

# The **D**S COMMENTARY ON BOOKS

LITERARY PERSPECTIVES ON SACRED AND CLASSICAL TEXTS

**Details**

In Memoriam: Helmut Koester (1926-2016)  
Fred C. Robinson (1930-2016)  
Walter Burkert (1931-2015)

**Debate**

**Dissent**

**Discussion**

**Discovery**

**Delight**

*Published reviews are in abundance today. Some of them are online and others are on library book-shelves, and there are a few privately circulated pamphlets whose essays enjoy the merit of a large circulation; even if not an interdisciplinary readership whose concerns regard the ancient civilizations of Greece, Rome and of the region of the Fertile Crescent.*

*Generally, specialized investigations of ancient texts taken up by Biblicists, Classicists, Orientalists and Theologians, forego academic interaction with textual transcriptions which fall outside their own fields of study. The enormous amount of research conducted along precise lines of work, and later issued for public consumption, means that the price of attainment in these spheres of genius is prohibitive.*

*The following review-essays are distributed for professional Divines, issued in order to exhibit decisive ideas to human reason, and to fill up an obvious gap in studies involving the control of two or more disciplines. As an assemblage of occasional papers, at times various critical texts, and volumes and/or extended articles will be discussed. It is my hope that some measurable contribution to critical scholarship may be had from these appraisals.*

Editor: D. Antoine Sutton. Contact info: PO  
Box 362, Red Cloud, NE 68970 or  
dssemitica@hotmail.com.

## Fall 2016 In This Issue

1. G.B. Conte, *Ope Ingenii: Experiences of Textual Criticism* (2013) ..... p. 2
2. G. B. Cobbold, *Lucretius: The Nature of the Universe* (2016) ..... p. 3
3. Wilfried Härle, *Outline of Christian Doctrine: An Evangelical Dogmatics* (2015) ..... p. 5
4. Walter Blanco & Jennifer T. Roberts, *Herodotus: The Histories*. (2nd. ed. 2013) ..... p. 10
5. Bill T. Arnold & Richard S. Hess, *Ancient Israel's History: An Introduction to Issues and Sources* (2014) ..... p. 12
6. Seyyed Hossein Nasr, *The Study Quran: A New Translation and Commentary* (2015) ..... p. 17
7. Give Due Regards to: Ernst Würthwein (1909-1996), *The Text of the Old Testament: An Introduction to the Biblia Hebraica*; revised and expanded by Alexander Achilles Fischer, (3rd ed., 2014) ..... p. 21
8. De Re Libraria: Deborah Lyons & Kurt Raaflaub, ed., *Ex Oriente Lex: Near Eastern Influences on Ancient Greek & Roman Law* by Raymond Westbrook (2015); Andrew Erskine & Josephine Crawley Quinn, ed., *Rome, Polybius & The East* by Peter Derow (2015); David Norton, ed., *The New Cambridge Paragraph Bible: King James Version* (2011); F. Montanari, GE: *The Brill Dictionary of Ancient Greek* (2015); Craig R. Koester, *Revelation: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (2014); C.R. Seitz, *Joel: The International Theological Commentary* (2016); J.J.M. Roberts, *First Isaiah: A Commentary*. Fortress Press (2015) ..... p. 22

Gian B. Conte,  
*Ope Ingenii:*  
*Experiences of Textual Criticism.*  
De Gruyter (2013).  
Pp. 110. ISBN 978 3 11 031272 0. \$61.00 (hb).

Professor Gian Bagio Conte is an eminent critic of classical texts. His Teubner edition, *P. Vergilius Maro, Aeneis* (2009), is well-known and recognized as a learned work of scholarship. It presents the best of his editorial acumen, and it is the best edition of Virgil published in the last 150 years. *Ope Ingenii* puts on display his exceptional insight in the unraveling of textual problems. Each example given by him comes from his private stock of textual problems that have fascinated him through decades of inspection. The book consists of a Preamble, followed by three chapters: (I) Punctuation; (II) Interpolation and Athetesis; (III) Corruption and Conjecture; and Epilogue. Two indices end the volume. His confession is plain and simple: “I have collected certain experiences of textual criticism” (p.vii).

In the opening pages (p.4), professor Conte [hereafter C.] divulges what he believes was a fundamental ingredient of A.E. Housman’s success: viz., paleography. He argues that since some errors in medieval MSS stem from archetypes, it stands to reason that if miniscule letters are converted back into capital letters, then the recovery of what might have occurred in misreading select letter-forms becomes apparent. True. Habitually medieval MSS were handled by several hands over a period of centuries. Letter-forms mutated in numerous ways; some blunders are accounted for by the fact that later scribes could not read the handwriting or notations of earlier copyists.

Learning from one’s predecessors is vital to critical inquiry. There is much one can gain in the study of the history of scholarship. C. acknowledges the contributions of Gottfried Hermann (1772-1848) as the ‘restorer of the text of Aeschylus’ (p.23). He interacts with notable critics, e.g., Angelo Poliziano (1454-1494), J.J. Scaliger (1540-1609), J. F. Gronovius (1611-1671), Richard Bentley (1662-1742), Friedrich H. Bothe (1771-1855), U. Wilamowitz-Moellendorf (1848-1931) and with Eduard Fraenkel (1888-1970). Various Greek and Latin

authors are discussed: e.g., Petronius, Ovid, Aristophanes, and Euripides.

The chapter on ‘Punctuation’ is convincing. However, the punctuation of his English renderings does not conform always to the punctuation of the text he cites: e.g., p.41. Of great importance is his statement that the linguistic signs, i.e., punctuation, provide the signals needed to read a passage correctly (p.16). In the editing of a text, indeed it is the punctuation that indicates how an editor or translator comprehends the flow of thought in each sentence. This partly explains why scholars nowadays seldom cite foreign language texts without translating them: the punctuated gloss always is evidence of comprehension or the lack thereof.

Chapter two makes a significant contribution. Although C. eschews consensus opinions in his work on profane texts, he initiates the discussion in chapter two by citing standard views of select *New Testament* passages (*Mk. 16*, *Jn. 8* etc.). His understanding of *New Testament* textual criticism does not show innovation or genius; nor does he discuss the subject with the evenhandedness he extends to “Homer’s” texts (pp.35-41), and this, despite the fact there are more *New Testament* MSS extant than there are texts of the *Iliad* or of the *Odyssey*. Conversely, C. knows Ovid’s *Metamorphoses* was an extremely popular poem in their day; but he believes Lucretius’ *De Rerum Natura* ‘was very rarely read’ (p.54). Several scholars will take issue with that assertion, since so much inter-textual study has been devoted to demonstrating the debt various authors owed to their reading of Lucretius.

One interpretative matter (p.41): at Virgil’s *Aen. 1.378-380* we read

Sum pius Aeneas, raptos qui ex hoste penates  
Classe ueho mecum, fama super aethera notus;  
Italiam quaero patriam, et genus ab Ioue summo

380 summo (A. vi 123)] magno R

I am the loyal Aeneas, who carry with me in my fleet  
my household gods, snatched from the foe; my fame is  
known above the heavens.

1 The value of these discussions of *Mark 16* diminishes apart from an engagement with J.W. Burgon’s (1813-1888) critical study *The Last Twelve Verses of The Gospel of Mark Vindicated Against Recent Critical Objectors and Established* (1871).

2 It is said that Erasmus of Rotterdam could not find the Johannine verse in any Greek manuscript. So he deleted it from his earliest editions, reinserting it later in a 1522 edition; again removing it from later editions. The explanatory note in the 1522 edition under the rubric ‘Annotations: Ex Capite Quinto’ for *I John 5* provides his extensive remarks against it. His arguments are not compelling in every case. However, Richard Porson (1759-1808) put up the best opposition to the Johannine Comma, (*I Jn. 5:7* of the *Textus Receptus* includes the disputed text: *ὄτι τρεῖς εἰσιν οἱ μαρτυροῦντες ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ, ὁ πατήρ, ὁ λόγος, καὶ τὸ ἅγιον Πνεῦμα: καὶ οὗτοι οἱ τρεῖς ἓν εἰσι*), when he issued in 1790 his 400 page *Letters to Archdeacon Travis, in Answer to His Defence of The Three Heavenly Witnesses, I John 5:7*.

It is Italy I seek, my father's land, and my stock is from Jupiter most high.

C. believes the last five words of line 380 are interpolated, being "totally inappropriate." He says its "sounds rather silly... almost a note of foolish boasting." There is hardly a problem here. The *Aeneid* is an historical epic. The context everywhere is strictly mythical. *Pius* in line 380 need mean nothing less than 'reverent' or 'devoted'; certainly it carries much more meaning than 'loyal' denotes. As a devotee, the reference to Jupiter is appropriate to the context of Aeneas addressing his mother Venus in disguise. *Iove* oversees Aeneas journey: his confession to the Tyrian huntress (Venus) is not an assertion of pride but a humble testimonial. Also, Italy is not the land of the father of Aeneas. Should not the English gloss in line three read "... Italy to be my fatherland"?

Chapter three helps the reader identify corrupt readings. His first example is *DRN* 1.122:

Quo neque permaneant animae neque corpora  
nostra

*Where neither our souls nor our bodies remain,...*

C. writes "All manuscripts agree in attesting the reading of *permaneant*... this verb... is not to be found anywhere else in all the work of Lucretius." He argues against the reading not because it is absent from Lucretius' vocabulary but on account of how he construes *quo*, 'an adverb of motion to a place.' So C. proposes to read *permanare*. That word is frequently attested in the poem. The line of reasoning here is erroneous, I believe. In fact no change is needed given that (1) *permaneant* is attested by ALL [C.'s word] the MSS, and (2) that there is no metrical problem, and (3) that no difficult adjustment is required. C.'s argument allows for no literary incongruities, which may have been in Lucretius's mind as he composed, and it may be that he deliberately stretched the meaning of *permanare*. Some would designate this procedure 'radical criticism' – correcting the paradosis in the face of overwhelming evidence. I regard it as an exaggerated kind of enthusiasm, one that should be treated with caution when it manifests because it does not necessarily restore an ancient writer's wording. A poem may be recast, by conjecture, in a form that pleases a modern editor, in spite of substantial amounts of MS evidence to the contrary.

There is a personal element. C.'s writing acknowledges the debts he owes to Bentley (pp.76-79) in his Virgilian research. On pages 92-94 he also reveals what he owed to Emil Baehrens (1848-1888) when he edited the *Aeneid*. The final section treats of metrical corrup-

tions. Readers are informed that "the most common risk is that metrical anomalies, which are indicators of corruption, are not even noticed, but are pacifically accepted" (p.105). That is an inescapable reality. But it is a realism to which C. does well to alert the reader.

Here is another first-rate volume which may be placed on the shelf alongside other useful volumes such as P. Maas' *Textual Criticism* (1963), R. Renehan's *Greek Textual Criticism* (1970), J. Willis' *Latin Textual Criticism* (1972), M.L. West's *Textual Criticism and Editorial Technique* (1973) and R. Tarrant's *Texts, Editors, and Readers: Methods and Problems in Latin Textual Criticism* (2016). C. ranges far and wide through ancient epic, lyric, tragedy and satire. His book, though brief, should be read by critics who are interested in intricacies of prime importance. Its shortcomings are few: viz., of passages utilized in biblical studies, can C. really believe that *I Jn.* 5:7-8 was "the only one in the Bible which speaks of the Trinity"? –p.31; the Latin text on page 42 lacks an English translation. The *Index Nominum et Rerum* is not comprehensive. Many scholars are cited in volume's text and footnotes and receive no mention in the index: e.g., M.D. Reeve, pp.32,69,89.

Readers should be grateful to De Gruyter for publishing this private notebook of reflections on texts.

---

G. B. Cobbold,

*Lucretius: The Nature of the Universe*

Bolchazy-Carducci (2016). Pp. xxxii, 289.

ISBN 978 0 86516 838 1. \$24.00 (pb).

Considerations of a textual nature are fundamental to studies on the text of Lucretius' (99BC-55BC) poem. His poetry does not suffer from neglect in contemporary studies. Detailed research is conducted routinely on various passages. Critical editions of individual books or segments of his poetry can be found in many academic catalogs. Absent from most publishers inventories are new listings of English translations of the entire Latin text. It is not easy to find suitable persons to apply the time to do the work or to take upon themselves so much discomfort. Since the 17th century, the whole of *De Rerum Natura* has been translated into English less than 50 times.

The popularization of classical Latin texts in English language requires accomplished men and women of letters with superb literary skills. Specialized themes debated in antiquity still deserve a fair hearing today. The distance between ancient and modern persons is relative to the intellectual dexterity of a translator.

Converting older ideas and insights into useful data for the present generation is not as easy as it appears.

The *DRN* was known to a few writers in antiquity and to a few Latin-writing Patristic authors. 9th century Carolingian copies of it could be had at various locations during the Early Medieval Period; but it was lost from public notice, until its rediscovery by Gian Francesco Poggio Bracciolini (1380-1459). That finding was a fortuitous event: unbelievers in any god now had ammunition for challenging Christian thought. Didactic poetry was a common instructional form of composition employed in antiquity to educate readers. A large range of poetic texts of that type found their way into verse-forms (cf. Vergil's *Aeneid*, Lucan's *Pharsalia*, Hesiod's *Works and Days*). Lucretius chose an Epicurean-philosophical subject. His was something approximating to a dogmatic textbook arranged with care and written in a style that is characteristic of the poetry of his age.

Cobbold's translation meets the needs of lay readers who are helpless without a guide who proceeds competently with checks and controls.<sup>3</sup> The 'Introduction' is sufficient to acquaint readers with the poet and the poem's history. Translated into prose, each book is preceded by an italicized synopsis; the poem is divided into short sections, headed by appropriate captions. An 'Annotated Index of Topics and a Glossary of Proper Names' (pp.271-289) concludes the book. Cobbold has tilled *De Rerum Natura's* soil well, and up from it has sprung a harvest of veritable truths powerfully represented in the English language. Subtle nuances do not usually escape his notice. Through misunderstanding, a translator may mislead readers: overlooked truths can go undetected by those who are unable to consult the original Latin text. If the gloss, however, captures the meaning of the author, then the original text remains safeguarded, even if it is not accessible to the reader.

Of the limitations of language at I:27-45 Lucretius said

"... I am well aware how hard it will be to cast light on the shadowy arguments of the Greeks in Latin verse, particularly since I shall have to invent words to deal with many of these topics: the vocabulary of Latin is deficient, and the subject matter is entirely new" (Cobbold, p.8).

Cobbold confesses that this translation is not meant "to serve as an aid for those reading it in the original Latin; but rather to be read easily and comfortably by anyone interested in Roman history and literature, or

in ancient science and philosophy" (p.xxxiv). Scholars will take issue with some of the interpretative liberties that Cobbold has allowed himself. Criticism will be leveled at some of his renderings. Despite this note of caution, scholars in private academies of learning, students in Junior Colleges, and non-specialists will not be disappointed. The translation itself is fluid and captivating. Even if there is an occasional infelicitous depiction of Latin sense, like 'big talkers' (p.88), the modern reader still will find comfort in the *DRN's* tuition.

The theological tenets to which Lucretius held were not mainstream opinions. Nor were all his readers, whoever they might have been, subscribers to his dogmatic views. It is doubtful that he did not blush when he wrote V.146-80:

"The important point about the gods is this: you should not believe that they live anywhere in our world....

Granted all this, my dear Memmius, it is quite unrealistic to pretend that the gods assembled the world, in all its magnificent complexity, by their own free will, or that it is consequently our duty to praise their work as a great and wonderful achievement. It is absurd to believe that the world is everlasting and indestructible; and even more absurd to suggest that long ago the gods drew up plans, and established a system that could never be overthrown, or subverted by argument, or abandoned, or questioned in any way—all for the benefit of the human race" (p.178).

As is obvious, Lucretius was not impressed by Roman gods; nonetheless he seems deferential to them when he pens verses to them, as a literary device, at the outset of certain books of the poem (e.g., I.1-49; IV.1-25); but this was a common phenomenon in ancient Greek and Latin poetry. Rapidly the poet shifts gears, discarding deity as a source of invention and substituting purely natural causes of creation. Lucretius weaves a web of Latin verse that avoids generalities. Cobbold captures the essence and tones of the Latin. The book's language is well-managed, yet vivid: e.g., I.265-328:

"Consider first the power of the wind: when it is once stirred up, it beats upon the sea and capsizes ships and rips away clouds. Or, it may rush across a plain in savage gusts, uprooting trees everywhere and battering the mountaintops with whirlwinds that wipe out whole forests. It rages, it roars, it screams. Gales slice apart the sea, the land, and the

---

<sup>3</sup> I shall apply the numeration that Cobbold uses for subdivisions in *DRN*. Because of how he divides his translation into sections, one must compare his translation with the Latin text to discern the exact verses quoted.

clouds, and whisk them up in sudden dangerous tornadoes. You cannot see the wind but it is obviously real.

Consider the destructive force of water: after a rain-storm a river, which you might once have thought was harmless, bursts its banks and barrels down from the mountains in a flash flood, bringing with it splintered branches and tree trunks. The best built bridges are no match for its strength; their trusses are pounded to bits by the foaming storm water. It howls and destroys as it goes. It uproots huge rocks. It washes away whatever stands in its way." (pp.13-14).

Notwithstanding the freedom the translator allows himself in rendering the Latin, the book itself is a valuable contribution to interpretations of classical texts. It enters the marketplace when there is a swell of specialized articles on *DRN*. Most of them address presumed textual errors. Few of them focus on literary-textual description. By dedicated study of complex materials, Cobbold now has supplied readers with constructive results. In order to comprehend the intrinsic worth of *Lucretius: The Nature of the Universe* one must come to know the meaning of Lucretius' Latin text. In this way, the translation will come close to being as precious a resource as the original Latin. Pearls of great price are not often discovered, but when those are found, their value is to be calculated by the appreciation they incur while in the possession of caring owners.

Not since I read Rolf Humphries' (1896-1969) verse translation *Lucretius: The Way Things Are* (1969) was I able to say that it has been a pleasure to spend prolonged periods of time perusing another popular translation of *DRN*.

The book is not without defects. Cobbold believes *De Rerum Natura* literally means "On the Nature of the Universe" (p.xxviii). The general idea of a cosmos is not present in the Latin. In its literal sense, it refers to aspects 'Of the Coming into Being of Things': *Rerum*, being a noun denoting real but vague entities. Cobbold assumes that the early Christians misunderstood the Epicureans 'definition of pleasure' (p.xxxiii) and so attacked Epicurus (341BC-270BC). Is it not likely, rather, that the Christian writers opposed Epicureanism not on account of a misunderstanding, but because of the lifestyles practiced by its adherents, which were all too familiar to early followers of Jesus' teachings?

Wilfried Härle,  
*Outline of Christian Doctrine: An  
Evangelical Dogmatics.*

Eerdmans (2015). Pp. 643.  
ISBN 978 0 8028 4842 0. \$50.00 (hb).

Foundations of any study of theology consist of various strata of biblical texts. Dogmatic formulations usually arise as a consequence of an overprovision of interpretations. Creeds and confessions appear early in the history of the Christian church. The explication of specific doctrinal points was conducted with a view to refuting heresy and to standardizing the theological views of various sects. John of Damascus' (675-749) *Exposition of the Orthodox Faith* was an example of such an expositor. His was a systematization of accepted ideas and opinions current among ancient writers. Systems of divinity, however, as understood by modern, Christian academics, were not inaugurated until the so-called Middle Ages. Thomas Aquinas' (1225-1274) ground-breaking work, *Summa Theologica*, established once and for all theology's reign over the sciences of that day. The scholastic study of Scripture in European universities became a burgeoning discipline. The latter Renaissance era saw a few Protestant Reformers reconstruct apologetic techniques that were maintained until skeptic scholars of the Enlightenment called into question the most basic premises of belief in God or "inspired" scripture. The rationalism of the day affected biblical studies in the West for the next two centuries.

Friedrich Schleiermacher (1768-1834) made an earnest attempt to merge aspects of skepticism with basic Christian dogma. The result was a modern liberal theology. Little of the scholastic forms of theology continued. The critical reasoning employed by German theologians in the twentieth century became self-reflective. The insights gained produced newer hypotheses, diverse theologies. Mostly theoretical, holders of these new views deemed absolute-truth to be non-existent. Since the mainstream foundational beliefs of theology were dismantled, all that remained to be done was to erect new "pillars of belief" upon a base of critical inquiry. This newest archetype did not win the approval of all persons. Wilfried Härle is another one of those people who is displeased.

Härle (hereafter H.) is an author, whose *Outlines*, even if designed to be introductory, reflect a continuance of the German school of meticulous study. He has an acute mind. His book is scholastic, Aristotelian in the setting forth of arguments: meeting one objection after another with rhetorical force. The tenor of H.'s writing is irenic, even when expressing disagreement. The field in which he has sown his seeds of theology is fertilized

with very strong Lutheran convictions. It is a laborious work; it will rival many standard introductory volumes in the marketplace at present. I cannot think of a theologian in the West who could have or would have composed a digest like this one.

The Table of Contents is comprehensive. There are fifteen chapters each consisting of various sub-sections: INTRODUCTION: (1) Dogmatics in the Whole Context of Theology as Science; I THE ESSENCE OF THE CHRISTIAN FAITH: (2) The Question of the Essence of the Christian Faith, (3) God's Revelation of Jesus Christ as the Basis of the Christian Faith, (4) The Bible as Source and Norm of the Christian Faith, (5) The Church's Confession as the Decisive Interpretation of the Christian Faith, (6) The Present Lifeworld as the Context of the Christian Faith; II EXPLICATION OF THE CHRISTIAN UNDERSTANDING OF REALITY: (7) Knowledge of God and of the World; Part A: The Christian Understanding of God: (8) The Being of God (Theo-logy), (9) God's Self-Disclosure in Jesus Christ (Christology), (10) The Presence of God as Holy Spirit (Pneumatology), (11) The Triune Essence of God (Doctrine of the Trinity); Part B: The Christian Faith's Understanding of the World: (12) The Created World (Doctrine of Creation), (13) The Fallen World (Hamartiology), (14) The Reconciled World (Soteriology), (15) The Completed World (Eschatology), Select Bibliography and indices.

In the Editor's Introduction, Nicholas Sogovsky reports that for the last twenty years H.'s *Dogmatik* "has been the most widely used German text to introduce students to Christian doctrine." The claim is not hard to believe. A survey of the book's content follows. P. 14: H. follows Wolfhart Pannenberg's (1928-2014) belief that theology "must take its general bearings from the general concept of science". In the past that belief would have worried me. Anytime someone tries to harmonize the core tenets of Christianity with the results of critical, scientific research the outcome tends to be bad for both departments. The results of "scientific research" always originate from the moods of the critics doing the research; and the critics' frame of mind completely controls how classical terms will be interpreted, and how ancient contexts will be re-imagined. Therefore the positive influence is limited.

In the early part of the book, this view leads H. into many convoluted discussions. Instead of being mesmerized by scientific terminology – in an introductory volume – the study of theology is improved when it is engaged in arguments which are scriptural, reflective and systematic. There is an abundance of theory of ideas, but little in the first sixty pages which advances the reader in the knowledge of historical dogmatics. In fact this is the least satisfactory portion of the book. It

is too theoretical, often governed by contradictions, but one should be cautious in criticizing H. exclusively on these grounds.

P.40: after a long discourse trying to explain "essence" he concludes, "This is why the attempt to define "essence" as the "distinctive and unmistakable" is unclear and misleading." Again, P.44: speaking of the meaning of faith/belief he writes, "'trust" means: allowing yourself, in your deeds and in your expectations and plans for action, to be drawn by another person or being towards devotion to this other person or being. But this definition is still too imprecise, as it is too informal." P.61: wanting to explain the basic core or 'essence of The Christian Faith' he states: "Determining its essence represents for theology a hermeneutic, analytic and reconstructive task that is both *difficult* to understand and *impossible* to complete" [italics mine]. Yet later on page 70 he can say of Jesus Christ: "...because it is with him that the identity, that is, the essence, of the Christian faith stands or falls." Although rudimentary, that was not a disingenuous summary of his views.

Not a few German divines publish scholarship that is equally hard going. They tend to distrust their own theologies, and have a harder time reconstructing them. The motive behind trying to explicate a [dogmatic] theology that is *impossible* to grasp may be questioned by readers. Words are literary signs, and when used by a skillful word-smith they are capable of much. This notion is not new. It is fairly old. Plato (c.429-347BC) believed language was instrumental. H. would agree I'm sure, even if he succumbs to a philosophy of language so tedious that it encumbers his detailed lines of reasoning. When meanings of words are elusive to an author, so are the right ways to use them. He often takes two full pages to state what could be said in one elongated paragraph.

H. erects his Dogmatics on his explanation of *systematic theology*: H. will be "giving an account of the truth-content of the Christian faith in the face of internal and external challenges" (p.27). The terms 'systematic theology' entail a classification of relations, a study of God's interaction with mankind in his world, both of which he is said to have created. Following H.'s scheme of systematics I supply extracts and some further remarks on his opinions.

Presenting plainly some texts of scripture which claim the exceptionality of Christ (p.76), he cites: e.g., *Jn.* 1:14, *Mt.* 11:27, *Jn.* 14:6 and *Ac.* 4:12 as he builds a case for Jesus' uniqueness:

"It is not so much the positive statements, but rather the negations associated with them ("no

one”, “no”) that give the impression of exclusivity. However, if we look at these statements closely, it can be seen that exclusivity applies only in one particular - though crucial - respect: with regard to revelation as the *way to salvation*. Here there is no possibility at all of any alternative, division, or amendment.

The real challenge, particularly for our pluralistic time and age, lies in the proposition that there are not several, or any number of, routes to salvation, but only *one* route, and that this route is revealed by God in Jesus Christ.”

The above citation is clear. From Jesus’ incarnation, throughout his sinless mediation, and unto his exaltation to God’s throne H. assumes the character of Christ to be unique. Some positions are difficult to reconcile with scripture, as when he proposes (p.84) that

“Christians really do have the missionary task of bearing witness to the revelation of God... this testimony has the character of a proclamation through which *God* can reveal himself to a person, in that he creates certainty of truth in him or her and awakens faith. This indispensable testimony to the truth of the revelation of Christ must however be radically distinguished from the claim towards other people, that they acknowledge the truth of the Christ revelation without its having been disclosed to them as such. Such a claim of absoluteness would be a demand for subjugation that violated the conscience of the people at whom it was directed, something that could never be countenanced within the mission of the Christian faith.”

The second sentence contains the crux of predestinarian salvation. The hopelessly depraved (or, dead-in-her-sins) person is graciously regenerated, or administered ‘faith’, by God, in order to be awakened to the great eternal truth of Jesus’ person and works. This thought is amplified on pages 254-300. The human capacity to apply reason to these truths is not a foregone event in that scheme. The last two sentences seem to echo a sentiment of universal salvation: namely, if a group of people have not heard of Jesus’ redemptive vocation they are not held responsible as guilty persons. The other side of the coin is that God would not hold these persons responsible for what they did not know. But the latter half of *Romans* 1 says otherwise. It is a chapter, in which, it is declared that mankind is judged not merely on the basis of his or her knowledge of Jesus, but according to their disavowal of explicit knowledge which is manifest to all persons through creation.

H. believes himself to be a confessional theologian (cf. his statement on the Formula of Concord, 1577; p.123), holding to the traditional Protestant canon. He writes (p.90) “Since the biblical canon is understood as the consequence of the revelation of God, the biblical writings are therefore, according to the teaching of the reformers, ‘the only rule and guiding principle according to which all teachings and teachers are to be evaluated and judged.’” He avers the construction of the canon preserves the true faith from distortion. Arguing for the significance of the normative canon, and against a statement formulated in the Council of Trent, he contends “For that reason it is impossible to adopt the Roman Catholic teaching according to which the church accepts and venerates written and unwritten tradition ‘with the same sense of loyalty and reverence with which it accepts and reveres all the books both of the Old and New Testament’” (p.91). Apocryphal texts are infrequently mentioned by H., mainly in footnotes.

He treads with caution on the topic of inspiration (pp.96-99). A common error is repeated. He denies the plausibility of any doctrine which upholds the inerrancy of scripture, saying, “any such attempt arises from the desire - a desire that contradicts the certainty of faith - to render witness to the revelation unassailable. In view of the fact that the Bible is manifestly rooted in history and capable of error, such an attempt cannot succeed” (p.96). All will not give their assent to that view of inerrancy. Except for instances within Catholic and Orthodox churches, that specific doctrine lost its footing among Protestants on the European continent more than two centuries ago. Still “inerrancy” is an idea maintained by evangelical Christians in North America and in the districts east of the Mediterranean Sea and south of it. On this point H. may be wrong, he does not put forward even the idea of a hypothetical set of original documents inerrantly composed. The discussion is original, insightful, but definitely in need of the moorings of more scripture.

H. respects the Roman Catholic position; and believes ‘the doctrine of Papal infallibility’ to be an obstacle in the way of any reunion of churches of the Reformation and of churches of Roman Catholic communions (p.117), especially since the papal stricture was reaffirmed at Vatican II (*Lumen Gentium* 25). What was reaffirmed? The Council of Trent (1545-1563) made no reference of papal infallibility. An incapability of erring was relegated to the church, of which it is stated (*Catechismus Romanus*, I, p. 10, ch. 16) “This one [Roman] Catholic Church cannot err in handing down the doctrine of faith and morals.” However, three centuries later on July 18 1870 papal infallibility was promulgated emphatically in Rome where it was insisted:

“... we teach and define that it is a dogma divinely revealed: that the Roman pontiff, when he speaks *ex cathedra*, that is, when in discharge of the office of pastor and doctor of all Christians, by virtue of his supreme apostolic authority, he defines a doctrine regarding faith and morals to be held by the Universal Church, by the divine assistance promised to him in blessed Peter, is possessed of that infallibility with which the Divine Redeemer willed that his Church should be endowed for defining doctrine regarding faith or morals: and that, therefore, such definitions of the Roman Pontiff are irreformable of themselves, and not from the consent of the Church”. See H.E. Manning, *The True Story of the Vatican Council* (London, 1877), p.184.

Chapter 8 focuses entirely on the idea that the essence of God is love, that it is the main constituent of God's nature. So he writes:

“I would like to point out here that talk of God's mysteriousness and strangeness actually presupposes that God's essence is decisively determined by grace, goodness or love. It is only because of this precondition that God appears puzzling and strange to us” (p.197). He also says “in the statement ‘God is love’ is concentrated, as we said, a wealth of biblical, ecclesial and theological statements about God” (loc. cit.).

Not so. It would not be possible to presuppose much about a God who is altogether mysterious. The fact that anything can be presumed implies degrees of revelation were provided, not just through the revelation of Jesus. Indeed why exalt one attribute, love, above all the other perfections of God? This love-view is restated again (p.203) where he says “love alone can be equated with the essence of God.” As noted above, H.'s idea of God's essence is indefinite. The biblical texts which reveal God's love, do not display in any lesser glory God's qualities of holiness, righteousness, jealousy or his modes of wrath.<sup>4</sup> The language describing each of them is equally vigorous and

attractive. H.'s view is a powerful thesis, and he uses it to substantiate his claim that “our reflections on the Christian understanding of God have rested on the insight that God's essence is love” (p.215). The promotion of this truth hardly paves the way toward the extirpation of errors which may soon appear as a result of his opinions.

**Excursus:** the use of ‘love’ as the definitive trait of God's being is more than an understated trend. It has swept its way over the shores of the field of systematics. The perspective it has left is too one-sided, and at points misleading. Liberal clergy and a few evangelical scholars are distressed over Old Testament passages which claim that some miseries and anguish borne by men originated with God, e.g., the flood waters that saved Noah and his family are supposed to have wiped out the remaining populace. All these things, according to scripture emanate from a just God. So to post-modern critics, even notions of wrath or hell are topics seemingly inconsistent with the nature of a benevolent being. Hypotheses of these kinds are influential in societies today.

In a fine systematic theology recently published by Gerald Bray entitled *‘God is Love’* (Crossway, 2012), therein love again swallows up all God's other qualities: e.g., p. 11: “It explains how God loves what he has made...”; p.17: “God's love for us is deep and all embracing”; p.81: “The love of God reaches out to each of us individually”; p.118: speaking of the Son's love for the Holy Spirit and of the Holy Spirit's love for the Father he writes, “the two things go together... making it possible for us not only to experience the love of God...”; p.176: “...the second and third persons of the Trinity love the first and have given him the honor of precedence within their relationship”; p.235: “In the wisdom of his all-embracing love...”; p.309: “Rebellion against God is the rejection of God's love.”; p.437: “...in his love, God left his rebellious creatures enough light...”; p.510: “However we conceive God's plan... it is designed and executed in love.”; p.608: “God's grace is the fruit of his love.”; p.670: “The church is primarily the community of those who have come to know the love of God...” and p.740: “Love is our eternal destiny.”

So much of what H. says is true. No one familiar with scripture can doubt the solemnity of those claims;

---

<sup>4</sup> H. is aware of the issue of God's wrath. The best he can do on page 226 is quote Otto Weber (1902-1966): “The wrath of God can only be understood as God's real and effective ‘No’ to sin. Since sin, for its part, is the rejection of the love of God ... the wrath of God is nothing other than his love turning against its own rejection.” Therefore at footnote 55, on page 227, he labels wrath “an aspect of the love of God.” The discussion is a mere three paragraphs long; ‘wrath’ is absent from the index of subjects. He does not go as far as Schleiermacher in avoidance of teaching on God's anger, but H.'s teaching on theodicy (an argument in defense of God's goodness despite the existence of evil) is a replacement for a genuine examination of Ponerology, (the study of evil). God's judgement is much more than a repudiation of transgression, a ‘No’ to sin; it is punitive. It is God sternly disciplining ancient Israelites and others for disobeying his statutes: e.g., *Numbers* 21:6 the Lord sent fiery serpents among the people who bit them and some of them died; *II Chronicles* 36 God simultaneously sent Jeremiah to Israel to prophesy to them (v.15) as an act of God's compassion on them, while also raising up the Babylonians, because of Israel's obstinacy, to carry away most of them to a foreign land (vv.20-21); *Acts* 12:23 the angel of the Lord smote Herod and he died; *Acts* 13:11 God blinded Elymas the sorcerer and the plagues poured forth upon the earth in *John's Revelation*. All of them are as consequential to comprehending the disposition of God's character as is the account of the multiplication of the loaves of bread by Jesus in *John* 6:1-13. Since justice is the cornerstone of the biblical God's government, despite the hundreds of reports of God's works in the Bible, no injustice or unrighteousness may be ascribed to his actions however curious or indecorous they may seem to readers.



nevertheless a few of them are oddly worded. And the adduction of everything towards love may be favorable to the conscience of secular and/or carnal readers, but some misrepresentation of God, although unintended, is inevitable. To reiterate, the positive prominence given to only one divine attribute, love, is incompletely supported by the biblical depiction of God; and the theory does not approach to the nature of cogent evidence.

A critical, short piece on Mariology is inserted on pages 297-299. It is marked by characteristic German thoroughness. His account of the Triune essence of God (pp.323-340) is influenced by remarks set forth in Karl Barth's arguments, bearing strong resemblance to the modalism taught in patristic times. This was the belief that God is one person who did reveal himself in three forms. He is unwilling to found his Trinitarian belief firmly on scripture, taking a purely historical approach. He asserts that the Nicene Creed and the Nicene-Constantinopolitan creed "were less obviously successful" in maintaining "oneness in the face of tritheistic tendencies" (p.327). He prefers the term 'mode of being' (see also p.334) to the word person because the latter is too "tied to the idea of individual instance" (p.328).

Believing that dogmatics should treat more than anthropology in its section on 'doctrine about creatures', he seems to be of the opinion that it is an indefensible theological position which argues to save human life but also permits plants and animals to be destroyed (p.360). H. oddly defines sin in this way: it is "primarily lostness, collapse, failure, and not primarily rebellion, disobedience, rejection of God." A few lines later he says that "in the biblical and reformation sense, sin is most appropriately spoken of when it is seen as a *missing of the destiny to live, as a breakdown or failure of Life*" (italics mine, p.397). The claims are not convincing. On page 400 he writes "Human beings are capable of sin, that is, they can fail to realize their destiny". This re-imagined sense disfigures the meaning of sin.

He affirms the doctrine of original sin (p.407). Following Martin Luther, H. supports the Reformation teaching of the enslaved will (pp.409-10); however he denies the notion that this is a thesis in favor of determinism: "each human being... has freedom of action.... There are of course limits to their ability, but within those limits, they can choose and act on their own initiative" (p.409). However, the limits of their choices are not delineated. In truth, according to H., the conviction of the *enslaved will, servum arbitrium*, descends in Christian tradition, not from scripture but from a period of time, the starting point being "at least the time of Augustine" (p.409).

In regard to election or double predestination at *Romans 9:22-23* he follows the 1577 Lutheran statement of faith, writing: "The Formula of Concord interprets this biblical text as follows: For the Apostle clearly says there that God 'endured with much patience the vessels of wrath,' and he does not say that God made them vessels of wrath. For if that had been his will, he would not have needed to have 'much patience.' That they were prepared for condemnation is to be blamed on the devil and the human beings themselves, not on God" (p.431). He does not believe that scripture teaches that baptism is dependent on a person's faith. Thus the baptism of infants is founded on the idea that it

"gives expression to the unconditionality of the divine promise of salvation. In a situation in life where it is not yet possible to speak of the infant's own achievement, or of a condition he or she must fulfill, a newborn human being is granted salvation as the destiny of his or her life in a clearly palpable fashion" (p.451).

Readers may find the argument somewhat farfetched. He means that the electing power of God may be dispensed arbitrarily by ordained clergy to all children. Moreover, since the relation between baptism and faith is not close, it leads to the notion that children of people of other faiths who are baptized (secretly or openly) become unconditionally elected through the dispersion of water upon them. The final section on Eschatology (pp.486-526) need not have been included. It is not an examination of what scripture says of the end of the age or of the consummation of all things, but of extracts of his beliefs on heaven and hell, and of a disconcerting concept of Christ the judge of all mankind (p.522).

*Details:* p.255 the Roman emperor was not always "understood as being of a divine nature"; H. believes the Jewish faith existed for a long period of time without a "creation credo": that is to say that the *Genesis 1 and 2* accounts "arose out of the encounter between the faith of Yahweh and other religions that laid claim to the nature or the coming into existence of the world as the sphere or work of other gods" (p.345-6). If there are manuscripts of ancient torah documents which did not contain the 'creation narrative', the Psalmists were unaware of it, just as they were unaware that their belief in Jehovah's creation, and their description of it, was an adaptation of a pagan concept. And H. denies the concept of creation *ex nihilo*, stating: "In the biblical creation narratives, there is no presupposition about creation from nothing" (p.356). His descriptions of all these things is based upon the Graf-Wellhausen documentary hypothesis theory, which states that the first five books of the bible comprise five different sources: a Jahwist source, written c. 950 BC, an Elohist

source written c. 850 BC, a Deuteronomist source written c. 600 BC, and a Priestly source written c. 500 BC.<sup>5</sup>

It is much easier to review a dogmatic theological textbook than it is to write one. As noted above, this one has its own complexities. H.'s volume provides a glimpse into how God is understood by one German scholar and possibly by the many readers of his dogmatics. Theology, generally, denotes the study of God. The writing of it usually is selective, and based on current academic trends. I believe it would be more appropriate for students of theology to reorient their perspective, returning to earlier sources, i.e., to eastern and western Church Fathers whose writings are extant. Christian theology should present from holy writings what may be known of God, emphasizing the Godhead's trinity of distinction.

Overstressing Christ in order to produce a Christo-centric system of divinity at this point is commonplace. For H. Christology is Theology Proper. This notion is not true to scripture. Absent from these discussions is a worthwhile treatment of 'Paterology', the study of God's status as Father or as one who begets; Pneumatology, too, is connected, but only insofar as it too exists within the trinity of distinction featured in the term 'Theology.' Academic writing on biblical revelation cannot advance very far if the proper sequence of the disclosure of God's characteristics is avoided.

H.'s book is rather more than introductory; whether or not it is "Evangelical" will be determined by how readers define the term. The above citations from the text present a large amount of the arguments he submits. To be credible, single-volume systematic theologies must present an adequate conception of how God was comprehended in the Bible and explained in early rabbinic texts and by the earliest adherents to the Christian faith. This book purports to reflect Lutheran views or the views of the Lutheran churches of the Reformation. It does not interact with the rabbinical corpus or with the writings of Apostolic Fathers or of later Patristic Fathers. Although H. is Protestant, suitable help could have been given to him by drawing on the annotations of *The Haydock Bible* (1811).

Editing: p. 117: read "...of the gospel will in the future be revealed..."; instead of "...gospel will in future be revealed..."

## HERODOTUS, A MAN WITH AN INQUIRING MIND

Walter Blanco & Jennifer T. Roberts,  
*Herodotus: The Histories.*

Norton (2nd. ed. 2013). Pp. xxi, 647.  
ISBN 978 0 393 93397 0. \$23.00 (pb).

Norton publishers should be commended. One of the chief architects of the classical foundations of western civilization has reappeared again in his entirety through this revised edition. W. Blanco - the translator, and J. Roberts (hereafter B&R) provide a lucid and effective introduction (pp.ix-xiii) to these international chronicles. Herodotus (c.484BC-c.420BC), the teller of tales and of truth, originated the genre of historical documentary in Greek language. Although his narrative is replete with reports of mythic and fictional accounts, his version of precedents and proceedings of armed confrontations between Greeks and Persians is superb. Herodotus was a reverent soul; impiety was obnoxious to him; his texts are deeply religious.

B&R are keen to expose a truth: "Herodotus' history embodies a moral: those who overreach or ignore natural limits are doomed" (p.xi). Ethical points are less important to some readers today than they were long ago. Greek tragedians and writers of Old and New comedy positively and negatively influenced many citizens and foreigners by their stage inventions. Herodotus, though, wanted readers of his prose to learn of some causes of war, and of the consequences resulting from going too far. Moreover he wanted to inform readers of the customs of surrounding cultures, and of the disruptions that war brings to their societal practices.

In ancient times a text was a literary classroom through which an author's characters provided private and public tuition to readers and listeners. B&R are cognizant of this fact. Their book aids the reader in his or her instruction. One advantage is that, with only a brief 'Introduction', readers may go directly to the text; supplementary material is placed at the end of the book (pp.421-623: i.e., various essays, glossary, selected bibliography, indices.). Footnotes are infrequent, concise and not distracting. Each of the nine books is preceded by succinct summary; although the one before book one could have been attached to the introduction since the significance of the outline to book one is negligible. Herodotus' use of material is distinct. By means of first-hand reporting, the peoples' perspectives are given a priority not given in any other comparable

---

5 Karl H. Graf (1815-1869) and Julius Wellhausen (1844-1918) were esteemed Orientalists in their day. Their hypotheses regarding the origin of Hebrew scripture long ago was resisted but not yet abandoned by most Old Testament scholars.

ancient near eastern text (cf. 2.123;7.152). It would be 1900 years later before serious, but similar notice would be taken of varied classes of people, when ancient Romans become the focal point of research being done by American and British classicists.

It is often assumed that Herodotus was deceptive. It is doubtful that he was a determined liar. Scholars who impugn his motives do no more or less damage to Herodotus' name than they do to their own names, since their displays of prejudice mirror the activity they seek to undermine. Some critical scholars, too, misinform readers. Indeed the falsifications fall under the rubrics "reconstruction" or "re-imagining". Sometimes a more scientific word is used, e.g., "conjecture."

*Summary.* Herodotus has much to say and many ways to say it. His interests are broad and diverse. Note some of the contents of each book: (1) introductory; but biographical material on Croesus the Lydian is set forth; (2) details of Herodotus' Egyptian researches; (3) Egypt's conquest by Cyrus son of Cambyses; (4) Herodotus' examination of Scythia, and his remarks on the Amazons, the fierce warrior women; (5) comments on Athenian history and events leading to Greek and Persian conflict; (6) Battle in the plain of Marathon; (7) Battle at Thermopylae; (8) Battle of Salamis; (9) Battles at Plataea and Mycale.

*The Translation.* 'Theories' of translation abound. It is to the readers' benefit B&R did not provide one. Not since medieval times have translators strictly applied methods of word-conversion with valid consistency. So it is better to discover modes of translation through the study of individual passages.

In comparison to *The Landmark Herodotus* (2007), Norton's *Herodotus: The Histories* is the more appealing edition in my opinion. The former gives me all that I want to know and much more that I do not desire to know. At nearly 1000 pages it is bulky, useful specifically for its geographical features and for reference purposes, but who wants to read the histories while grappling with a 3 ½ lb. book? The Landmark edition puts on display various textual issues. The Norton text passes over them without notice. Neither of the volumes in either series is noted for their criticism of texts anyhow so the disadvantages are minimal.

However, differences do manifest when comparing the two translations while reading C. Hude's Oxford Classical Text of the histories. As for MS readings, e.g., at 1.58 Landmark inserts "many peoples"/Norton retains "Pelasgians"; at 1.64.3 Landmark inserts "tyrant of the Athenians"/Norton retains "ruler of Athens"; at 2.116.2 Landmark inserts "it is clear that he accordingly composed (and nowhere contradicted) a version of the

wanderings of Alexandros"/Norton has "It is clear that in the *Iliad* he let slip his knowledge of the wanderings of Alexander (which he nowhere retracts)"; at 7.36.2 Landmark departs from MSS, inserting "They left a gap between the penteconters and triremes large enough to sail through..."/Norton: "Narrow openings or passages were left between the penteconters in three places so that people could sail in and out..."; at 8.77 Landmark has "when I consider words like these"/Norton prints "when I look at something like this" [underlining mine].

The Landmark translator sacrifices, by degrees, eloquence for stricter adherence to the Greek text. In contrast, the expressiveness of the Norton version does not denote inexactness, but the grammar and sentence structure of the English do not always reflect the movements of the Greek tenses. Subtexts from G.C. Macaulay's 1890 translation never are far from translators, and B&R renew old acquaintances with his renderings in numerous places. See for yourself at 1.17:

ἄλλα δὲ ἔργα ἀπεδέξατο ἑὼν ἐν τῇ ἀρχῇ ἀξιαπνηγτότατα τάδε. ἐπολέμησε Μιλησίοισι, παραδεξάμενος τὸν πόλεμον παρὰ τοῦ πατρός. ἐπελαύνων γὰρ ἐπολιόρκειε τὴν Μίλητον τρόπῳ τοιῷδε: ὄκως μὲν εἴη ἐν τῇ γῆ καρπὸς ἄδρός, τηνικαῦτα ἐσέβαλλε τὴν στρατιήν: ἐστρατεύετο δὲ ὑπὸ συριγγῶν τε καὶ πηκτιδῶν καὶ αὔλου γυναικίου τε καὶ ἀνδρηίου. [2] ὡς δὲ ἐς τὴν Μιλησίην ἀπικοίτο, οἰκήματα μὲν τὰ ἐπὶ τῶν ἀγρῶν οὔτε κατέβαλλε οὔτε ἐνεπίμπρη οὔτε θύρας ἀπέσπα, ἕα δὲ κατὰ χώρην ἐσάναι: ὁ δὲ τὰ τε δένδρεα καὶ τὸν καρπὸν τὸν ἐν τῇ γῆ ὄκως διαφθεῖρει, ἀπαλλάσσει ὅπισω. [3] τῆς γὰρ θαλάσσης οἱ Μιλήσιοι ἐπεκράτεον, ὥστε ἐπέδρης μὴ εἶναι ἔργον τῆς στρατιῆς. τὰς δὲ οἰκίας οὐ κατέβαλλε ὁ Λυδὸς τῶνδε εἵνεκα, ὄκως ἔχοιεν ἐνθεύτεν ὀρμώμενοι τὴν γῆν σπεῖρειν τε καὶ ἐργάζεσθαι οἱ Μιλήσιοι, αὐτὸς δὲ ἐκείνων ἐργαζομένων ἔχοι τι καὶ σίνεσθαι ἐσβάλλων.

The passage outlines some of the exploits of Alyattes (d. 560BC) son of Sadyattes, one who reigned for 12 years. He was the so-called founding king of the Lydian empire and was a fierce warrior who sired Croesus. B&R render the first sentence rather freely, "*These are the other great and noteworthy deeds Alyattes performed during his reign...*". Readers are afforded some help here. Even though the king is the subject, who may be deduced from preceding passages, the name Alyattes is absent from that specific Greek sentence. In its entirety 1.17 is quite lively, even emotive, containing several striking phrases. The timing of the invasion was strategic, replete with musical accompaniment. Lydian soldiers refrained from wrecking the dwelling places of the Milesians; but agriculture was a target of the king's malevolent plan. B&R capture the fluidity of Herodotus' text, writing:

*"This is how he invaded Miletus: he brought his army as soon as the crop was ripe in the fields. They marched to shepherd's pipes and lutes, fifes and flutes. When he came to Miletus, he did not demolish or burn even or even tear out the doors of any of the houses in the fields, but let them stand throughout the countryside. When*

he had completely destroyed the trees and crops in the fields, though, he would go back home. The Milesians controlled the sea, so there was no point in having an army set up a regular siege. The reason why the Lydian did not destroy the houses was so that the Milesians would be able to live in them while they went out to sow and work the fields, and so that he, after all their labor, would have something to destroy during his invasions.”

The English text reflects the Greek insofar as it mirrors Herodotus’ record. At 1.17.2 the adverbial use of “when” in B&R’s English also could be given a conjunctive gist, ‘[once] he reached Miletus...’, hinting, in a subtle way, at the exertive force necessary for overland movements during harvest. The mental picture is of the extension of one’s self into another sphere, with reference to a goal or objective, namely Miletus. Admittedly this assertion of mine is somewhat otiose, but it is nonetheless revealing. Whether good or bad, all translation is a form of interpretation. And the craft itself is demanding. Those specialists who do it well possess expansive philological skill and verve. B&R offers an attractive style.

Considering all the riches between its covers the purchased of it would be a worthwhile investment. The advertisement set forth on the back of the book is true: “Each Norton Critical Edition includes an authoritative text, contextual and source materials, and a wide range of interpretations -- from contemporary perspectives to the most current critical theory – as well as a bibliography and, in many cases, a chronology of the author’s life and work.”

It is hard to conceive a better assemblage of excerpts and essays. They comprise sections on ‘Backgrounds’ (pp.423-465) and ‘Commentaries’ (pp.469-609); James Romm’s brief treatise, ‘The Shape of Herodotus’ World’ was specially commissioned for this edition. If ever a third edition is issued, may I suggest to the editors that they include G.E.M. De Ste Croix’s paper ‘Herodotus’ in *Greece and Rome*, Vol. 24, No. 2, Oct. 1977, pp.130-148.

Bill T. Arnold & Richard S. Hess,  
*Ancient Israel’s History:*  
*An Introduction to Issues and Sources.*  
Baker Academic (2014). Pp. xv, 544.  
ISBN 978 0 8010 3930 0. \$44.99 (hb).

On the Baker Academic blog, the editors answer the question ‘Why We Wrote *Ancient Israel’s History*’:

[it] “grows out of a need we noticed many years ago when we were students together at Hebrew Union College...” and “little has been produced that attempts to dig more deeply into the historical questions relevant to specific areas of Israel’s history, to make full use and evaluation of the relevant evidence, and to do so within a handbook that surveys that entire history...” First, the aim is that it will provide a comprehensive survey of the field for the advanced undergraduate student and for the graduate student...” Secondly, “*Ancient Israel’s History* attempts to provide a useful resource for the scholar who wishes to understand the diverse perspectives in historical questions of this period and related issues of culture...” Thirdly, “our book attempts to provide prolegomena, or preliminary steps, to the study of Israel’s history.”

Hebrew-Bible studies are flourishing. One welcome trend in recent decades has been the issuance of those findings. The *Status Quaestionis* is apparent in this book. Most readers will delight in the book’s diagnostic value, longstanding difficulties are identified candidly. Several authors even invite readers to modify some established views. Students of the history of ancient Israel are awarded problems and prizes in abundance whenever they seek to acquaint themselves with certain procedures that fostered the destabilization of conventional views. As much occurred all the way through Church history each time readers of the Bible commenced their quest for truth. The search gave way to profusions of opinions. One book, *Biblia Sacra Polyglotta* (1653-1657) edited by Brian Walton (1600-1661), bested all its forerunners in its published judgments. It remained a model of biblical criticism for 200 years. The scholarly apparatus equipped readers with new materials for exegesis. Another, Richard Simon (1638-1712), too contributed to Old and New Testament criticism. His *Histoire Critique du Vieux Testament* (1678) set new standards, treating of Higher and Lower Criticism.

The influence that each of these men, as well as their books enjoyed was great. They held powerful sway over their fellow countrymen and over others in distant lands. The trail leading to and from select Old Testament (OT) scholars of repute is long. Owing to

the character of Simon's criticism there is a straight line to Abraham Kuenen (1828-1891) and his noble work *Historisch-Kritisch Onderzoek naar het ontstaan en de verzameling van de Boeken des Ouden Verbonds* (1st ed. 1861-65; 2nd ed. 1885-93). Massive credence was given to Julius Wellhausen's (1844-1918) *Prolegomena zur Geschichte Israels 1878. 1883*. Students of the history of Israel yet have not escaped its clutches, despite the valiant efforts of W.F. Albright (1891-1971).

Late Renaissance, Enlightenment, and 19th century scholars of Hebrew-biblical texts struggled with the same questions posed in Early and Late Antiquity: i.e., dates for the creation of the world; genuine and false ascriptions of authorship of the Pentateuch; the nature of Israelite exodus; unexplainable supernatural occurrences; chronologies; dispositions of prophets and early and late material in their writings; unraveling numerous knots that are tied into the background of the OT and the derivation of Jewish Wisdom literature. Questions have changed; solutions have not varied much. Now two editors want to provide further help.

14 essays are assembled here, initiated by the Institute for Biblical Research. Contributors were chosen on the basis of his or her "demonstrated expertise on the subject matter of that chapter."

Contents: 'Preface,' Bill T. Arnold and Richard S. Hess; 'Introduction: Foundations for a History of Israel,' Richard S. Hess; (1) 'The Genesis Narratives,' Bill T. Arnold; (2) 'The Exodus and Wilderness Narratives,' James K. Hoffmeier; (3) 'Covenant and Treaty in the Hebrew Bible and in the Ancient Near East,' Samuel Greengus; (4) 'Early Israel and Its Appearance in Canaan,' Lawson G. Stone; (5) 'The Judges and the Early Iron Age,' Robert D. Miller II (6) 'The Story of Samuel, Saul, and David,' Daniel Bodi; (7) 'United Monarchy: Archaeology and Literary Sources,' Steven M. Ortiz; (8) 'The Biblical Prophets in Historiography,' James K. Mead; (9) 'Late Tenth- and Ninth-Century Issues: Ahab Underplayed? Jehoshaphat Overplayed?' Kyle Greenwood; (10) 'Eighth-Century Issues: The World of Jeroboam II, the Fall of Samaria, and the Reign of Hezekiah,' Sandra Richter; (11) 'Judah in the Seventh Century: From the Aftermath of Sennacherib's Invasion to the Beginning of Jehoiakim's Rebellion,' Brad E. Kelle; (12) 'Sixth-Century Issues,' Peter van der Veen; (13) 'Fifth- and Fourth-Century Issues: Governorship and Priesthood in Jerusalem,' André Lemaire; (14) 'The Hellenistic Period,' David A. DeSilva; Indexes.

The historical 'Introduction' is a learned conspectus; but the role of archaeologists' contribution to correct interpretations of ancient Israel in the mid-20th century may be an exaggeration. For a thoroughgoing

investigation of how critical studies of Old Testament texts developed, readers are encouraged to acquire John Rogerson's *Old Testament Criticism in the 19th Century: England and Germany*, (Fortress, 1985).

Of chapter (1): The first 8 pages do not make the best use of the readers' time, stressing the historian's inability to elucidate a "history" of *Genesis* in the absence of corroborating evidence. There is no exegesis of any pericopae; the *Genesis* events are generalized and not explained (e.g., 'Ancestral Narratives,' p.35f.) Arnold seems fearful of resisting 200 years of scholarly skepticism as he treats the accounts as 'mythopoeic' narratives.

The Graf-Wellhausen Document Hypothesis Theory controls his descriptions altogether. The Jahwist, Elohist Deuteronomist and Priestly formulation was on the cutting edge when formulated. It is antiquated now and in need of re-evaluation. An original thesis on that point could have been supplied. Varied topics are untouched in this critical piece. Gerhard Von Rad (1901-1971) incorrectly thought the history of Israel was built on creedal statements. It was once argued that the J source had literary merit, and that much of Israel's traditions were adaptations of Canaanitic sources. R.H. Pfeiffer (1892-1958) ploughed new ground while conceiving a Seirite source that demarcated disparaging remarks against Israelite tribes. Possible similarities between *Genesis* 1 and Phoenician cosmogony are ignored.

(2) Hoffmeier provides a synopsis of what Israelites believed of their own origins. His footnotes engage some minimalist attitudes; their mind-sets, however, have antecedents. P. Haupt (1858-1926) did not believe the Israelites ever were in Egypt (*JBL* 36, 1917, pp.93-99); Eduard Meyer (1855-1930) thought Judaism was created during the Persian Empire (cf. *Der Papyrusfund von Elephantine*, 1912). Aspects of these positions persist to this day.

Hoffmeier reviews objections, using scripture as a reliable witness, he writes: "In fact these data (some of which will be reviewed below), in my judgement, beyond merely providing local Egyptian color and general contextual material for the biblical narratives, go a long way toward demonstrating the authenticity of the biblical tradition" (p.49). His arguments on Israel's exodus, tabernacle, and their wilderness journeys are well-reasoned.

(3) Greengus errs with his initial description of *b'ērit*, covenant (p.91), saying it "is also used in secular contexts to describe relationships between human parties." In addition, "In secular contexts it is therefore often

customary to translate the term *bĕrit*... as contract, pact, treaty” (p.91). Philologically the word should be defined by its usage among Jews, not its use among Akkadians, where rulers often were representatives of the gods or in some cases in the greater near east deemed to be gods themselves. Greengus’ proof-texts refute his main thesis. *Bĕrit* was not a secular word within the Jewish community, but suggests the idea – known throughout the ancient Near East – that pacts and treaties between individuals, also, were to be honored by each person as a covenant made before the face of God(s).

(4) Israel’s appearance in Canaan is the topic of remarks by Stone. He does believe their appearance is materially confirmable. Of *I Kg.* 6:1 he says, “the figure 480 years, however, seems suspiciously round and typologically pregnant” (p.136). The connotation of the last two words is fuzzy. Still, Stone believes the Merneptah Stele remains “the principal documentary evidence outside the bible bearing on Israel’s appearance in Canaan (p.142). Akin to Arnold he is diffident on the issue of Israel’s “conquest” of Canaan. Although Miller in the following chapter believes it to be a historical fact (p.167), Stone is unsure if the Joshua narratives “intend to constitute a conquest” at all (p.162).

(5) Miller’s writing is thought-provoking; but if one is constrained to point out one hermeneutical weakness, it is this: of the historicity of events during *Judges*, Miller inserts a non-sense statement. Citing Michael Polanyi (1891-1976), he asserts “even if the narrative is implausible, it is still possible for our imagination to integrate the story’s incompatible elements into a meaning—a meaning that is born and remains more intuitive than literal but nonetheless is not merely a subjectively personal meaning” (p.168).

The paper proceeds from the point of view that incidents in *Judges* are not chronological but are arranged thematically in order to answer two questions (p.166): “How will reconstituted Israel conduct its affairs as a people of the covenant at home in Canaan? How will Israel be governed without a Moses or a Joshua to exercise leadership?” Retributive theology is a defining motif. He doubts the existence of Jewish religious orthodoxy at that time. He is a well-informed scholar. Essays of erudition sounding a similar note may be had in R.D. Miller, *Between Israelite Religion and Old Testament Theology: Essays on Archaeology, History and Hermeneutics* (Peeters, 2016).

(6) Bodi takes stock of East Semitic tablets to revise accounts of Samuel, Saul and David. He argues that Saul and David were not really ancient kings, but tribal chieftains. Seemingly there is something unique

about David and Saul (p.202) “in the literature of the ancient Near East.” He embraces the newer view (pp.203-204) that the Throne Succession Narrative (*II Sam.* 9-20; *I Kg.* 1-2) is not “a piece of historiography” but was created for “serious entertainment” (loc. cit.).

He believes “the narrative deals with rivalry between two houses fighting for tribal supremacy” (p.204). He follows Israel Finkelstein in his belief that the term ‘monarchy’ (in its designation of Kingship) should not be used to describe Saul, David or Solomon (p.211), because it sounds too European. Why not also dispense with the word ‘tribe’? It may sound too African or too Native American Indian to readers. Anyone who is willing to examine the contexts of ‘king’ in its application in *I Samuel & II Samuel* may be able to deduce if it maintains the special denotation for which Finkelstein argues. The use of Mari texts is ubiquitous in this essay.

(7) Ortiz upholds the recognized kingships of Saul, David and Solomon. He attempts to clarify two historical conclusions which he believes are incorrect: (a) p.227, “Many students come to this period [United Monarchy] with contemporary reconstructions that are erroneous” [brackets mine]. (b) p.233, “biblical scholars also erroneously assume that the temple played a larger role in the daily life of the common Israelite.” Scholars of later periods believed it was the core of Jewish life. For positive affirmation of a temple-centered Judaism before AD 70 see Lester Grabbe, *Judaism from Cyrus to Hadrian: Sources, History, Synthesis*, 2 vols. (Fortress, 1991), 538,585. Such a stance is not obnoxious, and it is no different than saying ‘ancient and modern Islam is a Kaaba-centered faith.’ One must understand ritual, Quranic texts and Meccan traditions to endorse that view, regardless of how intense or less fervent is the faith of certain adherents of particular Islamic sects.

Ortiz’s negative view may stem from recent discoveries of various temple ruins just outside of Jerusalem {see Beth A. Nakhai, paper presented in Warsaw in 2012 at the 8th International Congress of the Archaeology of the ancient Near East: ‘Where to Worship? Religion in Iron II Israel and Judah,’ lately published in N. Laneri, ed., *Defining the Sacred: Approaches to the Archaeology of Religion in the Near East* (2015)}. The daily life of an ancient Judean/Israelite during the united monarchy turned on the king’s role as God’s appointee. The priesthood, and liturgy, were of obvious importance. The prophets usually rebuked them for apathy and for the mixture of true and false religion. At the center of either of those spiritual conditions were a people who found the temple imposing, and who sometimes followed divine

ordinances with a lack of interest.

(8) Mead's article is a cogent piece, and is helpful throughout. He is familiar enough with prophetic material in the wider sphere of the ancient Near East. He concludes that "Israelite prophecy shared the same kinds of phenomena found in other ancient Near Eastern cultures, from the titles used by some prophets and the types of phenomena that they experienced to their shared speech forms and similar subject matter." But Mead also believed "Israelite prophecy was clearly distinctive..." (p.285).

(9) Greenwood endeavors to rehabilitate the image of Ahab. He implies that scripture is incomplete or that it may mislead. However, no similar accusation ever is attributed to the Mesha Stele, to which he gives so much uncritical attention. The discussion takes the reader along routes which require more explanation than he was willing to give. His article concludes by stating "The authors of Kings and Chronicles had a theological agenda that superseded the historical record." In other words, literary documents having to do with an author's God, tend to be biased and untrustworthy.

Question: do not ALL ancient religious inscriptions from Mesopotamia or the north-west regions of the Euphrates reproduce more or less the religious ideals and excitements of their day, whether written in times of war or peace? Can it not be said that Mesopotamian literary expressions are foremost religious in their character? According to Greenwood's stance, the correct answer will render obsolete all those documents.

(10) Richter believes that the eighth century is on surer footing. She cites Baruch Halpern who says "there is not much doubt that the archaeological record of the 8th-6th centuries comports in almost every particular with the general political picture that we derive from epigraphs and the biblical record, critically regarded" (p.320). On account of the external evidences in reserve, Richter believes that "we can approach the task of reconstructing the eighth century with great historiographic confidence" (loc. cit). But should it be said optimistically that her essay provided that reconstruction? I believe so.

The write-up on the section 'Samaria: Its Ostraca and Ivories' is informative. In a fine discussion in both text and footnote #24 (p. 327) proposals that Jeroboam I's bull-calves actually were older symbols of Jehovah/Yahweh, and not wholly idolatrous, are contrasted with reasonable opinions. If so much of the biblical text is to be regarded in any way, then the editor of *I Kg.* 12:28 surely is of the opinion that Jeroboam's syncretistic form of worship was a newer form of an

older idolization seen in Aaron's Day. Jeroboam epitomized the new Aaron, absent of a new Moses to deliver the people.

(11) Kelle proffers an objective overview, which is not easy and agreeable task. He is hesitant to call the biblical sources of the 7th century trustworthy. He proceeds on the assumption that "these considerations suggest that while historians need not assume an essentially skeptical stance relative to the Old Testament's presentations, they must also avoid overinterpreting the biblical text as though it were a historical account whose primary purpose was to transmit historical detail" (p.352). Apparently there are some chronological incongruities in the regnal years of *II Kings* and *II Chronicles*.

And so, in the first part of his essay he deliberates on the alleged co-regency of Manasseh, striving to settle the issue by utilizing Assyrian royal inscriptions (p.358). Manasseh is reported in two inscriptions (p.360); but according to Kelle, the negative depiction in *II Kg.* 21:1-9 may be inaccurate. His adoption and implementation of paganism "may represent the cosmopolitan religion of a culturally integrated setting, with the voluntary incorporation of religious elements from various cultures and the revival of older, non-exclusivistic, Yahwistic practices from the time before Hezekiah's reforms" (p.361). Bearing in mind *Deut.* 17:14-20, how Manasseh's actions can be reconciled with the Mosaic code - i.e., 'thou shall not have other gods, ... neither bow down to them' - is not made clear.

(12) Van der Veen argues in favor of some sort of a continued Jewish settlement in the aftermath of the Babylonian exile. He believes the archaeology proves it to be so. At one time it was believed, I guess, that people thought Jerusalem had become wholly desolated and uninhabited. He is less agitated than Hans Barstad who claims that the alleged "Empty-Land position" was a myth foisted on later generations by "a small community of zealous Zion-oriented Jews who later returned from Babylon" (p.387). The insertion of the juglet (figure 12.3 on p.392) is hardly a clarification. Neither the photo, nor the telling of its discovery should be used to insinuate that there was any continued civilian occupation of the land, although the Hebrew text *Nehemiah* 1:1-4 maintains this position; quite the reverse, the dating of the juglet is an approximate, and may be an artifact discarded by pilgrims passing through the territory.

(13) Lemaire is a first-rate epigrapher, and has attained to a position of eminence in his field. He believes that *Ezra* and *Nehemiah* - as one book - likely were written at the initial stage of the Hellenistic period "when the High priests were the main Jewish authorities" (p.407).

He accepts a substantial part of the historical account in *Nehemiah*, except where it is plainly stated that certain reforms are attributable to him. Lemaire claims: "This may suggest that the chapter [13] was reworked in a final redaction" [brackets mine], p.410. Or, it may not suggest that at all and actually may be a historical report of the restructuring which occurred under his leadership. That is one good reason to assign the improvements to Nehemiah. Lemaire's position is not original, recurring to C.C. Torrey's (1863-1956) views of a century ago. Torrey mistrusted large parts of the transmitted texts, and through his ingenuity found *Ezra 1-2* had lost material, which he ultimately could not reconstruct, further he found that *Ezra 7* and *Nehemiah 8-10* were indefensible.

Lemaire's disputation of the present state of (or biblical presentation of) *Ezra/Nehemiah* as contemporaries (pp.416-417) is mystifying; and there is no evidence for his supposition that Alexander the Great (356BC-323BC) perhaps promoted priests to prominence and dispensed with the role of local governors in the lands he conquered (p.425). As a matter of historical fact, occasional rule or empowerment of priests in Ancient Israel has no connection to the movements of Alexander the Great. Alexander was a deeply religious man. He was ambivalent toward foreign, religious priests. However, he appointed satraps to rule in his absence: cf. pp.213-214 of Peter Brunt (1917-2005), 'The Aims of Alexander' in *Greece and Rome*, 2nd Series, Vol. 12., No. 2 (Oct., 1965), pp.205-215.

(14) DeSilva's masterly paper I deem the best historical survey piece in the whole book, although it is misnamed: it treats of mainly Hellenistic *Palestine* and not of the wider realms of cultures in the Hellenic world that the title implies. There is very little critical discussion.

Some details: on p.30 Arnold says "history begins with the invention of writing." Untrue. History begins with the recording and transmission of information. This testimony and its transfer may be oral and/or written. He is following in the footsteps of Robert Miller's 2011 book *Oral Tradition in Ancient Israel* (cf. fn. 25). In relation to Noah's account of the flood, Arnold claims "we have remarkably close parallels in the famous Gilgamesh epic" (p.33). He fails to notify the reader that the dissimilarities far outnumber the similarities. The dissonance between the two accounts rankle any semblance of concord. Also the text of Gilgamesh (Tablet XI) contains numerous expansions of detail in its flood account. Generally, in textual criticism or in the reconstruction of ancient readings, the usual manner of a scribe, when there was an appeal to augmentation, was to inflate the original text, not to contract it. Gilgamesh's literary inscription signals the existence of a more remote, ancient source. There is no evidence to prove or to refute the possibility that its account derives from an orally composed narrative, now recorded in *Genesis*, the Jewish book of origins. On page 134:

there are many academic articles on the Greek text of Homeric epic and its uses that are of authoritative quality rather than E. Yamauchi, 'Historic Homer' from the *Biblical Archaeology Review*. [E.g., see the publications of Hellenic scholars M.L. West (1937-2015), G. Nagy or R. Janko].

P.257, Ortiz says "We have no archaeological evidence of Herod's temple, but no scholar seriously doubts its existence." Serious scholars also would know that the archaeological evidence for Herod's Temple is not too hard to find: e.g., a temple warning inscription was found in 1871. See H.M. Cotton, et al., *Corpus Inscriptionum Iudaeae/Palaestinae* Part 1, (2010), p.42f; but see also the work of Herodian Temple specialist and archaeological architect Leen Ritmeier at [www.ritmeyer.com](http://www.ritmeyer.com). He has also found archaeological support for Solomon's Temple, a verification that Ortiz, too, denies exists for Solomon's Temple (loc. cit).

P.313, Greenwood writes: "Using both radiocarbon and isotope dating methods, Thomas Levy and Mohammad Najjar have confirmed 'that during the mid-ninth century BCE, the gatehouse and probably the fortress ceased to have a military function, but they were part of large-scale metal production activities at the site.'" The confirmation regarding the fortress is contested by their use of the word "probably." P.317, Greenwood rejects the scriptural data on the Omride dynasty, saying: "The extrabiblical evidence, however, paints a different picture." This idea does not hold true. Scripture concerns itself principally with their bad deeds (or moral failures), not their building accomplishments and repairs; the Tel Dan and Mesha inscriptions render conclusions which predominantly treat of the latter and of their conquests. P.448, DeSilva referred to "Pompey, the triumvir charged with eastern affairs..." This is an incorrect ascription. It is well known that Pompey (106BC-48BC) was never a triumvir. Pompey was part of a *conspiratio*, a combination of three strong men who sought to control the Roman state, albeit it lacked formal recognition. The real triumvirate of 43BC (several years after Pompey's death) consisted of Octavian (63BC-AD14), Mark Antony (83BC-30BC) and Marcus A. Lepidus (c. 88BC-12BC?). See E. Badian (1925-2011), 'M. Lepidus and the Second Triumvirate' in *Arctos*, Vol. XXV, (1991), pp.5-16.

There is further work to do. Could not specialists be found to integrate critical discussions of *Esther*, *Job*, *Proverbs*, *Song of Solomon*, *Ecclesiastes* and *Joel and Zephaniah*? Facets of each book's context and content illuminate aspects of several of the periods addressed. For this volume to be of value to graduate students, it must speak to issues of the most technical nature. Hebrew prosody and metric in the *Psalms* also is overlooked; one needs to know in a book on 'Issues and Sources' whether or not the superscriptions to individual psalms are authentic; even if some English translations omit them, all extant Hebrew MSS containing *Psalms* retain specific, descriptive captions (cf. B. Waltke, 'Superscripts, Postscripts or Both' *JBL*, Vol. 110, No. 4 (Winter, 1991), pp. 583-596. Moreover can it be demonstrated that there is any correspondence between Hebrew poetic meter and the Sanskrit *arya* meter? Samuel Terrien's (1911-2002) critical edition of *Psalms* for Eerdmans is helpful; Michael V. Fox two-volume *Proverbs* for the Anchor/Yale series warrants attention. Comparativists are obliged to pursue these matters even further, e.g. with Bendt Alster, *Sumerian Proverbs in the*



*Schoyen Collection* (Cornell, 2007) nearby.

After so many years, and despite substantive literature in abundance, M.H. Pope's contribution (1916-1997) to the texts of *Job* and *Song of Solomon* retains its value as a standard-bearer. So much in this volume is missing. All the research in *Ancient Israel's History: An Introduction to Issues and Sources* can be found in standard one-volume Bible commentaries. Far more comprehensive discussions are available in critical, single-volumes of each period (e.g., *Cambridge Ancient History* series) or in special editions of biblical books.

In *Ancient Israel's History* there is blatant mistrust of biblical records: several writers assume that the ancient Jewish writers were biased, unable to be freed from subtle prejudices which evidently pose no threat to modern interpreters; Ugaritic, which once was a mainstay in Old Testament comparative studies, in this book has been replaced with the Mari. This partly explains why the former is absent from the subject index and the latter is present. This is not new. Mitchell Dahood (1922-1982) mischaracterized the *Psalms* in numerous places through three volumes (1966-1970) using Ugaritic without adequate controls. So did Alfred Haldar (1907-1986) in his *Studies in the Book of Nahum* (1949), whose genius was not often misplaced, yet he misconstrued *Nahum's* text by way of Sumerian, Akkadian and Ugaritic. It is not often that one encounters so many images of questionable provenience in a biblical resource volume for laymen: the figures appear regularly in Peter Van Der Veen's article. What of the possibility of including fraudulent relics? This is a textbook of Higher Criticism; but the inclusion of a lengthy article on Lower Criticism is what is necessary to found all the claims made above in a book entitled *Ancient Israel's History*.

There is the assumption that archaeology must confirm biblical narratives in order for those narratives to be true. That assumption bears the weight of the majority of propositions set forth in this volume. This deduction is not without its problems, and this situation clearly is acknowledged by Hoffmeier (specifically in regard to *Exodus*) on page 48. Maybe the night is too far spent to sound an alarm about these matters. But one hope is that other experts, e.g., cuneiformists, with better lamps at the readers' feet will help guide them along these pathways. All told, these impressions call to my mind I.M. Diakonoff's (1915-1999) observation: "One might notice that in the field of history many an Assyriologist is ready to accept theories and hypotheses based on such slender foundations of facts – and, at that, of facts so feebly interconnected – that they would certainly be rejected by their authors them-

selves, had these theories been referred to the field of philology", cf. his paper 'On the Structure of Old Babylonian Society' in H. Klengel (ed.) *Beiträge zur sozialen struktur der alten Vorderasien*, (Berlin, 1971), p.25 n.3. His remark applies to Professors in conservative and liberal seminaries, and in departments of divinity and religion.

Doubtless the archaeologist of Syro-Palestine lands will not need this volume; what will be made of it by trainees for divine vocations I do not know, but there is critical matter and much more besides that they may take on trust with them into their respective fields of service. Historians of other disciplines may find the discordances all very interesting. The book commands respect. The quibbles above, such as they are, do not diminish its introductory value. For many people, traditional interpretations of the Hebrew Bible remain unshaken. Unlike traditional reflections, critical thought, when it is applied to the Old Testament, concerns itself with perennial problems, to which no definitive solution ever can be given.

---

Seyyed Hossein Nasr, editor-in-chief, et al.,  
*The Study Quran:  
A New Translation and Commentary.*  
HarperCollins (2015). Pp. lix, 1988.  
ISBN 978 0 06 112586 7. \$59.99 (hb).

It is believed within the Islamic Ummah that the Quran was written over a period of 23 years. Followers of Muhammad (c. AD570-632) memorized large proportions of his revelations. Some of these supporters died during the Battle of Yamama (AD632). To preserve the recitations, Abu Bakr (c.AD573-634) directed those who had committed the readings to memory to write them down. Later they were collated: one standard text, the Uthman Codex, emerged from this process, and was disseminated. In a simplified way, that essentially is the accepted story of the Quran's transmission. Both Theodor Noldeke (1836-1930) and Albrecht Noth (1937-1999) proved that other theses of transmission, too, were plausible. Their contributions were seminal - *Geschichte des Qorâns* (1860) and *The Early Arabic Historical Tradition: A Source Critical Study* (1994)<sup>6</sup> respectively – even pivotal to historical and textual studies. None of the gains made over the last century are visible in these pages. Customary Islamic narratives go unchallenged; the divine authority of scripture is respected.

---

6 This volume is a translation and expansion of Noth's 1973 volume *Quellenkritische Studien zu Themen, Formen und Tendenzen Frühislamischer Geschichtsüberlieferung*.

The Quran made its appearance in Latin in the year 1143. With that event in Toledo, the gates of interpretation were thrown open. And ever since then persons of exceptional and unexceptional abilities have delved into its Arabic text. The attacks have been relentless. Multitudes of westerners wrestled with idioms of eastern origin, only to be bested by them. Aside from the publications of M. M. Pickthall (1875-1936) and A.J. Arberry (1905-1969) *inter alia*, translations of the Quran have not been remarkable. Every decade or so a new translation is published, which then is hailed as the solution to common non-Muslim misinterpretations. Clarifications certainly are needed. *The Study Quran: A New Translation and Commentary* (hereafter *TSQ*) is the latest literary invention.

It is likely that the value of *TSQ* will be long-lasting. The translation will attract the learned world. Rightly used it is a unique tool. Edited by western-directed Muslim scholars it proposes to apprise readers of the beauty of the language of Islam's most holy text, and to provide a truer rendition of Quranic surahs (p.xlii), and 'to take a step toward transforming English into "an Islamic language"' (p.xlvii). Those propositions are not unreasonable. The labor was divided equally between the editors. Dr. Nasr, as chief editor, assumes the responsibility for *TSQ*'s arrangement and final wording. There are several historical essays (pp.1587-1855) which have practical importance, and are written mainly by persons thoroughly familiar with their topic. Every one of them is splendid in his or her pursuit of meaning. Two papers stand out: a paper by J-L Michon (1924-2013) on Islamic art (p.1751f.) is of majestic quality, and a superb one by H. Yusuf (p.1819f.), a survey of how death is understood in Islam. Each surah is preceded by detailed introductory matter culled from early oral testimonies. *TSQ* lacks the Arabic text; and for that reason will not be deemed by those who are familiar with Islamic traditions in the Middle East to be a proper "Quran" / "Recitation" in that word's descriptive sense.

Through the years study-Qurans in English have been issued by a variety of Islamic sects.<sup>7</sup> *TSQ* seemingly is impartial in its composition and scope. However, several essay writers largely direct their attention toward the hermeneutical interests of Sufi mysticism or more particularly to *Irfan*, 'Gnosis' (e.g., xxxix). Even though the Quran is the basis of all Islamic science, this is not a critical edition; neither the notes nor the essays contribute original insights to textual specimens or to historical incongruities. Deference to traditional opin-

ions, but in one specific case post-modern considerations (see *Questions and Concerns* below), is prevalent. Since readers of *TSQ* are unable to benefit from the use of critical editions of commentaries in its pages, an edition with some critical evaluations even now is preferable. When compared to the scientific research made public for the community of Christians in *The HarperCollins Study Bible* (2006), the dissimilarity is striking.

Nine years in the making, *TSQ* falls within the same category of other 'popular' English editions of the Quran known to scholars and students of Islam. One contested opinion is maintained here: the conviction of generations of believers who believe that the Arabic of the Quran cannot be rendered accurately ever in any language (cf. pp.xxx;1606). The notes are encyclopedic, containing a compendium of citations from more than 40 Islamic commentaries: biographies of the commentators are provided (pp.1919-1930).

Brilliant notes often exceed ½ or 2/3 thirds of the page. With so many of them, attention to academic decorum might have fostered a desire for exact paginal citations of statements, rather than the mere insertion of an abbreviation to signify the commentary from which the quotation is drawn; *ahadiths* (collections of oral reports) are placed in an appendix (pp.1862-1906). This is unusual. Typically they are kept separate from the text in order to prevent students from attributing to them a similar inspiration that is entrusted to the text of the Quran.

Sometimes the translation employs archaisms, e.g., the use of 'wert', 'callest' or 'thee' and 'haply' et. al. At other times there was a necessity for a good English stylist because the language is rather unnatural: e.g., Sur. 39:23

"God has sent down the most beautiful discourse, a Book consimilar, paired, whereat quivers the skin of those who fear the Lord."

Taking Surah 112 as another example, the capitalization and punctuation of verse 1 is overdone: *TSQ* text has, 'Say, "He, God, is One,...". Would it not be no less exact – and better in English – to render the Arabic "say God, he is one,..."? Moreover the prominent CAPS of pronominal and adjectival descriptions of Muhammad and Allah are rather off-putting (see p.xlviii, *Various Stylistic and Technical Points*), and they are inconsistently used: e.g., Sur. 32:23-24, "... a guide for the

---

7 E.g., see ed., Maulana M. Ali, *The Holy Quran: With English Translation and Commentary* (1917, rev. 1951); ed., Abdullah A. Ali, *The Quran: Text, Translation and Commentary* (1934); ed., H.M.M. Pooya Yazdi and S.V. Mir Ahmed Ali, *The Holy Quran: Text, Translation and Commentary* (2004); and ed., M. Asad, *The Message of the Qur'an* (rep. 2003).

Children of Israel. And We appointed leaders... who guided by Our Command...". Again at 48:15-16, "Those who stayed behind will say when you set out to capture spoils, "Let us follow you." They desire to change the Word of God. Say, "You will not follow us; thus has God said before." Then they will say, Nay, but you are jealous of us." Nay, but they..... Say to the Bedouin...". Or Sur. 63:11b, "And God is Aware of whatsoever you do."

Surah 96:1-5 is the fruit of an earnest desire on Muhammad's part to draw nigh to deity, and it is the earliest Muhammadan revelation. Mankind's creation from blood was not original to Islam, but is likely to have been borrowed from Babylonian myth: see *Enuma Elish* Tablet VI.33, 'with his blood they created mankind.' The Arabic vulgate is not immune from the need for emendation. A few analytical remarks are provided for future editors of a critical text and/or English translation. The Arabic text has

أَقْرَأْ بِاسْمِ رَبِّكَ الَّذِي خَلَقَ ﴿١﴾  
 خَلَقَ الْإِنْسَانَ مِنْ عَلَقٍ ﴿٢﴾  
 قَرَأْ وَرَبُّكَ الْأَكْرَمُ ﴿٣﴾  
 الَّذِي عَلَّمَ بِالْقَلَمِ ﴿٤﴾  
 عَلَّمَ الْإِنْسَانَ مَا لَمْ يَعْلَمْ ﴿٥﴾

TSQ translates:

- (1) Recite in the Name of thy Lord Who created,
- (2) created man from a blood clot.
- (3) Recite! Thy Lord is most noble,
- (4) Who taught by the Pen,
- (5) Taught man that which he knew not.

Reiteration is not uncommon in ancient Semitic languages or in this Arabic text; verse one terminates with خَلَقَ and verse two commences with the same word. It looks as if it is an issue of scribal reduplication. Something similar is apparent in verse four and five with the use of the word عَلَّمَ. The text is not beyond repair. The vowels assigned to each are replicated exactly in both. Delete the second خَلَقَ and omit the first عَلَّمَ and a smoother rendition presents itself.

Translate as:

- (1) Read aloud in the name of the Lord who
- (2) made man from an embryo of blood.
- (3) Read aloud, for your Lord is the noblest one
- (4) Who by the pen
- (5) Taught man what he did not know.

As well, in a transliterated form, its poetic features are patent. By placing the verse in two strophes a rhythmic system becomes manifest. [underlining below is mine]

- (1) iqra' bismi rabbak
- (2) lladhii khalaaq
- (3) l-insaan min 'alaq
- (4) iqra warabbuka l-akram
- (5) lladhii bil-qalam
- (6) 'allama l-insaana maa lam ya'lam

In this English edition of *TSQ*, the poetic beauty of the Arabic text often is displaced, and the displacement incites surprise and dismay. At 2:255 - a very popular verse - one wonders, why is *kursiyya*/كُرْسِيِّة rendered incorrectly as 'Pedestal' and not correctly as 'throne'? The use of pedestal misinforms, and readers well may think of a plinth or podium. At surah 100: 1 *TSQ* reads "By the panting chargers". Although "chargers" is fashionable in several English translations, "warhorses" would be more precise for the context of men-at-arms. In the notes for 9:5, the so-called sword verse receives fair treatment. And excellent statements regarding how Islamic authorities interpreted and applied this verse may be found. On the other hand, in the article, 'Conquest and Conversion, War and Peace in the Quran' (pp. 1805-1817), the author is at odds with his own evidences, and struggles to explain whether or not early Muslims indiscriminately assaulted innocent people during the dispersion of the religion of Islam across Arabia. His assertion that the attacks were primarily defensive and his explanations of 'Jihad' and 'Coercion' will not persuade all readers.

*Questions and Concerns*: (p.xl) the *TSQ* was supposed to complement *The HarperCollins Study Bible*. When approached, Seyyed H. Nasr accepted the chief editor's role on the condition that "this would be a *Muslim* effort... it would *not* be determined or guided by assertions presented by non-Muslim Western scholars and Orientalists who have studied the Quran profusely as a historical, linguistic, or sociological document, or even a text of religious significance, but do not accept it as the Word of God and an authentic revelation"(italics his). That mind-set is open to reproach: people might view his attitude as one of prejudice and emotion. The invitees should not have accepted his conditions. The meaning is this: the very best of current Quranic criticism (eg., 'Post-Enlightenment Academic Study of the Qur'an', IV, pp. 187-208, by Marco Schöller in volume 4 of J.D. McAuliffe, *The Encyclopedia of the Quran* (2009) was set aside in order to ensure homogeneity. Should not this procedure be allowed to "Christians" also in the revision of the next critical edition of the *HarperCollins Study Bible*? I doubt that it should be.

(p.xlii): was the Quran first issued in Latin in the eleventh century? - I believe Peter the Venerable's translation was published in the twelfth century. (p.1588): is it really true when Ingrid Mattson claims that it is only "the minority of Muslims who apply a narrow 'fundamentalist' hermeneutic to the Quran"? Is not the real minority those persons who do not apply that hermeneutic and who live in the west or are western-oriented in their interpretation of Islamic texts?

(p.1614): is M.M. Al-Azami correct in assuming that Abu Bakr “was chosen by the majority of Companions as the Leader of the burgeoning Muslim community”? Shiites will disagree with him. (pp.1696-7): Ahmed M. Al Tayyib (the former Grand Mufti of Egypt, and now the Grand Imam of Al-Azhar) wrote on the ‘The Quran as Source of Islamic Law’. In his discussion he cites 42:13, 45:18 and 2:229-30, and in the midst of elucidating the all-encompassing nature of Islamic Law, he claims,

“The Quran thus contains explicit statements that it is the sacred source and primary authority for Muslim legislation in personal, social, economic, and political matters – and no change of time or place can affect this primacy. Nowhere does the Quran indicate—whether directly or indirectly—that its laws are of limited duration, that they belong to a particular period, age, or society, that Muslims may thereafter deem themselves no longer bound by its precepts, or that they may choose to organize their lives or societies by resorting to other than the revealed Book of the Prophetic authority in founding their common laws and establishing their familial, social, economic and constitutional orders.”

The above paragraph should be read slowly because it has implications, if ever implemented, for citizens in nations not currently governed by Islamic precept (for a critical view of Sharia law and of the inherent contradiction in the terms ‘modern Islamic state’ see, Wael B. Hallaq, *The Impossible State: Islam, Politics, and Modernity’s Moral Predicament* (Cambridge, 2013). And although it may be a mischaracterization, it would be understandable, given certain statements printed in *TSQ*, if a few readers suppose some statements in this edition of the Quran to be stringent or immoderate. In Joseph Lumbard’s paper ‘The Quranic View of Sacred History and Other Religions’ offers a scholar’s version of Islamic teaching. The essay contains inaccuracies of great import: e.g., (p.1769) Muhammad is known to be the final revelation of God, the seal of the prophets. The term ‘Islam,’ denotes ‘submission’ and refers to one’s complete compliance to Islamic ideals. But Lumbard would have readers believe the Quran teaches that Jews, Christians and Sabeans will be recompensed in positive ways on the Day of Judgment. Are such rewards plausible for either of them after having denied and disclaimed the prophet-hood of Muhammad during their earthly existence?

(p.1779): alluding to Jesus’ divine power, Lumbard cited sur. 5:110 which is derived from the apocryphal text, *The Gospel of Thomas*. After which he expresses his doubts regarding whether the Quran actually condemns Christian Trinitarian doctrine (he seems unaware of the opposing voice in the first sentence of *TSQ*’s notes to 4:157 or to 5:73 where the latter has “...this verse criticizes the Christian doctrine of the Trinity”). Lumbard does not follow the plain grammatical sense: he reinterprets said verse, stating plainly “Viewed in this light 5:73 does not oppose the various forms of orthodox Trinitarian doctrines that have prevailed for most of Christian history.” Incredible! Islam deplores any form of *shirk*, ‘the worship of others along with Allah.’ Surah 4:48 reports that *shirk* is an unforgivable sin (cf. Sur. 9:31; 29:65). [In one hadith of *Sahih Al-Bukari* (4/3334) on this verse the inference to be drawn is that those who do so will be sen-

tenced to hellfire.] However, the heart of Trinitarian theology is the doctrine of Jesus’ Sonship – that he is co-equal to God the Father and God the Holy Spirit, which is emphatically repudiated by orthodox Islamic belief.

Further, Lumbard writes (p.1780) that “The fundamental difference between the Islamic and Christian understandings of Jesus is that Islam follows the Quran in always seeking to reaffirm the transcendence of the Divine by focusing upon Jesus’ humanity, whereas traditional Christian theology presupposes his divinity, while confirming his humanity.” That is an understatement. The ‘fundamental difference’ is that in Islam Jesus is highly regarded purely as a prophet and messiah, but in Christianity Jesus was believed to be the pre-incarnate God-made-flesh, one who died on a cross vicariously for man’s sin, and was resurrected from the dead to justify those who believe on him. Muslims believe he was raised unto God (Sur. 4:158 as cited by the author), but the previous verse in Arabic clearly denies Christ’s crucifixion and death, and when upraised to heaven he could not conceivably have been divine. Christians affirm that Jesus was exalted to the right hand of his heavenly father, from which place he came to earth. Lumbard’s views are speculative; and they do not convey authentic Islamic teaching. (p.1794): would not devout Muslims who were reared in non-western nations, (i.e., Saudi Arabia, Iran, Egypt, Morocco, etc.), and whose lives are regulated by Sharia Law, disagree with Maria M. Dakake’s qualifying statement that “men certainly do not enjoy absolute, complete or unconditional rights in relation to their wives and children?” – seeing that *Al Nisa* 34 is cited.

The reviewer has fond memories of reading Islamic jurisprudential texts at the university library in Jeddah, Saudi Arabia, and of poring over the Arabic text of the Quran as a young man in classrooms of Amman, Jordan. Comparing its verses to the Holy Bible in Arabic, and giving particular attention to Syriac Church fathers, was one of the ways by which he occupied his time. Philological rigor, combined with literary insight, yields fresh interpretations: so wide an experience of Arabic literature is necessary to critiquing this book. The editors of *TSQ* have made a vigorous and indefatigable effort evaluating Islamic materials. It is filled with new and creative ways to read old texts (p.1659f.). Fair-minded academics may lament the uncritical tenor of a comprehensive study-volume, in which writers fail to challenge or even to treat with caution any of Islam’s fondest preconceptions, but they will be grateful for the recording and transmission of so many historical details.

This beautiful book is bound between black hard-covers, wrapped in a dark blue dust jacket. The Islamic cover-art embossed on the front is attractive; a few of the comments on the back-cover offer unstinted approbation. The pages are thin and crease easily. There is a fine index (pp.1931-1988). Eight very helpful maps conclude the volume. The publication of *TSQ* is a notable achievement. Its purchase should be desirable, if not for the translation, just for the extensive notes.

## Give Due Regard to

Ernst Würthwein (1909-1996),

### *The Text of the Old Testament:*

#### *An Introduction to the Biblia Hebraica;*

revised and expanded by Alexander Achilles Fischer,  
(3rd ed., Eerdmans, 2014). Pp. xix, 343.  
ISBN 978 0 8028 6680 6. \$30.00. (pb).

It is no longer the fashion in academia to refer to Assyriologists, Egyptologists and Semitists as Orientalists. Despite the augmentation of specialism in these subjects in recent times, in an earlier phase the foundations of their training had one similarity: one century and a half ago the Higher Critical studies of so-called oriental texts also encompassed the study of the Hebrew Old Testament. Few scholars, at that time, advanced critical scholarship of *Biblia Hebraica* with the vigor employed by Paul E. Kahle (1875-1965). His forceful researches prompted the replacement of Jacob ben Chayyim's (1470-c.1538) Rabbinic Bible text (1524-25) with the Leningrad codex (c.1008 AD), the oldest dated MS, allegedly copied from MSS written by Moses Ben Asher (died c.960 AD).<sup>8</sup> Later, the rediscovery of the Aleppo MS, and the fortuitous detection of the Qumran MSS, would lead to modifications in scholarly description of the diffusion of biblical Hebrew texts. Differences in the Babylonian (pp.240-2) and Tiberian systems (pp.26-30) of pointing, along with Palestinian systems (p.244) were obvious when the Cairo Geniza fragments became available.

Ernst Würthwein's introduction receives an overdue makeover in this new edition. The supersession of the old version now is complete. First appearing in 1952 as *Der Text des Alten Testaments*, it went through five editions up to 1988. Würthwein's genius was visible, and it was much exalted above the common rank and file of editors. Times have changed; new, but splendid material has come to light. On account of this, A.A. Fischer (hereafter: AAF.) says "the text has been completely rewritten, with a new chapter added on the texts from Qumran" (p.xi). Textual criticism is foundational to translation work. AAF's expert acquaintance with writings of commentators on Old Testament readings is estimable; his execution of the procedures of textual criticism raises questions.

The book's subtitle is ambiguous. It is unclear at the outset whether the reader will be initiated into wide-ranging investigations of the Old Testament or if one will gain exact knowledge of how to interpret the apparatus of *Biblia Hebraica* [i.e., Kittel's (BHK) Stuttgartensia (BHS) or Quinta (BHQ)], with all its abbrevi-

ations, symbols and Masoretic variants. As is the case, all the above is included, especially the promotion of the scholarship presently carried out by editors of BHQ.

In the opening pages, the crux on *Isa. 21:8* (p.xvii) is taken into account. AAF. alters the paradosis because he is displeased with the Hebrew subtext, rendered in English: "he cries out, a lion". The dislike of a reading is not the only sufficient grounds for suspecting scribal alteration. I share his feeling that there may be an interpretative problem. He seems to misread the tense of the Hebrew, preferring the Greek version [act. ind.] heading the page. Since he believed the editors of the *Septuagint* were unsure of how to treat the 'lion' issue, he appeals to an interesting comparandum, to the *Isaiah* scroll of Qumran to substantiate an alteration. This revision is done devoid of critical discussion on why the *Isaiah* scroll reads "seer" or why it is a better text than the *Septuagint* or Masoretic variant. So explained, it is doubtful to me that a scribal error exists; the 'alter ego' theory of his is incapable of proof.

Moreover AAF. bolsters the impression that the conditions for performing criticism on Old Testament and New Testament ancient texts differ (p.xix) the one from the other. However, neither of them is at variance with the type of demanding criticism that also is necessary for establishing the texts of classical documents. It is distressing to withdraw from the confines of classical studies of Greek and Roman documents to text-critical forays (pp.189-203) where biblical editors remain straight-jacketed by critical principles crafted two centuries ago. The genius of the critic should be unrestricted. It need not be hampered for all time by the brilliance of those persons who were asking different questions at a different time. And considering his instigation of objections he tendered at *Isa. 21:8* why should he write in footnote 14 page 194, "...Text critical decisions should not be corrected in retrospect if literary criticism or the history of redaction finds them awkward or inconvenient.?"

Millions of people believe the traditional Hebrew text to be unailing; millions of others rely first and foremost on critical editions of Hebrew Scriptures. The use of all of them may seem extraordinary. AAF. burdens himself with the notion that "it is impossible simply to rely on the Masoretic text from a sense of (false) respect for the Bible." That is an oddly worded proposal when he holds unconcealed respect for the Qumran scrolls, and it is to devotees of the Holy Bible that Eerdmans is marketing this textbook. In truth all MSS must be adjudged, respected somewhat, and diligently

8 Cf. Bleddyn J. Roberts, *The Hebrew Bible since 1937, JOTS*, Vol. 15, No. 2, (1964), 253-262.

compared. If a MS is of no value, and must be scorned or snubbed, then there is little need to cite it.

On pages 195-198, his suggestions on *II Sam* 6:3-4 seem to me obtrusive. Of אֶת־הָעֲגֹלָה הַחֲדָשָׁה he writes: “to begin with, the adjective הַחֲדָשָׁה “new” in the second instance at the end of v.3b should have the definite article, because it qualifies a noun with a definite article.” He believes that the clause in v. 4 “by the ark of God... does not connect smoothly with the preceding phrase... because the ark of God has already been identified as the object of the verb by the 3rd person masculine suffix.” However, in the clause - “they brought it out”- (v.4), ‘it’ also may be taken to refer to the cart itself, and not specifically to the ark. Moreover הַחֲדָשָׁה need not be admitted as a type of dittography, and it need not take a definite article if here we have a literary device, one of elision: i.e., if it was the intention of the author that the final sound of the vowel-syllable of הָעֲגֹלָה elide and pose as the homonymic but definite article הַ which was omitted in the following word. Anomalies aside, the reading reflects a stage of medieval transmission in which exemption was given to this usage; the Masorah is silent. A worst case scenario is to place the word between obeli.

There is much to acclaim in this revision. The historical work to a great extent is better than the criticism of texts. Chapter 1, ‘Language, Script, and Writing Materials’ is exceptional and well written, offering a bird’s-eye view of the history of Hebrew language and the writing of it; chapter 2, on ‘The Masoretic Text’ is encyclopedic and critical in its approach to the alleged authority of “the Council of Jamnia”, but the possible idea of Islamic influence on Jewish writers of the Babylonian Talmud proves false when one realizes that the enlargement of Quranic readings occurred at a stage when the Talmud already was completed.

Chapter 3, ‘The Qumran Scrolls’, affirms the demolition of the consensus of the Qumran hypothesis. The unfinished collapse of the theory during the final years of Frank Moore Cross (1921-2012) did not diminish his reputation. Norman Golb, one of several vocal opponents of the theory, goes unmentioned. Who wrote the scrolls, and to whom they belonged remains unknown. They were not passed down thru antiquity by any identifiable Jewish sect; neither Palestinian rabbis nor do the texts of Pseudepigrapha or early Church Fathers cite comparable readings. There is a fine list of MSS from the Qumran caves (table 5) on page 63; but so-called Dead Sea Scrolls’ readings are accepted uncritically throughout the volume.

Chapter 4, ‘The Samaritan Text’, he disapproves of the use of the term “schism” to describe the Jewish/Samaritan separation, assuming the term to be

derogatory in the sense that in church history it is used to denote one group’s orthodoxy and the others’ heretical beliefs (p.81). But is not that the idea that was assumed and is yet current among the orthodox believers of each of these sects? Chapter 5, ‘The Septuagint’ gives dependable coverage; chapter 6, ‘Other Translations’, admits the oral and literary use of Aramaic and Greek in Jesus day, but assumes that Hebrew was only a written language (p.130): “the population at large no longer understood it.” This opinion persists in 21st century critical circles, and it will continue to be accepted if users of this ‘Intro’ find that statement credible.

There was more to say about Coptic, Ethiopic, Armenian and Arabic texts. Extended quotations of competent scholars whose mastery of each recension was/is deep would have sheltered students from some misleading historical assertions. Of the final sections on ‘Textual Criticism’ the remarks above give my general impression. Pages 208-303 set forth numerous plates, which may be used for profit, and are accompanied by a compendium of remarks. This volume is a treasure trove of data. Differences of opinion listed above should not be permitted to eclipse my admiration for this work of scholarship. It represents some of the best of the Teutonic biblical tradition. The German Bible Society is doing pioneer work. It is innovative, but built, I believe, on an insecure theoretical basis. Although it is not my belief that it is possible to recover the earliest form of the ancient Jews’ Hebrew Bible from a critical edition, readers will find delight in the various ways certain verses were construed through millennia, and they will possess fully the distinct outlines of modern, German biblical criticism.

*Errata:* on page 80, read “Assyrian province of Samaria...” as opposed to “... of Samarina...”

---

## De Re Libraria

Deborah Lyons & Kurt Raaflaub, edd.,  
*Ex Oriente Lex: Near Eastern Influences on  
Ancient Greek & Roman Law*  
by Raymond Westbrook. Johns Hopkins (2015). Pp.  
xx, 264. ISBN 978 1 4214 1467 6. \$59.95 (hb).

In the last half-century ancient historians have shown convincingly that the cultural tapestry of ancient Hellenic peoples was interlaced with Anatolian, Egyptian, and Mesopotamian materials. Such connections must remain hidden to researchers who lack a

comprehensive knowledge of classical Greek literature, north-east African sacred writing, south-west Asian languages, and Sumerian idiom and north-west Semitic dialects.<sup>9</sup> Few persons can control all these sources.

Raymond Westbrook (1940-2009) stood in the first rank of American Assyriologists whose expertise evenly encompassed ancient Greek and Roman legal texts, and juridical rules extant in cuneiform tablets. Through his researches of the latter he developed a thesis, unacceptable to most classicists, but for the most part favorably reviewed by scholars of post-modern, literary disciplines: “that ancient Near Eastern law was relevant, even essential, for the understanding of Greek and Roman law” (p.x). So goes the Westbrook hypothesis. The book consists of twelve papers: all but one, chapter 4: ‘Barbarians at the Gates: Near Eastern Law in Ancient Greece’, were previously published: several of them appeared in volume one of the two-volume publication *Law from Tigris to the Tiber: The Writings of Raymond Westbrook*, edd., Bruce Wells and F. Rachel Magdalene, (Eisenbrauns, 2009).

Two papers deserve notice. Chapter 3: ‘Drakon’s Homicide Law’ takes up a transcription of a Greek text, composed on a stele authorized by Athenian officials (c. 409/408 BC). The author adopts a problem: why the wording of the law-code begins with a copula, *kai*. Westbrook takes the conjunction “to be a simple connective, which means that there was a provision that preceded the law on unintentional homicide in the original document and that provision was omitted in the extant copy, for good reason” (p.47).

Chapter 11, ‘Reflections on the Law of Homicide in the Ancient World’ provides a resourceful analysis (pp.196-200) of the Akkadian term *mar awilim*, *son of a man*. He gives five reasons why it ‘has to be translated consistently as “son of a man” throughout.’ The range and profundity of the two aforementioned essays is impressive. He frequently employs Hebrew Bible law-code texts, without bringing into disrepute the Scriptures or his scholarship. Chapter 12: ‘The Early History of Law:

A Theoretical Essay’, establishes principally the Westbrook hypothesis. In reality, each of the other papers is an extended footnote to historical claims discussed in it.

Westbrook argues that longstanding beliefs regarding the emergence of ancient law in lands around the Mediterranean basin followed Darwin’s 19th century evolutionary theory of the ascent of man. This he ascribes to Sir Henry Maine’s 1861 volume, *Ancient Law* (p.222). The argument is coherent; but, in my opinion his view in its present form does not entirely displace G.R. Driver’s (1892-1975) and Sir J. C. Miles’ (1870-1963) progressive views pertaining to the code of Hammurabi.<sup>10</sup>

On page 226 Westbrook states “the earliest law that we can recover comes from the Near East. The sources from that region predate by far sources from other early civilizations such as India and China”. Westbrook fails to mention that this is so because Assyriologists have assigned older dates to these sources, although the dates assigned may not be mistaken. Although elsewhere well-treated, e.g., *A History of Ancient Near Eastern Law I-II*, ed. R. Westbrook (Brill, 2003), his contentions here do not seriously impair the worth of ancient Egyptian legal texts. Again, he asserts “The earliest decipherable legal documents (from Sumer in southern Mesopotamia) reveal a legal system that is already mature.” Question: “mature” in relation to what, or in what sense? The statement is vague. It would be bold to believe that territorial judiciaries in any advanced sense were spread widely in the ancient Near East. Some cuneiform legal texts in-fact might contain adaptations of material from non-literary societies (i.e., south Arabian or sub-Saharan African), later noted down by cultures where reading and writing already was in existence.

Westbrook’s claim that ancient Near Eastern law was “essentially static over the course of several millennia” (p.228) is untrue to what is known of all societies of the past. Legal discourse is dynamic, and it develops within the diversities of human contact and relations. In

---

9 This brief review is not burdened with the many references to critical editions and to literature which could be appended to support the claims and arguments contained within it.

10 “The family is the primitive unit of which the paterfamilias is the chief, but it does not long live in isolation; groups are formed for security, and matters affecting the group are decided by the king or chief... If one member of the family injures another, the matter is settled by the head of the family who does what he thinks right to requite the wrong... If, however, one member of a family injures a member of another... a feud arises between the two families... Here the group itself is concerned... for the blood-feud is civil war. The community must then lay down rules and the first is that, when the blood of the murderer has been shed, the murder has been requited and the peace between the two families shall be restored. Here the germ of one of the principle limitations on the indiscriminate vengeance of the blood-feud appears, the principle of the “tit for tat” or talion. This principle is applied not only to slaying but to all corporeal injuries, and the doctrine that the punishment must fit the crime begins its history. The limitation on the blood-feud is the recognition of the “composition,” whereby the offending party buys off the consequences of his act. In the first instance composition is purely voluntary, a private agreement between the two families, which is perhaps the earliest type of contract. Subsequently, composition for certain offences became compulsory...”, cf. p.224, quoted from *The Babylonian Laws*, Vol. 1 (1952).

addition he says, “a core legal tradition common to all that did not develop significantly over this period” (loc. cit). And he wrongly assumes that “jurists do not appear until the third century in Rome” (p.230). This cannot be correct. What of the 5th-4th century BC Greek, Attic orators, and of the arenas in which they operated? Mesopotamian science was influential in the past, but not to the degree Westbrook presumes. The light that he insists derives from ‘The Land Between Two Rivers’ casts an inescapable shadow over all his classical discussions; none of the papers provide solid evidences to buttress most of his claims. There are reasons why this is so.

Roman Republican law arose out of senate consultations, popular discourse, and from the need to apply them to their peoples and/or to political clients. Greek law, although it was *polis* oriented, could not overlook the estates of its rural precincts, but “law” as well developed by means of pragmatic but reasoned discussions. The force of Westbrook’s thesis is weakened by the fact it is inaptly deduced. ANE statutes do not suggest much less than that a sovereign’s power to impose dictates was recorded. Using modern legal terms to describe what ancient societies in Mesopotamia achieved may mislead; Egyptian law and its influences on Greek law are not unknown any longer.

There was a shared legal ontology. It was unlike the one assumed by Westbrook. Basic human values were innate to persons of all cultures, and various customs surfaced accordingly. Resemblances in laws, e.g., homicide, marriage and purchase of property, do not imply ‘borrowing’ each time a comparison is made between them. Laws unite and bind individuals into corporate social orders. If Graeco-Roman law is derivative of Near Eastern law, then why did the *polis* and the *civitas* develop in ways in no way similar to ANE community constructs?

Roman jurists, poets and other writers of ancient texts seem wholly unaware of all these supposed ostensible links. The compilation of correspondences is noteworthy. Comparisons do not, however, always express modification, but they do signify the existence of similarities whose origins may be hypothesized wrongly. For some, the craft of reconstruction, or of conjecture-beyond-evidence, becomes a hallucinogenic in itself. The effects are devastating, akin to the old idea that once upon a time there were Greeks in possession of the knowledge of reading and writing, then they experienced the loss of that ability, but soon after, there was an eventual rediscovery. Likewise, the Westbrook hypothesis posits that ancient Greeks and Romans learned law from easterners, then purposely failed to disclose or forgot that they once learned so. And their adoption of all this material, unknown to any succeed-

ing generation of writers, was not formally understood until Post-Enlightenment scholars of the west recreated its origins for modern readers. Westbrook denigrated the notion that Greek genius miraculously arose from Zeus’ head. Still, through succeeding decades he exchanged a Hellenic myth for a Mesopotamian one.

This collection of papers leads the way in minute investigations of ancient legal theory, and it is a useful volume if controlled by the recent opinions of other Classical and Near Eastern scholars. It also improves the state of resources available to students whose own critical genius displays less instinct for theoretical work. My cavils relate to his versions of the origin of Greek and Roman law alone. It is the singular admiration for his diagnostic skill which attracts readers of ancient Near Eastern law to his scholarship, and as a result he will not be forgotten.

---

Andrew Erskine & Josephine Crawley Quinn, edd.,  
*Rome, Polybius & The East*

by Peter Derow.

Oxford (2015). Pp. xiii, 311.

ISBN 978 0 19 964090 4. \$59.95 (hb).

As a historian of [Hellenistic] Greek History and of [Republican] Roman history, Peter Sidney Derow (1944-2006; hereafter P.S.D.) radiated a brilliance of intellect which illuminated ancient texts. With this book in-hand the reader is introduced to 14 of his essays. Half of them appeared in classical journals; the others were issued in various monographs; one was unpublished: chapter 8, ‘Polybius III, Rome and Carthage.’ The essays fall under several categories. I: Narratives, II: Polybius and Roman Power, III: The Roman Calendar, IV: Epigraphy.

The writing is meticulous, requiring for a few papers patience and an extremely disciplined mind to penetrate its subject matter. The details of Polybian minutiae that one encounters are impressive, if not overwhelming. Understandably his work has been acclaimed. Polybius (c.200-c.118BC) was a Greek historian who wrote of Rome’s ascent to its position of power, cf. 1.1.5. He believed the study of history to be foundational to civility and to the correct establishment of political activities. Readers of his *Histories* recognize their didactic emphases. Specialists have found him to be a spirited proponent of making right uses of source documents. They have not all found that he attained to his goal. In certain places Polybius is inexact; P.S.D. believes Polybius was a professional his-



torian (p.118). I believe he wrote for a larger audience than the Latin speakers of Italy who knew Greek or to citizens of Greek states. He composed his material for all readers of Greek in the far flung corners of the world who were in need of expert instruction in the origins of Roman dominance.

It is true that these papers turn over the soil of Polybian research and plant new seeds of thought, but many avenues were explored by P.S.D. The editors (p.3) promote the thought that the paper, 'Polybius, Rome and the East' "is perhaps the most influential article on Polybius to appear in the last fifty years." Fortunately it reappears in this volume; Polybius was clear at 1.63.9 about Roman policy in the east: it was anything but fortuitous. Overcoming strong foes, e.g., victories in the First and Second Punic Wars, usually induces in victors the desire to further their influence. So why disallow the inference one may derive from the Greek text regarding the shared, longed-for 'universal rule' (p.129),<sup>11</sup> which Polybius believed was the aim of Rome and Carthage (1.3.7)? The war was fought over who would attain to 'first-place' in their common struggle, as are all battles when one country attacks another. On page 131 he specifies his own understanding of Rome's quest for 'universal rule' as "that situation in which everybody was subject to the Romans".

P.S.D.'s translations of Greek texts are products of careful thought, prudently transforming some of W.R. Paton's (1857-1921) Loeb<sup>12</sup> renderings (1922-1927) into better models of translation. In his overview of Polybius biography and of his books P.S.D. writes: "It is not a history of Rome that he was writing, but an account, first, of the process whereby the Mediterranean world came to be conquered by Rome and, then, how its several peoples (including the Romans) fared during the time of Roman rule" (p.90). The article from which the citation is taken is, 'Polybius (205?-125? B.C.)' and is a very effective introduction to Polybius.<sup>13</sup>

For those who become lost in the maze of the Roman calendar, I see no way out of it. P.S.D. thought it was necessary to do chronographic work on the period 218BC-168BC. He believed that "something approaching precision is attainable in dealing with the latter part of the period, namely 190-168" (p.209). The faith

he places in the words of Polybius is quite remarkable; but he does not justify with solid arguments the astronomical synchronisms that he uses. Therefore they are not definitive. Consensus opinions on the distillation of these matters are elusive. Even with Livy's (59 BC-AD17) help, the designation of 'even' years only for intercalary years seems remote; and I agree with him that "Proof is not possible..." (p.212). The Roman calendar-charts in table 10.1 and 11.1 ease the pain of the discussion as he compares accounts in the histories of Polybius and of Livy.

The manuscript tradition was not his principal concern; not all historians of ancient Greece engage in the study of epigraphy over extended lengths of time. The small number of people who do so, affect it with a flair for reconstructing contexts. Greek epigraphists will crave this book for the final three papers, 'An Inscription from Chios' - co-authored by W.G. Forrest (1925-1997), whom P.S.D. succeeded in Ancient History at Wadham College, Oxford - and 'Pharos and Rome' and 'RC 38 (Amyzon) Reconsidered' - co-authored with J.T. Ma and A.R. Meadows. These papers serve to remind readers of what could have been had P.S.D. lived a bit longer. Sadly, he did not; but the republication of a selection of his papers is a happy event.

---

David Norton, ed.,  
*The New Cambridge Paragraph Bible:  
King James Version.*  
Cambridge (2011). Pp. xxxvi, 1566. ISBN 978 0 521  
19501 0. \$45.00 (hb).

About five years ago there were celebrations in several parts of the world to commemorate the 400th anniversary of the so-called Authorized Version of 1611. Its merits notwithstanding, in our time few historians or scholars of medieval Bible texts expect to see new editions of the King James Bible. The importance of the Greek and Hebrew texts upon which the English translation is based was downgraded by progressive 19th century editors. The King James Bible's influence in the English speaking world is unparalleled; if this renown exists only among Protestants it is because certain Roman Catholics who are of one mind continue to

---

<sup>11</sup> P.S.D. claimed, "Taken by itself this could mean that both sides entered and fought the war with universal rule as their aim. That it does not carry this implication is clear in general from Polybius' discussion of the outbreak of that war (where desire for universal rule is never mentioned)..."

<sup>12</sup> In recent times a six-volume Loeb edition (Harvard, 2010) of *Polybius' Histories* was published, newly edited by F.W. Walbank (1909-2008) and Christian Habicht.

<sup>13</sup> See also B. McGing, *Polybius' Histories* (Oxford: 2010).

uplift the notable virtues of the Douay-Rheims translation.

The literature on the history and backgrounds of this bible is immense and still growing. Readers familiar enough with the history of the Bible in English will be acquainted with the name David Norton. He is prolific and has published, among other things, *A History of the Bible as Literature: from Antiquity ... to the Present Day* (Cambridge, 1993) in 2 volumes; *A Textual History of the King James Bible* (Cambridge, 2005) and *The King James Bible: a Short History from Tyndale to Today* (Cambridge, 2011).

The volume before us is a companion volume to the 'Textual History' he wrote. The task involved is a difficult one. Some translators kept scrupulous notes of the committee proceedings; much else disappeared long ago. This Bible must be had by those enthusiasts whose delight in Jacobean literature abides. Far more people still memorize or read scripture privately in the authorized edition than likely would publically acknowledge. David Norton has given to posterity a thoroughly re-edited text, and Cambridge press again has given to readers a beautiful edition, whose physical presentation rivals the magnificence of any other bible.

The editor's introduction is brief (pp.vii-xi). His method is simple. As far as is possible, first-edition readings will be reintroduced; subsequent editorial revisions – post-1611 – are subject to critical reexamination. The result is an "authorized" text which approximates as closely as possible to the translators' text. Available to them was a vast corpus of resources. Their dependency on previous editions in English is common knowledge. Reliance on the Geneva Bible of the reformers is illustrated in the discussion of the modification of "hewed" to "shewed" at *Hosea* 6:5 (p.viii).

Norton's intention is clear. He wants older and varied forms of spelling to be preserved for a modern generation: "*The New Cambridge Paragraph Bible* keeps the modernisation within strict limits: spellings may be modernised, but words and grammatical forms cannot change" (p.ix). Nice logic: for his line of reasoning safeguards some forms of the syntax of the Masoretic text, of the so-called *Textus Receptus* and of the Latin Vulgate, thereby placing grammatical constructions in their most literal senses before astute readers of English who are able to compare them to original readings in the source texts. These resemblances are less noticeable in modern English versions whose translations, despite their greater margins for error, were founded on cutting-edge modern theories of word-conversion.

In accordance with its title, "What *The New Cambridge*

*Paragraph Bible* does is to present the entire text in paragraphs that conform as far as possible to present-day ideas of paragraphing. This contributes to the aim of making the King James Bible as readable and comprehensible as possible without falsifying the essentials of the translators' work" (p.x). It follows a single column format. The original 'Dedication' (pp.15-16) and 'The Translators to the Readers' (pp.xvii-xxxv) is retained. Full notes have been affixed to the latter. The conventional style, which at one time placed notes in the center column was discarded, now alternative renderings and other notes are in the inner margin of each page. *Italics*, used in other editions, to supply the perceived intended sense, are abandoned.

In the Pentateuch the editorial principles are coherently displayed. *Exodus* 15: 'The Song of the Sea' and *Deuteronomy* 32: 'The Song of Moses' appear in poetic dress. The reviewer was surprised to see Jacob's prophecies to his sons set off in verse in *Genesis* 49, thinking it was a precursor of things to come in sections dealing with divinatory expressions. The presentation of *Job* should be emulated. Each speech-narrative is given a lyrical form in verse lines, although Norton admits "it is not always clear what parts of the original were poetry, nor how that poetry should be lineated; moreover the King James Bible was made a prose translation, and its words only sometimes work as verse" (p.x). In theory, the lineation would prove difficult at times. It should not have been so with *Proverbs*. Yet I cannot understand why certain parts of the verses are rendered in double-spaced couplets: e.g., chapter 10:1-22:16; 25:11-27:14. It is quite erratic. As for the *Psalms*, where titular ascriptions apply to select sacred songs they are italicized and stand out. The letters seem to have an enlarged, still felicitous appearance.

Popular passages which have passed into English idiom receive indentation and become conspicuous in *Ecclesiastes*: e.g., 1:1-11, 'Vanity of vanities, saith the preacher...'; 3:1-8 'To everything there is a season...'; 11:1-4 'Cast thy bread upon the waters...'. The whole of *Lamentations* is in poetic verse, as it should be. It is a mournful song. The same cannot be said for *Isaiah*, *Jeremiah* and *Ezekiel*. Much of the layout of *Isaiah* and *Jeremiah* is in verse; the first half of *Ezekiel* for the most part is in block narrative. Prophetic utterances you would expect to read in rhythmical form – e.g., *Ezek.* 36-39 – are not given such treatment. Those graceful predictions of restoration and wrath may go unnoticed in their current arrangement.

Seeing that Mary's and Zacharias' hortatory speeches of *Luke* 1 are in verse form, one would have thought the Sermon on the Mount (*Mat.* 5-7) would be set up like some wisdom-verses in *Proverbs*; apparently there was not a single verse in *John* that possessed recognizable

lyrical qualities. There are irregular displays: e.g., “ye” and “you”. Norton’s critical text (CT) differs from the standard text (ST) of the King James Bible. It is not always understood why the changes are made, whether because of MS readings or because of some form of update. *Galatians* is an example. At 1:1 verse parentheses are removed; but for 2:6 and 2:8 they are retained. In *Jn.* 2:7 he preserves the “ye” form of “ye must be born again;” but in *Gal.* 1:6 “ye” is converted to “you.” At *Gal.* 1:14 “mine” in the ST becomes “my” in the CT. At 3:1, and 4:17 “ye” in the ST becomes “you” in the CT. However, at 4:21 and 5:18 the “ye” style remains.

Editorial procedures are inconsistent. Everywhere the word “spake” is amended to “spoke” (*Lev.* 10:3); but the usage of the old fashioned word “nigh” is retained (loc. cit) even when “near” follows (op. cit. 10:4). The ‘thou shalt not’ forms of the Ten Commandments of *Exodus* 20 remain. The verse numbers of this edition are tiny. Embedded in each paragraph as they are, it sometimes is a chore to locate them. If another edition ever is issued, why not append a list of all the places where the critically edited text diverges from the received text (e.g., *II Tim.* 2:22, CT: “Fly”; ST: “Flee”). Or, in the inner margin the variant MS readings should be inserted, that is if this is to be a truly critical edition erected upon a critical system.

These minor cavils intend less than they may seem to convey. Readers who will purchase this volume want only what is promised: the original readings of the translators. Norton’s modifications are helpful, but can we call this the 1611 bible issued in its most original sense? As it stands, what is given is merely another editor’s diplomatic text. Originally published in 2005, an eight page ‘Table of Corrections and Amendments’ for this edition is provided online on *The New Cambridge Paragraph Bible* page.

*The New Cambridge Paragraph Bible* should not litter a shelf. It should be used diligently by any who desire to understand subtle classical points of reference and the interpretative genius of persons of the Late Renaissance era.

F. Montanari,  
*GE: The Brill Dictionary of Ancient Greek.*  
 Brill (2015). Pp. lx, 2431.  
 ISBN 978 90 04 19318 5. \$125.00 (hb).

The writing and editing of dictionaries is an aspect of lexicography in which few people will engage in their lifetime. It is rare to find persons whose private or scholarly pursuits entail studies of vocabulary expressions in ways that are so stringent. Those pupils who learned to memorize word-lists and glossaries at the elementary level, if the process was accomplished at all, they will have gone far in understanding the rudiments of lexical work. Mastery of context is an essential tool in establishing the definition of a word; since that kind of expertise is not the norm in everyday affairs, lexemes that are unfamiliar usually guide one to a dictionary. The scientific pursuit of comprehending a word’s meaning with precision has had a long history. Ever since antiquity when individuals read ancient hieroglyphs or cuneiform, and much later the archaic Greek of “Homer”, students have sought to properly define obsolete words, or words whose meanings changed through time.

*GE: The Brill Dictionary of Ancient Greek* (hereafter *GE*) is the latest addition to Greek lexical studies. It stands on its own merits. It is innovative in the best way, employing very broad conceptions of the language and the highest standards. As stated by Dr. Montanari in his Preface (p.vi), *GE*

“is not restricted to language material dating from the archaic, Classical and Hellenistic eras. Significant consideration is also given to later forms of Greek, in particular Greek of the imperial age and of the first centuries of Greek Judaic-Christian literature (Old and New Testament, Patristics, etc.), up to the VIth century and with sporadic later examples (this is the period for which the great LSJ is notoriously weak, especially after the II<sup>nd</sup> century AD). Furthermore, GI / GE makes substantial use of papyri and inscriptions, and includes a wealth of proper names...”

Dr. Montanari brings exceptionally rich equipment to his studies of the varying linguistic vistas of lexicography. The editors of this English edition were Madeleine Goh and Chad Schroeder. It was made under the auspices of the *Center for Hellenic Studies*. Gregory Nagy and Leonard Mueller were the advisory editors. The basis of the English volume was the 3<sup>rd</sup> Italian edition of F. Montanari, D. Manetti, I. Garofalo, *Vocabolario della Lingua Greca* (2013), although it is not a slavish translation of its precursor. Nagy and Goh spell out their aims in their Preface (p.vii),

“Our objective was an accurate elucidation of each Greek lemma in English, and, accordingly, it is to be emphasized that the lexicon is not a translation of the Italian definitions in and of themselves... Still, we have tried our best to render 132,884 lemmata into as clear and idiomatic modern English as possible in the span of four years. In addition to the updated language of our definitions, the strengths of this volume include the incorporation of new evidence, especially from epigraphical sources and papyri. Our methodology relies on the application of historical linguistics to the study of the new lemmata, and this reliance takes us even beyond the third edition of the Italian version.”

Of other preliminary matter there are pages at the front-end illustrating ‘How-to-Use’ the book. There are also sections on Abbreviations, appearing twice: (viii-ix) and the same ones at the book’s end, Glottonyms (ix), Collections (x-xi), Authors and Works (xii-lvi) Papyrus (lvii-lviii), and Inscriptions (lix-lx).

Each Greek entry is in an attractive and readable font. Entries are given in variant forms. Glosses or definitions appear in **darkened letters**; and **Bold-faced** numbers, indicating verbal-forms, also introduce distinctive uses. In places where ancient authors are cited, UPPERCASE letters are used. See below

*ἀγαπατός Dor. see ἀγαπητός.*  
*ἀγαπάω, contr., impf. ἠγάπων, mid. pass. ἠγαπώμην || fut. ἀγαπήσω || aor. ἠγάπησα | inf. mid. ἀγαπήσασθαι Bas. (PG 31.1633.22) || pf. ἠγάπηκα, mid. pass. ἠγάπημαι || ppf. ἠγαπήκειν, mid. pass. ἠγαπήμην || aor. pass. ἠγαπήθην || fut. pass. ἀγαπηθήσομαι* ❶ **active a to treat with affection** ▶ τινα s.o. Od. 23.214; ἄ. νεκρούς to perform the last rites for the dead Eur. *Suppl.* 764 | **to pet** (*puppies and little monkeys*) Plut. *Per.* 1.1 || **extens. to love, be fond of** ▶ *with acc.* Plat. *Rp.* 330c, *al.*; ἀγαπήσεις τὸν πλησίον σου you will love your neighbor NT. *Mat.* 5.43, *al.* | ▶ *with double acc.:* (ἀγάπη) ἦν ἠγάπησεν αὐτήν (the love) which he showed her VT. *Reg.* 2.13.15 || *of God’s love of man and man’s love of God* NT. *Mat.* 22.37, *Mar.* 10.21, *al.* | *of sexual love* Plat. *Symp.* 180b Luc. 21.2 *etc.* | **to prefer:** τι ἀντί τινος sthg. to sthg. else Demosth. 18.109 = τι πρό τινος Plut. *Cam.*

10.7 || *with inf. to be fond of, to be accustomed* Aristot. *Oec.* 1348a 29 b **to be pleased, be satisfied** ▶ τι with sthg. Isocr. 4.140 Demosth. 6.9 = τι Lys. 2.21 Demosth. 1.14 = ▶ *rar.* τινος Alexis 130.7 | ▶ *with ὅ* with the fact that Od. 21.289 | ▶ *with ὅτι* that Thuc. 6.36.4 *etc.*; οὐκ ἀγαπῶντες ὅτι not content to Luc. 52.3 || ▶ *with εἰ* if Plat. *Rp.* 450a *etc.* = εἰάν Plat. *Rp.* 330b = ▶ ἦν Aristoph. *Ve.* 684 *etc.* | ▶ *with ptc.* Isocr. 12.8; τιμώμενοι ἀγαπῶσιν they are satisfied to be honored Plat. *Rp.* 475b | ▶ *with inf.* Isocr. 18.50 Demosth. 55.19 *etc.* | *abs.* Lycurg. 73 *etc.* c **to persuade, entreat** VT. *Chr.* 2.18.2 ❷ **passive to be treated with affection** Pind. *I.* 6.70 || **to be loved** Plat. *Pol.* 301d Demosth. 61.9 | λιθίδια τὰ ἀγαπώμενα precious stones Plat. *Phaed.* 110d *Dor. inf.* ἀγαπήν Metop. (Stob. 3.1.110) || *impf.* ἠγάπευ Leon. (AP. 7.664.4) || *ep. aor.* ἀγάπησ

The above is in the Brill-Roman font, and is extracted from the online sample pages; but in the hardbound volume ancient authors are not cited in lowercase letters, as given above. There is an online edition and a deluxe edition (\$450.00) too is available bound in two volumes with encasement. The three-column format of *GE* is attractive. Greek lexemes have their appropriate accents. On account of the citations of classical texts, theologians whose endeavors involve Greek studies will find that it is a sound supplement to F. W. Danker, *A Greek English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*, 3rd ed. (Chicago: 2001). Indo-Europeanists will cavil at some of the grammatical attributions; but those who are dependent on the reading of ancient Greek texts for intellectual sustenance, for researches of a disinterested kind and for their livelihood, should acquire *GE*.

Craig R. Koester,  
*Revelation: A New Translation with  
 Introduction and Commentary.*  
 Yale University Press (2014). Pp. xlii, 881.  
 ISBN 978 0 300 14448 8. \$65.00 (pb).

The literary history of *Revelation* is worth studying. Its acceptance into the canon of scripture was not immediate, nor was it without obstacles. It was excluded from the Syriac canon for several centuries. Authorship in ancient times was important. If a document had been penned by an apostle of Christ, knowledge of this source during various stages of transmission would advance its standing. Thus many ancient texts were attributed to members of Jesus’ circle of twelve apostles. If one prefers explanatory volumes whose theological material does not overwhelm, the Anchor Yale Bible Commentary Series have few rivals. Far more useful to competent divines and scholars than to laypersons, critical tools of the finest kind are needed to

make the best use of each volume. Inscriptions, other textual artifacts of archaeology, Classical and Near Eastern texts supplement the readers' resources in greater measure than is found normally in a biblical commentary. The advantages are many; but there are drawbacks.

Apocalyptic literature is a topic of interest for many researchers. The discoveries of the "Dead Sea Scrolls" and "Nag Hammadi Texts" in the 1940s continue to intrigue. Much has been learned through decades of minute studies on those texts. Koester's (Hereafter K.) work is not the effort of a novice. Incorporating the results of the most recent research, K.'s contribution to studies of *Revelation* is encyclopedic and comprehensive. The date of its origin remains disputed; K. believes that it is stylistically different from the *Gospel of John*. He is fair in his depiction of how various Christian sects understood *Revelation*. Moreover, current descriptive interpretations - "futuristic, timeless, church historical and preterist" - are discarded by him (p.xiii).

He operates in no novel sphere; but this book may be viewed by competent authorities to be strides ahead of most recent publications on John's *Apocalypse*. Of course K. presumes there is a literal God, and that he has a throne and his judgments will be initiated from that seat of authority. Heaven is real to K., as is a virtual return of the Lord from heaven. He used the old paradigm of "Western" and Eastern" (Latin/Greek) writers to describe the sixth cycle (pp.742-743), it is a model of little value today. The authors cited in connection with Patristic Fathers are Eurasian or of west-Asia; but truly eastern writings, i.e., Syriac or Armenian interpretative texts go unmentioned. What of ancient Ethiopian apocalyptic literature?

### Content

A superb translation of the Greek text is provided (pp.3-25). An introductory section (pp.29-150) follows, along with bibliography (pp.153-206). Exegetical matters are not always exact. They are of a comparative sort, citing numerous authors' opinions. The historical value of this commentary is incomparable however. Section I on 'History of Interpretation and Influence' (pp.29-65) is not bettered by anything now available. In section II 'Historical Issues' (pp.65-85), all his remarks are conventional. Section III 'Social Setting of Revelation' (pp.85-103) and section IV 'Literary Aspects' (pp.103-132) and section V 'Rhetorical Aspects' (pp.132-144) are definitive. The discussion in section VI 'The Text of Revelation' (pp.144-150) is proletarian.

K. manages all the segments by dividing them into a

scheme of 6 cycles of visions: First Cycle: Christ and the Seven Assemblies (1:9-3:22); Second Cycle: The Seven Seals (4:1-8:5); Third Cycle: The Seven Trumpets (8:6-11:18); Fourth Cycle: The Dragon, the Beasts and the Faithful (11:19-15:4); Fifth Cycle: The Seven Bowls and the Fall of Babylon (15:5-19:10); Sixth Cycle: From the Beast's Demise to New Jerusalem (19:11-22:5). *Revelation* contains introductory (1:1-8) and concluding material (22:6-21). I suggest future editors split John's text into 4 visions, each of which is announced with a distinct command, sometimes with the phrase 'come up here', [excluding the one at *Rev.* 11:12]: First Vision (1:10-3:22); Second Vision (4:1-16-21); Third Vision (17:1-21:8) and Fourth Vision (21:9-22:5).

Respect for his scholarship must be conveyed in this review. K. is at his best when synthesizing data. His use of Old Testament scriptures is helpful throughout, providing indispensable details for conceiving the broader contexts which must be assumed for the text. Comments and notes on the 7 churches are impressive, as are the well-structured ones on New Jerusalem. K. believes "The Creator and the Lamb are the theological center of the Apocalypse" (p.367). That belief is the nucleus of his expansive remarks.

### Criticisms:

On page 368 K. cites Ovid *Met.* 1.175-76 following the sentence "In the imperial world Jupiter was said to have a heavenly council". In fact it would be more appropriate if it appeared after the subsequent clause (*loc. cit.*) where it reads "at the political level the emperor dispensed justice while seated on this throne", for the *Palatia* was Augustus' abode on the Palatine hill. Occasional vague statements appear: e.g. (p.375) K. writes "Lions were regal (Pliny the Elder, *Nat.* 8.19.48)". It reads like an observation on feline temperament. Definitely what he intended to convey is the idea that for some persons 'the image of lions was of imperial significance as symbols for royal figures.' K.'s reference to Pliny's section on 'the peculiar character of a lion' has no bearing at all on his discussion on Israelite kingship.

Hardly any exegesis in the English text is based on the grammar or syntax of the Greek wording; ideas derived from secondary literature obtrude in all directions. In most places *στέφανος* is translated 'laurel wreath' instead of 'crown'. Even though the Graeco-Roman garland or headdress was popular at the time of the writing of *Revelation*, for various contexts e.g., *Rev.* 4:4, 12:1, 13:1, 19:12 etc., a diadem-version of ornate headdress signifying royalty, rather than a victorious athlete, seems appropriate when describing the covenantal God or demonic beasts or divine beings who are associated with redemption. The Graeco-Roman portrayals

are excessive at times; Near Eastern materials are not used to their best effect. Those readers who are adept at reading the source-text will be grateful for the compendiums of data placed before them. They will be less excited, however, about the uncontrolled use of classical literature. For example,

On page 502, K. treats of the death of the 2 witness of *Revelation* 11:10b. His translation reads:

*'and celebrate and give gifts to each other, because these two prophets brought such pain to those who live on earth.'*

His note has: "This gift exchange is reminiscent of the Roman Saturnalia festival, which was celebrated for seven days beginning on December 17. Both slaves and free people joined in drinking wine, feasting, and playing games. Wealthier people gave gifts of furniture, clothing, money boxes of wood or ivory, dice combs, writing tablets, books, baskets, jugs and cups. Poorer people made presents of wax candles and clay figurines (Martial, *Epigrams* 14; Lucian, *Sat.* 14; Suetonius, *Aug.* 75; Macrobius *Saturnalia* 1.11.49). During Domitian's reign, one writer referred to "the glad festival of our merry Caesar and the banquet's drunken revel" and hoped that as long as Rome stood, the festival would continue (Stadius, *Silv.* 1.6.7-8,101-2). In *Revelation*, however, the celebration is interrupted at its midpoint, after three and a half days, when the witnesses are raised and an earthquake shakes the city where the festival is taking place (Rev 11:11-13 sic).'

Paragraphs like the one above could be multiplied (cf. p.608, notes on "harps"). He makes a broad assumption that the peoples' reaction in the city to the deaths of the 2 antagonists was less spontaneous, but was some kind of organized gala. No attempt is made to explain why Jewish citizens, who are residing in a place metaphorically called Sodom and Egypt, would suddenly appeal to the activities of the Romans' Saturnalia: no sacrifice was offered at a pagan temple, a civic banquet was not observed. The only similarity is the distributing of gifts; the pitiless rejoicing of Jerusalem's citizens was only a microcosm of a soon-to-be transnational event on account of the death of, and unburied bodies of, two god-fearing humans. John's description is wholly unlike the raucous atmosphere of the Saturnalia festival.

Somehow the Millennium (p.773) is given an allegorical meaning of "completeness", which illustrates K's peculiar views on how to construe large numerical digits. Smaller units usually pose no problem, except in his remarks on the 'two witness' (p.497) who somehow are "representatives of the whole church". He does not doubt or dispute that there were 7 churches in Asia or 4 beasts around the throne; but of the 144,000 persons of *Revelation* 7 (pp.417,607) he is content to interpret the figure too as a symbol of "completeness"; Query:

must the Anchor/Yale editions persist in the use of transliterations in the place of original language scripts? Individual New Testament documents are not very long, so the optimal plan for each commentary should be to provide a unique set of photographic plates of source-texts.

K.s book is a "landmark commentary", as noted on the back cover the volume. He is a man of unlimited patience. His commentary astounds. It is a vigorous conspectus of Christian eschatology. It represents the best of modern biblical scholarship on the most important text of ancient, Christian, apocalyptic literature. He is untiring in his effort to extract meanings from each context. The depth of his study is fathomable only by those who have conducted comparable researches. The book stands as a monument in the field New Testament studies.

---

Christopher R. Seitz,  
*Joel:*

*The International Theological Commentary.*

Bloomsbury T&T Clark (2016). Pp. xii, 239.

ISBN 978 0 56757 073 4. \$94.00 (hb).

An admirable attempt is made here to provide companion volumes to *The International Critical Commentary (ICC)* series. With the creation of *The International Theological Commentary (ITC)*, an observable gap in knowledge now is in the process of being filled. For Seitz, theology should be the focus; *Joel* is the subject matter. He is an authority on this biblical text. His contributions to historical studies of the Minor Prophets have not been insignificant. This latest submission of his solidifies Seitz's place as a first-class researcher. His control of secondary literature is marked, and there is something to learn from each page. His analyses on pages 111-119, on 'The Solemn Opening' 1.1-4, give a glimpse of much that will follow. There are notices of literary structures, superscriptions, historical questions illustrated by Patristic solutions, certain modern writers are copiously cited, and grammatical matters are easily depicted. But the depths of *Joel's* theology are not explored.

There are more than 90 pages of preliminary remarks (pp.1-93). *Joel's* relationship to other books in the Minor Prophets is examined comprehensively; he argues that the Day of the Lord (DOL) "is in fact an encounter with God himself" (p.79). The commentary extends from pages 111-226. At no time is *Joel* wrongly caricatured. All the material is not properly balanced. The didactic and moral outlook of *Joel* is adequately

traced. The work is pioneering, and it is not a product of modern theoretical views. Advancing a type of hermeneutics once employed by Brevard S. Childs (1923-2007), Seitz applies the 'Canonical Approach,' which follows biblical interpretations of an earlier time and opposes assertions that "the manuscript tradition... lacks any interpretative significance" (p.20). The NRSV is the focal translation of the Hebrew texts (pp.100-109). The NIV is utilized frequently. Literary-critical elements preponderate. The paragraph on page 131 is typical.

"The portion of text (1.5-7) is but the first section of a longer rhetorical unit, composed of three parts (1.5-7; 1.8-10; 1.11-12) culminating in 1.13-14 and the cry of 1.15. Each of the units is introduced with imperatives. The final unit (vv.13-14) itself contains nine imperatives in two brief verses. The effect of this is to underscore an atmosphere of great urgency, in the light of 1.4 and the ensuing descriptions of a natural assault. ..."

Seitz's theological input is not considerable. On page 137 one finds a common form of exegesis:

"...it appears that the locust plague is a more generalized example of God's judgement presently engulfing a generation. Absent are indictments for sinful conduct deserving punishment, such as we find elsewhere (especially Zephaniah). Joel sees in the terrible locust plague a generalized divine judgment, like gravity or what Christian theology might register as the effects of 'original sin'. The 'people's joy' is erased as the locust plague renders its own stalking judgement."

A review requires a display of faults or weaknesses. These are not hard to find. There is inattention to Joel's conception of God's person and attributes. Indeed in *Joel* readers will turn up theology in abundance: chapter 1 outlines the significance of God's sanctuary (1:9,15-16); chapter 2 summarizes God's retributive acts (e.g., 2:11) and his jealous but merciful nature (2:18); chapter 3 gives a rough idea of God's restorative process (3:1,7,18). Other items may be noted; several topics needed expanded scrutiny: the mediatory vocation of God represented by his ministers (1:9,2:17), the import of the presence of the Spirit in the last days (the two paragraphs on page 199 are insufficient), and warfare used as an instrument of God in his humbling of Israel (2:11;3:9-13). The author might have depicted the theology of Joel in the same way that academics often portray the principal loci of Jewish theology or the conceptual assumptions of history-of-religion figures. Then "theology" could have formed the core of the commentary.

If the aspiration is to complement the notable *ICC* series, a higher academic standard must be attained. Transliteration should be abandoned. The inclusion of

original-language texts (of the same kind found in appendix II), along with an English translation composed by the author, is desirable.

*Minor details:* Seitz wrote in fn.1,p.111, "The name *Pethuel* is unknown apart from the reference here." It is not clear if he means unknown in the remainder of the Hebrew text or that the name is not extant in antiquity. Yet, a similar form, *byd'l* or *bēyad'el* [*in the protection of EL*] was not infrequently known in ancient Ammonite inscriptions: see F.M. Cross, 'Personal Names in the Samaria Papyri,' *BASOR*, 344 (Nov., 2006), 77. The letters 'b' and 'p' are often interchangeable in Semitic speech. The solution may be only to attribute the shorter form of the name to processes of elision: In several places Seitz's writing is unclear, e.g., p.xi: "This dialectic also opens the text onto the long and rich history of interpretation ...". Onto is obscure in that sentence. In an academic textbook, why the use of colloquialisms like "low-flying assumption" (p.18), "the issue is close-run" (p.38) or the use of terms like "knock-on effect: (p.119); the use of "prise" for "pry", (pp.19,150) although not incorrect still is odd in his expressions. Far too many editorial matters go unnoticed: footnote 8, page 8 should read 'Theodoret of Cyrus,' rather than "Theodoret of Cyr" and should follow the forms of note 5 on page 15. Jerome's long citation (pp.15-17) would be easier to discern if the whole of it was placed between quotation marks ["], as was done for Calvin's (1509-1564) lengthy excerpt in note 9 on page 114; but from which of Jerome's books is the extract taken? Readers unacquainted with Jerome cannot know. Appendix 1 should have been omitted.

This edition has its uses. As a tool of form-criticism the *ITC* can be highly recommended. Nonetheless, how can it be that a 21st century 'critical' commentary issued to supplement the *ICC* contains theological researches that are not quite equal to rhetorical and theological discussions published over 100 years ago in J.M.P. Smith, W.H. Ward, J.A. Bewert, *Micah, Zephaniah, Nahum, Habakkuk, Obadiah, and Joel* (1911)? Hopefully in future volumes the theological aims will be achieved.

J.J.M. Roberts,  
*First Isaiah: A Commentary.*  
Fortress Press (2015). Pp. xxix, 524.  
ISBN 978 0 8006 6080 2. \$69.00 (hb).

*Hermeneia* commentaries provide detailed and learned investigations of ancient texts: the historical-critical method predominates. Of prime importance is the translation and textual notes (e.g., cf. 38:9-20). These two are reinforced by a mass of scholarship that is reminiscent of the annotations of medieval commentators. Consequently *Hermeneia* volumes do not suffer from compression. It is the custom that the thoughts of each expert should be fully expressed. In this volume J.J.M. Roberts (JR) continues that tradition.

*First Isaiah* is the title of JR's new edition. It signals his consent to the prevailing scholarly view, initially developed in the Middle Ages by the biblical criticism of Abraham Ibn Ezra (c.1093-1167), a view which was reformulated by Bernhard Duhm (1847-1928) at the end of the 19th century through his 1892 publication, *Das Buch Jesaia übersetzt und erklärt/The Book of Isaiah Translated and Explained*. Conceived along their lines of reasoning *Isaiah* consists of texts written by three different hands: supposedly chapters 1-39 are the primary section, written by one who was a resident of Jerusalem; but *Deutero-Isaiah* 40-66 purportedly was composed later during the era of Babylonian and Persian empires. *Trito-Isaiah* 56-66, it is said, is a composition of derivative texts made to resemble its predecessor, the second series of prophecies. So goes the modern, critical view of this text.

There is a long history here. *Isaiah* was a scroll that was well represented among the documents discovered at Qumran. Extant variant readings gave witness to its diverse textual tradition. Textual criticism of it has been an absorbing task: cf., E. Ulrich and P. Flint, ed., *Qumran Cave 1. II, The Isaiah Scrolls* (Oxford, 2010). Little can be said of who placed them in the districts where they were found or of how those scrolls were used, but scholars continue to hold forth on these matters in seminars and symposiums: see S.W. Crawford, C. Wassen, ed., *The Dead Sea Scrolls at Qumran and the Concept of a Library* (Brill, 2015). *Isaiah* was a text of profound importance during the Herodian temple period. Apparently Jesus saw a few of *Isaiah's* passages as the basis of his mission (cf. *Lk.4:17f.*) As a result of its citation in the New Testament, it soon came to be designated '*The Fifth Gospel*' by more than one ancient

Christian reader. Its estimation in rabbinic literature was great, and it remains a celebrated text within that corpus of prophetic treatises.

As for the book itself, JR's 'General Introduction' is modest in scope and in its language. Avoiding hubris he approaches the prophecies of *Isaiah* critically. He is acquainted with the intelligent views of his scholarly forebearers. His praise of them is not excessive and appraisals of their views are fair. There is real scholarship here, the kind of which is impatient of imprecise explanations.

His translation is elegant, even idiomatic, much unlike J. Blenkinsopp's<sup>14</sup> formal paraphrases in *Isaiah 1-39* (Anchor Bible). E.g., see *Isa. 21:1-2*,

### Blenkinsopp

The oracle "the wasteland by the sea."  
As whirlwinds in the Negev advance,  
coming from the wilderness, from a land of terror,  
a grim vision is announced to me:  
"The treacherous one is betrayed,  
The despoiler is despoiled.  
Attack, then, Elam!  
Lay siege, Media!  
I have brought all sighing to an end."

### And J.J.M. Roberts

Oracle concerning the wilderness of the sea,  
Like storms passing through the Negeb  
It comes from the wilderness  
from a fearsome land.  
A harsh vision was reported to me:  
"The treacherous one deals treacherously;  
The plunderer plunders.  
Go up, O Elam! Besiege, O Medes!  
Put an end to all his groaning!

The difference is startling. JR has a feel for Hebrew idiom. This facility for language extends to his commentary and, by extension, to his textual notes. He writes "unapologetically as a Christian interpreter of the text" (p.8). And he offers theological insights that are applicable for Christians today. Critical scholars seldom are called upon to offer appropriate analyses for the modern world. Regularly they provide scrutiny which raises questions about a text's meaning without supplying answers. E.g., in *Isaiah 2* Judah is cautioned about following Israel's example of trusting in other

---

14 J. Blenkinsopp's credentials are beyond question. His three-volume commentary *Isaiah 1-39; Isaiah 40-55* and *Isaiah 56-66* (2000-2003), is infinitely superior to all North-American English editions that had come before its publication. It has few rivals after these many years, even so the translation in many places desperately needs revision.



gods for their wellbeing. So JR comments “This warning against displacing God in the search for human security is a recurring theme in *Isaiah*, and it is a theme that remains relevant for the contemporary world” (p.48). As it is in so many other places, that statement is rather vague and is too ineffectual for human appliance.

*Isaiah* is a perfect book for typological use and allusive studies of specific New Testament passages. JR is eager to show the support this book of the Old Testament gives to Gospel readings. His commentary on 6:1-13 are illustrative. His powers of recall are prodigious. He accounts for numerous texts’ theological content by reorganizing them in “Zion Tradition categories” (p.113): this interpretative style was outlined on page 4 where he wrote:

“This was a political and a theological construct, originally created in the days of the Davidic imperial expansion to legitimate that expansion theologically, then maintained and refined under Solomon, and preserved by Solomon’s Judean successors as the ideal despite the breakup of the empire and the collapse of the political reality that had initially given credence to the construct. There were three main points to this construct: (1) Yahweh was the imperial God, king of all the gods and ruler over all the nations; (2) Yahweh had chosen David as his earthly vice-regent and had made an eternal covenant with him that one of his descendants would always sit on David’s throne as Yahweh’s ruler on earth; and (3) Yahweh had chosen Jerusalem as his imperial capital and earthly dwelling place.”

Those facts are prominent in Israelite history; but I doubt that it was assumed throughout Israel that God was deemed the ‘king of all gods’: in many passages biblical writers deny the real existence of other deities, except in people’s minds. His is a well-thought out plan of approach. The method is clearer to me in JR’s writing than it is in the text of the Bible, and it is a revealing map of his thinking processes. The matching technical equipment serves him well.

*Other notes.* Superscriptions: the arguments in the two paragraphs on page 11 regarding the order of Jerusalem and Judah are weak. JR writes “By analogy to the superscriptions at the beginning of a number of other prophetic books... the superscription in Isa. 1.1 is probably intended as a heading for the whole book, or at least as much of the book as existed at the time the superscription was added”. He continues by stating “In fact, one may argue that the superscription in 2:1 provided the model for the creation of 1:1”. Those claims are doubtful. The placement of either of them in primary or secondary positions means little to the criticism of *Isaiah*’s texts. It is improbable that 1:1 ever was meant to be a heading for the entire book, it signified only the geographical locations

which would be the target of specific prophetic utterances. 2:1 is less a compositional model than it is another heading of a predictive message, and it need not be taken to be an editorial addition.

This is a full and careful examination of *Isaiah* 1-39. JR’s researches add substantially to our knowledge of the text.

Corrections: on page xv, “Hermanthena”, amend to “Hermathena”. Page 205: the textual note at 14:5 (‘e’) should read *šhēveṭ*, rather than *šhēbeṭ*.

*Rev. D. Antoine Sutton completed his doctoral studies at Knox Theological Seminary and is Senior Minister of the Tabernacle in the Great Plains, Red Cloud, Nebraska (USA). He is a biblicalist whose specialisms and reading/research interests include: Semitic pursuits and Arabic grammar; the poetry and textual criticism of A. E. Housman; the text and transmission of Manilius’ Astronomica; the origin and formation of the earliest historical traditions of Islam; theology during the Enlightenment period; and the use of typology as a literary and/or theological device in the exegesis of ancient Greek and Roman poetry and in expository studies of Old and New Testament texts.*

*I am grateful to several readers who applied their genius to specific sections in this bulletin. These individuals, however, will remain nameless.*