (Exod 32:14). The point of the correspondence here underscores a basic similarity in the lost human condition and a universal spiritual need that Jonah, as a man of God and representative of the people of God, should have been keenly aware of and sensitive to, but which he (also they) was apparently not the least bit interested in or concerned about.

The "mother lode" of intertextual citation and paraphrase is found in the psalm of Jonah.[26] Just about every verse (except for v. 6) incorporates a key reference with varying degrees of precision, to create an interwoven poetic tapestry of panegyric theological language. The very first line, for example, finds close and noteworthy parallels in two different psalms:[27]:

"I called in my distress unto YHWH, and he answered me" (Jonah 2:3a).
"In my distress I called YHWH, and unto my God I cried" (Ps 18:7).
"Unto YHWH in my distress I called, and he answered me" (Ps 120:1).

"Jonah"—or whoever composed/compiled this song—was certainly familiar with his Psalter. Most modern commentators no longer doubt the appropriateness (or even the genuineness) of the psalm,[28] either in its cotextual (literary) or contextual (situational) setting. However, current hermeneutical interest centers not so much on such likenesses, the many cross-textual echoes and verbal recurrences, but upon the crucial disparities, both great and small, that are often manifested in this Jonahic psalm. Is there any significance, for example, to the fact that Jonah begins with a personal reference to his own petitionary action—"I called"—thus inverting the order of Psalm 120? One reason may be intratextual: a closer

---

Wendland, *Demarcating the Compositional Units*, 326-327).

[25]Magonet, 65.

[26]This psalm also contains many *intra*textual correspondences; cf. Trible, 166-171.

[27]For a full listing of citations, paraphrases, and allusions, see Magonet, 44-49; Sasson, 168-215; also James Limburg, *Jonah: A Commentary*, The Old Testament Library (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1993), 63-64.

[28]Excluding one of the more recent studies, that of Trible, e.g., 172-173.

contrastive parallel is thereby formed with the introduction to the sailors' prayer in 1:14, "And they called unto YHWH" (cf. the king's decree in 3:8b). The two passages are very different, of course: the latter is a passionate appeal for help and forgiveness, with a special focus upon the fate of poor Jonah and a pervading emphasis upon the pity of YHWH. Jonah, on the other hand, and incongruously perhaps, utters a song of happy thanksgiving that highlights a distinctly personal perspective on his rapidly changing fortunes and what he piously intends to eventually do for God. There is a tangible irony here in the pitting of pagan versus prophet. Further aspects of this vital rhetorical dimension will be more fully explored in Part Three, along with a number of additional important intertextual "deviations" with respect to citation, paraphrase, and allusion that make this psalm semantically unique and emotively compelling.

Plot Dynamics

Several other distinctions that Sternberg makes in his important study of "the structure of repetition" in Hebrew narrative discourse may enable one to make an even more detailed analysis of the form and function of recursion in Jonah and other biblical texts.[29] The categorization of such iterative instances in terms of "plot dynamics" is particularly useful. A "*forecast*" stimulates an "expectation about the narrative future," an "*enactment*" involves a "focus on the narrative present," and a "*report*" produces a "retrospection on the narrative past."[30] An example from Jonah, based on general intratextual synonymy, concerns the eventual fate of the "great city" of Nineveh. The sequence begins with this command of the LORD: "Cry out against it because its evil has come up before me!" (1:2; cf.3:2, "forecast"). We hear about its delayed "enactment" in 3:4: "He [Jonah] cried out and said, "Yet forty days and Nineveh will be overturned!" A summary "report" of what eventually took place is given in 3:5: "And the people of Nineveh believed in God," and more specifically in the king's command: "Let them cry out unto God" (3:8). The ultimate report is found in 3:10: "And the LORD saw their doings, how they turned from their evil way; then he relented from the evil that he said he would bring upon them." Extensive recursion of this nature provides fertile ground for the creation of message-enhancing irony and enigma (see Part Three).

Degree of Subjectivity

Another distinction that allows for these and other rhetorical effects to be more fully explored concerns the particular "source" of any given

[29]See especially Sternberg, chap. 11.

[30]Sternberg, 376.

instance of recursion (a repetend) and the degree of subjectivity or objectivity represented.[31] The thoroughly objective and omniscient narrator reports, for example, that "Jonah arose to run away to Tarshish away from YHWH" (1:3). As readers, we have no cause to doubt that this was the man's precise intention. Later, however, it comes as somewhat of a surprise that "the men [sailors] knew" Jonah was running away from YHWH" (1:10). In this case the transmitter of the information was the prophet himself. Consequently, considering the source, we may be excused for at least a little suspicion, as well as curiosity about how much and how accurately the situation was presented to these foreign mariners and why this news had caused such fear in those who did not even "know" YHWH. No doubt the "great wind" (1:4) that was growing in intensity ("raging," 1:11) upon the sea, coupled with Jonah's own theological testimony (1:9), exerted considerable influence upon their response.

In the preceding discussion I have merely been able to scratch the surface of repetition, a feature whose manifold complexity not only enriches the depth and diversity of Hebrew narrative, but which also taxes the insight and ingenuity of those who endeavor to probe its inspired artistry and message.

3. Variation in Literary Discourse:
The Flip Side of Recursion

As has been suggested above, large-scale or extended recursion in literary discourse normally appears in exact form only in a limited number of cases in order to achieve certain special aesthetic, rhetorical, or structural effects. In fact, along with the formal sameness or similarity (synonymy) there will always occur a definite difference to some degree—certainly so with respect to the literary cotext and situational (often including the "locutionary" or "speech-event"-related) context in which the reiterated items are placed. Furthermore, all of these differences, large and small, are somehow significant, for:

> There is no randomness or free variation in the [narrative] surface structure. Any morphosyntactic form in a text represents the author's choice whether conscious or automatic; we may not know the whys of all such choices, but we may speculate on them as implementations of differing discourse strategies.[32]

Even more basic is the fact that meaning in any conventional system of signs, language in particular, is generated as the product of both

---

[31]Sternberg, 380.

[32]Robert E. Longacre and Shin Ja J. Hwang, "A Textlinguistic Approach to the Biblical Hebrew Narrative of Jonah," in *Biblical Hebrew and Discourse Linguistics*, ed. Robert D. Bergen (Dallas: Summer Institute of Linguistics, 1994), 336-358.

similarity and difference, continuity and discontinuity, recursion and variation. This principle is the fundamental basis for productive signification on both the paradigmatic (selectional) and the syntagmatic (combinatorial) axes of verbal organization—from the phonological (i.e., distinctive sonic features) to the highest generic levels of composition (i.e., "prose" vs. "poetry"). In "literary" (artistic, poetic) works, additional meaningful types of likeness-with-contrast in the form of varied sequences and patterns are typically incorporated to augment the total signaling potential of the discourse in both denotative (referential) and connotative (associative) terms.

In many cases where some distinctive intratextual poetic effect is created in a literary composition, a basic structure of recursion is utilized to establish the necessary backdrop ("ground") against which, or a fixed frame of reference within which, a certain *deviation* ("figure") can be introduced. This sort of variation is occasioned by a marked deflection from a norm that has been either deliberately or unconsciously built into the text, notably by means of some form of repetition, or which is inherent in the language code itself (the order of syntactic elements). Such a disjunction—whether subtle or pronounced, overt or inconspicuous—serves to highlight specific aspects of the overall organization of the discourse and/or its central theme (motifs, subtopics, etc.). Any departure from some recursive pattern then would be one way in which an author more or less "defamiliarizes" his account to force listeners (or readers) to take notice. According to the Russian Formalist school of literary criticism, such *defamiliarization* functions to "transfer the usual perception of an object into the sphere of a new perception—that is, to make a unique semantic modification" and thereby "to create the vision which results from that deautomatized perception."[33] However, as far as the Scriptures are concerned, the purpose of this technique is not merely "an aesthetic end in itself."[34] Rather, it is invariably connected with a more effective communication of the intended message, whether that be primarily informative, emotive, volitional, and/or mixed in nature.

The best example of pointedly contrastive deviation within a framework of recursion in Jonah occurs at the beginning of the second half of the narrative, namely, 3:1-3a. The adverb *šēnît*, "a second time," formally announces the pattern and a likely parallel to 1:1-3. The wording

---

[33]Victor Shklovsky, "Art as Technique," in *Russian Formalist Criticism: Four Essays*, ed. and trans. Lee T. Lemon and Marion J. Reis (Lincoln, NE: Univ. of Nebraska Press, 1965), 21-22.

[34]Shklovsky, 12.

of these two opening pericopes is largely the same, a fact which is significant in itself. YHWH gives his prophet another chance to fulfill his office according to divine expectation. But the real impact of the second episode is conveyed by its several key differences from the first. At that time Jonah was told simply to "call out *against* [Nineveh]" ('*āleyha*); now the LORD commands him to "call out *unto* [Nineveh]" ('*ēleyha*) "a calling [proclamation] which I am giving unto you." In chap. 3 the assignment to Nineveh is given in more personal terms, that is, with respect to Yahweh in relation to Jonah. In addition, there is no explicit mention of Nineveh's flagrant "wickedness" (*rā'āh*), though this might reasonably be assumed. From the plot perspective too, the outcome is drastically different. This second time Jonah "arises" and does not try to run away "from the face of YHWH," but rather he travels to Nineveh "according to the word of YHWH." The alteration here—along with the recursion—is carefully selected and situated to inaugurate this major recycling of the account and to suggest a change in the nature of the interpersonal dynamics now operating among the chief participants.

Variation in literary discourse may take the form of a "deviation" from some established pattern or norm as illustrated above, or it may be realized in the *diversity* that results when a paradigmatic set of synonymous or contrastive items is created within the text. The classic example of this technique in Jonah occurs in the catalogue of YHWH's covenantal attributes in 4:2, all of which complement one another (ironically so in this instance) to present the fullest possible expression of undeserved divine mercy. A similar specific, but less concise and spatially concentrated, picture is given of the "greatness" of Nineveh. This city was not just "great/large/important" (the simple adjective *gĕdôlāh*, 1:2/3:2) in the abstract, but it was "great [important] to God" (3:3), "a journey of three days" in magnitude (3:3), a city consisting of both "great and small ones" socioeconomically (3:5) and of urban and rural dwellers ("man and beast, the herd and flock," 3:7), numbering "more than 120,000 people" (4:11), who in their moral-religious naivete "do not [even] know the difference between their right hand and their left" as far as YHWH is concerned (4:11). By means of such lexical diversity attached to a single referent, the odious, alien metropolis of Nineveh is given "a human face" (cf. '*ādām*, 4:11), as it were, hence every bit as worthy and needy of the "piteous concern" (*ḥûs*, 4:11) of Yahweh as were the original Jewish hearers of this prophetic message.

Three overlapping types of "variation," involving both *deviation* from a norm and *diversity* in form, are prominently manifested in the book of Jonah: lexical-semantic, spatial-syntactic, and temporal-pragmatic. Certain

aspects of these have already been exemplified in the previous discussion, but it may be helpful to describe and illustrate their nature and function as distinct stylistic and rhetorical categories.

Lexical-semantic Variation

Lexical-semantic variation is undoubtedly the most recognizable and commonly found type of modification, one that is used in conjunction with recursion to create some special semantic effect in relation to a given narrative plot and/or theme. This primary category can best be surveyed in terms of Sternberg's five "forms of physical deviance in repetition": "expansion or addition, . . . truncation or ellipsis, . . . change of order, . . . grammatical transformation, . . . [and] substitution."[35]

Of these, *expansion/addition* would appear to be the most important or productive narrative technique for the book of Jonah. As was noted earlier, the growing "fury" of the storm at sea and the resultant "fear" of the sailors in chap. 1 is mirrored in the steadily augmented qualifiers that are used to describe these interlocked natural and human phenomena. There is an expansion from "a great storm on the sea" (1:4) to "the sea continued to rage [ever more] against them" (1:13) as the overt cause. As for its consequence, there is a corresponding progression from "the sailors feared" (1:5) to "the men feared *YHWH* with a great fear" (1:16). The final "addition" of "the LORD" highlights the awesome demonstration (1:15) of his ultimate power over what had previously been their greatest "fear." As Magonet observes, "in the form of writing is reflected its content."[36] We might add, also its underlying thematic (theological) implications. Perhaps the most interesting variations of this kind, not surprisingly, occur in the last chapter to dramatize the contrast between the attitudes of Jonah and YHWH over against Nineveh. When the LORD interrogates the prophet concerning his burning anger "about the plant" (4:9a; cf. 4:4, an explicit expansion) and whether this was a "good" idea, Jonah insolently replies that his ire is "good" enough even "to die for" (4:9b). YHWH goes on to point out that Jonah's indignation stems from his previously undisclosed "pity" over the passing of this transient plant (4:10; cf. 4:7). God, on the other hand, was anxious not only "about [the people of] Nineveh," but "also [its] many cattle" (4:11; an emphatic ironic "addition" in ultimate syntactic position).

Jonah 4 also contains several outstanding instances of *truncation/ellipsis*. In the very first verse, for example, it is easy to miss the fact that the construction of the original text appears to deliberately

---

[35]Sternberg, 391-392.

[36]Magonet, 32.

leave implicit the specific cause of Jonah's "great displeasure," the repentant "deeds" of the Ninevites which led to the LORD's "relenting" (3:10). Perhaps this was done to give a somewhat closer and hence more dramatic impression of what Jonah's actual perspective was. In the event, he did not even want to think about such an offensive outcome, though indeed he had already anticipated it (4:2). This indicting cause-effect connection is brought out more clearly in a rendering such as, "But *this* was very displeasing to Jonah, and" (NRSV)—in contrast to a more literal and equivocal, "But Jonah became greatly displeased and . . ." (NIV). Another self-incriminating omission occurs in Jonah's complaint when he leaves out from the revelation of "his word" (4:2; cf. YHWH's word in 1:1; 3:1) the fact that his attempted "flight to Tarshish" was directed "away from the presence of YHWH" (cf. 1:3; a truth that he had apparently revealed to the sailors, 1:10). Perhaps the prophet finally realized that this was a physical and spiritual impossibility.

Closely related to the preceding is the subtle intertextual "truncation" that also occurs in Jonah's confessional lament of 4:2, an utterance which clearly recalls the LORD's own revelation of his essential nature (name) to Moses in Exod 34:6-7. Significantly, however, Jonah leaves out the original mention of "faithfulness" ('ĕmet, NRSV), perhaps because this would have reflected badly on his own name ('ămittay, 1:1) and the committed servant he should have been.[37] More important, Jonah omits the last part of the divine saying: "[He] fails to cite God's rewarding of grandchildren for their ancestors' merit . . . and totally ignores the concluding note of retribution,"[38] the punishment that will befall the descendants of iniquitous ancestors. Instead, Jonah "substitutes" the exactly opposite idea: "ready to relent from punishing" (NRSV), which is, of course, a reinforcement of this crucial attribute of YHWH as expressed in the very words of the heathen king and the LORD alike (3:9-10). Another major omission distinguishes Jonah's earlier "prayer" of chapter 2: Although the "confession of sin" is an optional constituent element of the individual "psalm of praise and thanksgiving,"[39] it certainly would have been appropriate in Jonah's composition (cf. Ps 32:5), if he had recognized any personal wrongdoing in his relation to YHWH.

[37]Sasson, 69.

[38]Brichto, 85.

[39]For a further description of this particular psalmic *genre*, see Erhard S. Gerstenberger, *Psalms [Part 1]: With an Introduction to Cultic Poetry*, The Forms of the Old Testament Literature 14 (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1988), 140-141; cf. also Claus Westermann, *The Psalms: Structure, Content and Message* (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1980), 72; Ernst R. Wendland, "Genre Criticism and the Psalms," in *Biblical Hebrew and Discourse Linguistics*, ed. Robert D. Bergen (Dallas: Summer Institute of Linguistics, 1994), 394.

A *change of order* is most evident in the series of urgent questions with which the sailors ply Jonah after he has been implicated by the lot. It appears as if there has been some sort of reversal in "the normal sequence,"[40] which begins with the interrogative climax, "Who is responsible for all this?" (1:8a), and works down to the general issue of nationality. But perhaps this is merely an indication of the sailors' great distress and an anxious desire to discover the deity responsible for the calamity surrounding them so that the appropriate supplication can be made (cf. vv. 6-7). In any case, Jonah's evasive reply features another significant spatial displacement or hyperbaton: "A Hebrew [am] I and YHWH, God of the heavens *I [am] fearing*, who made." Lexically, Jonah tries to "box" his God in (by the repeated emphatic pronoun "I"), but in doing so "YHWH" is put into a syntactically prominent position and hence dominates the entire utterance.[41] Such unexpected grammatical shifts (from the usual V-S-O word order) often serve a compositional function to mark a new juncture in the discourse. This may also involve lexical recursion, as we observed at the onset of the second scene: "to sail with them to Tarshish away from *YHWH* (1:3)—(1:4) And *YHWH* hurled a great wind on the sea." This stylistic transposition plus the accompanying repetition effectively highlights the theological fact that "man proposes, but God disposes."

A recursive change in order is formally characteristic of the "chiasmus" construction, which performs a number of functions on both the macro- and the microstructure of Hebrew discourse, in prose as well as poetic texts. At the beginning of the story, for example, there is an ironic reversal of events on board ship (A-B—B'-A') that serves to highlight Jonah's failure to carry out the LORD's explicit command as earlier enunciated. After receiving the divine command to "get up . . . and call out against [Nineveh]" (A: v. 2), Jonah "gets up" and "goes down" to Joppa to "go down" on board a ship bound for Tarshish (B: v. 3). But then, having "gone down" into the very heart of that vessel and lain down to sleep (B': v. 5b), Jonah is discovered by the captain and told to "get up and call out unto his god[s]" (A': v. 6) in the hope of averting the disaster that he himself had brought upon all.

Later on, after the dramatic events of chapter 1, we hear that YHWH "provides" a great fish to deliver his guilty prophet from a just drowning in the sea. In grateful response, Jonah "prays" to the LORD (2:1). The correspondence between these two verses is heightened by the reiterated phrase "from the inside of the fish." The change of order here serves to

[40]Brichto, 70.

[41]Contra Trible, 141.

foreground the close interrelationship between Jonah and "his God" (2:1), the God from whom he had been trying so hard to flee. The sovereign transcendence and intimate immanence of Yahweh are stylistically suggested by the fact that he stands both "outside" and "inside" a much longer double chiasmus that conjoins Jonah and the great fish that had swallowed him:

(1:17)	*YHWH*	fish			Jonah	
		Jonah			fish	
(2:1)		Jonah	*YHWH*		fish	[prayer]
(2:10)	*YHWH*	fish			Jonah	

However, Jonah's self-centered attitude does not seem to have changed much, as evidenced by his first-person-oriented song of thanksgiving (27 references to "I/me/my," as opposed to 15 second- and third-person references to the LORD). This predominantly personal orientation is given its cue in the reordering implicit in the prayer's very first word, "I called" (2:3). The closest psalmic parallel to this initial line begins instead with a focus upon YHWH: "To the LORD in my distress I called" (Ps 120:1; cf. Ps 18:7, "In my distress I call, O LORD!", the vocative here placing the emphasis again upon YHWH).

Certain *grammatical transformations* (perhaps "morphosyntactic" would be a better designation so as to distinguish this from the preceding category) may be utilized in conjunction with their context to produce a wide range of interesting semantic implications. Naturally, these are not always evident in a translation, hence the importance of a thorough examination of the Hebrew text. The guilt of Jonah is revealed, for example, when the mariners decide to "cause the lots [object] to fall [*hiphil* verb]," and having done so, when "the lots [subject] fall [*qal* verb]" upon Jonah (1:8). The righteous (divinely-directed), cause-effect nature of this divinatory procedure is thereby implicitly underscored. Jonah opens his thanksgiving prayer to YHWH by referring to the latter in the third person (2:2a). In the very next line (2:2b), however, there is a transformation to the second person which remains in force throughout the rest of the poem, indicating perhaps a reapproachment between him and his God. The contrast between the past "evil doings" of the Ninevites and YHWH's present merciful activity is foregrounded in 3:10 by a reiteration of the root ['-*śh*] in three different forms: a plural noun, an infinitive construct, and a perfect finite verb, the last emphasizing the LORD's decision *not* to destroy the city. After this extraordinary sparing of infamous Nineveh, Jonah complains that it is "good" (adjective) for his life to be taken away (4:3). Yahweh's rhetorically barbed response is sharpened by his ironic use of the same root [*tôb*], but now as a verbal

infinitive: "Is it good [this] anger of yours?" (4:4). The underlying correspondence here might emphasize the very fact that Jonah's "anger" could one day cost him his "life." Finally, the book's closing passage contains a prominent transformation with respect to the initial personal pronoun, set within a recursive frame begun in the preceding verse, which functions to intensify a profound "perspectival clash":[42] "As for *you* [Jonah]," the LORD said, "*you* were concerned about that plant" (v. 10), "But as for *me*, should *I* not be concerned about Nineveh?" (v. 11). The respective objects of the verb are foregrounded at the same time by positioned parallelism and attribution for additional contrastive effect.

The category of formal *substitution* is probably second only to the expansion in importance. The effect of this device is heightened in an ancient language such as biblical Hebrew, which is characterized by overt repetition. When a synonym is used, or where there is an obvious change with respect to one element, such as placement, within a sequence of recursive constituents, this normally carries with it some special semantic (including thematic) and/or pragmatic (sociolinguistic) significance. For example, in the reiterated [verb + cognate noun] syntactic frame of 1:16, the three actions referred to typify a cause-effect (internal/external) relationship that encompasses the ultimate in religious devotion: "fear" = > "sacrifice" + "vow." A good example of lexical substitution occurs at Jonah's "recommissioning," when "the word of the LORD comes to [him]"—not as "the son of Amittai" ("faithfulness," 1:1), but simply "a second time" (3:1). In other words, the prophet's fidelity remains to be proved as he is told once more to "call out," now "unto Nineveh" (3:2), not "against [it]" (1:2). Indeed, at this stage in the narrative, one wonders who was more "evil" and accountable in the eyes of YHWH—the deliverer of the divine message or its delinquent addressees.

Does Jonah pass the LORD's overt test of his character? The issue is very much an open question at the end of the account (4:11) as we witness the man "rage with a great raging" (cf. NJB) when the teeming city of Nineveh is spared (4:1), but "rejoice with a great rejoicing" (4:6) over the appearance of a transient plant, whose demise he later mourns in trenchant anger (4:7-8). This emotive and attitudinal contrast is associated with the clearest instance of synonymic "substitution" in the book, namely, that involving the divine name: It is the "LORD God" who graciously provides the castor-bean plant (4:6) to "deliver [Jonah] of his discomfort [lit. 'evil']," just as he planted a garden for the benefit of the first humans in Eden (Gen 2:8). However, it is simply "God" who subsequently "provides" the means of the plant's destruction and then

[42]Sternberg, 398.

reproves an unrelenting Jonah for his introverted response. All this is in obvious contrast to God's "repenting over the evil" (3:10; 4:2) he had intended for the now "transformed" Nineveh (3:8-9)—a city in which "each one [had] turned from *his* way of evil, and from the violence that was in *their* hands" (3:8b). The synonymous, complementary parallelism of the preceding expression emphasizes both the individual and the corporate guilt and responsibility of all citizens in this salvific, life-changing event.[43]

Spatial-syntactic Variation

Spatial-syntactic variation could perhaps be classified under a "change of order" as discussed above, but in this case the crucial shift occurs, not so much in terms of a proximate group of lexical items ("diversity"—though this may still be involved), but rather with respect to the usual arrangement of syntactic elements in the Hebrew verbal clause, namely, verb = > subject = > object, especially in relation to "the sequence of *wayyiqtol* clauses that occur throughout the story from beginning to end."[44] For this reason, outside the Hebrew text, the critical movement is not perceptible in any but an interlinear translation. Such a departure from the norm is utilized to foreground the noun phrase involved to provide "focus" or "emphasis." Such an item is put into *focus* in order to mark it as the new principal topic or agent in the discourse. This construction often coincides with a major compositional boundary, especially when reinforced by some other prominent signaling device, such as those mentioned above in connection with recursion. *Emphasis*, on the other hand, is more restricted in scope; it pertains to a single clause, sentence, or utterance (if in direct speech). It serves to intensify the semantic significance of, or to call special attention (in terms of thematic and/or plot-related importance) to, the noun (or qualifier) so displaced. Most commonly the movement of the item is to the front of its regular position in the clause (i.e., "front-shift"), but on occasion the displacement goes in the other direction, that is, to the rear of the clause/sentence ("back-shift"). The operation of focus and emphasis and the distinction between these two functions are illustrated in the following examples:

The nominal "(And) YHWH" begins 1:4, but since the divine name has just been mentioned at the end of v. 3 ("from before YHWH"), this does not seem to be simply an instance of "special emphasis."[45] More precisely, we have here the onset of a new stage (episode) in the action,

[43]Cf. Trible, 186.

[44]Longacre and Hwang, 345.

[45]As stated, for example, in Sasson, 93.

which coincides with a dramatic revelation of (and a focusing upon) the principal divine "character" acting behind the scenes, so to speak, to control all subsequent events upon the sea. An emphatic front-shift does occur in the last clause of this verse as the narrative spotlight shifts to "the ship," which was "threatening to break up." A similar thing occurs in 1:5c. "(And) Jonah" appears at the head of the clause, but this person is not necessarily "emphasized" thereby.[46] Rather, the spotlight is shifting back to him by means of a narrative "flashback" to an earlier point in time. Thus the function of the syntactic deviation is global, not local, in nature—a product of the author's selective "staging" of crucial events in the story.

The norms of syntactic ordering are quite different in Hebrew poetry and prose, but it is apparent that the fronted pronoun "I" in 2:4 is distinguished for some special reason. Although there may be an element of "emphasis" here,[47] the introverted structure of the complete psalm, coupled with the contrastive content of this very utterance, would indicate that it may play a more important role in the poetic discourse, namely, to signal the compositional "core" of the chiasmus.[48] We observe a similar thing in 2:9, where a corresponding front-shifted emphatic pronoun is utilized to mark the close of the song as well as to suggest its singer-centered focus.

Another example of such structurally-related foregrounding—or in this case, "backgrounding"—is found in 3:3b, where the initial "(And) Nineveh" is not given any particular referential "emphasis."[49] Instead, the complete clause is marked as being an explanatory "aside," one that occurs "off" the event-line and is intended to highlight the city's great size and significance "to God." A final instance of this sort of discourse "focus" may be observed in the last verse of the text. The presence of the separable pronoun "I" is no doubt "emphatic," in contrast to the corresponding "you" (sg.) of the preceding passage. But its frontal position in "the Hebrew word order"[50] serves primarily to highlight the important shift in the LORD's argument at this stage, that is, to its climactic second half, which of course concludes the adventures of Jonah with a challenging comment by the Lord.

A good example of utterance "emphasis" was observed earlier in

[46]Limburg, 50.

[47]Limburg, 67.

[48]Cf. Wendland, "Text Analysis."

[49]Contra Limburg, 77.

[50]Limburg, 97.

Jonah's "confession" of 1:9. Here a front shift of the object phrase, "Yahweh the God of heavens," though surrounded by Jonah's obtrusive references to himself, places the appropriate thematic prominence where it belongs, not only with respect to this particular juncture in the account, but also within the entire second episode, and even the book as a whole. Similar emphatic syntactic advancements appear in Jonah's song of thanksgiving, first as a series to progressively stress the depths to which he felt he had sunk ("from the belly of Sheol," 2:2b; "all your breakers," 2:3b; "the deep," 2:5b; "to the roots of the mountains," 2:6a; "the [lower] earth," 2:6b). A second set of front-shifted elements then serves to contrast the prophet himself ("I," 2:9a) and his promised ritual actions with the disparaged behavior of "those who cling to worthless [idols]" (2:8a).

The relative significance of syntactic position in nonfinite clauses is based on percentages and the usual order of components in similar expressions. For example, "by reversing the more normal phraseology [in 1:12b], *'anî yôdēa'*, the narrator stresses Jonah's awareness of his role"[51] in relation to the maritime disaster that has befallen the crew. This interpretation is reinforced by the subsequent advancement, "on account of me," in the verbless object clause that follows, which is neatly balanced by "upon you [sailors]" at the end.

Back-shift displacement in the syntax is not nearly as common as front-shifting, but the impact is equally as great, as we observe in the initial clause of 1:16, literally: "And they feared, the men, with a great fear *YHWH*." This mimics the progressively profound realization to which these heathen sailors had been inevitably led by the awful sequence of events at sea. This gradually unfolding revelation confirms Jonah's prior (1:10b) and later (1:9) public testimony. Later, the miraculously saved singer's realization of his utter dependence upon God is reflected syntactically by a retrogressive movement of two self-references, "my life" and "my soul" in 2:6b-7a, and their juxtaposition with "YHWH." But the most obvious and dramatic example of emphatic back-shifting is found—appropriately—at the end of the discourse. In this case, the second and thematically surprising half of a compound subject is positioned as the concluding climax of the utterance and the entire book. Indeed, YHWH is concerned "*even* [*w-*] about Nineveh's many animals" (4:11b)! Thus "syntax has distorted a desired link between the vocabulary of God's lesson and that of the king's edict [in 3:8]"[52]—the purpose being to accent man's inability to limit the magnitude of the LORD's mercy by humanly-based rational and religious categories.

[51]Sasson, 125.

[52]Sasson, 315.

Temporal-pragmatic Variation

Temporal-pragmatic variation in Hebrew narrative discourse involves a disruption or displacement in the normally strict diachronic flow of events. In other words, the sequentially unfolding verbal event-line is interrupted, and there is a shift in time, usually backward ("flashback"), but sometimes forward (by way of prediction or a more covert "foreshadowing") to a new and distinct temporal and situational setting.[53] Sternberg observes, "Within his generally reticent discourse, *fore*telling would yet seem the least congenial form of telling, expositional *back*telling definitely included."[54] Such retrospective deviation may vary according to quality (perspicuity) and/or quantity (the degree of chronological separation, that is, relatively near to or far from the current setting). But due to its deliberately disjunctive effect, it is functionally significant in terms of general or specific character representation and motivation, (sub-) thematic expression, and/or the pragmatic (interpersonal/audience-related) intent of the message.

The problem confronting analysts of Hebrew narrative is that these points of temporal discontinuity are not always unambiguously marked in the original text. In an English story, for example, a flashback is often indicated by the presence of a pluperfect ("had") tense and/or the use of a temporal adverb (phrase), ("at that time," "the previous day," "the week before"). In Hebrew, however, such verbal-based differentiation is simply not available, and the adverbial cue is much less common in occurrence. The primary marker is a shift in word order (coupled with an obligatory nonnarrative verbal tense sequence (N + *qatal*[55]), but this device is also used for other purposes (to indicate emphasis or to distinguish a compositional boundary), and is a rather ambiguous signal. One is left to rely upon the cotext and the structure of the narrative as a whole to make a decision with regard to any possible instance of such chronological displacement. It is in this light that I would propose chronological displacement as a feature of considerable rhetorical importance in the story of Jonah.

In order to support such a claim, it is necessary to begin with the most conspicuous, least controversial cases, simply to develop an argument that will take into consideration the greatest amount of evidence, whether strong or weak. At the top of such a "scale of certitude"

[53]I have not yet made a study of possible "parallel," or simultaneous, event sequences, e.g., "Meanwhile back at the city, . . ."

[54]Sternberg, 268 (original emphasis).

[55]Longacre and Hwang, 347.

is the flashback that is found in 4:2. There can be no doubt about this instance because it is explicitly stated to be a reference backward in time, to the very beginning of the narrative: "Is not this what I said while I was still at home? For this reason I hurried to run away to Tarshish." The unambiguous presence of temporal reordering suggests the possibility that other examples of this device remain to be found.

Several other possible instances of a flashback construction have been noted in Jonah. This first occurs in the second half of 1:5: "As for Jonah [initial syntactic front-shift], he *had gone down* (lit., "he went down") below deck."[56] Wolff observes: "Before the narrator can bring him into the scene (v. 6) he has to catch up with what has been happening to the Hebrew ever since he went on board at Joppa (v. 3)."[57] Another likely example comes in 1:10: "because he [Jonah] *had told* them." In this case, the flashback may be marked by being the third in an unusual narrative series of three *ki* ("for, that") clauses. Once again the narrator intentionally omits "certain events from their proper chronological sequence in order to introduce them later for greater impact."[58] In other words, "Biblical narrative often withholds pieces of exposition [or in this case, conversation] until the moment in the story when they are immediately relevant."[59]

An interesting and debatable instance of such "reordering" appears in 4:5. A number of commentators[60] have suggested that immediately after Jonah's climactic prediction of disaster in 3:4, "Yet forty more days and Nineveh will be overturned," there is a bifurcation, or "literary forking," in the narrative. One line reports the dramatic and turbulent events within the city itself, which ultimately lead to its receiving a saving reprieve from the LORD, vv. 5-10. The other line, beginning at 4:5, follows Jonah outside the doomed city to a place where he awaits its downfall, since he is "still not certain of the outcome of his warning."[61] This is not a matter of dealing with a clumsily misplaced piece of text, as some older commentators have suggested.[62] It is rather the display of a

[56]Cf. Magonet, 116, n. 20.

[57]Wolff, 112.

[58]Leslie C. Allen, *The Books of Joel, Obadiah and Micah*, NICOT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1976), 185.

[59]Robert Alter, *The Art of Biblical Narrative* (New York: Basic, 1981), 66.

[60]For example, Allen, 231; Brichto, 78; Wolff, 163; and Douglas Stuart, *Hosea-Jonah*, Word Biblical Commentary (Waco, TX: Word, 1987), 504.

[61]Stuart, 504.

[62]This is pointed out by Wolff, 163.

deliberate, artistically fashioned (e.g., the lexical "overlay" in 3:10 and 4:1), "cut-and-paste" technique whereby the *actual* events, whether parallel or overlapping in nature, are reported in a way that best suits the author's didactic and admonitory intentions. In this instance, the prejudicial anger of Jonah, which ends the narrative proper (4:3-4), is placed in the background, while the unmitigated mercy of YHWH is highlighted and brings the story to a more positive, theologically-centered close (4:11).

However, the narrative can also be interpreted in strict chronological sequence. This indicates the potential problems involved when a temporal (versus a "textual") displacement is posited, for there is admittedly a rather large disjunctive gap involved in this instance. It also illustrates the need for a careful weighing of all available evidence for the move, both cotextual (linguistic) and contextual (situational). The "flashback" approach to 4:5, for example, "And Jonah *had gone out* from the city and established himself," is supported by: (a) the obvious emphasis upon "city" that follows the prediction of Nineveh's "overturning" in 3:4; (b) an explanation for the phrase "to see what will happen to the city" (4:5), which seems to contradict Jonah's knowledge of its deliverance and his consequent "anger" in 4:1-2; (c) the presence of less ambiguous flashbacks in the book (4:2); and (d) the rhetorical advantages of this perspective on the text as outlined above. Finally, we should take note of a probable "retrospective reference" at the onset of the LORD's concluding speech in 4:10, namely, his mention of Jonah's "pity" (*ḥ-w-s*) in 4:10. It is not mentioned earlier in the narrative, but it seems to refer back to the powerful, but unexpressed, sorrowful reaction that Jonah experienced when his shady plant dried up and died (4:7b).[63]

On the other hand, commentators have also proposed a number of what may be termed "false flashbacks" throughout the book. The psalm of Jonah in chapter 2, for example, is sometimes construed as a later reflection or a conceptual "flashback" upon the events recorded in 1:17 and 2:1, in support of erroneous conclusions such as these: "The *situation* of the psalm [and its language] does not fit the context";[64] or the psalm "disrupts symmetry . . . and introduces perspectives at variance with the narrative."[65] Therefore it is not necessary to use a pluperfect to translate the verbs of "descent" (recounting Jonah's predicament, v. 3), because it is supposedly "the appropriate tense in light of the logic of the chronology

---

[63]This interpretation is convincingly argued by Trible, 219-223.

[64]Wolff, 129.

[65]Trible, 173.

of events."[66] Actually, this song of grateful thanksgiving is suitable where it occurs within the structural framework of the book. It could be a response to YHWH's act of delivering Jonah from death by drowning (1:17), whereas his subsequent rescue from the sea/great fish itself (2:10) goes unthanked. Furthermore, this psalmic *genre*, "an individual song of thanksgiving," does not invariably celebrate some specific personal salvation event *in the past*. Due to its functional affinity to the individual lament, the temporal orientation could possibly be *future*, namely, a strongly anticipated deliverance based upon YHWH's prior acts of preservation.[67] This would fit the setting quite well in 2:2-9 as a response to 1:17 and in confident hope of 2:10.

A few other examples of such chronological misinterpretation may be noted. A pluperfect rendering of the event of 2:1 ("had appointed"),[68] is quite unnecessary and even counters the Hebrew narrative perspective and style. There is a relatively insignificant "gap" in time involved here. Moreover, use of the *"waw*-consecutive" construction followed by an explicit noun subject would represent the least disruptive way of indicating concurrent actions being carried out by different agents, that is, "YHWH" and "the men" (1:16). It is misleading to claim that "as far as events are concerned, this goes back in time, catching up with what has already happened."[69] Similarly, it is not accurate to view 3:6-9 as "a kind of flashback."[70] This would instead be a significant example of the Hebrew narrative technique of "summary-and-scene," in which a general synoptic overview of an important pericope (v. 5) precedes a more detailed account of what happened (vv. 6-9). Having heard the divine "proclamation" (v. 2) that Jonah was currently announcing throughout the city (v. 4), the Ninevite king responds by issuing a royal edict to apply to all his subjects, including the livestock (3:7). This is similar to what happens in 1:17, a summary statement which leads to the psalm of 2:1-9, and also the "preview-and-quotation" sequence that occurs at the end of 4:8, "[Jonah] asked that he might die. He said, 'It is better for me to die than to live.'"[71]

It is a sign of our author's considerable narrative skill that along with the several passages involving a temporal displacement backward, there are

[66]Stuart, 469.

[67]Wendland, "Genre Criticism," 390-394.

[68]Stuart, 468.

[69]Wolff, 126.

[70]Wolff, for example, renders the verbs of vv. 6-7a by an awkward string of pluperfects (144-145).

[71]Cf. NRSV; contra Brichto, 269, n. 20.

also a few cases where a definite future orientation is suggested, again inserted for apparent rhetorical reasons. Meir Sternberg provides a useful classification of such "foreshadowing" by proposing three main types: "analogy, paradigm, and dramatic forecast."[72] *Analogy* entails episodic similarity, that is, a series of events experienced by one biblical personage that corresponds in significant respects to what later happens to another. Such "analogical organization [is] designed to launch inductive reasoning from known precedent(s) to some present counterpart facing an uncertain future."[73] Thus the completely unexpected "conversion" of the Tarshish-bound mariners gives an unobtrusive hint that if and when Jonah ever reaches Nineveh with his "word of the LORD," the outcome for them might not be as bleak as first indicated (1:2). The several important parallels that materialize to link the two accounts (chaps. 1 and 3) later confirm this divinely-planted intuition. An instance of *contrastive* analogy pertaining to the *same* personage would of course be that which is played out in the resending of Jonah to Nineveh (1:1-3 and 3:1-3).[74]

A *paradigm*, which operates from the principle of deduction, is the product of a recursive series of such "analogies." It is "a general rule . . . which grows in predictive determinacy and ideological force with each new successful application" to enhance a greater awareness of "God's controlling design" in biblical history.[75] The outstanding example of this phenomenon in Jonah—arguably the thematic point of the entire book—is embodied in the prophet's ironic testimony of the benevolent divine character in 4:2. In fact, the "paradigmatic" nature of this theological proposition motivated Jonah's fateful flight in the first place, and paradoxically, also made possible the gracious experience of divine "deliverance" (2:9) that his erstwhile shipmates enjoyed.

Most obvious on the continuum of revelation that ranges between implicit analogy and overt narrator prediction is what is realized by some manner of *forecast* by a character (including, most reliably, God himself). Such "deductive prospection," designed to "catch the eye [and the ear] of the most dim-sighted [and hard-of-hearing]," is normally reserved for "vital matters of doctrine."[76] Thus Jonah's capsule sermon, "Yet forty days and Nineveh will be overturned" (3:4) at first seems to be an application of the divine principle of retribution that chronic "evil" will be punished, a

[72]Sternberg, 268.

[73]Sternberg, 268.

[74]These are not necessarily different characters, as Sternberg seems to imply, 268-269.

[75]Sternberg, 269.

[76]Sternberg, 270.

notion that is implicit in the words of Jonah's first commissioning (1:2). However, this forecast leads to an expectation that is counteracted both by antrospection in the analogy of the sailors' salvation and also by retrospection in the stated paradigm of God's essential goodness. The theologically-grounded punitive proposition is not thereby compromised in the process; it is simply superseded by its larger, contrarational correlate, namely, the fact that Yahweh prefers to "relent" and to respond in "compassion" to penitent hearts and concrete acts of repentance (3:9-10). This hope-generating possibility, which is undeserved and contrary to all human logic, lies semantically implicit within the key verb itself, *h-p-k* "over-turn/turn-over," a response to those who respond in repentance (cf. Hos 11:8, in which the latter verb also co-occurs with "relent" *n-h-m*).

The wider functional and theological implications of the Hebrew narrative stylistic techniques of recursion and variation, as well as their specific manifestation in the rhetorical devices of irony and enigma, will be considered in Parts Two and Three of this article.

THE COLTON CELEBRATION CONGREGATION: A CASE STUDY IN AMERICAN ADVENTIST WORSHIP RENEWAL, 1986-1991

Author: **Viviane Haenni**, 1996
Advisor: George R. Knight, Ed.D.

This study investigates the experience of Celebration Center (Colton, California), its milieu, and its impact on the North American Seventh-day Adventist Church through what has been perceived as the celebration movement and controversy, while addressing underlying historical, sociological, and philosophical/theological questions.

The principal findings of the study reveal that Celebration Center has uniquely attempted to explore a more multilayered approach to church life and worship within White Anglo Adventism. The celebration experience has ventured into breaking up some old Adventist expectations through its congregational trend; its emphasis on love, acceptance, and forgiveness; its different church organization and more holistic worship; and its accent on the divine presence, the Holy Spirit, and the spiritual gifts of all believers. In trying to explore in the late 1980s a new experiential liturgical language, Celebration Center seems to have uniquely embodied change and become, at times, the irrational scapegoat of people's fear/anger and sense of loss brought by societal and religious modifications.

Anticelebrationists have generally been perceptive in their recognition of deeper changes at stake in the celebration experience but have been mistaken in attributing them to a conspiracy within or outside of Adventism. The implemented changes by the celebration movement are reflective of powerful trends shaping American Christianity and Adventism, such as revivalistic, third wave, and baby boomer religious innovations and the convergence between the liturgical and pentecostal/charismatic movements. Celebration worship grows out of a particular worldview not completely in harmony with the theological and philosophical assumptions of the years of denominational consolidation and stabilization (1920-1950) that are predominant among antagonists. The celebration movement and the reactions against it can be both understood as grass-roots attempts to bring renewal within White Anglo North American Adventism.

The principal implications which arise from the findings are: (1) A timely need for Adventism to recount its own history, apply to worship its holistic approach to reality, and to investigate new models of hermeneutics, ecclesiology, sacramental litergy, and church structure. (2) The common convictions of pro and anticelebrationists could inform Adventism of possible directions for the future and offer grounds of reconciliation.

A CRITICAL STUDY OF CARL F. H. HENRY'S PORTRAYAL OF THE
HUMAN ROLE IN REVELATION AND INSPIRATION

Author: **Boxter Kharbteng**, 1996
Adviser: Miroslav M. Kis, Ph.D.

This dissertation concerns Carl F. H. Henry's portrayal of the human role in
his doctrines of revelation and inspiration. The study examines the consistency of
Henry's portrayal of the role of man within his own exposition of those doctrines.

The investigation is divided into 7 chapters. Henry's apologetical presentation
of the doctrines leads to the initiation of the study with a survey of the different
theories of revelation and inspiration (chapter 1). The survey increases the
intelligibility of Henry's own reaction to the different theories of revelation and
inspiration, and man's role in them.

Chapters 2 and 3 provide an in-depth understanding of Henry's doctrines of
revelation and inspiration, thus ensuring an adequate grasp and appreciation of the
significance of his exposition of these doctrines and the human role therein.
Chapter 4 deals with Henry's doctrine of man. The treatment serves as an
additional basis and explanation for his depiction of the human role in revelation
and inspiration. Chapter 5 carries out an analysis of Henry's depiction of the
human role in revelation and inspiration. The analysis is approached from three
vantage points: man and the origin of revelation-inspiration; man as receiver of
revelation-inspiration; and man as carrier (conveyor/communicator) of revelation-
inspiration.

Chapter 6 evaluates Henry's portrayal of man in revelation and inspiration.
First, the chapter points to four reasons why consistency is expected in Henry's
own depiction of the human role in revelation and inspiration. By using nature
and function as criteria of the evaluation, the chapter correlates these criteria in
relation to revelation and man as well as inspiration and man. Moreover, the
human function or role in these doctrines is highlighted and carefully compared.
In the process, it has been observed that whereas Henry assumes man's ability to
receive (understand) and convey revelation unerringly and independent of divine
help, yet when it comes to his role in conveying/communicating inspiration, such
a competency is denied to him. This consequently leads Henry to portray man in
inspiration as limited, erring, and constantly in need of divine help at every level,
including the use of words during the writing of revelation or inscripturation. In
view of his insistence upon revelation's lucidity to man, its propositional form,
man's linguistic capacity, the content identity between revelation and inspiration,
as well as the identicalness of the human agent between the two events, Henry's
divergent portrayal of man's role within these events betrays inconsistency.

Chapter 7 summarizes the research and submits some recommendations that
hope to broaden the depiction of the human role consonant with Scripture's own
portrayal of that role, and bring about a consistency to Henry's portrayal of the
human role within his doctrines of revelation and inspiration.

ESCHATOLOGICAL PARADIGM AND MORAL THEORY IN CONTEMPORARY CHRISTIAN ETHICS: STEPHEN CHARLES MOTT AND THOMAS W. OGLETREE

Author: Larry L. Lichtenwalter, 1996

Adviser: Miroslav M. Kis, Ph.D.

Twentieth-century reinterpreted eschatology introduces a paradigm for Christian ethics that engenders significant divergence among Christian ethicists in the way its application influences moral theory. These divergences indicate the need to clarify the issues revolving around its methodological application in order to bring credible structure for applying the eschatological paradigm in Christian ethics.

A set of analytical distinctions and procedural suggestions in this study provide an extensive framework for comparatively observing where ethicists begin, move, and end in terms of using eschatology as paradigm in their moral theory: (1) role and function of paradigms, (2) levels of paradigm operation (macro, meso, micro), (3) levels in ethical structure (philosophical/theological bases, principles, area rules), (4) three principles of verification (role of Scripture, community, and the nature of social involvement), and (5) three conceptually interwoven and complementary components of the paradigm *(already/not yet, reign of God, horizon of future)*. A correspondence is proposed between the levels of paradigm operation and the ingredients in ethical structure. A complex interplay is indicated between the paradigm's components and the principles of verification which highlight the methodological nuances the paradigm elicits.

Mott and Ogletree were selected because they represent the latter phase of twentieth-century reinterpreted eschatology and its application toward moral theory. Their projects elucidate the complex nature and subtle interplay between the various ingredients involved in using eschatology as paradigm and the ever-present presuppositions of those seeking to apply it—illustrating what happens if you take the eschatological paradigm and apply it this way or that way. Their diversity suggests that the question of the use of eschatology in Christian moral theory remains open. Their respective orientation to Scripture shows considerable contrasts with respect to consistency, specificity, and relevancy of eschatological paradigm application. Their projects suggest that the question of the role of Scripture alone gives promise of bringing stability to the use of the eschatological paradigm in Christian ethics. The paradigm functions best when expressing biblical ethics rather than moral philosophy.

Perspectives for using eschatology as paradigm are proposed along with its relation to other paradigms in Christian moral theory and directions for further study.

Arichea, Daniel C. and Howard A. Hatton. *Handbook on Paul's Letters to Timothy and to Titus*. New York: United Bible Societies, 1995. v + 336 pp. $14.00.

The series of *Helps for Translation* produced by the United Bible Societies includes a set of handbooks on various books of the Bible which are primarily intended to help those engaged in translating the Bible into tribal and other modern languages. They are, therefore, rather specialized in their content, discussing primarily those aspects of the text which are of particular significance for translators and taking up the problems that may arise in view of the idiosyncrasies of modern languages. The writers are biblical scholars and professional translation consultants.

The *Handbook on Paul's Letters to Timothy and to Titus*, like the others in this series, concentrates on exegetical information important for translators and attempts to indicate possible solutions for translational problems related to language or culture. The authors use the Revised Standard Version (RSV) and Today's English Version (TEV) in parallel columns, first in larger segments that will make possible an overview of each section of discourse, and then in bold print, normally verse by verse, followed by detailed comments and discussion. Quotations from other passages or other versions are printed between quotation marks and in normal typeface. The quotation from the TEV version serves as a primary model of how a translation may take shape; however, many other versions are provided as well, especially where they offer models that may be more satisfactory than those of TEV.

Some of the readers may find it surprising that the authors do not use the New Revised Standard Version (NRSV) as the base for discussion. The reader should understand that the handbook attempts to explain the ancient Greek text to translators who have not learned the Greek language. According to Arichea and Hatton, the reason for not using the NRSV is that "since the NRSV has succeeded in rendering the message of the ancient text in a form easily understood by today's reader, it reveals less correspondence with the form and shape of the ancient text than does RSV. The authors have therefore found it easier to discuss the ancient text by using RSV as the base" (vii).

In the introduction and the first section of the book, Arichea points out regarding the authorship of the Pastoral Letters that "scholarly opinion is divided on whether the Pastoral Letters were written by the apostle Paul or by someone else, perhaps a disciple of the apostle who wanted to write with Paul's authority" (1). Whichever position is taken, according to Arichea, the letters themselves say precisely that it was Paul who wrote these letters. For instance, there are details of Paul's travels and situation. This *Handbook* refers to Paul as the author of these letters. Following the tradition of the church, if it was the apostle Paul who led Timothy to faith in Jesus Christ, this would explain why Paul refers to him as "my beloved and faithful son in the Lord" (1 Cor 4:17). Timothy played an important role in both Paul's second and third missionary journeys. Paul also mentions Timothy as one of his companions during his imprisonment in Rome (Col 1:1; Phil 1:1; Philemon 1).

On the other hand, Titus is not mentioned at all in the book of Acts, although Paul mentions him in his letters. This has led to the suggestion by some scholars that perhaps Titus is the same person as Silas who mentioned together with Timothy in the book of Acts (Acts 17:14-15). Hatton observes that "this suggestion is made more attractive by the fact that Titus is more frequently mentioned in Paul's letters, and in the few places where Silas appears, he is mentioned together with Timothy, but Silas and Titus are never mentioned together (2 Cor 1:19; 1 Thess 1:2; 2 Thess 1:1)" (261). The first reference to Titus is in Gal 2:1-3, where Paul mentions him as an uncircumcised Gentile who accompanied Paul and Barnabas to Jerusalem to meet the leaders there. It has been proposed by some scholars that both Timothy and Titus are intended to represent younger leaders of the Christian community.

In the second section Hatton comments that in agreement with the literary customs of the time, Titus begins in very much the same way as 1 Timothy and 2 Timothy. He adds that "the writer, Paul, refers to himself in the third person, and pronounces a short blessing. The only thing that is somewhat unusual in this introduction is that, instead of simply stating what his credentials are, Paul makes a rather lengthy statement about the purpose and function of his apostleship" (260).

A selected bibliography is included for the benefit of those interested in further study. The glossary explains technical terms according to their usage in this volume. The translator may find it useful to read through the glossary in order to become aware of the specialized way in which certain terms are used. An index of important words and subjects concludes the handbook.

This handbook is designed for missionary translators without a technical knowledge of Greek. Its readable, nontechnical approach, makes it accessible for beginning students and lay people, while its theological insights will illuminate the text for every reader.

Berrien Springs, MI 49103   P. COUTSOUMPOS

Ball, Bryan W. *The Seventh-day Men: Sabbatarians and Sabbatarianism in England and Wales, 1600-1800.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994. xi + 416 pp. $60.

"Seventh-day Men" refers to those who kept Saturday as the appointed day of rest and worship in Great Britain in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Bryan Ball's purpose was to trace the development of the Sabbatarian movement from its prehistory in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries up through its demise by the beginning of the nineteenth century.

The result is the first fully documented history of the Sabbatarian movement in England and Wales. In his usual style, Ball's use of primary documents has been extensive and intensive. The volume, utilizing large numbers of rare documents, has demonstrated that the Sabbatarian movement was much more extensive than previously recognized.

Readers of Ball's earlier work on Puritanism—*The English Connection: The Puritan Roots of Seventh-day Adventist Belief*—will note a certain similarity in methodology. Both works somewhat follow the tradition of Le Roy Edwin

Froom's *Prophetic Faith of Our Fathers* and *Conditionalist Faith of Our Fathers* in finding the genesis of their interest in discovering and documenting the historic precursors of Seventh-day Adventist beliefs. In pursuing that task Ball has significantly contributed to the scholarly understanding of the theological heritage of Adventism.

The volume's first two chapters provide historical background for the rest of the study. Chapter 1 surveys seventh-day beliefs in the period before 1600. The line of discussion runs from the early church to the Celtic church and up through the medieval Lollards in Great Britain. Beyond those topics, the first chapter focuses on the Sabbatarian impetus among the Anabaptists on the Continent and the significant Puritan Sabbatarian controversies that took place in England in the early 1500s.

The second chapter extends the content of the first by discussing the contributions of John Traske and Theophilus Brabourne to the development of seventh-day Sabbatarianism in the Puritan context of the early 1500s. Ball's treatment of Brabourne is especially helpful, although one is left to wonder why there is no recognition of the work of Nicolaus Satelmajer on the topic. That same bibliographic lack in regard to secondary citations may also be noted in the section on Anabaptism in terms of Daniel Liechty's volume on Andreas Fischer and Gerhard Hasel's unpublished thesis on Anabaptist Sabbatarians.

The remaining chapters are devoted to tracing the seventh-day movement in England and Wales between 1600 and 1800 and to discussing the reasons for its decline. Each chapter chronologically develops the Sabbatarian movement within specified geographical and regional areas. As with Ball's other works, the treatment is heavy in detail. That makes the volume an excellent resource for further researchers even though the format provides for slower reading and makes it more difficult for the reader to form a gestalt of the entire movement.

Ball finds the seventh-day movement firmly rooted in the restorationist mentality with its desire to move beyond any additions or perversions of doctrine developed in the history of the church and to get back to NT practice. Thus the desire of the Sabbatarians was for a completed Protestant and Puritan Reformation that would be free of all Roman influence.

Not surprisingly, Ball discovered a strong emphasis on apocalyptic prophecy tied to the beliefs of the Seventh-day Men. Thus they had much to say about the change of the Sabbath from Saturday to Sunday in relation to Daniel 7:25.

Concepts of latter-day "remnant" theology emphasizing "the idea of a people prepared for the coming of the Lord" also found expression in Sabbatarian literature (15). The latter-day "remnant" would be known as those who "keep the commandments of God, and the faith of Jesus" (see Rev. 14:12).

Ball discovered that some of the Seventh-day Men also believed, as do Seventh-day Adventists, that the last "'great controversy'" between good men and evil ones would focus on the Sabbath, "with the saints being assured of victory over the mark of the beast" (16). Also like the Adventists, Ball discovered that the Seventh-day Men held that proper attitudes toward the Sabbath would be a "preservative against atheism" (ibid.).

The Seventh-day Men is an important contribution to our understanding of the rise of Nonconformity in Great Britain. Beyond that, it provides further

understanding to Seventh-day Adventists who have at times been too prone to
think of their ideas as new and unique. Ball's meticulously researched book is thus
a must acquisition for all libraries with an interest in Nonconformity, Adventism,
and Sabbatarianism.

Andrews University   GEORGE R. KNIGHT

Bradley, James E., and Richard A. Muller. *Church History: An Introduction to
     Research, Reference Works, and Methods.* Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1995.
     xvi + 236 pp. Paper, $19.00.

     James E. Bradley of Fuller Theological Seminary and Richard A. Muller of
Calvin Theological Seminary have written this book "as a practical resource for
students beginning graduate programs" in church history and historical theology
(x).

     According to the authors, this book was "organized with the needs of the
research student primarily in mind" (xii). The first two chapters provide the
student with theoretical bases for launching a historical research. The first presents
basic definitions of the related disciplines, a brief history of church historiography,
and models used by historians to construct histories of doctrine. The second
discusses problems in examining historical resources, finding meaning from them,
and presenting them objectively.

     Chapters 3 to 6 take the reader by hand through "the logical searching
sequence" of the research (xii). Chapter 3 acquaints the reader with the process of
topic selection and the various types of basic reference works and secondary
literature. The next chapter presents the method of accessing primary sources in
each period of church history through the use of specialized bibliographies and
catalogs, computerized databases, new sources in microform, and archives. The
fifth chapter introduces the reader to the process of note-taking and writing. It also
deals with the mechanics of footnotes, bibliographies, and word processing on
computers. In the final chapter, the reader finds tips on lecturing and publishing.

     The main text of this book is followed by 70 pages of additional materials
which are by no means extraneous. The 48-page annotated bibliography—listed by
genre, historical period, and geography—provides selected aids to the study of
church history and historical theology. The aids included here are reference works
which point to primary sources in specific subfields. This section is followed by
a 17-page appendix which lists computer databases and new sources in microform.
An index of personal names is found on the final five pages of the book.

     I find that the book succeeds overall in achieving its purpose of providing a
solid theoretical and practical foundation for beginning graduate students in
church history. Beginning graduate students in church history may be acquainted
with the basic information and research methods but may lack an overall
understanding of the key issues of church historiography and knowledge of
important resources in specific subfields. This book should help fill such needs.

     Clearly, this book, written for novitiates in the field, will not meet the needs
of an experienced researcher; yet even an old hand will appreciate the lengthy

bibliography and appendix. This section can serve as a checklist for all who want to assure the completeness of their research.

Another strength of this book, which a veteran researcher will also value highly, is its inclusion of new sources and methods of research, e.g., computer applications and new sources in microform. In chapters 3 to 5, the section on research and writing, the authors introduce important computer databases and microform sources, discuss enthusiastically their strengths (while cautioning against their idiosyncratic weaknesses), and show how these new resources can complement traditional methods of research (see 73-75, 84-89, 109-120, 144-121; see also 215-231). Because the authors presuppose basic acquaintance with computers on the part of the reader, a complete novice to computers may find the sections on the use of computer databases somewhat metaphysical. Given the growing importance of computer resources to the discipline, however, the introduction of computerized resources in this book may motivate some readers to begin befriending computers!

Among other strengths of the book is the chapter on preparing for lectures and publication (152-166). The chapter does not attempt to be a primer on pedagogical method or a "winning" formula for getting materials published. Instead, it serves to remind the reader that the final goal of research is effective public presentation and/or publication. The chapter encourages the student reader to view research not as an endeavor for its own sake, but truly as a means of adding to the extant knowledge on the subject.

Some readers may want to question the authors' philosophy of historiography set forth in the chapter entitled "Perspective and Meaning in History." The central issue for the authors is the degree of objectivity that a Christian historian can attain in writing church history. The authors' central thesis is offered already in the preface: "We remain committed to the belief that the results of an investigation reached by a Christian historian ought not to differ appreciably from the results of a similar investigation reached by a purely secular historian—at least not because of the fundamental religious or spiritual commitment of the investigator" (xi). The authors contend that "a methodologically constructed and controlled objectivity" (49) can be achieved even for a confessional interpreter of history. This objectivity is not "a bland, uninvolved distancing of the self" but an involvement in the materials of history which recognizes empathies and biases present in both the researcher and the the materials. Readers may argue with the authors as to whether such objectivity is a historiographical fantasy or an attainable reality.

Many readers belonging to particular ethnic or denominational traditions will not be satisfied with the bibliography. This section is hopelessly—but understandably—Euro-centric and Americo-centric. A graduate student wishing to specialize in the history of Asian or African Christianity will not find this book useful. Also, readers coming from, for example, the Adventist tradition will be disappointed to find no work listed under the section on general reference tools for denominations (see 206-207).

In spite of certain deficiencies, this book remains an excellent methodological introduction to students who are embarking on a lifelong study of church history. This book should not be faulted too much for not covering the whole field, as it

equips its readers with the necessary navigational tools and skills to embark on their own probes into the history of Christianity.

Berrien Springs, MI 49104   JUHYEOK NAM

Crockett, William, ed. *Four Views on Hell.* Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1992. 208 pp. $14.99.

Evangelical publishing has recently revealed increasing maturity with dialogical works on such themes as the millennium and predestination/free will. *Four Views on Hell*, a welcome addition to this genre, provides a forum for substantial presentations of the literal, metaphorical, purgatorial, and conditionalist views. In addition, the four contributors interact with each other at the end of each chapter.

It is obvious that any doctrine of hell is "out-of-kilter" with contemporary thought, yet none of the authors—all of them systematic theologians—discounts the possibility of ultimate separation from God. In fact, this illustrates an omission in the book. There is no separate treatment of the "universalist" position that hell is not an option at all.

Basing his view on what he considers to be Scripture's "literal, normal interpretation" (27) and word studies, John Walvoord asserts that the objections to the literal view of hell are founded in theological presuppositions rather than in exegesis. However, one must ask whether it is really possible to separate exegesis from theology. Theology must be built upon proper exegesis, but exegesis of one passage of Scripture must take into account the larger biblical perspective as well. Each must inform the other, and it is vital that exegetical conclusions with regard to God's justice and righteousness be tested by such prominent theological themes as God's love and grace. In fact, it seems to me that Walvoord's concluding argument that the "infinite nature of sin" demands "infinite punishment as a divine judgment" (27) is based on a Calvinistic theological framework rather than on exegesis.

William Crockett agrees with Walvoord that "hell" is eternal, but he attempts to mitigate its "hellishness" by his argument that, according to Jesus and the apostles, "the final abode of the wicked will be a place of awful reckoning," although we cannot know what it will be like until the afterlife (45).

Undoubtedly, Crockett's position highlights, especially for those who hold the Bible to be the Word of God, the question of whether the literal sense of the words is to be accepted as the actual meaning. Might not the biblical context sometimes demand a symbolic/metaphorical interpretation as the most natural meaning? Still, with Pinnock (87-88), one has to ask whether Crockett has actually gained anything with his metaphorical view. While he extinguishes the fire of hell, God continues to be seen as punishing sinners for eternity. Does making hell mental agony rather than physical pain make an unpalatable doctrine more preachable?

In his review of the purgatorial position, Zachary Hayes does not address the issue of hell *per se.* Rather, he has chosen to discuss the subject from the Roman Catholic perspective of an "interim period" between heaven and hell (93). For

Hayes, purgatorial cleansing is necessary because of the distance between humankind and God due to human finiteness and guilt (95) as well as the fact that life's projects are left incomplete this side of death (96).

Evangelical Protestants will immediately ask what scriptural warrant Hayes has for such a stance. In response, it has to be said that he does not make a strong attempt to find purgatory in Scripture although he does refer briefly to 2 Macc 12:41-46; Matt 12:31-32; and 1 Cor 3:11-15. Instead, he clearly indicates that he views Scripture as functioning alongside of Christian tradition, and so new doctrines and new formulas "may legitimately emerge later in Christian history" (103).

However, the Roman Catholic/Protestant argument over purgatory is oversimplified if it is dissolved into a discussion in regard to *sola scriptura* and/or tradition. After all, most Protestants also place enormous importance on tradition. Hayes is correct in pointing out that the real issue revolves around what God's grace is (113-114). His picture of God's mercy and human freedom is an attractive one, but it does not adequately account for the present completeness of the believer in Jesus Christ.

Interestingly, Clark Pinnock is somewhat attracted to Hayes' purgatorial view (129-131). One can only wonder if, in his journey from a Calvinian paradigm of divine sovereignty to a more Arminian dialectic of divine control and human freedom, he has not over-balanced on the side of human response. Perhaps too, Pinnock's basic amillennialism has created an eschatological void which can only be filled by some kind of purgatory.

For the conditionalist, the highlight of the book is Pinnock's spirited defense of hell as "final destruction" (137). Although he does tackle the major proof texts for the traditional view, one is somewhat disappointed by Pinnock's failure to engage in word studies of *she 'ol, gehenna, 'olam,* and *aiōnios*; especially since Walvoord does so. However, Pinnock provides a strong biblical, theological, and philosophical case for his alternative position. He points out that the traditional view is founded in the Hellenistic doctrine of the immortality of the soul rather than in Scripture. In addition, he asks legitimately whether an eternally-burning hell measures up to human or biblical standards of morality and justice and whether such a view is not more consistent with cosmic dualism than with Christian eschatology (147-155).

Finally, *Four Views on Hell* well illustrates the fact that most theological disagreements find their basis in what one thinks Scripture *is*. That almost predetermines what we will conclude from its words.

Avondale College   RAY C. W. ROENNFELDT
Cooranbong, N.S.W.
Australia

Daniels, Peter T., and William Bright, eds. *The World Writing Systems.* New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996. xlv + 919 pp. $125.00.

The editors have chosen a list of brilliant, very competent contributors to join them in writing the many chapters in the 74 sections of this comprehensive book. As stated in the preface (xxxv), while "each contributor was asked to provide a

historical sketch and the table of signforms in their standard order and their variations," "the bulk of their work was to be a description of *how the script actually works*—how the sounds of a language are represented in writing, along with a brief text in the language(s) the script is used for." The standard transliteration shown is that "used by scholars, and by governments and libraries," the International Phonetic Alphabet.

The 13 parts are: I, Grammatology; II, Ancient Near Eastern Writing Systems; III, Decipherment; IV, East Asian Writing Systems; V, European Writing Systems; VI, VII, and, VIII, Middle Eastern Writing Systems; IX, X, and XI, Sociolinguistics and Scripts; XII, Secondary Notation Systems; and XIII, Imprinting and Printing. Each part contains an introduction and one or more sections, and each section is comprised of from one to eleven chapters with subsections. Even included in Part XII are shorthand systems and numerical, music, and dance notations. In the sections which I felt competent to judge I could find no fault, but only admire the excellent organization and clear presentation, with charts and other helpful illustrations. Bibliographies follow each section, and an index concludes the volume.

What Editor Daniels remarked in his subsection "History of the Study of Writing" (6) concerning an 1821 book in German by Ulrich Friedrich Kopp could well be said concerning this huge volume: "His work would well repay careful study, though no single modern scholar would be competent to evaluate it in its entirety." It is difficult to imagine that anything more comprehensive will ever supersede this work.

Andrews University   LEONA GLIDDEN RUNNING

Davies, Eryl W. *Numbers.* The New Century Bible Commentary. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995. 452 pp. Paper, $23.00.

The New Century Bible Commentary differs in several ways from other well-known series. Comments are organized by pericopae or textual units, as usual, but not segmented for bibliography, translation, textual notes, form analysis, explanation, etc. Instead, most of those concerns of the commentator are interwoven into a continuous interpretation. While segmentation is handy for quick reference when looking for a specific kind of information, the non segmented approach of the *NCBC* makes for a high readability and is especially useful as an integrated overview of the results of scholarship on a given passage.

A comparison between this and some differently-organized commentaries shows that, in spite of the integrated approach, E. Davies has managed to present just as much information relevant to all those exegetical tasks as the other commentaries. Indeed, in certain cases he presents more, because the space saved by not giving a translation of the text (the series is intended to be used in conjunction with the Revised Standard Version) is put to good use by giving a fuller summary of the contents of the scholarly works belonging to the specific bibliography. And he has certainly done his homework in that kind of bibliography.

Davies is especially helpful when describing the various lines of interpretation

or ways in which a passage has been understood. In evaluating them he usually favors the most "classical" alternative, so to speak, from the viewpoint of modern interpretation. The evaluation is usually guarded and thoughtfully considered. An exception may be found on p. 17. When discounting the possibility that the census figures found in Numbers may derive from authentic sources, as suggested by several scholars, Davies claims that they are merely "the invention of the Priestly author," as evidenced by the fact that exactly six tribes had more, and six tribes had fewer members than the average for the twelve tribes. This result he deems artificial, but such "evidence" would certainly be disputed by any statistician.

Of special interest to many readers is the stance of a commentator toward the historical-critical method. The methodological approach used by Davies is fully critical, as usual in mainstream scholarship. The solid scholarship of the commentary, however, should not be ignored even by those who look for alternative ways to understand the text.

In his introduction of the book, the author deals with the problem of source division (xlv-li). However, the discussion of difficulties recently encountered by the Documentary Theory is centered solely on the challenge posed by Rendtorff, a scholar who does not rest his case primarily on evidence gathered from the book of Numbers. Therefore we must conclude that Davies is dealing with the problem of the composition of the Pentateuch as a whole. That being the case, the discussion hardly seems sufficient for the purpose. The problem of the Documentary Theory is certainly much larger than Rendtorff, and should not be dismissed merely by showing that this scholar has not proven his own version of the history of the composition of the Pentateuch.

The table of contents is very detailed for the introduction (12 lines for 30 pp.) but extremely succinct for the commentary (3 lines for 370 pp.). In particular, a list of excursuses (such as those of pp. 12-23) would be welcome.

As with other volumes in the series, this commentary has been carefully edited and is reasonably free from typographical mistakes. The typeface is compact but still very clear. This is a high-quality volume packed with information.

Universidad Adventista del Plata   AECIO E. CAIRUS
Villa Libertador San Martin, Entre Rios, Argentina

Dockery, David S. ed.   *The Challenge of Postmodernism: An Evangelical Engagement.* Wheaton, IL: Victor Books, 1995. 428 pp. $16.99.

In the context of religion, philosophy, and politics, post-modernism is, roughly, the rejection of the Enlightenment's "understanding of human reason, human action, and human culture." For postmodernists, this dubious Enlightenment understanding is marked by such features as: a belief in the capacity of detached reason, using arguments and information accessible, comprehensible, and defensible to everyone, to ground moral, religious, and scientific practice; the importance of a measure of alienation from one's psychosocial context in order to achieve appropriate objectivity; the capacity of a political order dependent on agreement regarding fair procedures to meet the needs and foster the ends of persons with diverse substantive goals and convictions; the essentially—politically

irrelevant or destructive and publicly indefensible character of religious belief, which is rooted, supposedly, in local prejudice. All of these positions are, to one degree or another, rejected by those who adopt the postmodern label.

What postmodernists are against is considerably clearer than what they are for. In fact, radically different schools of thought may appropriately claim the postmodern label "Communitarian." Postmodernists often see the decline of the authority of a supposedly neutral science, of the quest for an unachievable objectivity in science, philosophy, and politics as opening the way for a renewal of distinctive traditions of belief and practice—often religious in nature—to which modernity has been unfavorable. By contrast, "anarchic" postmodernists tend to view the decline of modernity as the final failure of attempts to provide rational defenses for moral and religious beliefs or to construct a coherent common culture; they often imply that the advent of the postmodern era should be greeted by an enthusiastic acceptance of an unavoidable cultural or even individual relativism. And yet other categories and subcategories might be identified.

The difficulty in clarifying the nature of postmodernism makes it hard for the contributors to any symposium on the topic—of which there have by now been many—to be sure just what it is they ought to be assessing or responding to. Every commentator offers her own classification scheme—more than one such typology is employed in *The Challenge of Postmodernism* and none is identical with the one I have suggested. (Perhaps this fact itself, evincing as it does the intractability of language and the resistance of reality to imprisonment by our concepts, is a symptom of the postmodern condition.)

It would obviously be impossible in a short review to detail the contributions to the ongoing discussion of postmodernism made by all those whose work appears in this book. I do want, though, to comment briefly on some of the more interesting chapters.

Kurt A. Richardson's *Disorientations in Christian Belief: The Problem of Detraditionalization in the Postmodern Context* is uncompromising in its criticism of postmodernism, which Richardson terms "a movement embodying irresponsibility in any and every form." I find Richardson's assessment excessive, but it is articulate, reflective, and coherent—more than a pasted-together array of quotes from others.

Stan Grenz, a distinguished up-and-coming Baptist theologian, offers an informative overview of postmodernity that is more lighthearted than one might expect. The secret? Grenz's analogy between the modernity and postmodernity on the one hand and *Star Trek* and *Star Trek: The Next Generation* on the other. Grenz's suggestion, offered here and elsewhere, that a postmodern evangelical theology "must be focused on spirituality"—that *piety* be the defining characteristic of the new evangelicalism—has met with mixed responses (including criticism elsewhere in this volume).

The single best section in the volume may be the six chapters on hermeneutics. While the positions taken vary, clear, original, first-hand thinking is often in evidence. This is not to say, of course, that all of the arguments in this section are equally persuasive. Mark Seifrid's "The Pauline Gospel in a Postmodern Age" defends a Reformation-oriented interpretation of Paul against the more sociologically-focused positions of contemporary thinkers like James

Dunn and E. P. Sanders. Those who find the "new perspective on Paul" attractive may not agree with Seifrid in dismissing Krister Stendahl's claim that Luther's reading of Paul lies at the root of the neurotically introspective conscience of the West. But his stress on the importance of grace in Judaism is welcome, as is his insistence that we may too quickly read our own concerns with plurality, unity, and diversity into the Pauline materials. The reader who, like me, tends to find contemporary work on Paul not only historically fascinating but theologically and spiritually helpful may not wish to concur with Seifrid's judgments; but he is at any rate suggestive and thoughtful. Adventist readers will be interested to note that Southern Adventist University systematic theologian Norman Gulley is responsible for a chapter in this section entitled, "Reader-Response Theories in Postmodern Hermeneutics." It is good to see that Adventists, once shunned by evangelicals as by other Christians, have become increasingly welcome in evangelical conversations of various sorts. Dan Stiver's "The Uneasy Alliance between Evangelicalism and Postmodernism" is perhaps the best of the hermeneutics chapters. Stiver paints a positive picture of many postmodernists—while noting the diversity of positions that might claim to *be* postmodern—and suggests, appropriately, that Christianity has more to gain than to lose from the passing of the modern era. Stiver's essay is an excellent overview of the varieties of postmodernism and their theological availability.

Kathryn R. Ludwigson's "Postmodernism: A Declaration of Bankruptcy" may not fully take the measure of the postmodern challenge. Ludwigson—apparently the only woman among the contributors to this volume—rightly points to the unsustainability of a radical relativist position. But she assumes too readily, I think, that one can avoid relativism through an appeal to revealed absolutes without taking completely into account the challenge posed to all appeals to absolutes of any sort by the postmodern recognition of the situated, limited character, not only of *what* we know but of *how* we know. If the postmodern claim were only that we don't know very much, evangelicalism might reply by alluding to an inerrant Bible and Catholicism by trumpeting the claims of an infallible church—"Yes, we do *too* know the truth about God." But postmodernism calls into question the very processes by which we acquire knowledge, interpret experience, and validate our claims to truth.

The rise of postmodernity has obvious implications for Christian higher education, as thinkers including Nicholas Wolterstorff and George Marsden have appropriately noted. C. Richard Wells chooses to explore these implications indirectly through a splendid and informative appreciation of John Henry Newman, "Newman Revisited: The Idea of a University in Postmodern America." Wells's reflections on *Newman's Idea of a University* situated in the context of the growth of his life and thought, are enjoyable both as a resource for ongoing Christian deliberation about the educational task and as an exercise in the history of ideas.

Kelvin Jones suggests that a series of formal principles are employed in everyone's thinking and can be derived by a method akin to Kant's transcendental deduction. In "The Formal Foundation: Toward an Evangelical Epistemology in the Postmodern Context" Jones delineates these formal principles and argues that they can serve as the basis for a contemporary Christian apologetic conversation with the non-Christian world. It is open to question whether even transcendental

claims as limited as those Jones makes will be affirmed by people sensitive to the difficulty of successfully effecting a transcendental deduction of anything. Nonetheless, his proposal is intriguing, and might provide a bridge between modernist and postmodernist theological and apologetic positions.

James Emery White's "Evangelism in a Postmodern World" is a clearly-written delineation of the challenges faced by Christians who seek to communicate the good news of God's love in a postmodern world. Focusing on the cultural characteristics of those to whom we must communicate this good news today in Europe and North America, White suggests several characteristics our communication ought to exhibit. He does not highlight, as I wish he would, the opportunity offered by such encounters to grow and learn as well as to teach, and he does not question directly whether postmodernism might entail any theological revisions, but readers of this volume involved in the practice of evangelism will find many useful pointers toward an evangelistic style more suited to contemporary needs than many church planting and discipling methods currently in vogue. White's discussion might have been even more helpful had he highlighted how the capacity for dialogue about and involvement in the quest for appropriate social change might facilitate recruitment into the church. These concerns do receive some attention in the following chapter, Rick Gosnell's "Proclamation and the Postmodernist," which contains a variety of helpful insights. Gosnell's concern with dialogical models of preaching and evangelism that invite involvement and participation, as well as his awareness of the importance of stories, are especially welcome.

This book is valuable as an evangelical contribution to the theological discussion of post-modernism. For readers of *A USS* who might wish to explore the topic further, however, *The Challenge of Postmodernism* may not be the place to start. William C. Placher's *Unapologetic Theology: A Christian Voice in a Pluralistic Conversation* · remains the best general introduction to post-modernism from a Christian theological perspective; works by philosophers that traverse similar terrain include Richard Bernstein's *Beyond Objectivism and Relativism,* Jeffrey Stout's *The Flight from Authority* and *Ethics after Babel,* and Alasdair MacIntyre's work of the past decade and a half. This is not to downplay the distinctive contributions some essays in this volume surely make. But those interested in postmodernism will no doubt benefit from exposure to sources representing other perspectives as well.

La Sierra University   GARY CHARTIER
Riverside, CA 92515-8247

Dyck, Cornelius J., trans. and ed. *Spiritual Life in Anabaptism.* Scottdale, PA: Herald Press, 1995. 312 pp. $16.95.
Liechty, Daniel, trans. and ed. *Early Anabaptist Spirituality,* Classics of Western Spirituality. New York: Paulist Press, 1994. xxiii + 304 pp. Cloth, $29.95; paper, $19.95.

The stated purpose of these two books is to provide a collection of sixteenth-century Anabaptist writings which focus on the Christian spirituality of the

movement. The collections are intended to feed the spiritual needs of the reader as well as promote scholarship in the study of spirituality. These works also seem intended for classroom use. In English translation these collections join Walter Klaassen's *Anabaptism in Outline* and Williams and Mergal's volume in The Library of Christian Classics as standard classroom texts. As with Williams and Mergal, Liechty's collection consists of a few larger representative works. Though Dyck follows Klaassen's model of arranging shorter passages by subject, Dyck's passages tend to be longer than Klaassen's, including some complete texts of significant length. Both Liechty and Dyck provide substantial introductory comments which place the writings historically and theologically.

In translating, Liechty tends toward a rather even English reading, smoothing out rough and colloquial language, occasionally to the detriment of meaning. This is less apparent in Dyck's volume, probably because a substantial portion of the intended audience has some command of the source languages. Few of Liechty's readers would be able or interested in looking over the translator's shoulder. Another smoothing activity of Liechty is his removal of anti-Semitic and mysogynist comments in the original (cf. 281-282, nn. 11, 12). Admirable though his intentions may be, this would disqualify his volume for upper-level classrooms.

Dyck provides some selections which would be difficult to access otherwise. In particular he includes passages from the neglected Waterlanders, a liberal Dutch movement. The last chapter is devoted to a classic Waterlander text. In contrast, most of Liechty's passages are widely available in English. The value he adds is to be found in his endnotes, some of which are substantial and insightful.

An aspect of Christian spiritual life underrepresented in these volumes is that of the Lord's Supper. The issue of the Lord's Supper preceded baptism in the formation of the Swiss Anabaptist movement; it was basic to the Dutch Sacramentarians who prepared the way for the the Anabaptist explosion in the Low Countries, and remained an important aspect of Anabaptist spirituality. Of particular interest is the relationship between Christ's broken body and the sufferings of the persecuted Anabaptists. Also important are the interpretations of 1 Corinthians 10:15-17. Dyck's volume offers one Eucharist passage by Hans Schlaffer (204-207). In Liechty's collection is a paragraph from Peter Walpot's *Articles* (170-171).

One subject avoided by both of these volumes is the incarnation theory of Melchior Hoffman which was held by Dietrich Philips and Menno Simons, not to mention most Dutch Anabaptists. This theory is significant both in the theology of Dutch Anabaptism and in its spiritual life. However, because it is not orthodox and has been rejected by most modern Mennonites, it is often avoided, as in these volumes. Also avoided is pre-Münster eschatology. The long shadow of the Münster fiasco has almost erased eschatology from Anabaptist thought, including these two collections.

Neither of these two volumes is ideal as a classroom textbook, though either will complement another selection of texts admirably. Dyck's volume is clearly the better collection for study. For spiritual nourishment, it is up to each reader to decide which is best.

Madison, WI 53713 JAMES E. MILLER

Dyrness, William A. *Emerging Voices in Global Mission Theology*. Grand Rapids,
    MI: Zondervan, 1994. 255 pp. Paper, $14.99.

This Dyrness book follows his two earlier volumes on the same
theme—*Learning About Theology from the Third World*, and *Invitation to Cross-
Cultural Theology*. The author, who is Dean of the School of Theology at Fuller
Theological Seminary, designed this book to complement the two earlier works
and sees it as a source of theological reflection which illustrates the principles
taught in the earlier volumes.

The author begins by contrasting the early neglect evangelicals manifested
toward non-Western theology, with the encouragement which mainline Protestant
missionaries gave to initial stages of theological reflection in the countries that
they served. He encourages evangelicals to embrace the task of promoting and
developing theological reflection globally. This is needed, he argues, because
Christians in Asia, Africa, and Latin America now vastly outnumber Christians
in the West, and because Western theology itself needs these other theologians to
help bring about its own true theological maturation.

Dyrness proceeds to present the works of nine different writers. One author
comes from Eastern Europe, two from Latin America, and three each from Asia
and Africa. The selections, including a brief introduction to each geographic area,
average 26 pages in length. Each selection is self-contained with a proper
introduction and conclusion. No attempt is made to follow a particular theme
throughout the book. The book concludes with short vitae of the nine
contributors and Dyrness himself.

The diverseness of the nine essays appealed to me. One senses that the topics
were chosen by the authors and not artificially assigned by the editor of the book.
The writers care about their topics and write with a passion on what matters to
them in their particular context. Since the essays do not seem to be excerpted out
of some other longer work, one does not get the impression that one is hearing
only a part of the story and left wondering what part was missed. Each individual
essay hangs together and appears to be written especially for the book. The only
exception is the reflection on the Filipino situation by Evelyn Miranda Feliciano
(155).

Dyrness and Zondervan are to be applauded for beginning to introduce
evangelicals to the important topic of global Christian theology. Evangelicals have
a long way to go to reach the richness available through other sources, like Orbis
Press, which has published extensively in this area.

For ease of reference it would have helped to have the brief histories of the
contributors given as part of the introduction to their section. Given the quite
personal nature of much of the theology, more information about the authors
would have helped in relating to their essays and identifying with their situations.

In actuality I was disappointed by the lack of differentness I found in the
book. I was primed for freshness and a *real* encounter with another culture and its
related theology. Except for the African essays of Okorocha and Bediako, I felt the
essays lack real serious interchange between the Bible/Western theology and a
major non-Western culture. Volf from Eastern Europe, Balcomb from South
Africa, and Miranda-Feliciano, while relating to a specific historical situation in

their country, seem dated and localized by the very specificity in time of their references. Although I found the essays valuable, the kind of "aha" experience of suddenly seeing the Bible and theology through a new lens, which the first reading of Kosuke Koyama gave me, never came.

These limitations, however, should not stop the flow of books such as this. Evangelical Christians in the West need such volumes more than they know, probably even more than non-Western peoples need to write them. I urge Dyrness, Zondervan, and their allies to write and publish and not grow weary in well-doing. I also urge Western Christians caught in the strait jacket of a one-culture theology to read, learn, and watch their world grow.

Andrews University   JON L. DYBDAHL

Frend, William H. C.   *The Archaeology of Early Christianity. A History.*
    Minneapolis: Fortess Press, 1996. 412 pp. $39.00.

W.H.C. Frend seems to thrive on formidable literary projects. His magisterial, 1022-page tome, *The Rise of Christianity,* is now nicely complemented by this study, which details how much of the hard, archaeological evidence on the early church was first discovered. Professor Emeritus of Ecclesiastical History at the University of Glasgow, Frend is also well known for his *Martyrdom and Persecution in the Early Church,* as well as his monographs on Donatism and Monophysitism.

In this latest work, he charts the history of Christian archaeology from Helena, the mother of Constantine, and her search for the "true cross" in Jerusalem, to the latest twentieth-century discoveries. En route to the modern world, Frend exposes the roots of archaeological science in the Renaissance, the early field surveys by area travelers, the nationalistic impulses (starting with Napoleon) and theological biases that colored some of the methodology and results, and, in particular, the widespread regional successes of Christian archaeology in the Mediterranean lands, Western Europe, and even central Asia.

As in the case of "biblical archaeology," the expression "Christian archaeology" must be properly interpreted. It does *not* mean archaeology so slanted that the excavator searches for—and finds!—artifacts of only Christian interest. Scientific archaeology must aim solely for the subterranean truth—whatever the find. Nevertheless, the *area* of the dig will usually presume some specialized interest. One does not, for example, look for Aztec artifacts in Mesopotamia! Accordingly, there need be no apologia for "Christian archaeology" as such, especially in view of the numerous instances Frend cites of partiality at Christian *expense,* such as those excavators who demolished Christian strata in their hurry to reach classical levels.

How to structure this book must have been a problem for Frend. His approach, it seems, could have been topical or chronological, and he opted for the latter in his general arrangement. At times, I wish he would have chosen a topical structure instead. It would have been so convenient to learn *all* the history of Christian archaeology at a given area across 1700 years: Rome, for example, or Corinth, Philippi, Antioch, or Carthage. But that would have defeated the saga of

how archaeology in the individual areas responded to the general pressures in each era from Roman Catholic or Protestant apologetics, Western European nationalism and imperialism, or specific sponsorships. In this "areas vs. eras" dilemma, Frend probably chose the better way, even if this compels the reader to revisit familiar sites again and again to witness archaeological progress across the centuries.

To anyone well acquainted with biblical archaeology, Frend's reportage may at first seem somewhat unbalanced. Except for recent discoveries in Israel and Jordan, the "Holy Land" seems to get short shrift in these pages, and the great William Foxwell Albright, for example, is not even mentioned. It must, however, be immediately recalled that Frend's theme here is the archaeology of *early Christianity*, which is, of course, predominantly postbiblical.

As if to compensate for any such omission, Frend includes a *massive* amount of material on North African Christian archaeology, not only because Frend himself was active in digs there, but because the Christian West must never forget how powerful and active Christendom was in that area prior to the Muslim onslaught. The same, of course, applies to Asia Minor, whose Christian archaeology is also admirably reported in these pages.

The greatest finds in all the Mediterranean lands—and their finders—are well described in Frend's facile prose, as well as the most important Christian archaeological discoveries and discoverers in France, Germany, and England. The vignettes of the giants in the field are vivid, and the way they responded to the influences impinging on them from time and circumstance are memorable indeed. As indicated, various engines often drove archaeology in times yore: religious triumphalism ("Catholic" archaeology in the Roman catacombs to "prove" the claims of the Roman church or Protestant criticism to "disprove" them), German radical criticism that questioned everything, European nationalism that wanted to superimpose the flag over every find, or an aggressive neoclassicism that prioritized whatever was pagan over whatever was Christian.

Fortunately, most of this has been surmounted in current scientific archaeology, but Frend does identify one large cloud remaining on the horizon. "The main threat," he writes, "comes from the population explosion of the present century and the ever-expanding and destructive infrastructure needed to sustain it" (p. 387). When rivers are dammed or cities expand, ancient sites are destroyed, and international salvage projects have not always succeeded in rescuing them.

This appropriate warning is typical of the good sense that underlies all these pages. Once again, W.H.C. Frend has taken a broad topic, surveyed it with meticulous care for detail, and then presented it in a form that will engage any reader, lay or professional.

Western Michigan University   PAUL L. MAIER
Kalamazoo, MI 49008

Fuller, Daniel P. *The Unity of the Bible: Unfolding God's Plan for Humanity.* Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1992. 508 pp. $24.99.

The question of a center or many centers as a unifying theme for biblical theology has long been debated. It is in this context and from an evangelical

viewpoint, that Fuller writes another book about the subject. The purpose of the work is to facilitate the teaching of what Fuller calls "the whole Bible" to interested lay persons.

The unifying theme of the Bible for Fuller is the upholding of the glory of God, His name, and His mercy (xiv). This thesis can be seen most clearly in its relation to salvation history (reminiscent of the approach of Oscar Cullmann). Therefore Fuller divides his book into four parts, each one dealing with an aspect of salvation history. In Part 1, he finds a theological center in the promulgation of God's glory, a view that for him brings unity to the apparent diversity of the various genres of Scripture. Part 2 focuses on how God's glory is upheld through the plan of redemption. Part 3 demonstrates how God's name is glorified through His long interaction with Israel. Part 4 shows that Jesus Christ is the ultimate expression of the unifying theme of Scripture, the glory of God, His name, and His mercy.

Fuller's book has a number of strengths. First, he clearly emphasizes the unity that undergirds the Bible and its interpretation. This is especially relevant in an age where that truth has been eclipsed. Furthermore, his attempt to apply an inductive method of biblical study (106-110) to understand what its original writers were communicating is indeed a refreshing perspective. The assumption is that the Scriptures themselves, not external sources, must supply the data from which one interprets Scripture—a most timely emphasis. Finally, Fuller's concern for producing a readable book on the subject of the unity of the Scriptures so that lay persons as well as professionals can understand it and use it for apologetics makes this book a useful tool.

As one reads this book, one wonders whether or not the book should not be retitled for it seems to be more of a theology of justification than a book on the unity of Scripture. It appears that Fuller has allowed his presuppositions to provide an undergirding for his support of his thesis. For example, he states that he presupposes that the Bible is verbally inspired and inerrant (xvii) and then goes from there to say that one needs to prove a verbally-inspired Scripture, which is at best circular reasoning. Again, he seems to hold that one proves the supernatural intervention of God in this world by arguing from the implication that a natural event has a cause, and so the cause for the special status of Israel in God's eyes and in the world must be God's (supernatural) intervention, for it does not make sense to take it any other way (34). While this may make sense to the person who believes in God as a causative factor in human history, it does not prove it to one who starts at another point. Hence, the assumptions of Fuller's presuppositions may well mitigate the use of his work for apologetic purposes, which is ostensibly his reason for writing the book. Thus the work illustrates the danger of allowing one's presuppositions to determine the shape of one's understanding of doctrine.

Related to this, it seems that Fuller has not really engaged the Bible in the form of an inductive inquiry, i.e. allowing the text to determine his theology. Rather, he appears to do quite the opposite. Immediately following his introduction of the methodology he used in discovering the unifying center of Scripture (106-110), he moves right to an explanation of the Trinity rather than to the text of Genesis and its understanding of creation as that doctrine upholds God's glory, which is his stated purpose. Hence, his conclusions about Gen 2

appear to be colored more by his understanding of the Trinity than by the text
itself. It seems, then, that his view that God's glory is the unifying center of the
Bible is, perhaps, based more upon his theological presuppositions rather than
upon the inductive data originating in the text.

In spite of its weaknesses, Fuller has made an evangelical contribution to the
discussion of the unity of Scripture. Perhaps its lasting contribution may be the
very call to attempt to engage in inductive study when dealing with Scripture and
its attempt to emphasize the Bible's unity rather than its often-supposed disunity.

Southern College   BRUCE NORMAN
Collegedale, TN 37315

Geisler, Norman L. and Ralph E. MacKenzie. *Roman Catholics and Evangelicals:*
    Agreements and Differences. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 1995. 538 pp.
    Paper, $24.99.

Norman Geisler and Ralph MacKenzie have coauthored a book which
describes the theological agreements and differences between Roman Catholics and
Evangelicals. But, let me add quickly that this is not a book to refuel the doctrinal
controversies between the two traditions. Its purpose is quite the opposite.
Though conscious of real doctrinal differences, the authors intend "to examine
some of our common spiritual roots and see if we have any theological or moral
bridges upon which we both can travel" (15).

Conspicuous for the writing of this book is the March 1994 document signed
between Roman Catholics and Evangelicals, "Evangelicals and Catholics
Together." Although the authors wait until the last appendix of the book to
evaluate it, they articulate a positive and sincere doctrinal response in favor of this
document. Even in their candid, and sometimes blunt, expositions of the doctrinal
differences between the two traditions, they write with respect for and genuine
pathos toward Roman Catholics. Their aim is obviously to present the doctrinal
foundation on which these two groups of Christians can have a united voice "to
fight the forces of evil in our society and our world" (357).

The twenty chapters are divided into three parts. Part one, "Areas of
Doctrinal Agreement," presents eight doctrines shared by both traditions and
based upon "the creeds and confessions and councils of the Christian church of the
first five centuries" (17). The authors believe this doctrinal unity is essentially
Augustinian. Thus both traditions agree on the doctrine of Revelation and an
inspired and inerrant Scripture (chap. 1). They share the same basic orthodox view
of God and the Trinity (chap. 2), of human beings (chap. 3), and of Christ (chap.
4). In chapter 5, the authors discuss the common core of Augustinian beliefs in the
doctrine of salvation by grace. The agreements on the doctrine of the church
center around its foundation, nature, and function (chap. 6), and those on ethics
are rooted in the nature and will of God and his revelation to mankind (chap. 7).
Finally, both share common views about personal and cosmic eschatology (chap.
8).

Part two includes eight chapters which deal with areas of doctrinal
differences. These include the apocrypha (chap. 9), the infallible authority of

Scripture (chap. 10), the infallibility of the teaching magisterium of the church (chap. 11), the doctrine of justification by faith alone through Christ alone (chap. 12), the sacraments as a cause of grace (chap. 13), the visibility of the church and papal supremacy (chap. 14), mariology (chap. 15), and purgatory (chap. 16).

The third part is its culmination. Since Evangelicals and Roman Catholics have so much in common, as presented in part one, and, in spite of the significant doctrinal differences expounded upon in part two, the authors "believe that there are, nonetheless, many areas of common spiritual heritage and practical social and moral cooperation possible" (357). These areas include social action (chap. 17), educational goals (chap. 18), spiritual heritage (chap. 19), and evangelism (chap. 20).

The strengths of this book are obvious from the beginning. The authors, both Evangelicals, present to an Evangelical audience the official doctrinal beliefs of Roman Catholicism. This they skilfully do by referring to well-known Roman Catholic authorities whom they list in the footnote on p. 1. They also present a well-articulated and scholarly Protestant perspective on the same doctrines. Many Protestants will be surprised to learn of the Augustinian heritage of both traditions.

Some of the weaknesses are just as obvious. One occurs repeatedly in the section on agreements. While, for example, Geisler and MacKenzie attempt to show the Augustinian doctrinal agreement on salvation, they distance themselves for fear of sounding as if their understanding of salvation is too Catholic. They make sure their readers know that although there is an agreement on salvation by grace, there is in fact no agreement on how this salvation is granted to the individual. They even mention that Roman Catholics do not have the same understanding of salvation by grace as Protestants do (85-86). As these disclaimers are presented one begins to wonder to what extent there is a real doctrinal commonality between the two traditions. Are the authors so intently irenic that they stretch the doctrinal agreement? Such distancing occurs also in the chapters on the doctrines of revelation, human beings, ecclesiology, and eschatology.

The last section and, more particularly, the last chapter on cooperation in evangelism, raise some concerns. The authors give, as a good example of cooperation, the Billy Graham crusades in which Roman Catholic clergy participate. Many Evangelicals do not agree with their conviction on this matter. Thus one may ask: as Evangelicals, for whom are Geisler and MacKenzie speaking? Clearly not all Evangelicals. Also, when the authors describe the goodwill of Roman Catholics who desire to unite with Evangelicals in social cooperation, do they have in mind only Roman Catholics in the United States? It is well known that where Roman Catholics are the predominant religious group such goodwill does not always exist.

The intent of this book is therefore felt to be clearly political. The authors long for a reformation of the social climate in the United States and perceive that cooperation between Evangelicals and Roman Catholics could possibly realize this objective (357). One way of arguing in favor of such cooperation is to show that there are some doctrinal agreements between the two traditions.

Although this book is to be commended for its scholarship, another weakness occurs when statements are made that some Roman Catholics agree with the Protestant understanding of a doctrine and yet no reference is given to support

such an affirmation (for examples, see pp. 196 and 216).

    This work will appeal to those who are interested in ecumenical dialogue and the present state of relationships between Roman Catholics and Evangelicals. Geisler and MacKenzie have published an excellent work that will certainly have an impact on ecumenical trends in the United States. Yet one wonders if the two Jerusalem crosses at the top of every page will, in the end, convince Evangelicals and Roman Catholics that they have enough in common to become a political force for social change.

Andrews University   DENIS FORTIN

Grenz, Stanley J. *Theology for the Community of God.* Nashville, TN: Broadman & Holman Publishers, 1994. 560 pp. $29.99.

    In his book, *Theology for the Community of God*, Grenz breaks rank with traditional evangelical theology and engages in the kind of constructive, dialectical theology usually associated with mainstream liberal theology—while seeking to retain the declarative, authoritative voice that has marked evangelical theology in the past. This is a courageous undertaking. Unfortunately, I fear that Grenz has not succeeded. Nevertheless, I find his thesis provocative, despite the lack of logical rigor marshaled in its defense.

    Based on a deductive logic of divine sovereignty, evangelical theologians have traditionally assumed that since God cannot lie, and Scripture is inspired by God, the Bible must be free of all error. On this understanding of authority, the theologian functions as a taxonomist and curator, whose primary duty it is to collect and organize the "facts" of Scripture. The difficulty with this position lies not only in the fact that the narrative-like structure of Scripture resists compartmentalization into neatly drawn boxes, but, as Grenz emphasizes, this "concordance" or "propositionalist" approach fails to give adequate attention to the fact that "by its very nature theology is a contextual discipline" (8).

    But how can one speak with a declarative, evangelical "Thus saith the Lord!" if one allows that theological reflection arises out of particular biological, historical, and cultural contexts, all of which are open to distortion and sin? In a provocative thesis that reveals the author's indebtedness to Hegel by way of Wolfhart Pannenberg, Grenz proposes a relational, trinitarian theology which discovers in biblical faith God's program for bringing into being an emerging eschatological community of "reconciled people, living within a renewed creation, and enjoying the presence of their Redeemer" (30). In a word, because God is the trinity, a plurality in unity, life-in-community is the ontological ground of creaturely life (98). Despite appearances to the contrary, creation, insofar as it is the work of the triune God, is created for the enjoyment of its completion in God.

    The logic of this affirmation goes something like this: Because God is love, God is self-giving. Because God is self-giving, God willingly creates the world. But, "precisely because creation is God's loving act, it is free, voluntary, and non-necessary" (133). As a trinity of love, God is already complete without creation. Thus, creation possesses an autonomy that is its own. Yet insofar as it is created in accordance with the very essence of God—trinitarian love—"this counterpart

exists to be both the recipient of, and the mirror of divine love" (133). Thus Grenz
reaches the radical conclusion that all of creation is destined to return to God. Hell
exists neither as literal fires, nor as the extinction of evil. Rather, in a statement
that Grenz never teases out, hell is the dark side of God's love. "As the eternal
lover, God never withdraws his love from humankind, not even from those who
spurn him. . . . Yet in their alienation from the Lover [the unrighteous] experience
it in the form of wrath. . . . This is hell" (839).

The implications of this thesis for theology are profound. If revelation is
limited and even broken, this is as we might expect, since God never determines
creation but works through creation to bring it into conformity with its *telos*—life
in a community of love. If we have difficulty discovering in Jesus of Nazareth
evidence of his divine transcendence, but find only one who confesses his humble
dependence upon the Father, this is again what we should expect. The "filial
relationship of the Son to the Father as exhibited by Jesus of Nazareth constitutes
the paradigm for creation" (137). And, if we fear that creation is characterized by
a state of alienation and brokenness which undermines and destroys community,
the historical reality of the resurrection of Jesus, who is the embodiment of the
divine essence, stands as the guarantee of the end toward which all of creation is
directed. As the Lord of creation, Jesus in his life, death, and resurrection is the
revealed meaning of all creation (353).

Finally, if we seek empirical confirmation of the truth of these things, we can
find it in the church; for we "who were God's enemies now experience
community with him, because the Spirit has effected our new birth into the
Father's family as the brothers and sisters of the Son" (572). "The fellowship we
share with each other is not merely that of a common experience or a common
narrative, as important as these are. Our fellowship is nothing less than our
common participation in the divine communion between the Father and the Son
mediated by the Holy Spirit" (630). This is the beginning and end of all creation,
life-in-community with God.

As a thesis, I find Grenz's dynamic, trinitarian theology appealing. Still, the
task of theology is not simply to be suggestive but to provide explanation and
reason why Christian teaching is credible and therefore deserving of attention.
Unfortunately, Grenz's development of his thesis is weak. His work lacks the
logical rigor and consistency evident in first-rate theology. In the first place,
despite his advocation of narrative as the proper medium for writing theology,
particularly trinitarian theology, Grenz writes without a narrative breath within
him. Not only do each of the chapters begin with an encyclopedic tabloid of
propositions—hardly the way to begin a story—but the propositions end up
governing the development of the themes. The consequence is that *Theology for the
Community of God* reads like a gnostic codebook of theological esoterica. The
price paid for this approach is high. It forces Scripture into the dim background
of theological conversation, while at the same time cutting off from conversation
those who are unskilled in jargon of historical theological debates.

For example, in a theology built around the question of God's providential
leading of history, Grenz never discusses, as an identified issue, the problem of
human suffering and pain. Instead, the human dimensions of pain and suffering are
pushed into the background by a discussion of the historic categories of

providence, concurrence, and government and their proper definitions. Grenz's only answer to the problem of evil itself is the *assertion* that "despite appearance to the contrary, the world historical process is going somewhere. . . ," namely, "toward the establishment of community" (161). But this is the very proposition that is called into question by suffering and pain; therefore it must be defended, not simply asserted. To see how the implications of a trinitarian theology might be developed to offer a profound archeology of evil as well as a practical response to evil, the reader is advised to see Peter Hodgson's *God in History: Shapes of Freedom* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1989). One could wish that Grenz had provided from a conservative perspective what Hodgson has achieved from a liberal perspective.

Second, in his zeal to defend his own position, Grenz often resorts to straw-men arguments that fail to present opposing views in their strongest light. Again, a single example will have to suffice to illustrate a widespread problem. In his defense of the divinity of Jesus, Grenz appeals to Jesus' understanding of himself as the revelation of God and to the historical *facticity* of the resurrection. One might expect, therefore, that Grenz would address the challenge posed to such a line of argument by the recent work coming out of the Jesus Seminar. Yet nowhere does Grenz address the work of Burton Mack, Robert Funk, John Dominic Crossan, and others of the Jesus Seminar. Rather, he reiterates traditional apologetics used to support the historicity of the open tomb and the postresurrection appearances of Jesus to show that Jesus' body could not have been stolen, nor could Jesus have only swooned and then come forth as the Lord of history, nor could the appearance of Jesus be attributed to psychological hallucinations (335-336). Such arguments fail to address, however, the questions being asked today. Today's scholars are not asking about the possibility of the revivification of Jesus' body or about how many witnesses claimed to have seen the resurrection. Rather, they are asking about the intention of the biblical texts—which are seen as inventive stories of faith, rather than factual records. It is this challenge, then, that must be addressed by anyone claiming divinity for Jesus on the basis of his self-identity and resurrection, since the claims of the text must be in accord with the intention of the text, yet Grenz never addresses it.

Finally, and most troubling of all, is the definitional circularity that is replete throughout Grenz's argument. The example I offer is elicited as an illustration of a wider problem. Grenz, in a departure from traditional evangelical theology, defends a holistic anthropology that views human beings as a unity of body, mind, and spirit. The hope of eternal life is based, therefore, not on the immortal properties of the soul, but on the promise of resurrection in Christ (210-218, 776). Grenz goes even further to insist that this resurrection cannot be identified with the moment of death, since the Bible places "our individual entrance into eternity in the context of the one general resurrection" (768). Yet Grenz maintains that the righteous dead are conscious of happenings on the earth in an intermediate state between death and the resurrection. In an odd categorical mistake, Grenz claims that since the righteous dead are with God, and God is in eternity, the righteous dead have passed from time to eternity, and therefore perceive the world as God perceives it (777). Now certainly no such conclusion can be drawn from the fact that the righteous are "kept with God unto the resurrection" (776). It is logical to

assume that "the dead sense no gap between death and the resurrection," insofar as time stops for the dead and eternity begins with the resurrection. But simply because one is surrounded and held fast in the love of the eternal God is not a reason to deduce that the righteous are conscious—especially if human beings are psychosomatic unities as Grenz claims.

In the end, this reviewer wonders whether evangelical scholars such as Grenz can retain their distinctive identity as evangelicals and engage in the dialectics of mainstream theology. I fear that the rules for engagement in mainstream theology inherently erode the authoritative foundation of evangelical faith, since mainstream theology is conducted in a public forum that prohibits all forms of special pleading for one's own case. Arguments stand or fall on the basis of their ability to withstand criticism, not on the basis of appeal to some established authority. Ostensibly, Grenz engages mainstream theology on its own terms, yet time and again he resorts to assertion, apologetics, and definitional solutions to make his claims. As a consequence, I fear that Grenz has introduced his evangelical readers to the set of problems that dominate mainstream theology—such as questions of cultural relativity, origins, the historicity of Jesus, human anthropology, and eschatological disconfirmation—without offering an adequate response from within evangelicalism to answer these problems. Still, insofar as *Theology for the Community of God* draws attention to the paradox of creating an authoritative/dialogical theology, it is crucial reading for any evangelical who is interested in the future of her or his tradition.

Walla Walla College   GLEN GREENWALT
College Place, WA 99324

Gustafson, David A. *Lutherans in Crisis: The Question of Identity in the American Republic.* Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993. 176 pp. Paper, $15.00.

Mauss, Armand L. *The Angel and the Beehive: The Mormon Struggle with Assimilation.* Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 1994. 296 pp. Cloth, $29.95.

Every church in every age has had to face the challenge and threat of assimilation. Will it maintain its identity or assimilate to the larger culture? is the question forced upon it. That question was particularly urgent for minority groups in nineteenth-century America.

While the new nation had within it the drive for freedom, individualization, and social/religious pluralism, it also harbored the paradoxical drive for homogenization. The drive toward homogenization lay in part in the young nation's sense of millennial mission to the world. Written into the fabric of American institutions was the desire to "Americanize" those who were different or "too different" from the mainstream, whether the differences be those of language, ethnicity, or religion.

Protestantism of an evangelical sort lay at the heart of the nation's unofficial religious establishment. And those groups outside the Methodist/Puritan Protestant lineage felt subtle and not-so-subtle pressures to conform.

Two recent books from widely different religious groups have taken up this

theme. One group originates from outside the American context while the other is "homegrown." The first is the Lutheran community, which not only brought variations in language and culture with it from the old world, but also "foreign" ideas about religion and the church. The second group is the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, who, even though indigenous, had enough peculiar religious ideas to make the Mormons significantly different from mainline Protestant evangelicalism.

Both the Lutherans and the Mormons struggled with the tension between maintaining their unique identity and assimilation to the larger culture. The history of their struggles is important to all communions because the tension is not theirs alone. Even though the exact forms that the struggle took in those two churches may have been unique to their experience, there is much that can be learned from their experience by those outside their orientation.

David Gustafson's volume presents the Lutheran version of the assimilation/identity struggle. The American Lutheran controversy extended from 1849 to 1867, and Gustafson's study is the first complete account of this crucial aspect in the development of Lutheranism in the United States.

The struggle took place along four axes set forth by majority Protestantism· (1) a vehement anti-Catholicism, (2) a strong individualism that emphasized the right of private judgment in matters of biblical interpretation and doctrine, (3) the necessity of a personal conversion experience, and (4) a symbolic (Zwinglian) orientation toward the sacraments. The American party favored a Lutheranism tailored to the religious climate of the United States, while the confessional party (which arose in the middle of the nineteenth century as a counter movement to assimilation tendencies) sought to maintain traditional Lutheran perspectives and identity in the new nation.

Gustafson points out that while the confessional movement did much to arrest the drive toward assimilation, it did not settle the issue for all time. As he puts it, "any church that seeks to remain true to its history and confessions and yet respond to contemporary problems could have an identity crisis" (170). Thus the debate regarding the form Lutheranism should take in America is not finished, but that debate, argues *Lutherans in Crisis*, can learn much from the American Lutheran controversy of the mid-nineteenth century.

Armand L. Mauss in *The Angel and the Beehive* faces the same dynamic as did Gustafson, but he does so through a quantitative/sociological (rather than historical) methodology. Beyond differences in methodology, this book focuses on the twentieth century rather than the nineteenth.

Mauss points out that the Mormons have been an American success story as far as assimilation is concerned. By the middle of the twentieth century the Saints had largely achieved churchly respectability. But, contrary to theoretical predictions, the assimilation process has not continued apace in the second half of the century. To the contrary, claims Mauss, "in many ways the past few decades have witnessed an increasing reaction of the Mormons against their own successful assimilation, as though trying to recover some of the cultural tension and special identity associated with their earlier 'sect-like' history" (x). It is that surprising reactionary mentality that Mauss explores in his book.

Mauss sees in the reaction to undifferentiating assimilation a maturity for

Mormonism that was not present until recently. By defining the limits of assimilation as well as the minimal spiritual core of what it means to be Mormon, the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints is now ready to replicate the process on a world-wide basis.

The two books examined in this review are helpful to all those interested not only in the religious traditions that they treat, but, more importantly, in the dynamics of assimilation versus identity. Thus their insights are of value to students of both religious and secular culture.

Andrews University   GEORGE R. KNIGHT

Hebblethwaite, Peter. *The Next Pope*. New York: HarperCollins, 1995. 186 pp. $20.00.

In this behind-the-scenes look at the forces that will choose the successor of John Paul II and decide, to quite an extent, the future of the Roman Catholic Church, Peter Hebblethwaite reveals the intricate and often politicized process by which the college of cardinals will choose one of their own as the next pope.

As John Paul II, having survived an assassination attempt and serious illnesses, is in the eighteenth year of his pontificate, a billion Roman Catholics and millions of others around the world cannot help but wonder who will succeed the most-traveled and most widely-known Roman pontiff in history.

The pope himself has recently revised the way his successor will be elected. While faithful to a long-established tradition, he has fine-tuned papal election procedures that Pope Paul VI instituted in 1975. Among other things, John Paul II has ordered improved secrecy measures, secluding the cardinal electors to a new compound built specifically for the election. He has reasserted the controversial rule set in 1970 barring cardinals more than 80 years old from participating in the conclave. He has also reiterated a series of solemn oaths that those who attend papal elections must take, never to reveal any details of the proceedings. The Sistine Chapel, where the conclaves are held, will be swept for listening devices and recording instruments. Some voting procedures have been eliminated, reinforcing the secret ballot. The pope offered no explanation, however, as to why he decided to alter the rules governing a deadlocked conclave. If, after four balloting sessions and a two-thirds-plus-one majority, the cardinals have failed to elect a pope, they could abandon the procedure by a simple majority approval instead of a unanimous agreement. At that point, a new pontiff could be elected with a simple majority. This could have substantial effect on the next election.

An expert on Roman Catholic affairs, a papal biographer and confidant to some of his church's key leaders, Peter Hebblethwaite was probably the scholar best suited to analyze the new discipline and to reflect on the next papal conclave. He died December 18, 1994 while the book was being printed. One can only be sorry that he was unable to write a biography of the current pope as he did of both John XXIII and Paul VI.

This is a short book, but none of it is extraneous or repetitious. It is fascinating reading and, if I am not mistaken, nothing like it yet exists. With the keen eye of an expert historian, the author begins with a sketch of the conclave

process and recent changes in papal instructions. He then outlines landmark features from papal elections of the past two centuries and the lessons one can draw from them. One chapter deals with the election of Karol Wojtyla and his pontificate as John Paul II, particularly in relation to the Second Vatican Council and certain key encyclicals.

By far the most intriguing sections of the book are Hebblethwaite's speculations about who is or is not *papabile* and why. Readers will be surprised, pleased, and worried by the candidates put forth. He also examines the issues that will most likely influence the next conclave's decisions, including the cardinals' nationalities, the alienation of theologians, and the ordination of women.

The result is an engaging and informative account of the mystery-shrouded process in which some 120 cardinals, literally sealed off from the rest of the world, will elect the 265th pontiff.

Whether such a study is premature of not is debatable. Yet thinking Roman Catholics and millions of others ought to be considering the directions that the Roman Catholic Church could take in the third millennium. Hebblethwaite states: "A conclave is a moment of freedom, a chance for the church to make a fresh start" (172). Reading this book should assist one in facing, discussing, and evaluating the next papal election more knowledgeably.

Andrews University   RAOUL DEDEREN

Isichei, Elizabeth. *A History of Christianity in Africa.* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans; London: SPCK, 1995. xl + 410 pp. Paper, $19.90.

This new book on the history of Christianity in Africa is a remarkable achievement. In just over 400 pages the author succeeds in giving a well-organized, well-researched, and well-written account of the history of Christianity on the entire African continent, from antiquity to the present. The material is presented chronologically and regionally. The first chapter sketches the birth and development of the church in North Africa, Egypt, Nubia, and Ethiopia, and the near-eclipse of the church in the Maghrib. Except for Egypt and Ethiopia, it was not until ca. 1500 that any further African church history can be reported. Thus the second chapter deals with the "Churches of the Middle Years" and covers the period of 1500-1800, while the third chapter describes the outburst of missionary activity in the nineteenth century. This is followed by a few chapters which, in more detail, sketch the developments in Southern Africa, East and East-Central Africa, and West Africa until ca. 1900. Chapters 7 and 8 focus on West-Central Africa and North Africa, but take the reader beyond the *terminus ad quem* of the preceding chapters to more recent times. Chapters 9, 10, and 11 bring the reader back to Southern Africa, East and East-Central Africa, and West Africa and cover the 1900-1960 period. This is followed by a final chapter about post-1960 developments. The thirteen maps are extremely helpful.

Most African church history has been written by non-Africans and has tended to emphasize the role of mission organizations and mission churches. Having lived and worked in different regions of Africa for 16 years, Elizabeth Isichei has by and large succeeded in avoiding this unfortunate bias. Her observations about

missionary achievements, and also about the shortcomings of many missionary endeavors, give praise where praise is due, but also remind us of some missionary methods and philosophies which in retrospect are cause for embarrassment rather than pride. Quite correctly the book emphasizes the enormously important role of African evangelists or "missionaries."

If any part of the book must be singled out for its superb quality, it is possibly the treatment of the post-1948 period in South Africa (chap. 11).

No doubt the author has tried hard to maintain a balance in her treatment of the various periods, the different regions, and the large number of organizations, churches, and currents. That she has not fully succeeded could only be expected, considering the complexity of the topic. Nonetheless, I venture to suggest that the earliest phase of African Christianity should perhaps have been dealt with a little more extensively. Also, I feel that some areas (Nigeria, East Africa) have received more than a fair share of attention, whereas the Francophone and Lusophone areas have been underreported. The same is true for the work of the church in the large cities.

The author is to be commended for the even-handed treatment of Roman Catholicism and Protestantism, and for the attention she has given to "African" Christianity as manifested in the independent churches. But when referring to the spread of Protestant Christianity over the African continent, she has not shown the same impartiality: the traditional ("mainline") churches and their mission outreach receive the bulk of her attention, while other Protestant mission organizations and churches are mostly only mentioned in passing (if at all). And where they are mentioned, there is at times some confusion on the part of the author. How else would one explain the greater attention for the role of the Plymouth Brethren and the Watchtower Society, than, for example, for the Seventh-day Adventists and the Pentecostals? And to classify the Wycliffe Bible Translators among the "extreme right wing" of Protestantism is clearly an injustice (336). It might also be added in this connection that the reference to the influence of the American "New Religious Right" on the African Continent betrays a lack of familiarity with the American religious scene (335ff).

A History of Christianity in Africa offers a wealth of information. One could argue, however, that the reader would not have lost much if fewer facts and names had been mentioned, and a number of themes had been more fully developed. Some fascinating questions remain unanswered. Just to mention three of these: 1. How must it be explained that Christianity disappeared from the Maghrib and Nubia, while persisting in Egypt and Ethiopia? Recently this problem has received considerable attention from missiologists, and a somewhat detailed answer to this question would have been welcome. 2. The book repeatedly points out that African women have been much more open to the Christian message than African men. Why is this the case? The problem is stated but no attempt is made to answer it. 3. Christianity has been extremely successful in Africa. Often it has been suggested that the traditional African religions provided the fertile soil in which the Christian plant could grow. Unfortunately, once again the author does not attempt any explanation.

Although the text of the book is enriched by many endnotes, a separate bibliography would have been helpful. It is clear that Elizabeth Isichei is

acquainted with most relevant literature. At times one may wonder why a particular source has not been referred to. One such example is her failure to mention the outstanding (published) dissertation about the life and work of Jacobus Capitein (David Nii Anum Kpobi, *Mission in Chains*. Zoetermeer, 1993), when she briefly discusses the fascinating life story of this 18th-century Dutch-trained Ghanian theologian. Much more mysterious is the fact that she only once refers to Adrian Hastings' works on the history of the church in Africa. His recent masterpiece (*The Church in Africa, 1450-1950*; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994) was probably too late to have been incorporated in Mrs. Isichei's research, but that was certainly not the case with his earlier work (*A History of African Christianity, 1950-1975*; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979).

However, in spite of some weaknesses, *A History of Christianity in Africa* is an excellent book and is to be highly recommended, not only for readers who want to be initiated into the subject, but also for those who already have a solid background in this area.

St. Albans, UK   REINDER BRUINSMA

Kern, Kathleen. *We Are the Pharisees*. Scottdale, PA: Herald Press, 1995. 160 pp.. Paper, $9.95.

Kathleen Kern proposes to do two thing in this small volume. Initially she intended to alert the reader that the Pharisees "had gotten a bad rap historically"(11), and that Jesus' criticisms of that group are in reality criticisms of us. Ultimately, she hopes the book will facilitate better relations between Christians and Jews.

In chapter 1, "We are the Pharisees," she proposes five reason why we need a better understanding of the Pharisees. First, by studying centuries of Jewish culture before the time of Jesus, we understand more clearly how the New Testament came into being, and thus grasp God's revelation in it. Second, all Pharisees are not alike. Not all are guilty of our stereotypical rigidity, legalism, self-righteousness, and pride. Third, the harsh words of Jesus are not only relevant to a Jewish sect of the first century, but also to us. Fourth, the words of Jesus have been used as anti-Semitic propaganda to hurt and destroy, instead of to help and empower others. And fifth, historic Anabaptist churches can find in their own history parallels to the Pharisees that can help them be more loving and humane in dealing with Jews.

The next six chapters flesh out the above reasons. Chapters 2 through 4 are historical or biblical; chapters 5 through 7 focus on application. In the first of the historical chapters, "First-Century Palestine," a birds-eye view of the background of the Pharisees within Judaism is given. The next two chapters analyze the biblical portrayal of the Pharisees. Chapter 3, "The Overlooked Pharisees," constitutes a positive look at them, while Chapter 4 studies "Negative Accounts of Pharisees in the Gospels."

Chapter 5 sets forth "How Jesus' Critique of the Pharisees Applies to Us." In this chapter, Kern admits that the comparisons between Jesus' accusations against

the Pharisees and the contemporary North American religious scene will not always be exact, but does demonstrate striking applications at the personal, congregational, national, and global levels.

A summary of "Christendom's Persecution of the Jews" is presented in chapter 6. Kern recounts how, particularly over the past millennium, well-educated, well-meaning Christians have used the Pharisee passages in the New Testament to justify anti-Semitism, murder, and the Holocaust. Possibly surprising to the reader will be the blatant anti-Semitism in Kenneth Taylor's paraphrase, *The Living Bible*, from which she presents numerous examples (122-126). She argues that texts like this fuel anti-Semitism.

The final chapter of the book presents what is probably Kern's deepest goal in writing this book. "Toward Humility and Dialogue" particularly addresses her own denomination. She calls for dialogue and understanding between Mennonites and Jews who have shared a similar history of persecution.

The volume is good. Yet some things bother me. For example, she states that the information on first-century Palestine which she presents in chapter 2 is "hypothetical and based on the conjectures of scholars" (25), because the material we have available is relatively skimpy. There is some truth to this observation; but the lack of qualification is distressing. The tools and methodologies of archaeologists and biblical social scientists allow us to be more accurate in our assessments and conclusions than previous biblical scholars were able to be.

Again, although she gives an excellent treatment of negative accounts of Pharisees in chapter 4, chapter 3 represents a strained attempt to find positive attitudes toward the Pharisees in the Gospels. It is certainly true that in Paul's Philippians (3:4-7) statement and in several places in Acts such an assessment is valid (as she more than adequately shows). However, to infer from the Gospel account (especially John) that Pharisees are presented in a positive light is to do injustice to those texts as well as to the author's intent.

Chapter 5 is worth the price of the volume. It is a chapter that probes, prods, and challenges us. Kern shows that "most human beings, Christian and otherwise, possess the same weaknesses for which Jesus criticized that Pharisees" (102). But she goes further. First, in focusing directly on her Mennonite denomination, she gives examples of its traditional exclusivity and church-discipline positions (85-86)—a pointed challenge that not many of us would have the fortitude to make. Second, many good contemporary Pharisees/Christians will be chagrined at her global illustrations. For example, she points to the contradiction in U.S. government policy regarding Haitian refugees versus Cuban refugees (87). Such exclusivity makes us also the target of Jesus' remarks.

Finally, the reader will be impressed with the list of questions for discussion given at the end of each chapter. They are for the most part insightful questions that can aid in the personal internalizing of the subject and the issues. They are also useful as icebreakers for small group discussions, or for extrapolating from the text to the contemporary church.

Kathleen Kern sets out "to help readers identify with the humanity of the Pharisees. In doing so," she says, "we can easily identify with the humanity of their spiritual descendants" (137). In spite of the few shortcomings of the book, Ms. Kern has accomplished her goal. Our understanding of the Pharisees, Christian-

Jewish relations, and the battle against anti-Semitism, has taken another step forward.

Walla Walla College   PEDRITO U. MAYNARD-REID
College Place, WA 99324

Knight, George R. *The Fat Lady and the Kingdom: Adventist Mission Confronts the Challenges of Institutionalism and Secularization.* Boise, ID: Pacific Press Publishing Association, 1995. 175 pp. Paper, $ 11.99

In this challenging book, best-selling Adventist author George R. Knight pleads with the Seventh-day Adventist Church (which he currently serves as a professor of church history at the SDA Theological Seminary) to be frank about its past, critical about its present success, and open to change as it considers its future. The main thesis of the book is that Adventism is in danger of losing its mission focus as it uses more and more of its resources and energy to keep its bureaucracy alive and to maintain its numerous institutions. The author admits that the title could be understood in terms of sexist stereotypes, but feels that this is a small price to pay for the clear parabolic message it offers: The woman, a prominent NT symbol for the church—and by extension for the Seventh-day Adventist denomination—has "increasingly gained her identity through the size, number, variety, and quality of her packages [institutions and programs]," with the final result that she cannot enter the door to the Kingdom unless she lets go of these "packages"—something she is extremely loath to do (16). Knight suggest that the Adventist Church has taken on the role of "furthering the mission of semi-autonomous institutions," while these institutions should in fact have the primary purpose of furthering the mission of the church (17).

All chapters of the book have been previously published as articles in various Adventist journals or books or have been delivered as formal papers. Although this causes some discontinuity in style, this has not seriously affected the flow of the argument. The ten chapters are arranged in four main sections. Section I deals with "The Threat of the Present versus the Challenge of the Future." Section II focuses on "The Shape of Adventist Mission," while the next section studies "The Relation of Institutions and Lifestyle to Mission." The final section is entitled "Adventist Futures in Relation to Adventist Pasts."

In his analysis of present-day Adventism, Knight utilizes David Moberg's model of the five stages in the life cycle of a church. According to this model, church organizations go through five distinct stages: (1) Incipient organization; (2) Formal organization; (3) Maximum efficiency; (4) Institutionalism; and (5) Disintegration. Knight suggests that the Adventist Church, at least in the "first world," is on the brink between stages 3 and 4. This may be true for North America, but from the perspective of this reviewer, who lives in Europe, it would seem that in some countries the church already shows evidences of entering stage 5.

Throughout the book the author insists that the Adventist Church must deal with two problem areas. First, it must redirect its energies. Traditionally, the Adventist "missiological quadrilateral" has consisted of the publishing, medical, educational, and conference aspects of the denomination's work" (81). Knight does

not argue that this fundamental pattern needs to be changed, but insists that it must be retuned so that the church will regain its missiological effectiveness. Too many institutions and organizational entities have become ends in themselves and hardly, or not at all, contribute to the mission of the church.

Secondly, there is the matter of standards. Chapter 8 explains by what various ways Adventists arrived at their standards, and how even today the formation of standards continues largely on an "ad hoc" basis. The church must do better in relating its standards and values to the present-day cultural context, and must avoid the peril of "ghettoization" as well as that of "uncritical assimilation" (125).

The final and possibly the most insightful chapter explores the dilemma the SDA Church has to come to terms with: How credible is its proclamation of an imminent Parousia after more than 150 years? How can modern Adventism retain its prophetic vision and clear sense of mission? Some Adventists live in a past-oriented intellectual and/or social ghetto (158). This approach must be rejected just as decisively as another "dysfunctional" approach which is totally fixated on the future. But Knight adds that an exclusive focus on the present, in a search for relevance, is also not enough. Relevance needs rootage. At the same time Adventism cannot survive without a clear apocalyptic understanding. The Adventist Church, therefore, needs to be relevant, but is must be so within "the framework of the continuum of the past and the future" (158).

George Knight's view of what is happening in his church to a large extent coincides with that of this reviewer. I concur that the recent Global Mission initiative (76f) is a promising attempt to shift more of the church's resources and attention to mission outreach, in particular in areas where the church has not been active before. But Knight fails to signal how this "fresh" outreach model has already fallen victim to immense bureaucratization and institutionalization.

Finally, although Knight warns his readers that this book does not offer a "full-blown set of remedies" (8), his suggestions towards such a remedy are disappointingly meager. It is to be hoped that future publications will remove this disappointment.

St. Albans, UK REINDER BRUINSMA

McGrath, Alister E., ed. *The Christian Theology Reader.* Cambridge, MA: Blackwell, 1995. xxiv + 422 pp. Paper, $21.95.

Alister McGrath has published this *Christian Theology Reader* as a companion book to his *Christian Theology: An Introduction* which, because of limitations of space, did not include many citations from original texts. The *Reader* is divided into ten chapters following the same broad thematic presentation as found in the *Introduction* but can be used as a resource on its own. It contains 280 seminal texts of Christian theology, drawn from 161 different theologians or sources representing significant landmarks in Christian thinking on various doctrines.

Characterizing this *Reader* as "a general introduction to the great tradition of doing theology within a Christian context," McGrath, who is research professor of systematic theology at Regent College, Vancouver, B.C., has attempted to choose texts that are characteristic, intellectually and chronologically, of two

thousand years of Christian theology. "The texts have been chosen on the basis of the known needs of those studying Christian theology at seminary, college, or university level" (xviii).

The *Reader* is particularly helpful as a textbook and is very user-friendly with its introductory sections on how to approach the readings and use the book. Each chapter includes study panels listing various readings relevant to a doctrine or theological theme and study questions to further facilitate reflection and thinking. Each text has an explanation about its context and key features, and alerts the reader as to what to look for in it. At the end of the book, one finds brief biographical sketches and details about the theologians and Church documents cited in the *Reader*, a glossary of theological terms, and suggestions for further readings.

Although McGrath did not want the readers to think that the omission of a theologian from the *Reader* is to "be understood to imply that this theologian has made an insignificant contribution to the development of Christian theology" (xviii-xix), his omissions of Arminian/Wesleyan thinking on grace and salvation, and of Augustine on the church and eschatology, are great weaknesses which, it is to be hoped, will be corrected in the next edition. Furthermore, the introductions and contexts of some brief texts are so short that the reader is sometimes left to wonder about the larger context of the authors' thoughts and the relevance of such texts in the *Reader*. Here also later editions could correct these deficiencies.

Yet, in spite of these weaknesses, this *Christian Theology Reader* is an excellent textbook, one that will encourage further study into the development of Christian theology.

Andrews University   DENIS FORTIN

Miller, Stephen B. *Daniel.* The New American Bible Commentary: An Exegetical and Theological Exposition of Holy Scripture, vol. 18. Nashville: Broadman and Holman, 1994. 576 pp. $27.99.

Stephen Miller has written a very readable commentary on the Book of Daniel. It is based upon presuppositions which are in harmony with the more conservative branches of Protestantism, while at the same time showing a fair and thoughtful attitude to other points of view. The author does not make dogmatic claims for most of his positions, but looks at the alternatives suggested by other authors and states his own preference with reasons.

The Editor's Preface mentions that the New American Commentary series is built upon the "full authority of the Bible," taking it as divinely inspired and inerrant. This stance indicates where Miller stands on many critical issues concerning the book of Daniel. Even those who may disagree with his presuppositions will respect the documentation of sources and the caution of the author's stated views.

The conservative approach is quickly apparent in the extensive introductory section. There is a lengthy discussion of the dating of the book with a careful analysis of each piece of evidence (24-43). The author rejects the Maccabean

hypothesis and argues on the basis of many different evidences that Daniel was the original author. Miller cites the paucity of Greek terms in the Book of Daniel as an argument against a mid-second-century B.C. origin (30).

A very refreshing aspect of the commentary is its spiritual tone. This is achieved particularly by observations and modern applications which are given at the close of each chapter. In addition the overview of theological emphases (50-51) is insightful, but could have been made more forceful by emphasizing that the issues in Daniel are grand and eternal. Daniel focuses on God's vindication of his people, and on ultimate issues concerning truth and its opposers.

Miller's prophetic interpretation emerges as futurist, but this is not at first obvious. The following are samples of his interpretations with brief reactions to them. In Dan 2 he shows some uncertainty before opting for an "eschatological ten-kingdom confederacy" preceding the second advent (99). The stone is interpreted as the kingdom of Christ, but is seen as "an earthly, future (millennial) kingdom of Christ that will continue into the eternal state" (100). (I might present a different view. Various references such as John 14:1-3 and 1 Thess 4:16, 17; together with Rev 20 and 21 imply a rescue of the righteous from this earth and a heavenly millennium to be followed by the descent of the saints and the New Jerusalem to earth.)

Jesus' statement in Mark 1:15 can be seen as endorsing the year-day principle of prophetic interpretation as he indicated the closing of the 69th week of Daniel's prophecy (9:25-26) at the time of his baptism. Miller is ambivalent on this. He does see the relevance of the decree of Artaxerxes I in 458 or 457 B.C. as the commencement of the seventy weeks (sevens) of Dan 9:25, with its culmination in about A.D. 26 [or A.D. 27] (263, 266, 258). He refers to this as "an amazing fulfillment of prophecy" (266). However, Miller relegates the seventieth week to the end of history and sees it as involving the final persecution by the Antichrist (258, 271). A rather literal translation of Dan 9:27 (in the light of vv. 25-26) can be seen as describing the work of the Messiah (ending the sacrificial system with his own death in the midst of the 70th week, probably in 31 A.D.) as well as a judgment on the "abomination of desolation" (cf. KJV and NASB).

Miller correctly identifies the "Little Horn" of Dan 7 as the "Antichrist," in parallel with descriptions of this power in 2 Thess 2:3; Rev 13:1-8; and 1 John 2:18 (213). However, this is explained as a last-day power persecuting the saints for the first half of his total seven-year career (215). Thus the "three and a half times" (1260 days, etc.) are taken as completely literal. In fact, Miller sees the "abomination of desolation" power opposing God, etc., as Antiochus IV in Dan 11:31, but in Dan 12:11 he sees it as the future Antichrist predicted as still future by Christ himself in Matt 24:15 (35).

Apart from the theological interpretations, there are few negative aspects. The work could be enhanced by an alphabetized list of authors and sources cited in the text and footnotes. A comprehensive bibliography (in addition to the helpful list of abbreviations for the "sources commonly used" which is given prior to the table of contents) would also assist further study. Typos are remarkably few, but there is a sequence of three dates on page 95 which are given as "B.C.," but which should be "A.D."

This commentary makes interesting reading and is well-informed on a

spectrum of views. A good acquaintance with archaeological literature enabled the author to give excellent support for some of his interpretations. Use of the NIV as the basic translation for this commentary is also in its favor as an up-to-date reference work. The author seems to have deliberately chosen to make this commentary appealing and understandable to a wide cross section of readers.

Southwestern Adventist University   LLOYD WILLIS
Keene, TX 76059

Moessner, Jeanne Stevenson, ed. *Through the Eyes of Women: Insights for Pastoral Care.* Augsburg Fortress: Minneapolis, MN: Augsburg Fortress, 1996. 333 pp. Paper, $21.00.

The pastoral-care issues for women in the Christian church have long held an interest in the heart of Jeanne Stevenson Moessner, editor of *Through the Eyes of Women.* Earlier she coedited *Women in Travail and Transition: A New Pastoral Care* (Fortress, 1991). A member of the American Association of Pastoral Counselors, Ms. Stevenson teaches pastoral care at Columbia Theological Seminary in Decatur, Georgia. Joining the editor are eighteen contributors (Carolyn Stahl Bohler, Ph.D., Paula Buford, M.Div., Th.D. cand., Barbara J. Clarke, Ph.D., Pamela Couture, M.Div., Ph.D., Jane E. Dasher, M.Div., Beth Ann Estock, M.Div., Brita L. Gill-Austern, M.Div., Ph.D., Miriam Anne Glover-Wetherington, Kathleen J. Greider, Ph.D., Irene Henderson, Dipl. Theology, Emma J. Justes, Sister Elizabeth Liebert, SNJM, Ph.D., Joretta L. Marshall, Bonnie J. Miller-McLemore, Ph.D., Martha Bowman Robbins, Th.D., Letty M. Russell, Carroll Saussy, Ph.D., Teresa E. Snorton, Th.M., S. Amelia Stinson-Wesley) who jointly seek to understand pastoral care from the perspective of advocacy for women. These women, who serve as pastors, pastoral counselors, clinical pastoral education supervisors, and academics, attempt to facilitate the reader's understanding of women's needs. They view women, not as victims, but as part of a human web of relationships which make up culture and society both outside and within the church.

The editor speaks of the gift of new insight often gained in visiting a foreign country. Pastoral care offered by predominantly male care-givers often resembles the efforts of a new missionary in a foreign culture. Unless people's needs are understood within their own context it is difficult to offer care that is appropriately helpful. Jeanne Stevenson Moessner and the other contributors help the reader to look into and through the eyes of women to gain new insights for pastoral care. They also seek to provide a mirror for care-givers, that they might be aware of how their work is influenced by assumptions and traditional practice.

The integrity of this volume is greatly strengthened by the joint effort of professional women working together. Each is experienced within her area of ministry. Each offers insights gained through both being a woman and ministering to women. While each could have individually written such a volume as this, they offer a more powerful contribution through working together and listening to one another over a period of four years. Each presents a credible bibliography specific

to the issue she addresses.

Through the Eyes of Women contains three parts. The authors in part one expand the reader's view of the individual to a larger perspective; to understanding the person-in-relationship. They look at (women's) intrapersonal tension between caring for others and caring for self and then move outward to offer suggestions for care within contexts of gender, race, and individualistic society.

Part two deals with specific issues that affect women and seeks to offer insights for pastoral care, insights that grow out of these specific issues. The authors suggest that the church is the appropriate place to examine anger and its relationship to one's faith and spirituality. They invite the reader to look at the possibilities of aggression and/or militancy being a positive or constructive force for justice. The significance of body issues is addressed in chapters on sexual identity, rape, mastectomy, and hysterectomy. To minister to the whole person it is vital to listen to the questions raised, the feelings that must be dealt with in the face of loss—loss of breast or womb through surgery, loss of sexual identity, or loss of personhood through rape.

The concluding portion of *Through the Eyes of Women* looks at "Visions of Home." Being at home with oneself enables one to move from individuality into community, into the body of Christ. It is there that one learns how to love—both others and oneself.

I began reading this book expecting to find affirmation of what I already knew of women's needs. I was quickly confronted with awareness of my own needs to learn and understand. I have recently been drawn into the fellowship of a Black congregation. Being Caucasian and confident of my personal lack of prejudice, I was immediately confronted with awareness that "lack of prejudice" does not equal "feeling at home." I was totally surprised at my discomfort even while being warmly welcomed. I soon realized that even my womanhood did not give me an inside track for ministry to my new sisters. Reading Teresa Snorton's chapter entitled "The Legacy of the African-American Matriarch" provided much-needed understanding both of the women who are becoming my friends and of my own naivete concerning cross-cultural pastoral care.

Even in my womanhood, I found new insights for care of self and others in every chapter of *Through the Eyes of Women*. I realized that bias exists within every human heart whether we know it or not. I'm quite certain that I was asked to review this book primarily because I am a woman trained for ministry. Some might read this review and think it biased by my own gender. My hope is that bias will not deter anyone from reading this work. While addressing the issues of women, it has made me more attentive to the issues of men as well. Though they may be different, they are no less important for pastoral care.

This book can be of great value for anyone who seeks to minister as Jesus did; who desires to interact with women and men in a way of empowerment and healing. Our church, any church, would be blessed if both men and women who find themselves in roles of Christian leadership would read this book with open heart and searching mind. "This collaborative work is designed to encourage church leaders, to better equip pastoral counselors, to inform lay leaders, and to serve as a textbook in pastoral care courses" (3). It would also be useful for Christian health-care providers to better understand the spiritual connotations of

the physical needs that they seek to treat. The authors of *Through the Eyes of Women* are to be appreciated for their useful work.

Buchanan, MI 49107   DELCY KUHLMAN

Moore, David George. *The Battle for Hell.* Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1995. 118 pp. Cloth, $28.00.

Moore's book *The Battle for Hell* is an honest and good contribution to the ongoing debate in the evangelical church regarding the final destiny of the lost. In it the author is passionately fighting for the reality of eternal hell. Consequently, his strong bias is too obvious not to influence his evaluation of the sources. The leading part throughout this study and the ever-present question is no doubt: "is belief in eternal conscious hell biblical and necessary for true, evangelical faith?" The author's definitively positive response to this is the book's thesis.

Moore begins methodologically in the first chapter by defining key terms and then surveying some deviating evangelical scholars on the question of hell. Chapter 2 concentrates on the objections which these evangelical critics, of whom Clark H. Pinnock is the most notable, raise in regard to eternal hell as opposed to the biblical teaching (as they see it) of annihilation. Next, Moore evaluates a number of relevant and not-so-relevant biblical texts, in light of the viewpoints of the progressive evangelicals. He then discusses God's justice and Greek philosophy in regard to the notion of hell. Chapters 3 and 4 address the "emotional struggles" and other implications that are naturally fruits of the teaching of eternal hell. In the fifth and last chapter the author deals with his "own personal struggles" with the delicate issue of hell.

The rich source material reflected in the endnotes and bibliography is the strength of this study. The author makes massive reference to his evangelical counterparts; about one third of the book's main body is in the endnotes. The 17 pages of bibliography, of which 14-15 pages directly pertain to individual eschatology, provide an extensive source background for Moore's book.

The author's direct equation of hell and eternal torment throughout this study is extremely unfortunate. The reader easily gets the impression that Pinnock, Stott, and other evangelical critics of the traditional hell teaching do not believe in the punishment of the wicked, in which most of them of course do. The author, moreover, claims that one has to believe in hell as opposed to annihilation in order to be biblically orthodox; thus, hell and annihilation are incorrectly set up as diametrical opposites.

Moore does not solve the dilemma of whether Pinnock, Stott, and others of their persuasion still are to be regarded as evangelicals or not; the combination of their recognized intellect, general faithfulness to the Bible, and invaluable scholarly contribution to the evangelical world may be the reason for the author's ambivalence and hesitance. No doubt, Moore is touching a sensitive and vulnerable nerve in current evangelicalism. An increasing number of evangelicals, influenced by progressive scholars such as Pinnock and Stott, tend to depart from belief in eternal conscious punishment of the lost. Thus, it is expedient that the issue is being addressed—in this sense Moore is faithful to his theological heritage.

From a strictly conservative evangelical point of view Moore's book is a reasonably good defense of the traditional understanding of hell. From a theological and biblical point of view, however, this book lacks much. First of all, it offers only a very narrow treatment of the rich biblical teaching on the destiny of the lost. Scores of the classic biblical texts supporting the annihilation notion were strangely ignored. Furthermore, LeRoy Froom's standard two-volume encyclopedic work on the history of belief in conditional immortality (*The Conditionalist Faith of Our Fathers*—an essential source for Moore's evangelical opponents), was totally ignored except for mention in the bibliography.

A number of formulaic blunders such as (1) "the burden of proof rests upon the annihilationist" (17); (2) "all people truly deserve [to be tormented for all eternity]" (28); and (3) the claim that groups which believe in annihilation "have not launched great missionary enterprises" (67), show quite a bit of spiritual arrogance and in some instances poor scholarship. Despite this and the obvious disharmony between the size (118 pages) and the price ($28), the book has value in that it provides a good update on the present debate about hell among the evangelicals, and a good starting point for anyone who wishes to pursue Pinnock's theological struggle with the concept of hell.

Berrien Springs, Michigan   KENNETH JORGENSEN

Muller, Richard A. *Post-Reformation Reformed Dogmatics.* Vol. 2, *Holy Scripture: The Cognitive Foundation of Theology.* Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1993. $24.99.

The interpretation of the development of Reformation and post-Reformation theology has been much debated. One of the major discussions asks whether or not Reformation and post-Reformation theology constituted a radical break with medieval thinking, particularly in regard to *sola scriptura* and its implications for the interplay between the tradition and Scripture in dogmatics. It is within the confines of this debate that Richard Muller has written his book, *Post-Reformation Reformed Dogmatics.*

Muller's thesis is that the movement of Protestant theology from the Reformation to its "high orthodoxy" of the seventeenth century is neither a radical alteration of perspective, a distortion of previously held theological viewpoints, nor a purely continuous development of earlier theology. Rather, Reformation and post-Reformation theology represents a path which has both continuities and discontinuities with later medieval theology (45, 40). The major difference between medieval and Protestant theology is not due to dissimilar theological positions so much as it is found in an altered hermeneutical/exegetical situation.

Muller attempts to demonstrate his position first by examining the history of the doctrine of Scripture in medieval and Protestant traditions. His main thrust is that the issues of the authority and inspiration of Scripture, so important for Protestant orthodoxy, had their roots in the discussions of the medieval doctors, hence providing a continuity between the two. In part two, Muller discusses the various specific aspects of the doctrine of Scripture, again comparing the two eras, demonstrating how they both had similar interests. In this section, however,

Muller also points out some dissimilarities between post-Reformed orthodoxy and medieval thought. These are brought about, in his opinion, because of the movement in post-Reformed orthodoxy away from the *quadriga* of medieval practice towards a more literal exegesis through the use of the original languages and scientific/historical exegetical methodology.

Muller most certainly reminds one that the development of Reformation theology is far from the monolithic endeavor that it is sometimes assumed to be. Indeed, he has demonstrated that dogmatic positions are not usually independent developments that make a radical break with what was held in the past but an evolution of thought from the perspective of a different set of questions that are raised because of advancing knowledge of the world and of God's revelation. Hence, there is both continuity and discontinuity with the past. The former gives the Christian faith stability in that it is connected with past revelation and the understanding of that revelation by the church in terms of an orthodox belief system. The latter prevents the stagnation of Christian belief into a rigid traditionalism and orthodoxy that resists the unfolding revelation of truth, fossilizes Christian dogmatics, and thus makes it irrelevant to the changing world that it must evangelize.

While Muller's position appears to be fundamentally sound, his radical separation of the theological and historical tasks of understanding the development of Reformed dogma (4) creates a tension in his own work. First, he has ably proven that the theological developments of the Reformed view of Scripture are closely connected with its historical development. Second, if theology and historical development are to be radically separated, then there may be no need for the discipline of historical theology, calling into question the whole purpose for his work. The work could have been strengthened by the addition of a scriptural index, a subject index, and a bibliography.

In retrospect, Muller has most certainly produced a work on the history of the Reformers' doctrine of scripture that is informative and helpful in understanding the maze of theological developments that took place in this important theological locus. Two major strengths of the work are the voluminous references to the original works of the Reformation and post-Reformation, and the thesis that dogmatics must have stability (continuity with the past) and yet not become static (discontinuous with the past) so that it may remain relevant and open to new understandings of revealed truth.

Southern Adventist University   BRUCE NORMAN
Collegedale, TN 37315

Muraoka, T. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint: Twelve Prophets*. Louvain: Peeters, 1993. xxii + 257 pp. ca. $65.00.

When the first volume of *A Greek Lexicon of the Septuagint* prepared by Lust, et al., was published in 1992, it was the first of its kind in over 170 years (see *AUSS*, 31 [Autumn 1993] 249-251). Now we have another volume by the same name. As it happens, they are a study in contrasts.

There are two principal approaches to Septuagint (LXX) lexicography: translator's intent, and reading as a Greek document. Ironically, Lust and his

confrères chose the former approach, while Muraoka chose—and argues for—the latter. Thus, while not ignoring the (putative) Hebrew original, he focuses on "what sense a reader in the last few centuries before the turn of the era who was ignorant of Hebrew or Aramaic might have made of the translation" (viii). Consequently, he includes in the scope the witness of the daughter translations and the Greek patristic commentaries.

Given the decision to publish this as a pilot project, the choice of the Minor Prophets (MPs) is easily defended. First, Muraoka decided to work only with a Göttingen text. Thus the Pentateuch was not considered, since at that time Wevers had not yet completed publishing the text. Second, the consensus is that the MPs are the product of one translator, and hence a coherent corpus. Third, since the scope of vocabulary is limited, it was possible to undertake a fully-fledged lexicon.

When it comes to word meaning, there are again two approaches: translation equivalents, commonly known as glosses; and definitions. Muraoka opts for the latter approach. For instance, בית is typically translated as οἶκος and glossed as "house." In this lexicon there are four definitions: "1. Building for dwelling, 2. Family, 3. Group of people descended from and named after prominent ancestor, 4. Community of residents in a certain locality" (167).

Modern lexical theory and practice have made significant inroads on just how a lexicon is prepared. Since Louw and Nida arranged their lexicon (P. Louw and A. Nida, *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament*, 2 vols. [New York, 1988]) around semantic domains, it is relevant to mention that Muraoka has chosen the traditional alphabetical ordering of the entries.

There are 2,018 entries in the volume. Where the use of a word is coextensive with the occurrence(s) in the MPs, the lexicon entry is complete for that word. In those instances where words occur in the MPs and infrequently beyond that, and all of the witnesses are available in the Göttingen edition, all of the uses are cited.

Each entry has four main sections. First, the headword is listed including relevant morphology for verbs. Next comes the main body of the entry where the sense of the word is defined and its usage described. Third, where appropriate, groups of words semantically associated with the headword are listed, along with relevant bibliography. In the final section the relationship between the LXX and the original Hebrew is explored. This work is based on Hatch and Redpath, although for subsequent work the evidence is in the process of revision.

I suspect the volume was typeset rather than prepared camera-ready on a computer. The layout presents well, and the various Greek typefaces are a joy to read, something that seems to be decreasingly true of Greek texts in general. Unfortunately, as with the Lust volume, typographical errors abound in the Introduction, causing one to wonder about the rest of the volume. However, subsequent use and study have not turned up any in the body of the lexicon.

This volume, then, is a useful beginning and harbinger of a valuable tool, should the complete work ever see the light of day. On the other hand, I would hope that this volume be *sui generis*, that no other partial lexicons, such as for the Pentateuch, be attempted short of the final goal.

Loma Linda University
Loma Linda, CA 92354   BERNARD TAYLOR

Musvosvi, Joel Nobel. *Vengeance in the Apocalypse.* Andrews University
    Seminary Doctoral Dissertation Series, vol. 17. Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews
    University Press, 1993. ix + 305 pp. $19.99.

Joel Musvosvi has chosen to deal with a topic that is not well understood and
provokes diverse responses, but he deals with it very sensitively and biblically. The
subject of God's vengeance in Scripture is often approached with certain
presuppositions regarding how God should or should not conduct himself, given
his character and nature. There is a tendency to define vengeance in
anthropomorphic terms which preclude viewing it as an act of God. Yet Musvosvi
looks carefully at the biblical evidence without beginning with such
presuppositions, and he finds that vengeance plays an important role in the
covenant relationship which God has with his people, in which God is the
protector of his people, exercising judgment against their enemies. Thus God's
vengeance has a positive role, rather than the negative role which some have
ascribed to it.

Musvosvi begins by looking at the biblical and Near Eastern backgrounds to
the concept of vengeance. He finds that in the Ancient Near East vengeance was
an important part of suzerainty treaties. The suzerain had a responsibility not only
to protect his subjects, but also to punish those who violated the treaty (46). A
similar function is ascribed to Yahweh in the OT covenant with Israel. Yahweh
acts with vengeance against those outsiders who oppress his covenant community,
and he acts with wrath against those within the community who violate the
covenant (99). Vengeance refers primarily to his acts of judgment in which at th'
same time he delivers and vindicates his people and punishes their oppressors (109)
"Vengeance is, therefore, a balanced revelation of both mercy and justice" (75)

In the imprecatory psalms, some of the most difficult texts to deal with
theologically, Musvosvi concludes that "imprecations and vengeance are not
anthropocentric but theocentric" (96), revealing the divine perspective to human
cries for justice and judgment. Further, in the prophets, when Israel rejoices at the
punishment of their enemies, such rejoicing is based not on the intensity of the
suffering of the enemy but on the mighty acts of their covenant Lord, who has
prevailed and upheld his covenant promises (111). The chief concern is the
upholding of Yahweh's honor as righteous judge and covenant-keeping sovereign
(115, 120). "To attack the covenant community is to attack that community's
Lord" (121). Noting the reversals between the saints and the earthly powers in
Daniel, Musvosvi points out God's role: "God as Judge passes a verdict which
reverses the judgment of earthly courts and in the process vindicates his loyal
subjects. This is at the core of the Biblical concept of vengeance" (125).

In addition to the OT evidence, Musvosvi also considers the extrabiblical and
NT evidence outside of Revelation. He finds no departure from the OT concept
that vengeance is a divine prerogative based on the obligations God incurs under
the covenant as protector and vindicator of his covenant community (130, 134-35,
143, 147). "Jesus did not do away with biblical vengeance" (137) in the Gospels.
"Jesus and the Apostles emphasized the need for moral/spiritual preparation for
the end-time vengeance" (146).

Persecution and suffering provide the context for the call for vengeance and vindication, Musvosvi demonstrates in his third chapter. Specifically, in the book of Revelation, persecution is the experience to be expected by the church, following the experience of their Lord, the martyr *par excellence* (175). God is portrayed in Revelation as the Sovereign Lord who hears from his sanctuary the cries of his covenant people and promises to bring vindication for them and judgment against their persecutors. The sanctuary is the place of sacrifice, and it is also the place from which vindication and judgment proceed (186-88). It is, indeed, the locus of the covenant relationship. It is not surprising, then, that the appeal for vengeance in Rev 6:10 "is to be understood in the light of the covenant motif, addressed to God as *despotēs*, the absolute ruler who can bring redress and justice for his abused and mistreated vassal servants (216). The accusation of justice will be taken as a lawsuit to court, where the just Judge will render a verdict in favor of those who have been treated unjustly and against those who have abused them (225-232, 248).

To simply render a verdict, however, would not ensure that justice was done (237). Therefore, the vindication is accompanied by restoration, and the condemnation, by punishment (255).

The dissertation is well written, despite a lot of mechanical errors. It is incisive and easy to read. It follows a logical progression of thought and covers most of the questions that would be raised in the discussion. The exegetical portion in chapter 4 is very well done, bringing from the text many insightful ideas that clarify the issues. I would highly recommend this volume to any reader who has an interest in the question of theodicy, especially pastors who have to deal with the practical questions raised by the experiences of their parishioners in regard to suffering, injustice, and God's responsibility.

Adventist International Institute							EDWIN E. REYNOLDS
of Advanced Studies
Silang, Cavite, Philippines

Nilson, Jon. *Nothing Beyond the Necessary: Roman Catholicism and the Ecumenical Future.* New York: Paulist Press, 1995. 105 pp. $7.95.

Jon Nilson, professor of theology at Loyola University of Chicago, has written this book on ecumenism to stimulate creativity and courage in Roman Catholic leaders. He challenges them to put into action their commitment to church unity. The author believes the ecumenical impact of the Second Vatican Council has slowed down and current ecumenical dialogues are stalled, producing an "ecumenical winter." To young theologians and church leaders, ecumenism seems to be "very old and unexciting news" (v). Although the ecumenical movement is irreversible, it needs new vigor. To rejuvenate it, Nilson offers to church leaders a simple solution drawn from Acts 15:28, "impose no burden beyond what is necessary."

In his first chapter, Nilson asserts that Christianity is ready for coalescing. Even though ecumenism is low on the churches' agendas, Christians are growing together and coming into one body. But the problem with modern ecumenism is

that bilateral dialogues produce statements of agreement that are rarely understood by the laity. These agreements are not working and Catholicism remains aloof, offering only symbolic gestures. What ecumenism really needs, according to Nilson, is a shared sacramental life that will ultimately bring about Church unity.

Chapters 2 and 3 are the theological foundation on which Nilson believes the future of Roman Catholic ecumenism lies. He maintains that unity is actually possible on the basis of Karl Rahner and Heinrich Fries' 1983 *Unity of the Churches. An Actual Possibility*. Their theses 1 and 2 "set forth the only basis on which the unity of the churches is realistically conceivable in our socio-cultural situation. . . . If we do not build unity on this foundation, let us at least be honest enough to declare that our unity . . . is impossible" (25). For Nilson, the Second Vatican Council Decree on Ecumenism, *Unitatis Redintegratio*, gives enough evidences to support the Rahner-Fries theses as a solid foundation for church unity. His purpose is therefore to creatively reassess the ecumenical implications of these theses.

In chapter 4, the author believes the time has come for the Catholic Church to tangibly show that it supports ecumenism. Roman Catholics and all Christians seeking unity should ask themselves what they are willing to abandon or surrender for the sake of unity. Based on *Unitatis Redintegratio*, Nilson says the Catholic Church agrees that there may come a time when deficiencies in conduct, in church discipline, or even in the formulation of doctrine might be appropriately rectified. He believes the time has now come for such initiatives. He argues that the "hierarchy of truths" concept should be clarified (66-73), that unity must be enacted in developing and implementing cooperative liturgical and sacramental programs in an atmosphere of mutual accountability (74-79), and that the doctrine of papal primacy, its meaning and limits, must be reexamined (81-89). Furthermore, Pope Leo XIII's judgment on Anglican orders should also be reexamined and no more Anglican priests be reordained in the Roman Catholic Church (90). Nilson affirms that these initiatives on the part of Catholic leaders would demonstrate that the Church is committed to unity and not only to dialogue.

Yet how far will Roman Catholicism go in its commitment to church unity? Perhaps Pope John Paul II's 1995 encyclical On Commitment to Ecumenism, *Ut Unum Sint*, is the answer to Nilson's query. While he reaffirms many ecumenical principles first articulated in *Unitatis Redintegratio* and also refers to Acts 15:28 (78), Pope John Paul still maintains an ecumenism of return to full fellowship with Roman Catholicism (11, 14, 86, 97) and that full doctrinal unity must precede a unified sacramental life (77, 78). Furthermore, contrary to the Rahner-Fries' theses and to Nilson's hope, the church will not accept doctrinal reductionism as a basis for Church unity (18, 36). However, on the positive side and agreeing with Nilson, this encyclical opens the door to a fresh reexamination of the papal primacy (88-96).

Although this book brings creativity and new perspectives into ecumenical discussions, it does not really bring any new thought. If Nilson's suggestions were followed we could perhaps see some visible unifications of churches with Roman Catholicism. Many Christian churches are waiting to see this kind of opening on the part of Rome in order to engage in further dialogue with it. But it is doubtful

that Rome will agree to follow Nilson's recommendations. One gets the distinct impression from *Ut Unum Sint* that the dawn of "spring" is not in the near future, at least not according to Nilson's prognostics.

Andrews University   DENIS FORTIN

Oberman, Heiko A. *The Reformation: Roots and Ramifications*. Translated by
    Alan Colin Gaw. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1994; Grand Rapids, MI:
    Eerdmans, 1994. xv + 234 pp. Paper, $29.99.

Ever since the publication of his *A Harvest of Medieval Theology* in 1963, Heiko Oberman has commanded attention as a scholar whose major interest bridges the gap between the religious thought of the sixteenth-century Protestant Reformers and that of their medieval precursors. Although a few years ago he produced what I consider one of the most significant one-volume biographical treatments of Martin Luther (see my review in *AUSS* 29 ([1991], 272-274), his most recent major publication prior to the present one bears a title which suggests Oberman's earlier and more general emphasis, *The Dawn of the Reformation* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark; and Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1992). That volume of essays, which in some ways sets the stage for the present one, was not reviewed in *AUSS*. I would here simply state that it provides a breadth of treatment that goes far beyond what its title implies, and could well be read in conjunction with the present smaller book.

The Reformation: Roots and Ramifications is a collection of ten of Oberman's published articles in German which were first gathered into book form in 1985 under the title *Die Reformation. Von Wittenberg nach Genf* (Göttingen: Vanderhoeck and Ruprecht, 1985). In noting his purpose for this compilation, Oberman has stated, "In the past I have concentrated primarily on the transition from medieval to early modern Europe, and on the unmistakable identity of the Reformation when it is seen from the perspective of the later Middle Ages. This volume, however, follows the winding path of the Reformation from Wittenberg through the southern German cities, south to Zurich, and then on to Geneva [this explains the German subtitle's specificity as compared to that of the English edition]. These essays, first published between 1966 [the date should be 1967] and 1984 . . . are not organized here by the dates of their publication or conception, but according to historical and chronological criteria" (xi). This plan of organization has been well chosen and makes the volume more cohesive and readable than it might otherwise have been.

The chapter titles in the volume are as follows: 1, "The Reformation: The Quest for the Historical Luther" (1-21); 2, "Martin Luther: Forerunner of the Reformation" (23-52); 3, "Martin Luther: Between the Middle Ages and Modern Times" (53-75); 4, "The Meaning of Mysticism from Meister Eckhart to Martin Luther" (77-90); 5, *"Wir sein Pettler. Hoc est verum*. Covenant and Grace in the Theology of the Middle Ages and Reformation" (91-115); 6, "Wittenberg's War on Two Fronts: What Happened in 1518 and Why" (117-148); 7, "From Protest to Confession: The *Confessio Augustina* as a Critical Test of True Ecumenism" (149-166); 8, "Truth and Fiction: The Reformation in the Light of the *Confutatio*" (167-

182); 9, "Zwingli's Reformation between Success and Failure" (183-199) and 10, "One Epoch—Three Reformations" (201-220).

The foregoing chapter titles indicate that the major emphasis of this volume is on Luther and the German Reformation. A reading of the chapters (or even a glance at the subtitles within the chapters) further reveals that in spite of Oberman's stated intent, as quoted above, this volume does contain a fair amount of material dealing with the Protestant Reformation as viewed from the perspective of the later Middle Ages. That such is the case is not bad, of course, but it does make certain material reiterative of what Oberman had already published earlier in book form or in other articles. For instance, the section on Gregory of Rimini unavoidably duplicates, albeit in a different manner, material which Oberman published in 1975 in *Luther and the Dawn of the Modern Era* (see my review in *RQ* 39 [1976]: 395-400) and *The Dawn of the Reformation* mentioned above. There is overlap, as well, with information set forth in Oberman's Luther biography, also noted above. Nevertheless, the chapters in this present volume do contain much information and many insights unique to them; furthermore, a number of readers who are unacquainted with the original German version of the articles will undoubtedly find this very-readable English translation informative indeed.

The final chapter of the book deserves special mention in view of the fact that its provocative title, "One Epoch—Three Reformations" may seem enigmatic. In essence, what Oberman does in this chapter is first, to discuss the Protestant Reformation as a "theological revolution" that must also be broadened to take into account social and political factors; second, to describe what he calls "Three Disguised Reformations"; and third, to give further attention to the aspects of reformation among "the refugees" and "deportees." The so-called "Disguised Reformations" are (1) the conciliar movement, (2) the "emancipation of the urban bourgeoisie and the establishment of urban elites" who came to have increased religiopolitical power and functions (the "priesthood of everyone eligible to serve on the council was the disguised revolution carried out by the Reformation at Zurich" [212]), and (3), the "universalization" that became characteristic of Calvin's reform movement in Geneva (as contrasted with the "localization" in Zurich).

Again, as in his previous publications, Oberman has made available to us not only a considerable amount of significant information but also a multitude of his characteristically keen insights. His *The Reformation: Roots and Ramifications* is a volume well worth reading (and well worth the somewhat steep price). Three indexes conclude the volume: "Index of Persons" (223-225), "Index of Modern Authors" (227-229), and "Index Verborum Latinarum" (231-232).

Andrews University   KENNETH A. STRAND

Paroschi, Wilson. *Critica Textual do Novo Testament* [Textual Criticism of the New Testament]. São Paulo, Brazil: Sociedade Religiosa Edições Vida Nova, 1993. 248 pp. n.p.

This book is a pioneer work in the field of NT textual criticism in South America. It provides a concise introduction to the history of transmission of the

NT text, and to the theory of textual criticism, including the criteria used to establish the original reading. The author leads the readers through the steps involved in the evaluation of variant readings by analyzing several difficult texts. The book is well documented and provides appendixes containing 4 graphs, 17 plates of manuscripts, papyrus, and NT editions.

Berrien Springs, MI 49103   JOAQUIM AZEVEDO

Saldarini, Anthony J. *Matthew's Christian-Jewish Community*. Chicago Studies in the History of Judaism. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1997. 326 pp. $42.00.

Stanton, Graham N. *A Gospel for A New People: Studies in Matthew*. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1992; Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox, 1993. xiv + 424 pp. $21.00.

Saldarini presents here the fullest application yet of sociological methods to the Gospel of Matthew. Other notable forays using this approach in Matthean studies include J. Andrew Overman's *Matthew's Gospel and Formative Judaism*, and the essays coming out of the conference on "The Social History of the Matthean Community in Roman Syria" held at Southern Methodist University and reported in *Social History of the Matthean Community: Cross-Disciplinary Approaches*, edited by David Balch and including an essay by Saldarini. In Matthew's Christian-Jewish community, as well as that earlier essay, Saldarini applies sociological studies of deviance, particularly those of Nachman Ben-Yehuda in *Deviance and Moral Boundaries*, and Kai Erikson (which he consistently misspells as Ericson) in *Wayward Puritans*.

It is on this point that Saldarini's thesis stands or falls. While his use of a sociological approach is clearly the most appealing and intriguing feature of Saldarini's work, it also represents its greatest weakness. Saldarini does not quite avoid the danger of importing something from the twentieth century into his reading of this first-century document. His approach invalidates the native's (in this case, Matthew's) self-description. For surely the implication of passages such as 1:21; 16:18-19; 21:43; and 23:13 is that the Matthean community is a distinct entity.

Saldarini's insistence on deviant groups being an essential and integral part of a society raises some interesting questions. First of all, which society? Roman? Jewish? This aspect of deviance theory depends on the notion of society as a closed group. That may be the case for seventeenth-century Puritans, but it cannot be so for Matthew's relation to Jewish groups in Roman Antioch. While Jewish groups must play some role in the larger Roman society, did Jewish society constitute a closed environment? Then there is the further problem of determining when a group would become a distinct sociological entity. Saldarini doesn't give any clear criteria for determining this. If Matthew's group is no longer associated with the synagogue (Saldarini doesn't specify whether they withdrew or were expelled) and has its own leadership and structure (including discipline), in what way is it not a separate and distinct entity? Saldarini has a point when he argues that it acts like a deviant group in recruiting members, but it is not clear that Matthew's group

recruits solely, or even primarily, from the synagogue of its former membership. Rather, 28:18-20 gives evidence that their focus has long moved beyond that.

Related to this last point is Saldarini's failure to provide any definition of the terms "Christian" or "Jewish." He simply argues that our reading of the Gospel is colored by second-century divisions. But if the characteristics that distinguish a group as Christian as opposed to Jewish are present in Matthew's community then what sense does Saldarini's argument make? Many studies point to Christology as a decisive factor in the "partings of the ways." Saldarini claims that Matthew's Jesus fits within the range of debate in contemporary Judaism. But here I think Graham Stanton has the better argument.

Saldarini's discussion of the variety of groups present in first-century Judaism cannot be faulted. But if Judaism is so diverse with no clear dominant group, in what way does it make sense to call Matthew's group deviant? Deviance only applies when you have a firmly entrenched power structure, but from Saldarini's account no such structure was yet in place. "The rabbis gained influence and then power in Palestinian society only gradually over several centuries. . . . Various groups maneuvered for power" (13). Even if Matthew's is one of these groups in competition for dominance, deviance theory would still not seem applicable.

Stanton's volume is a collection of fifteen studies with an introduction and conclusion. Nine of them have been published or presented previously (the list in the introduction is in error; chap. 7, "Christology and the Parting of the Ways," was delivered at the Second Durham-Tübingen Research Symposium on Earliest Christianity and Judaism, in September 1989 at the University of Durham and published with the other papers in *Jews and Christians: The Parting of the Ways A.D. 70 to 135* [Tübingen: Mohr, 1992]). The essays are divided into three sections. "Part I: Methods New and Old" includes three studies using in turn, redaction criticism, literary criticism, and sociological perspective. "Part II: The Parting of the Ways" contains seven chapters dealing "directly or indirectly" with the separation between Matthew's Christian community and Judaism. Stanton, as opposed to Saldarini, is convinced (I believe correctly) that "church" and "synagogue" had parted company. "Part III: Studies in Matthew" is a miscellaneous collection of other studies on the Gospel ranging from two essays on the Sermon on the Mount (including a critique of Betz's theory), a discussion of passages where Stanton feels the author has created sayings of Jesus, and Matthew's use of the Old Testament, to a study of the use of Matthew 11:28-30 in liturgies and its relation to Sir 51. In the latter, Stanton takes on Suggs' identification of Jesus with Sophia. Stanton groups these studies together to argue his thesis that "Matthew wrote his Gospel as a 'foundation document' for a cluster of Christian communities" in Syria. Matthew and his readers saw themselves as a "new people." While Stanton does not argue his thesis in full, as Saldarini does in his monograph, he does present a convincing argument.

Stanton's coverage of a wide range of issues and themes is particularly helpful as a general introduction to Matthew. Saldarini, with his consistent argument of a thesis and narrower focus, would be more useful for an advanced course. But either of these works would be troubling for a conservative audience. This is seen in their use of the Gospel of Matthew as a window on a particular community at a particular point of time. This approach is universally accepted in historical-

critical scholarship, even by evangelicals. Thus the Gospels are rarely read
anymore as treatments of the life of Jesus, but as collections of stories about and
sayings of Jesus (often viewed as freely created by the evangelists, a view of which
Stanton's essay "Matthew as a Creative Interpreter of the Sayings of Jesus" is a
classical example) used to address issues facing the particular "church" for which
the author writes. It is certainly true that each of the evangelists writes from
within a particular community situation and that this would naturally influence
the selection of their material and even how they present that material. But I think
it is a mistake to say that the Gospel reflects merely (or even primarily) the
situation of the Matthean community. Matthew is telling the story of Jesus. He
may indeed be telling it to a particular group, but he is primarily referring to the
life of Jesus, not the life of the community. So we would not expect a perfect fit
to the community situation; the traditions are chosen to meet their needs, not to
describe the community or its history. Despite this, both books are mines of
information and will make profitable study.

Spicer Memorial College   MATTHEW KENT
Pune, India

Shenk, Wilbert R. *Write the Vision: The Church Renewed.* Valley Forge, PA:
    Trinity Press International, 1995. 119 pp. $10.00.

Write the Vision is the second in a series of books dealing with Christian
mission and modern culture that seeks to (1) examine modern culture from a
mission perspective, (2) develop a theological agenda that the church must address
in order to recover its integrity, and (3) test new conceptualizations of the nature
and mission of the church as it engages modern culture.

Shenk's thesis for this book is that as the church has engaged modern Western
culture the Christian faith has been seriously marginalized. To be renewed and to
regain its integrity the church in the West must relate to its own culture as it has
already related to cultures in so-called mission lands.

Write the Vision developed out of a series of lectures Shenk gave at the
Emmanuel School of Religion in the fall of 1993 on the theme "Why Mission to
Western Culture." The book is divided into four chapters that look at "Integrity,"
"Mission," "Evangelization," and "Church" from the perspective of how the church
should relate to culture.

In Chapter 1 Shenk argues that the credibility of the church in Western
culture has been seriously undermined by the church's lack of integrity. The
church has become controlled by its culture, has forfeited its prophetic role in
society, and has ceased to faithfully witness to the reign and rule of God. This lack
of integrity has discredited the church both in the eyes of its own members and in
the eyes of the general public. If the church is to be what God intends it to be the
first step is to recover its integrity.

The thesis for the second chapter is that the church was instituted for the
service of the *missio Dei*. But Shenk charges that the church in the West has largely
forgotten that mission and has settled down in happy compromise with modern
culture. That compromise expresses itself in the all-too-common distinction

separating evangelism and mission. Evangelism is for the people of Christendom who are perceived as already Christian to some degree, whereas mission is what the church does when it encounters non-Christian cultures. This view has lulled the church in the West into a false sense of security and allowed it to accommodate itself towards the surrounding culture.

Chapter 3 looks at the question of evangelization. Evangelism in the first century was different from present practice in that it produced a crisis, it turned the world upside down, it challenged the status quo, and invited people to repent. In contrast modern evangelism has too often been centered on charismatic, powerful pulpiteers who created new methods and techniques, who focused on individual conversions while forgetting the corruption of the structures, and who rarely approached the evangelistic task biblically and theologically.

In this chapter Shenk lets his bias against church-growth thinking and practice clearly show. He criticizes churches that develop needs-driven ministries, that provide specialized services to reach the various segments of society, and that promote programs and activities to establish contact points with secular people. He accuses churches of recycling the saints instead of proclaiming the good news and freeing power of God to the sick, the blind, and the oppressed.

I believe that Shenk's brush is too broad as he describes how churches in the West have caved in to the pressures of modern culture and the demands of a consumer society. What about the many churches that do all that he criticizes churches for doing, yet in addition have strong discipleship programs that help free people from addictions, bondages, and sin? What about the many practicing pastors who share Shenk's concern about the church selling out to modern culture, but have spent years of their lives ministering to the hurting in our society through the very type of activity that he criticizes? I share Shenk's concern that the church not sell its soul to culture, but I am more optimistic in that I see glowing examples of churches that are not caving in to cultural practices and that are calling men and women to deep discipleship to Jesus Christ.

In his final chapter Shenk takes a long, hard look at the state of the church as it relates to modern culture. He sees the church sitting in the midst of awful human tragedy yet lacking the courage or will to be a saving presence. He sees a church that has lost its integrity and that has sold out to its culture.

The church is most definitely the people of God, but they must also be defined by their faithfulness to mission. The church today has too often declined to accept the *missio Dei* as its chief focus and has instead been much too willing to allocate most of its financial resources to self-maintenance. Renewal is possible if God's people turn their backs on their cultural idols and once again become agents for mission to their own culture.

Wilbert Shenk has once again been a prophet to the church in the West. His book, *Write the Vision: The Church Renewed* challenges and rebukes a church that has allowed its culture to shape it rather than having a radical impact on its surroundings. Every pastor and church administrator would benefit from this clear call to return to biblical Christianity so that the church can be renewed and become faithful to its mission.

Andrews University   BRUCE L. BAUER

Sindima, Harvey J. *Drums of Redemption: An Introduction to African Christianity.*
Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 1994, xiv, 211 pp. Cloth, $55.

_____. *Africa's Agenda: The Legacy of Liberalism and Colonialism in the Crisis of African Values.* Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 1995, xvi, 256 pp. Cloth, $59.95.

Both of the above books by Harvey Sindima, a Presbyterian theologian from Malawi, present an interpretation of the history of Christianity and missions in Africa from the viewpoint of what might be called an emergent African theology. *Drums* is comprised of two sections. The first and longer is a revisionary history of Christianity and missions in Africa from its beginnings in Alexandria and North Africa to the present, ending with a chapter on the development and significance of the independent churches. Sindima has collected and condensed a vast amount of information in all of this. The second part is comprised of a rather critical theological analysis of the missionary Christianity imposed upon Africa, of its failure to engage African culture, and of its dire consequences for African society, its values and sense of identity. Hence, argues Sindima, there is validity to the protest of African theologians who call for cultural retrieval and a theology that works from the bottom up. Several of these emergent theologies are reviewed and Sindima goes on to make suggestions regarding the theological reconstruction required.

The specific significance of the title *Drums of Redemption* escaped this reader, neither is the thesis or the purpose of the study specifically stated—perhaps it is to clarify the agenda and provide an historical background and foundation for the new wave of African theology.

In contradistinction there is no ambiguity about the title and purpose of *Africa's Agenda* and here the thesis is quite clear. Briefly stated, the charge is that the Christianity imposed upon Africa by missions in close collaboration with the colonial powers reflects the concerns of the Western enlightenment mind—rationality and doctrine, individualizing piety, and an ethical system related to private rights and property—more clearly than it does the mind of Christ or the communal Christianity of the early church. The legacy of exploitative colonialism and this "liberal" Christianity is the dislocation and corruption of traditional African culture and its value system—hence the "crisis of African values." Much of this is in continuity with and is obviously built upon the historical exposition of *Drums* but is even more aggressively stated here.

The *Agenda* for African leaders—intellectual, political, socio/economic, and religious—is the retrieval and reconstruction of a compelling value system. Analysis of this task looks both forward and backward. A chapter is devoted to the struggle for authenticity and the currents of thought in the "Negritude" movement. Another examines the attempts of leaders of several African socialisms to find pragmatic answers to the problems of social dislocation and loss of identity. The problem is regarded in the final analysis as one of cultural and spiritual identity; and neither these movements nor the African independent church movement, which successfully deals with the political problems of foreign control but not adequately with the theological issues at stake, is judged to get at the heart of the problem.

In keeping with this analysis, Sindima next presents a survey and analysis of the thought of some leading African theologians who have wrestled with the African crisis of values, and outlines his own agenda and method for a theology from below to provide a framework for transformation. A question may arise in the mind of evangelicals here as to whether an African Christology from below, which builds upon African concepts of spirit and life and death and the ancestors, can adequately portray the true meaning and uniqueness of Jesus Christ. Perhaps it is too early to tell and we need to wait further exposition from Sindima.

The book comes to cumulative force in an appeal to the church and religious leaders to take up the battle for the retrieval of values of humanity and life and corporate bondedness which will promote the transformation of society. In fact, he goes further and affirms that inasmuch as Christianity played a major role in creating the crisis, it has a moral responsibility to do so.

With the publication of these two books, Sindima emerges as a significant voice in the wave of emergent African theology and deserves to be taken seriously. His analysis is perhaps one-sided and overstates the case; however, he deals with major issues and reflects the thought of other African intellectuals. Church leaders and missionaries who seek to understand the challenge facing the church and to faithfully respond to the needs of Africa's people stand to benefit from these studies.

These studies could be profitably read in conjunction with two other recent publications on the church in Africa. The title of John Parratt's *Reinventing Christianity: African Theology Today*, 1995, is both apt and significant. It is a careful study by one who has spent twenty years teaching theology in Africa. While Sindima is not specifically mentioned, this book will help to place his thought in theological perspective. Elizabeth Isichei, who also taught in Africa for many years, has produced an admirable one-volume history of Christianity in Africa which will also provide perspective for Sindima's work (Elizabeth Isichei, *A History of Christianity in Africa, From Antiquity to the Present*, 1995 [reviewed in this issue of *AUSS*]).

Drums and *Africa's Agenda* contain more typographical and other errors than one would expect in such otherwise well-produced books.

Andrews University   RUSSELL STAPLES

Smith, Billy K., and Frank S. Page. *Amos, Obadiah, and Jonah*. The New American Commentary. Broadman and Holman, 1995. 304 pp. $27.99.

The New American Commentary (NAC) series aims at presenting the Bible student with material which is "the finest in contemporary evangelical scholarship." This particular volume is number 19B and is authored by Smith (Amos and Obadiah) and Page (Jonah). One can say that in general the volume is reader-friendly in more than one way, and is very much in line with the rest of the NAC series.

The beginning of each book is accompanied by a map of Syro-Palestine to help locate the sites mentioned in the text. The introduction consists of a historical setting, questions of authorship, and a survey of the message of the book. A

current bibliographical list is absent and instead one finds a list entitled "Commonly Used Sources." In some places, too much comment is made in apologetic defense of the unity of the book or its individual units. This may be unnecessary, given the fact that the overall presupposition of this series is that the biblical text is approached as it stands at present.

I would like to question a practice followed by this as well as many other commentary series on the Bible. It is customary to strictly follow the canonical order of biblical books when there is a need to put two or three biblical books together in one volume. Thus, books coming from different historical periods are grouped together in one volume. Even though there may be valid reasons to do so, I wonder why we should stick so rigidly to this practice. Would it not be far more practical to devote one volume to Hosea, Amos, and Micah, who were the three eighth-century minor prophets? The first advantage of this order would be that only *one* historical introduction would be needed for all three books. Second, one would find it much easier to draw parallels between the teachings of the three books. More than once in the present volume this is lacking. The same is true for the parallels from Isaiah, God's hatred of religious feasts (111); land-grabbing by the rich (62); mentioning of God's council, *Ṣod* (181). Themes such as the day of the Lord, rejection of empty worship, etc., lack their parallels with other eighth-century prophets (109-111). Third, some inconsistencies could be avoided like the ones on 23, 171, and 209, which first mention four eighth-century prophets, but then add Jonah to the list as well.

The dating of the three prophetic books is clearly conservative, yet the authors do not consider that the books were written at one sitting. In the case of Amos, it is stated that his reference to Zion shows that when he returned to Judah "there he edited the book" (36). This may explain why Smith does not agree that Amos was "a consistent prophet of doom," and this point makes sense.

Finally, I have found some typos, especially in the commentary on Amos. There are a few incorrect transliterations of Hebrew: *nādîm* (36), *sūb* (90), *'ōśēh* (101), and *rā'* (106).

I would like to commend both authors for excellent material presented in this volume. The book is suitable as a textbook for seminarians.

Adventist International Institute of Advanced Studies   Z. STEFANOVIC
Silang, Cavite, Philippines

Snyder, Graydon F. *Health and Medicine in the Anabaptist Tradition: Care in Community*. Valley Forge, PA: Trinity Press International, 1995. xvi + 160 pp. Cloth, $20.00.

Trinity Press International is publishing a series of fourteen volumes on Health and Medicine in various Christian traditions, yet another series of church studies edited in part by Martin E. Marty. Second in this series is Graydon Snyder's contribution on the Anabaptist health tradition.

Snyder's volume contains far more text dealing with Anabaptist community than directly dealing with health issues. For eight chapters Snyder retells the basic nature of Anabaptist community and its impact on health care. There is good

reason for this. In the Anabaptist communions the community is far more tightly woven and of greater importance than in most other Christian traditions. As a result the community looms large in both illness and health care. Often illness is based in part on a sense of separation from, or dishonor within, the community, and healing is effected in part through reconciliation (26-27).

Many Anabaptists find a strong linkage between the anointing of James 5:14 and the forgiveness of sins in verse 15. Snyder tells the story of a young wife in premature labor (31-32). A Brethren doctor knew she had had two previous abortions, and so recommended an anointing service. During the anointing she burst into tears and confessed. She did not confess concerning the abortions, but rather that she and her husband took their honeymoon in New York City, went to a movie there, and afterward conceived this pregnancy. The elder assured her that she was still accepted into the community, and as a result she was able to carry the pregnancy to term. Neither premarital sex nor abortion concerned the woman as much as separation from the community and flouting its rules while away. Healing came with reconciliation.

Community enters all aspects of Anabaptist existence from conception to death. Thus abortion is usually forbidden, as the fetus enters the community from the time the fetus is known to exist. Death is usually viewed in terms of separation from community (46,48). Thus when a dying person is no longer able to take part in community life, there is no reason for continuing bodily life through heroic medical procedures. On the other hand, as long as community is possible euthanasia is unthinkable. Mental illness is likewise seen in terms of community. Even "schizophrenia is a problem of social formation that should be addressed in terms of the patient's social environment" (49).

Snyder touches lightly on shamanism in some Anabaptist traditions. Little is explained and the reader is left wondering how important this aspect of health care is. Snyder does, however, emphasize the important role of community in the shaman's practice. It is always vital that the relationship of the sufferer to the community be established before the shaman can effectively work.

The book is not constructed on a simple linear plan, so that it is difficult to anticipate subject matter or find specific topics without recourse to the index. Also there is a great deal of extraneous material, even when allowance is made for explaining the community life of the Anabaptists. Telling of various mission ventures such as sending cattle overseas does illustrate Anabaptist missions, but does little to further an understanding of Anabaptist health practice.

There are other problems with Snyder's work. He is inconsistent. Though he establishes a strong connection between healing and confession/reconciliation, he later states that Anabaptists understand that "illness has not been caused by personal sin" (64). In both claims some nuance is needed. Snyder also emphasizes "rational" health care in Anabaptist history while downplaying modern shamanistic healing. At times apologetics gets in the way of his study.

Health and Medicine in the Anabaptist Tradition is more an exposition of Anabaptist community than of Anabaptist health care. It is an excellent introduction to the Anabaptist lifestyle, but falls short as a study of its stated topic.

Madison, WI 53713   JAMES E. MILLER

Thomas, Norman E., ed. *Classic Texts in Mission and World Christianity.* Orbis
  Books: Maryknoll, NY, 1995. 346 pp. $24.95.

Before his untimely death in 1992, David J. Bosch, one of the most prominent
missiologists of our time, published *Transforming Mission*, his *summa missiologica*
that has become a standard text in the field of missiology. Designed to be a
companion volume to Bosch's monumental work, *Classic Texts in Mission and
World Christianity* brings together excerpts of 180 documents in the history of
mission theology from early Christianity to the present. It actually turns out to
be a significant sourcebook for missiology, church history, and theology.

The texts are arranged in two main sections. Part One, focused on historical
paradigms of mission, contains 39 selections arranged in four chapters on the Early
and Eastern Church, the Middle Ages and Roman Catholic models, the Protestant
Reformation, and mission in the wake of the Enlightenment. Part Two, which
relates to contemporary paradigms of mission, contains 131 selections arranged in
14 chapters paralleling the "elements" of the contemporary emerging ecumenical
mission paradigm suggested by Bosch.

Norman Thomas is professor of World Christianity at United Theological
Seminary in Dayton, Ohio. He served as a missionary in Africa and is a well-
known mission researcher and the book review editor for *Missiology*. His expertise
is evident in the quality and accuracy of his one- to two-page introductions to the
chapters in which the theme of each is developed and placed in context, and in the
selections and chronological arrangements of the texts. In addition, Thomas also
introduces each selection with a short paragraph describing the context and thrust
of the excerpt, often giving an informative biographical sketch of the author. Since
many texts are multiple excerpts from larger documents, the introductions are
especially helpful to facilitate understanding. The selection of texts reveals a
magisterial grasp of the missiological literature; however there seems to be a bent
which favors ecumenical and liberationist thinkers. Thomas also provides cross-
references to *Transforming Mission*, a feature which is very useful for those
interested in following Bosch's argument. Indexes of scripture references, subjects,
and names, as well as footnotes after each chapter, further enhance the value and
usefulness of this book.

In contrast to Bosch, who devoted approximately one-third of his work to the
mission of the Apostolic Church, another third to the four *historical* paradigms of
mission, and a last third to the discussion of possible elements of a contemporary
missionary paradigm, Thomas skips the Apostolic Church, deals with the four
historical paradigms, and then devotes 75% of the book to contemporary models
of mission. He presents each of Bosch's suggested "elements" of a contemporary
paradigm as a paradigm in its own right. In this Thomas goes beyond Bosch, who
was possibly the first to apply paradigm thinking to missiology. While Bosch
endeavored to demonstrate an emerging consensus within the diverse perspectives
and elements of the contemporary discussion on mission, Thomas seems to
underline the diversity of perspectives.

Another distinction of this volume is Thomas's noteworthy addition of some
50 pieces from Asia, Africa, and Latin America, including 18 female authors. These
selections add a liberationist flavor and a challenging freshness to the symphony

of voices and extend the missiological dialogue beyond *Transforming Mission*'s mostly Western and male partners. Evangelical readers will also notice that while Catholic voices (especially of the latter part of the century) and ecumenical leaders and texts are well represented, evangelical contributions such as the text of the Lausanne Covenant or the work of the continuation committees, although mentioned in some introductions, are not included. The Wheaton Declaration is cited but important evangelical voices such as those of Ralph Winter and John Stott are not mentioned. Thomas may have felt that evangelical landmark documents are readily available in Scherer and Beavan's 2-volume *New Directions in Missions and Evangelization* (Maryknoll: Orbis Books, 1992, 1994). Evangelical authors with wider ecumenical influence such as Roland Allen, John Mott, Orlando Costas, Charles Kraft, and Donald McGavran have been included. Texts representing some African independent church leaders are cited, but there is little from the charismatic and Pentecostal wings of the church. This selective touch shows that Thomas has not only been a capable editor but an interpreter of the history and theology of mission with his own perspective.

Despite these criticisms *Classic Texts* should be seen as an outstanding contribution and important reference work in any library of mission. It will be useful in the classroom as a companion volume to *Transforming Mission* or as a sourcebook in its own right for a variety of courses in different theological disciplines. It should also prove of enormous value to denominational leaders and directors of mission agencies as they struggle with the issues of the church in mission.

In short, no serious student of mission can afford to ignore this valuable volume which brings together texts not easily located in any other work.

Institute of World Mission   ERICH W. BAUMGARTNER
Andrews University

Witherington, Ben. *Conflict and Community in Corinth: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary on 1 and 2 Corinthians.* Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1995. xx + 492 pp. $34.99.

Dr. Witherington, noted for *Women in the Earliest Churches, Jesus the Sage,* and *Jesus, Paul, and the End of the World,* offers a unique and invaluable commentary on the Corinthian correspondence. This work brings together insights from rhetorical, social-scientific, and cultural-anthropological criticism under one cover with the fruits of the more traditional disciplines. As such, this book is a welcome resource for pastors and students who need to become acquainted with the fruits of these burgeoning disciplines—particularly with regard to the Corinthian letters, which have received so much attention in this regard from scholars such as E. A. Judge, W. A. Meeks, G. Theissen, M. M. Mitchell, and S. K. Stowers. The specialist will also appreciate Witherington's lively interaction with these and other scholars (especially his critique of Wire and Castelli).

While recent commentaries on 1 and 2 Corinthians have not ignored the importance of social-scientific and rhetorical criticism, Witherington thrusts these disciplines to the fore, providing the reader with a thorough grounding in the

context of these letters. This is accomplished through a new form for the commentary genre. First, Witherington focuses primarily on the rhetorical unit rather than on each individual verse in isolation. This allows the reader to see more clearly the developing rhetorical argument and strategy—the forest through the trees, so to speak—without sacrificing, however, discussion of important or misunderstood terms and references. Second, the commentary is interspersed with sections called "A Closer Look," which succinctly provide essential background material for the section being investigated. The reader is thus afforded windows into pagan views of salvation, patronage in the ancient world, slavery, Greco-Roman prophecy, hardship catalogs in Stoic literature, and the like. Witherington includes a wealth of Greco-Roman comparative literature, bringing the reader into direct and frequent contact with Cicero, Seneca, Plutarch, Dio Chrysostom, and the rhetorical handbooks.

Based on his observations of cultural norms and rhetorical *topoi* used in the letters, Witherington concludes that the Corinthians' primary difficulty arises from their custom of evaluating their apostles by the standards of worldly orators and Sophists. He shows that anti-Sophistic rhetoric pervades 1 Corinthians 1 through 4, where the Corinthians themselves weigh Apollos over against Paul, as well as all of 2 Corinthians, where rival preachers have played up to the Corinthians' preferences. A second difficulty unifying the correspondence is Paul's refusal of patronage from Corinthian householders. He refuses to accept payment for his preaching, since God through Paul is the patron of the community. Such refusal amounts to an insult, and leads to Paul's having to defend himself against all the usual enmity *topoi*—insincerity, deviousness, and general mudslinging. Throughout, Witherington shows that the Corinthians' misunderstandings were not the result of malice or moral defect, but rather were quite natural given their primary socialization in Greco-Roman culture and norms.

Witherington presents a strong argument for the unity of 2 Corinthians, resting his case on rhetorical conventions and analogies from other speeches. The need to establish rapport and *ethos* in his audience's eyes account for the conciliatory tone of 1:1-2:13, which he correctly identifies as an *insinuatio*. While I differ in detail with his rhetorical analysis of this passage, I support his interpretation of the rhetorical exigency which necessitates this indirect approach to the main issue. Witherington reads 6:14-7:1 not as an interpolation but as a digression, calling the Corinthians to abstain from pagan feasts (recalling 1 Cor 10:14-21). Here I would suggest that the passage is more integral to the appeal than Witherington, following Fee, allows. He correctly notes that Paul must simultaneously convince the believers to dissociate themselves from the rival preachers—the messengers of Satan (11:15)—and reestablish his own authority Chapter 6:11-7:4 appears admirably to address both goals in a rhetorically adept manner, a position Furnish has argued and I have supported. The emphasis on "fellowship" and "partnership" in 6:14-7:1 would perhaps better apply to the main "partnership" to be renounced—that with the rival apostles. Such a position would consequently strengthen Witherington's proposal of unity of the whole, placing in the heart of the letter a central appeal for both dissociation from rivals and association with Paul, God's true ambassador. Finally, Witherington's arguments for connecting chapters 10-13 to 1-9 are the most compelling so far to be advanced

on this difficult question.

With regard to patronage relations, which I agree are of central importance to Paul's difficulties with the Corinthians, I believe Paul's role might be further clarified through the use of "broker" terminology. That is, precisely on the basis of bringing the Corinthians into the favor of his own Patron (God), he has become the Corinthians' patron, and deserves the respect and honor which accompany that role. In the Greco-Roman context, this respect derives not solely from being God's agent (the *shaliach*, clearly Paul's *self*-understanding from his Jewish background), but also God's "broker" (or mediator)—one whose benefaction is access to a great patron.

Witherington is commendably sensitive to honor and shame as primary values in the ancient Mediterranean world, but appears in his "closer look" section on honor to have swallowed too much of Malina's model. For example, Malina lays heavy stress on the agonistic nature of competition for honor—one person wins honor from another's loss. But Witherington elsewhere even quotes Plutarch's dictum that is "odious and vulgar" to "win applause from the humiliation of another" or to "cause another's disgrace to win glory for oneself," which clearly counts against Malina's one-sided emphasis on competition. This is not so much a criticism of Witherington as of his sources, and I would add that only his "closer look" is affected. His own work with the text is so well grounded in classical authors that the failings of those dependent on modern cultural-anthropological studies do not harm his work. I would also suggest that "shame" (as *aidōs*) is not strictly a woman's value, for persons of either gender are concerned about reputation. This "shame" rather manifests itself in different arenas (e.g., virginity for a woman, courage for a man). Here Witherington rightly notes that women can indeed aspire to honor not only through modesty but also through benefaction, and that the *ekklēsia* opens up still other avenues for women to achieve honor.

On balance, this is a very fine commentary and essential reading for any study of or sermon on the Corinthian letters. Pastors and seminarians will especially appreciate the very thoughtful hermeneutical suggestions appearing in concluding paragraphs or, more often, in footnotes, which challenge us in the church to weigh our ministers and ourselves by God's standards rather than by worldly criteria, and to examine how we, like the Corinthians, continue to function with the mindset of our society rather than the mind of Christ.

Ashland Theological Seminary   DAVID A. DESILVA
Ashland, OH 44805

Zurcher, Jean. *La Perfection chrétienne.* Lausanne: Editions Belles Rivières, 1993. 118 pp. n.p.

In this revision of an earlier writing, the author, a well-known Seventh-day Adventist educator and administrator, attempts to define the meaning of the word *perfection* primarily for ministers and laypeople of his church. First he considers the biblical evidence and then he devotes his attention to the concept in the writings of Ellen White.

The general impression can be summarized by one word: clarity. The organization is clear, the style is clear, the conclusions are clear, even the physical make-up of the book is clear. The brief summaries at the end of each section add greatly to the readability of the book. I must emphasize, however, that clarity is reached through selectivity and brevity rather than superficiality.

The conclusion of the discussion on the biblical passages is that perfection refers to a relationship rather than an ultimate, static, moral condition. We might say that the essence of perfection is singleness of loyalty rather than sinlessness. While in the OT the emphasis falls on the relationship with God, in the NT it broadens to the relationship with the neighbor, through which our relationship with God is affirmed. In both Testaments the purpose of the law is to clarify the characteristics of the bond. As is clear in the epistles of Paul, the concept also includes a very dynamic element. In Christ we are perfect, but the better we know him, the more we yearn to be truly like him and so we strive continually toward this goal.

Zurcher considers carefully the thorny problems raised by the passages in the epistles of John that seem to require absolute sinlessness. The author distinguishes between *sin* and *sins*. Sin is a condition; sins are acts and the two should never be confused. To understand those passages one should keep in mind those meanings. For John, to sin is to live in a state of rebellion against God and no one can claim to be a Christian who still is hostile to God. Thus Zurcher remains consistent with his essential thesis of perfection as relationship rather than the quality of acts and avoids the problems of the issues raised by the view that, in John, to be sinless means *not to continue* in sin.

One wonders why, especially in his discussion of the OT material, Zurcher does not refer to the covenant context of those writings. Humans such as Enoch, Abraham or David are perfect in the eyes of God, not because they are morally unimpeachable, which is certainly not the case, but because they are faultless in their attitude toward the covenant. Should not the NT texts also be understood in the context of the new covenant in the blood of Jesus? We are perfect insofar and as long as we bind our lives to the life of our Savior and live by his promises. Like Peter after his denial, we can boldly say, in spite of our falls, "Lord, you know that I love you!"

In the second part Zurcher considers three topics: Ellen White and Christian perfection; perfection as a privilege of human beings; character perfection possible only in Jesus Christ. He supports his interpretations with an abundance of primary material.

One cannot overemphasize the importance of character development for Ellen White. Within that concept she gives a progressive and moral dimension to perfection. As Zurcher shows, for her it is an endless quest, even through eternity. Thus even the most radical advocates of moral perfection must admit that it is never a completed thing. Our perfection is always relative to our stage of development.

One will wonder why Zurcher, who has emphasized so clearly in the first part that in Scripture perfection is bound to relationship, does not give direct consideration to that new moral tone that dominates in Ellen White's writings. Perfection for her is overwhelmingly moral perfection. This becomes especially

clear when Zurcher discusses her description of the last generation of Christians before the second coming of Christ. Survival at the climax of human history requires faultlessness, a logical implication, according to many Adventists, of the concept of the *investigative judgment*, or preadvent judgment, which by that time has been completed, thus ending Christ's intercessory ministry.

It is also difficult to understand why Zurcher does not mention Ellen White's Methodist roots. In many places her words have a very distinct Wesleyan tone. For her, however, perfection is not a second blessing, a gift at a specific time; it is the fruit of character development.

Zurcher warns his readers that the original terms in Hebrew and Greek are translated by many different words, thus making it very difficult to study the concept in a translation. In his book, however, Zurcher makes little effort to bring out what may be gained from the use of the biblical languages.

Zurcher's book can be highly recommended for its readability, its Bible-centeredness, and the author's insights. It provides its readers, even non-Adventist readers, a solid ground for personal reflection on this important topic.

Andrews University   DANIEL AUGSBURGER

TRANSLITERATION OF HEBREW AND ARAMAIC

CONSONANTS

א = '	ה = h	ט = ṭ	מ = m	פ = p	שׁ = š
ב = b	ו = w	י = y	נ = n	צ = ṣ	שׂ = ś
ג = g	ז = z	כ = k	ס = s	ק = q	ת = t
ד = d	ח = ḥ	ל = l	ע = '	ר = r	

MASORETIC VOWEL POINTINGS

_ = a	.. = e	◌ֵ = ê	= ō	ֹו = ô
= ā	= ē	= i	= o	ֹו = û
= a	(vocal shewa) = e	= î	= o	= u

No distinction is made between soft and hard begad-kepat letters;
dāgēš forte is indicated by doubling the consonant.

ABBREVIATIONS OF BOOKS AND PERIODICALS

AASOR	Annual Amer. Sch. Or. Res.	CH	Church History
AB	Anchor Bible	CHR	Catholic Historical Review
ABD	Anchor Bible Dictionary	CIG	Corpus inscriptionum graecarum
AcOr	Acta orientalia	CIJ	Corpus inscriptionum iudaicarum
ADAJ	Annual Dept. Ant. Jordan	CIL	Corpus inscriptionum latinarum
AHR	American Historical Review	CIS	Corpus inscriptionum semiticarum
AJA	American Journal of Archaeology	CJT	Canadian Journal of Theology
AJT	American Journal of Theology	CQ	Church Quarterly
ANEP	Anc. Near East in Pictures	CQR	Church Quarterly Review
ANET	Ancient Near Eastern Texts	CT	Christianity Today
ANF	The Ante-Nicene Fathers	CTJ	Calvin Theological Journal
AnOr	Analecta orientalia	CTM	Concordia Theological Monthly
ANRW	Auf. und Nieder. der römischen Welt	CurTM	Currents in Theol. and Mission
ARG	Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte	DOTT	Doc. from OT Times, Thomas, ed.
ATR	Anglican Theological Review	EDNT	Exegetical Dict. of the NT
AusBR	Australian Biblical Review	EKL	Evangelisches Kirchenlexikon
AUSS	Andrews University Seminary Studies	EncIs	Encyclopedia of Islam
BA	Biblical Archaeologist	EncJud	Encyclopedia Judaica
BAR	Biblical Archaeology Review	ER	Ecumenical Review
BASOR	Bulletin Amer. Sch. Oriental Research	EvQ	Evangelical Quarterly
BCSR	Bull. Council on the Study of Religion	EvT	Evangelische Theologie
BHS	Biblia hebraica stuttgartensia	ExpTim	Expository Times
Bib	Biblica	GRBS	Greek, Roman, and Byz. Studies
BibB	Biblische Beiträge	GTJ	Grace Theological Journal
BIES	Bulletin of the Israel Expl. Society	HeyJ	Heythrop Journal
BJRL	Bulletin, John Rylands University	HR	History of Religions
BK	Bibel und Kirche	HTR	Harvard Theological Review
BKAT	Bibl. Kommentar: Altes Testament	HUCA	Hebrew Union College Annual
BO	Bibliotheca orientalis	IB	Interpreter's Bible
BR	Biblical Research	ICC	International Critical Commentary
BSac	Bibliotheca Sacra	IDB	Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible
BT	The Bible Translator	IEJ	Israel Exploration Journal
BTB	Biblical Theology Bulletin	Int	Interpretation
BZ	Biblische Zeitschrift	ISBE	International Standard Bible Dict.
BZAW	Beihefte zur ZAW	JAAR	Journ. American Academy of Religion
BZNW	Beihefte zur ZNW	JAOS	Journ. of the Amer. Or. Society
CAD	Chicago Assyrian Dictionary	JAS	Journ. of Asian Studies
CBQ	Catholic Biblical Quarterly	JBL	Journal of Biblical Literature

Abbreviations (cont.)

JBR	Journal of Bible and Religion
JCS	Journal of Cuneiform Studies
JEA	Journal of Egyptian Archaeology
JETS	Journal of the Evangel. Theol. Soc.
JEH	Journal of Ecclesiastical History
JES	Journal of Ecumenical Studies
JJS	Journal of Jewish Studies
JMeH	Journal of Medieval History
JMES	Journal of Middle Eastern Studies
JMH	Journal of Modern History
JNES	Journal of Near Eastern Studies
JPOS	Journal of Palest. Orient. Soc.
JQR	Jewish Quarterly Review
JR	Journal of Religion
JRAS	Journal of Royal Asiatic Society
JRE	Journal of Religious Ethics
JRelS	Journal of Religious Studies
JSNT	Journal for the Study of the NT
JRH	Journal of Religious History
JRT	Journal of Religions Thought
JSJ	Journal for the Study of Judaism
JSOT	Journal for the Study of the OT
JSS	Journal of Semitic Studies
JSSR	Journal for the Scien. Study of Religion
JTC	Journal for Theol. and Church
JTS	Journal of Theological Studies
LCL	Loeb Classical Library
LW	Luther's Works, American Ed.
LQ	Lutheran Quarterly
MQR	Mennonite Quarterly Review
Neot	Neotestamentica
NHS	Nag Hammadi Studies
NICNT	New Internl. Commentary, NT
NICOT	New Internl. Commentary, OT
NIDNTT	New Inter. Dict. of NT Theol.
NIGTC	New Internl. Greek Test. Comm.
NKZ	Neue Kirchliche Zeitschrift
NovT	Novum Testamentum
NPNF	Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers
NRT	La nouvelle revue théologique
NTA	New Testament Abstracts
NTAp	NT Apocrypha, Schneemelcher
NTS	New Testament Studies
ODCC	Oxford Dict. of Christian Church
OLZ	Orientalische Literaturzeitung
Or	Orientalia (Rome)
OrChr	Oriens christianus
OTP	OT Pseudepigrapha, Charlesworth
OTS	Oudtestamentische Studien
PEQ	Palestine Exploration Quarterly
PG	Patrologia Graeca, Migne
PL	Patrologia Latina, Migne
PW	Pauly-Wissowa, Real Encyclopädie
QDAP	Quart. Dept. of Ant. in Palestine
RA	Revue d'assyriologie et d'arch.
RAC	Reallexikon für Antike und Chr.
RB	Revue biblique
RechSR	Recherches de science religieuse
REg	Revue d'égyptologie
RelS	Religious Studies
RelSoc	Religion and Society
RelSRev	Religious Studies Review
RevExp	Review and Expositor
RevQ	Revue de Qumran
RevScRel	Revue des sciences religieuses
RevSém	Revue sémitique
RHE	Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique
RHPR	Revue d'hist. et de phil. religieuses
RHR	Revue de l'histoire des religions
RL	Religion in Life
RLA	Reallexikon der Assyriologie
RR	Review of Religion
RRR	Review of Religious Research
RSPT	Revue des sc. phil. et théol.
RTP	Revue de théol. et de phil.
SA	Sociological Analysis
SB	Sources bibliques
SBLDS	SBL Dissertation Series
SBLMS	SBL Monograph Series
SBLSBS	SBL Sources for Biblical Study
SBLTT	SBL Texts and Translations
SBT	Studies in Biblical Theology
SCJ	Sixteenth Century Journal
SCR	Studies in Comparative Religion
Sem	Semitica
SJT	Scottish Journal of Theology
SMRT	Studies in Med. and Ref. Thought
SOr	Studia Orientalia
SPB	Studia Postbiblica
SSS	Semitic Studies Series
ST	Studia Theologica
TD	Theology Digest
TDNT	Theol. Dict. of the NT
TDOT	Theol. Dict. of the OT
TEH	Theologische Existenz Heute
TGl	Theologie und Gloube
TJ	Trinity Journal
TLZ	Theologische Literaturzeitung
TP	Theologie und Philosophie
TQ	Theologische Quartalschrift
TRev	Theologische Revue
TRu	Theologische Rundschau
TS	Theological Studies
TT	Teologisk Tidsskrift
TToday	Theology Today
TU	Texte und Untersuchungen
TWOT	Theol. Wordbook of the OT
TZ	Theologische Zeitschrift
UF	Ugarit-Forschungen
USQR	Union Seminary Quarterly Review
VC	Vigiliae christianae
VT	Vetus Testamentum
VTSup	Vetus Testamentum, Supplements
WA	Luther's Works, Weimarer Ausgabe
WBC	Word Biblical Commentary
WTJ	Westminster Theological Journal
ZA	Zeitschrift für Assyriologie
ZAW	Zeitsch. für die alttest. Wissen.
ZDMG	Zeitsch. des deutsch. morgen. Gesell.
ZDPV	Zeitsch. des deutsch. Pal.-Vereins
ZEE	Zeitschrift für evangelische Ethik
ZHT	Zeitsch. für historische Theologie
ZKG	Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte
ZKT	Zeitsch. für katholische Theologie
ZMR	Zeitsch. für Mission. und Religion.
ZNW	Zeitsch. für die neutest. Wissen.
ZRGG	Zeitsch. für Rel. u. Geistegeschichte
ZST	Zeitsch. für systematische Theologie
ZTK	Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche
ZWT	Zeitschrift für wissen. Theologie