Book Reviews

Holmgren, Fredrick C. *The Old Testament & the Significance of Jesus: Embracing Change – Maintaining Christian Identity: The Emerging Center in Biblical Scholarship.* Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1999.

In two previous monographs (*The God who Cares: a Christian Looks at Judaism* and *Preaching Biblical Texts: Expositions by Jewish and Christian Scholars*), Fredrick Holmgren has shown sensitivity toward and encouragement for the Jewish-Christian dialogue regarding the Tanak/Old Testament and the person of Jesus Christ. In his most recent book, *The Old Testament & the Significance of Jesus,* Holmgren shares more of his irenic stance and proceeds to make his case for *an* understanding and application of the character of the Old Testament (hereafter "OT") and its relationship to Jesus Christ. By appealing to the writings of many scholars from both conservative and mainline Christian perspectives, Holmgren tries to demonstrate an emerging center in biblical interpretation which is a rejection of several stereotypical understandings of the character of the OT and its relationship to Jesus while holding tightly to Christian identity. It is his contention that Scripture for Christians includes both Testaments and that one without the other cannot be called Scripture. Moreover, the Old Testament is an equal, rather than inferior, dialogue partner with the New Testament (hereafter "NT"). By calling the church and scholars to a more correct appraisal of the OT as it relates to the NT, Holmgren's book is greatly needed today.

Holmgren advocates several adjustments in our thinking to understand more properly the relationship of the OT to Jesus. First, the church should not think God has rejected Israel in light of Jesus' coming. The harsh, self-indicting words against Israel seen most clearly in the prophetic writings of the OT are preserved in Scripture precisely because subsequent Israelites need to obey Torah and thus preserve hope in God's good plan for them. Second, many Christians have overly criticized the Jews for not seeing Jesus in the OT and rebelling against their messiah. Holmgren reasons that seeing Jesus in the OT would not have been obvious by citing that NT writers themselves appealed to a "creative, depth" interpretation of the OT in which they modernized, actualized, and went beyond the plain sense of the older text to corroborate their experience and faith in Jesus. However, to draw the conclusion that the first Christians were applying someone alien to the OT texts is clearly not true; and Holmgren does at least mention this, albeit too briefly.

Third, Holmgren debunks the notion that Torah contributes nothing or very little to the Christian life. He adeptly points out that both positive and negative views of Torah

are preserved in the NT and draws some good conclusions from this both/and perspective. Torah shaped Jesus' life and teaching and when greater numbers of Gentiles wanted to be members of Christianity, Torah was determined not necessary for salvation *but* at the same time legitimate and good for the instruction of responsible living. Moreover, in regards to Jews, in Romans 9-11, Paul had a very difficult time saying Jews who followed the divine teaching at Sinai would be ultimately excluded from God's good intentions of salvation.

Holmgren shows fairly well (although his appeal to irony is questionable) why the new covenant mentioned in Jeremiah 31:31-34 originally pertains to the Israelites after the Babylonian exile. Also, he argues that the new covenant *is* the Sinai covenant by making some good exegetical comments (e.g. the Hebrew word translated "new," *ḥōdeš* can also mean new in the sense of renewal). Therefore, Holmgren asks, how does one make sense of the NT writers' creative/depth use of the Jeremiah text as applying to the person of Jesus when the original application was solidly based in the Sinai covenant?

Following in many ways the model of Nobert Lohfink, Holmgren believes there are ways to appropriate Jeremiah's words to both Israel (original intent) and Jesus (creative/depth interpretation). It is at this juncture that Holmgren's thesis is the weakest. Holmgren wants to allow for Jesus being the most complete fulfillment of the "new" covenant (essentially the view of the NT) while at the same time to allow for those who are faithful to the Sinai covenant a partial fulfillment status. From this idea, Holmgren concludes that God is likewise effecting in Jews who do not believe in Jesus his new covenant promised by Jeremiah; thus, he like Lohfink, arguing from Romans 9-11, believes God will not revoke the older covenant. I agree with Holmgren that Paul is not clear-cut regarding Jewish exclusion apart from Jesus in Romans 9-11, but there must be some discussion of the exclusiveness of salvation apart from Jesus if one looks at the greater argument in the epistle to the Romans and other NT passages.

I found Holmgren's discussion of the equality of the Testaments refreshing in light of present-day Marcionite tendencies. He does an admirable job pointing out areas the OT is not fulfilled by the NT by showing the "Plus" of the OT, a term used by Hebert Haag. Indeed, a discussion of human love and sexuality is rather incomplete without major voices in the OT, and the same can be said regarding problems of suffering and the varied contradictions of life, daily life experiences, human responsibility to God's world, and the specifics of the kingdom of God. It is the OT witness that prevents the real newness in Jesus from becoming irresponsible. For example, Jesus speaks about God's love and kindness while his actions are in accordance with Torah.

In the longest chapter (fifty-two pages), Holmgren points out some problems with the early Christian councils (especially Nicea) as they relate to the misrepresentation of Jesus. Although he is *not* proposing a rejection of the creeds, Holmgren makes a valid point by calling for the present-day church to reexamine the person of Jesus as presented in the NT. Christians need to script theology ("re-theologize") in a language used and understood by their contemporaries by looking at the NT evidence once again. In language influenced by Greek philosophy and culture, the Nicene and Chalcedonian creeds affirmed God was in Christ in a unique way with a heavy emphasis on the *being* of the Trinity. However, the modern worshipper today does not understand that language as expressed in the creed and, furthermore, the *being* of God is not the primary NT way of discussing the Trinity. So,

Holmgren makes a solid argument that 1) the NT writers employed Jewish Wisdom theology as a convincing means of understanding and describing Jesus' relationship to the Father, the God of Israel and that 2) because of this, Christians should try to restate the oneness and difference that Jesus has with the Father with this theology in mind.

All in all, Holmgren has caused his readers to rethink how Jesus relates to the OT witness, something which should always be a pressing concern for Christianity. Perhaps, the author's greatest contribution is to show how both Jewish and Christian faith communities interpret the Tanak/Old Testament in light of their own experience with God. On the other hand, Holmgren might have strengthened his discussion by not flattening the pervasive NT emphasis on the exclusive salvation of God as found in the person and work of Jesus, a subject that must be included in this conversation.

MICHAEL D. MATLOCK
Asbury Theological Seminary
Wilmore, Kentucky

Twelftree, Graham H. *Jesus the Miracle Worker: A Historical and Theological Study*. Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity Press, 1999.

Twelftree may already be known to many readers of *The Asbury Theological Journal* for his important study of *Jesus the Exorcist* (Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1993), which locates Jesus' practices of exorcism within the horizons of exorcism and exorcists in Palestinian antiquity. It is only a small step from this earlier study to the present focus on Jesus as miracle worker, and Twelftree's audience will find much in this new book to appreciate. Here we find the same sensitivity to critical and historical, as well as philosophical, issues, together with the addition of significant attention given to the particular perspectives of each of the Gospel writers on the miracles of Jesus. In both studies, Twelftree makes a strong case for reshaping the understanding of Jesus of Nazareth bequeathed to us by the past three centuries of the quest of the historical Jesus, in which the miraculous has generally been pushed to the periphery, if not ignored or rejected completely. This includes even N.T. Wright's pivotal study of *Jesus and the Victory of God* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1996), in which miracles are conspicuous by their near absence. For Twelftree, contemporary Jesus-study is "wildly out of balance" (p. 357), since miracles are crucial to Jesus' self-understanding, to his historical activity, and to his representation in the Gospels.

Twelftree defines "miracle," from the perspective of Jesus and the Gospels, as "an astonishing event, exciting wonder in the observers, which carries the signature of God, who, for those with the eye of faith, can be seen to be expressing his powerful eschatological presence" (p. 350). Captured in this definition is something of the author's attention to a wide range of issues, especially philosophical, theological, and historical. In fact, *Jesus the Miracle Worker* sets for itself four wide-ranging objectives: (1) to discuss the Gospel writers' perspective on Jesus' miracles, (2) to explore Jesus' own understanding of

his miraculous activity, (3) to examine the extent to which the miracle accounts recorded in the Gospels might be regarded as "historical" in the sense of "what actually happened," and (4) to draw out the implications of the miraculous in Jesus' ministry for the quest of the historical Jesus. In terms of sheer space, the first and third objectives receive the most attention. In fact, Twelftree's study could serve some readers as a working commentary on the miracle stories of the four Gospels (pp. 54-238). This is not to say that the author treats the accounts of the miraculous in an atomist or serial way, however, since he is very much concerned to suggest what these accounts contribute to the theology of each of the Gospels. As to the question, What actually happened?, he argues at length both that there is good basis for regarding the historical Jesus not only as having performed miracles but as a miracle worker of unprecedented ability and reputation, and that the vast majority of miracle accounts in the Gospels reflect actual events in the life of Jesus of Nazareth (pp. 279-330).

In many ways, Twelftree's study is a model of historical work in the Gospels. To make this statement is not only to applaud the author's contribution to study of Jesus and the Gospels, however, but also to suggest its limitations. Let me mention only two. First, Twelftree's focus and his efforts remain very much within the horizons of "what happened then," in spite of the fact that his readers may well have wished that he had explored the theological significance of Jesus the miracle worker for those of us who live at the turn of the third millennium. It is true, of course, that *Jesus the Miracle Worker* explores a number of theological issues, but this exploration is very much confined to the theology of Jesus or of the Evangelists—that is, "theology" is historically circumscribed, so that the chasm between "them" and "us" remains. As pastor of North Eastern Vineyard Church, Adelaide, Australia, Twelftree may well have contemporary interests of this sort and may well have been expected to pursue them in this study. This is not to suggest that Twelftree should have added a section on "application" to his already lengthy work. Rather, it is to query why Twelftree has set the horizons of "historical study" so narrowly. Can critical study of the Gospels afford not to engage more centrally the communicative claims of these texts we embrace as Scripture?

Second, it is of interest that, although Twelftree wants to examine the significance of Jesus' miracles within first-century Palestine, he largely uses conceptual categories from the modern era. How traditional societies look upon healing and the miraculous, how "health" might be defined outside of the western world, and other questions that might have arisen had Twelftree opened his investigation to the insights and sensitivities of medical anthropology are largely eclipsed by philosophical considerations and biomedical concerns arising with and since the Enlightenment. At the same time, the revolution in scientific understanding that has exploded upon us in the last fifty years, and which has great significance for study of the miraculous, does not seem to have influenced Twelftree's historical method. Instead, as in the earlier work of David Strauss or Rudolph Bultmann, for example, this study depends on a historical method grounded in the mechanics of Isaac Newton. To be sure, Twelftree's conclusions reverse those of a Strauss or a Bultmann, a reality that may be all the more important since his work deploys a methodology that is comparable to theirs. Whether Twelftree's examination of the "facts" garnered by such a scientific method has unveiled the full import of the

miraculous in Jesus' ministry is another question, however.

What Twelftree does, then, he does very well, and one finds in the pages of *Jesus the Miracle Worker* a wealth of exegetical treatment, a laudable willingness to tackle hard questions, an astonishing level of interaction with relevant secondary literature—overall, a well-crafted study. We may hope for the time, though, when history-oriented study of this nature will become more self-reflective about the theological claims inherent to these biblical texts, claims that traditional, historical inquiry has held at bay for far too long.

JOEL B. GREEN
Asbury Theological Seminary
Wilmore, Kentucky

Black, David A. *It's Still Greek To Me: An Easy-to-Understand Guide to Intermediate Greek.* Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker, 1998.

Over the years, David Alan Black has solidified his status as a household name in the area of New Testament Greek studies. Much of his work has been directed toward teaching the importance and relevance of Greek study for those engaged in Christian life and ministry. Therefore, his books span a whole range of topics related to this endeavor: from beginning to intermediate grammar, from text critical matters to linguistic concerns, from the interpretation of the Greek New Testament to the practical application of the Greek New Testament in ministry. Black's present work is no less "pastoral" in its focus. Even though he is introducing students to the introductory stages of intermediate Greek grammar, his presentation and tone throughout the book exhibits not only a good grasp of Greek grammar but also an uncanny ability to communicate the intricacies of that grammar in an encouraging and motivating fashion.

Black begins and concludes his treatment of intermediate Greek grammar by addressing some foundational elements involved in Greek language study. Part One of his book gives a basic orientation to grammatical nomenclature, providing a helpful treatment of the foundational parts of speech (noun, pronoun, verb, adverb, etc.) found in most languages, including Greek. Black builds upon this introduction by outlining the important parts of the basic sentence in the following chapter. Novice, as well as seasoned language students will benefit from a reading of these chapters, which serve as a solid, introductory treatment of these important grammatical categories. The final portion of the book, Part Four, has a two-fold usefulness. First, Black builds upon his earlier discussion of "the sentence and its parts" by examining the nature and various functions of the Greek clause. Second, he provides useful historical and semantic background for an understanding of the Greek New Testament, by locating it within the historical landscape of Hellenism, comparing it with the Greek of its classical predecessors, and underscoring its penchant for Semitic language patterns.

The middle portion of this book deals with actual Greek grammar. Part Two explores the Greek noun system and related issues (e.g., adjectives, pronouns, definite

articles, and prepositions) while Part Three explores the Greek verb system and related issues (e.g., moods, participles, infinitives, adverbs, and conjunctions). Throughout these sections, Black attempts to flesh out some of the grammatical discussion found in his earlier textbook, *Learning to Read New Testament Greek*, while attempting to probe further into those intermediate concerns that are most relevant for biblical study; teaching and preaching. In order to aid the student in appropriating this helpful discussion, he provides a good list of the key grammatical terms for each chapter as well as a number of Greek practice sentences (an answer key is found at the conclusion of the book). Black also provides additional readings from other standard Greek grammars that are helpful in terms of reference.

Throughout the book, Black's discussion is lucid and illuminating. His helpful insights and interesting historical interjections ensure an enjoyable reading experience. His discussion of misconceptions surrounding the aorist tense is particularly helpful for the intermediate student, although one wishes that he would expand his discussion to include a fuller treatment of aspect (type of action), since a lack of knowledge in this area tends to be a major stumbling block for many Greek students. In addition, at times Black employs confusing or unfamiliar terminology in his discussion. After exploring the different types of clauses in chapter two, he proceeds to employ the term "principal clause", a term that was not used in the previous discussion. Also, in the midst of an enlightening illustration from Ephesians 5:18-21, he uses the term "durative" to describe a particular participle in that context. Although a seasoned Greek student may have a sense of this term, many students would not and they will not find an explanation of this term in Black's later treatment of the participle. Portions of his discussion could benefit from a more consistent and intentional use of vocabulary in order to avoid confusion.

Another disappointing aspect of the book is found in the exercises at the end of each of the chapters. On five occasions (pp. 45, 49, 105, 109, 110), Black rightly points out that a determination of intermediate usage (i.e., like a subjective genitive over against objective genitive) is dependent primarily on the context in which a particular form or construction is found. In his own words, Black contends that "Greek grammar is at best secondary to the context, both literary and historical, in the interpretation of any passage of Scripture. If a proposed meaning cannot be established apart from an appeal to a subtlety of the Greek case system (or verb system for that matter), chances are good that the argument is worthless"(p. 45). Unfortunately, most of Black's exercise selections, since they are only one sentence in length, do not give the student the adequate amount of *context* with which to make these kinds of *contextual* decisions. Thus, the exercises do not allow the student to practice what Black preaches throughout his book.

I applaud Black's attempt to develop a text that would address intermediate Greek concerns while maintaining readability. The book is well written and incorporates illustrations, visual helps, and humorous chapter titles, all of which help to motivate the student to continue reading from chapter to chapter. Since the book spends a good deal of time reviewing material introduced in Black's beginning text, it will be particularly helpful for the Greek student who needs to review Greek grammar while being introduced to some of the most basic intermediate concerns. Thus, it may function

best as a companion volume to Black's earlier work. But those students who are in search of an extensive and detailed treatment of intermediate issues will need to look elsewhere, and refer to the additional reference materials Black lists at the end of each chapter.

J. CHRISTIAN STRATTON
Asbury Theological Seminary
Wilmore, KY

Croy, N. Clayton. *A Primer of Biblical Greek.* Grand Rapids, Mich./Cambridge, U.K.: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1999.

In the introduction to his book, Mr. Croy makes many assertions about the state of first-year Greek grammar books as a sort of *raison d'être* for the writing of this current volume. In his own words, "My own experience in teaching Greek and my conversations with other teachers suggest that most of the texts in print are flawed in various ways: faulty or inadequate grammatical explanations, excessive detail, inadequate exercises, unidiomatic exercises, pedagogical quirks or gimmicks, typographical errors, excessively high prices, and noninclusive language" (page xvi). Perhaps this current tome would be a much better piece had he observed those shortcomings in his own book.

In the title and throughout the book, Mr. Croy speaks of biblical Greek as if it were a special entity all to itself. He seems to be preserving the prevailing attitudes and notions concerning the language of the New Testament from the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries (it was even referred to as "Holy Ghost Greek"). That was a time before the great papyri discoveries and the philological use of Greek Romances. The data gleaned from these sources revealed that the actual language of the New Testament was just the average, run-of-the-mill ancient Greek Attic dialect of the Koine period—the same dialect that 80 percent of all ancient Greek literature utilizes. To be sure, the Koine period is distinguished by some grammatical peculiarities, as are all periods, but not enough to constitute another dialect and surely not another language, like Byzantine or modern Greek. It seems rather counter-productive to teach ancient Greek in such a way as to leave the impression that the student can read only the New Testament or perhaps the Septuagint, even though other literature is also accessible and available. It is possible to use readings entirely from the New Testament without giving that impression.

One of the greatest weaknesses of this book is the presentation order of grammatical information. Mr. Croy states that his is a natural order of presentation (page xvii). The question arises, then, natural for whom? A trained linguist? The book is divided into 32 lessons, so in a normal school year the teacher would cover one lesson per week. Lesson 1 is your typical alphabet and related material lesson. Lesson 2 introduces the verb in general and the present active indicative including the infinitive. Lesson 3 presents the first declension nouns of the feminine gender. So by the second or third week of class, the student has been introduced to both nouns and verbs, a sure recipe for disaster in today's classrooms.

For native English speakers, learning a highly inflected language like ancient Greek requires a rather long early period of adjustment. When one is only accustomed to adding an "s" or an "'s" to the end of a word, being presented with seven verb endings followed by 20 noun endings, some looking rather similar to each other, can be overwhelming. From the beginning, in addition to memorizing the paradigms, the student is expected to understand the use of personal verb endings (which he or she is accustomed to doing in English with pronouns), and five cases with three genders in the noun system. Considering that the average, native speaker/reader/writer of English pays little to no attention to these grammatical issues in his or her own language, it is understandable that the student would be completely confused, frustrated, and heading for the door by week three. The way the material is presented makes learning ancient Greek more difficult than it needs to be.

Another example of poor planning and execution is with the presentation of the third declension. This declension is first introduced in Lesson 17 with a brief discussion of its peculiarities and paradigms of the basic endings, along with the paradigms of ἄρχων and σάρξ. No where in this lesson or following lessons does the author explain or even mention what type of third declension he is illustrating. It is useful to know that ἄρχων is a dental and σάρξ is a guttural because it helps explain the spelling of the nominative singular and dative plural forms. By Lesson 17, students should be able to understand simple consonant contractions. So why not let them in on the secret? In addition the author introduces several third declension words in the vocabulary: one in particular, ἀνήρ leaves the student to his or her own devises on how to decline a syncopated noun. Just knowing the nominative and genitive will not help. He does this again in Lesson 19 with the introduction of μήτηρ and πατήρ in the vocabulary for memorization. He concludes his study of the third declension in Lesson 25 with the introduction of words ending in -ις, -ευς, the neuter γένος, and adjectives of the third declension, again with no explanation concerning their type. Giving the long forms of γένος in the paradigm and then contracting them is very pedagogical at this stage of the student's development.

The author's explanation of the periphrastic participle in Lesson 20 is also unsatisfying. The reader is left with the impression that only the imperfect active periphrastic and the perfect passive periphrastic are used in the New Testament. Also in this chapter, though the information is not incorrect, he leaves a false impression in paragraph 142. Here, Mr. Croy briefly describes and gives examples for six adverbial participles. For five of the six participles *(manner, means, cause, condition,* and *concession)* in his examples he uses the nominative case, which is the usual practice. However, his example for *time* is a genitive absolute (ἔτι λέγοντος αὐτοῦ ταῦτα, ἡ γυνὴ αὐτοῦ εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὸν οἶκον). By this illustration, the author leaves the impression that only genitive absolutes can be used in temporal clauses and that all genitive absolutes are temporal. Both assumptions are false. His elucidation of the genitive absolute in paragraph 135 does not clarify matters either, since all of his examples are temporal, and causal is not mentioned as a possibility. In addition, the author's explanation and examples of the aorist participle, paragraph 134, is equally confusing. At first, Mr. Croy says that the action of the aorist participle is *prior to* (italics are his) the action of the main verb. But later he says the action can be *simultaneous* (again his italics) with the action of the main verb (debatable), and then proceeds with six examples to illustrate the point. Of the six examples, two are

prior-time temporal, one is causal, one is attributive, and two are substantival (as is his custom, he does not label any of them). In his own translations of the sentences all show a prior-time action. If simultaneous action is really a possibility, an example would be nice as an illustration. It would also be helpful if the example sentences had been taken from Scripture and not composed by the author.

This volume has copious exercises, including composed sentences (referred to as *Practice and Review),* and readings from the New Testament and Septuagint. However, one of the author's observations was that in many grammars the "artificial" sentences were unidiomatic, as though his were going to be idiomatic. Regrettably, the *Practice and Review* readings fall short of this goal by mimicking, for the most part, English word order. This gives the student a false sense of security by thinking that ancient Greek can be read from left to right like English, with comprehension from word order and not case functions. Furthermore, it is imperative that the sentences (since they are isolated) be easily understood by the student, which is not always the case.

There are other shortcomings, but suffice it to say this volume could have used careful editing by the publisher. Note the missing verb near the bottom of page xvii.

MICHAEL J. HARSTAD
Asbury College
Wilmore, Kentucky

Meyers, Eric M., editor in chief. *The Oxford Encyclopedia of Archaeology in the Near East.* 5 volumes. New York: Oxford University Press, 1997.

Reading—even browsing!—through the five volumes of The Oxford Encyclopedia of Archaeology in the Near East (hereafter OEANE) comprises nothing short of an in-depth exposure to and education in archaeology. Not only is this true, but this particular educational experience—the (quite literal) dustiness of archaeology notwithstanding!—is an enjoyable one. This beautifully designed reference work is certain to become a classic in the field and a standard reference work for years to come.

OEANE contains over 1,100 entries by 560 contributors from more than two dozen countries. Indeed, the list of contributors reads as a veritable "Who's Who?" in archaeology. The words of these world-renowned scholars find a suitable home in OEANE as it is handsomely produced: the volumes are oversized, the type is easily read (despite a double column format), and some 650 drawings, plans, and photographs compliment the text. The articles are, in the main, moderately sized which makes them manageable, though occasionally an important article gets relatively short shrift (e.g., Dynastic Egypt receives only five pages). Each article also includes a bibliography, often annotated—an added bonus in a work such as this.

What is most satisfying about OEANE, however, is its range and scope. The reader will find here, in addition to standard entries on sites (e.g., Caesarea, 'Ein Besor), places (e.g., North Africa, Palestine), and so forth, entries on important archaeologists (e.g., William

Foxwell Albright, C. Leonard Woolley) and archaeological institutions (e.g., the American Center of Oriental Research). One also finds here articles on items, events, or entities that are unexpected in an encyclopedia devoted to archaeology with its attendant focus on artifacts and realia. Note, for example, the entries on the Bar Kochba Revolt, the First Jewish Revolt, Biblical Literature: Hebrew Scriptures (a mini-history of criticism), and Biblical Literature: New Testament (a discussion of the content of the New Testament). Epigraphic discoveries are, of course, of special significance to many excavations in the Near East and OEANE treats these in two main ways: 1) by offering articles on the various languages or scripts represented by such texts and locales (see, e.g., Aramaic Language and Literature, Cuneiform, Hebrew Language and Literature, Hieroglyphs, Writing and Writing Systems); and 2) by treating important inscriptions, texts, or groups of texts individually (see, e.g., Dead Sea Scrolls, as well as the entries on select documents such as the Rule of the Community, the War Scroll, etc.; or Inscriptions, along with the articles on the Zakkur Inscription, Deir 'Alla Inscriptions, etc.). Of course, in referring to an encyclopedia like this, one always finds oneself wishing that additional articles were included or that an important text or inscription had received a separate article (e.g., the Tel Dan stela) but editorial choices have to be made at some point. And, in any event, it goes without saying that OEANE provides solid, broad, and comprehensive coverage, even when it is not exhaustive.

Thus said, OEANE is an impressive achievement, but where it particularly excels and distinguishes itself from all previous attempts at archaeological encyclopediae is in its attention to and coverage of the history and theory of the discipline and method of archaeology itself. This is evidenced in a range of important articles that could easily constitute the readings for a semester-long course on archaeology. At the very least a selection of these articles could be used as background readings on archaeology – whether for students in a class or for participants in an upcoming dig. This series of articles on the discipline and method of archaeology include not only detailed discussions of the materials and media of antiquity (see, e.g., Building Materials and Techniques, Food Storage, Textiles, Vitreous Materials) but also the archaeologist's means to evaluate such remains and, indeed, the full range of archaeological technique (see, e.g., Architectural Drafting and Drawing, Dating Techniques, History of the Field [a massive, multi-article entry], Periodization [see also Appendix 2: Chronologies (5:411-416)], Reference Works, Restoration and Conservation, Stratigraphy). Some of these articles, as well as a number of general entries, would also prove informative to even a casual reader or to someone preparing for a trip to the Holy Land. These articles provide valuable, first-hand insight on how archaeologists do their job and the amount of methodological reflection and information included here is certainly one of the strong points of OEANE. Indeed, "there is nothing in the existing literature that can quite compare to this treatment" (1:xv). And, finally, despite this impressive attention to method and theory, OEANE still finds room to contain some 450 entries on actual sites.

While all of this is quite impressive, the range and scope of OEANE is not restricted to the realms of theory and content. The geographical range, too, is broad, encompassing, quite literally, the entire Near East "from the eastern Mediterranean to Iran, from Anatolia to the Arabian Peninsula" including also "Egypt, Cyprus, and parts of North and East Africa" (1:x). Yet even this proved too limiting, hence "places such as Malta and Sardinia where Semitic culture had been strong since antiquity, the Aegean world, and North Africa as far as

Morocco" are also treated (1:x). This impressive geographical scope is matched only by the broad chronological delimiters (if they could be called such!) of OEANE. The articles include the latest discoveries in the prehistory of these regions and continue their coverage through the Crusader period–in some cases extending into even later periods (1:xi).

One additional positive note: OEANE is user-friendly. I have already mentioned the annotated bibliographies; to this could be added the cross-referencing within the articles and across the volumes. Even more helpful, however–and unexpected in a work this size–is the excellent and extensive index found in volume five (5:461-553). The user of OEANE should also be aware of the Synoptic Outline of Contents (5:451-459), which presents the corpus of articles in OEANE under five general rubrics (with subcategories): Lands and Peoples; Writing, Language, Texts; Material Culture; Archaeological Methods; and History of Archaeology. Armed with both of these tools, the reader should be able to locate the desired information easily, even if OEANE does not contain an article devoted exclusively to that particular subject. The Synoptic Outline of Contents is especially helpful, though it would have been best to include this in the front of each volume as the casual user of OEANE is likely to miss it.

This brings me to a few infelicities and, of course, no work–especially a massive work such as this–can avoid containing a few. Sometimes the entries struck me as odd or oddly placed. For example: Why is there an entry on the 'Atlit Ram but not an entry on 'Atlit? Why is the entry on Central Moab alphabetized under "c" rather than placed as a subentry under the article on Moab proper? Why is the article on the Biblical Temple not included as a subentry under the larger article Temples? Such situations make the index and Synoptic Outline of Contents even more important and one should have them (i.e., volume 5) at hand when using OEANE extensively. Additionally, other minor items could be mentioned: e.g., the running header on 5:180 is incorrect; Appendix 1: Egyptian Aramaic Texts (5:393-410) would have been better placed with the article on Egyptian Aramaic Texts (2:213-219); the twelve maps of Appendix 3: Maps (5:417-430) are not numbered; sequential pagination of the volumes might have been nice; and so forth.

These minor observations are truly that – infinitesimally small in the light of the contribution that the OEANE makes and the incredible amount of material and wealth of information contained therein. The editor in chief, his consulting editors, and the publishers deserve both our hearty congratulations and our deep gratitude.

BRENT A. STRAWN
Asbury Theological Seminary
Wilmore, Kentucky

Cooper, John W. *Our Father in Heaven: Christian Faith and Inclusive Language for God.* Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker, 1998.

It is time for this book. The trend toward inclusive language has been growing steadily for nearly the past twenty years. It is time for inclusive language to be considered by conserva-

tive Christians and to be assessed by more liberal advocates of the movement. This book undertakes both tasks at once. While the book will not persuade dedicated inclusivists, it provides sound assessment on many, though not all of the issues at stake and strategies employed in the debate over inclusive God language.

Cooper has written an accessible and generally well argued yet non-technical apologia for the need for using feminine imagery for God within the limits of his high doctrine of Scripture. It is a book written to be understood by the reader. Over the course of its history, theology has too often been shrill and nasty. Cooper's book is refreshingly calm, even restrained at moments, as it faces emotionally charged issues. He takes no cheap shots.

Cooper defines inclusivism as an ideology dedicated either to a) using both masculine and feminine terms for God equally or b) avoiding gendered language altogether, or c) combining using and avoiding terms of both genders equally (25). The goal is either absolute parity of terms or careful avoidance of gendered language in the interests of justice for women and or pastoral care of women. After attending to biblical usage, not exhaustively, but attentively, he concludes that such practices are incompatible with the patterns of biblical language for God, which are overwhelmingly male. To follow inclusive language rules then departs from the scriptural pattern.

Cooper recognizes that the dividing line between inclusivists and traditionalists is their understanding of theological authority. For Cooper, Scripture is the rule, the standard by which experience, even the pain and suffering of women must be measured. Experience, which he treats under the heading of general revelation, must be interpreted in terms of special revelation–Scripture–not the other way round. This, of course puts him at odds with feminist theology which has done precisely the opposite by making "women's experience" the standard for judging Scripture's adequacy as revelation. What we have here are two different doctrines of revelation.

Repudiation of the principle of feminist theological authority however, does not let conservative Christians off the hook regarding feminine language for God. Cooper wants his readers to appreciate the Bible's birth and maternal imagery for God. Concern for women is not the only reason to redirect our language for God in the direction of feminine imagery. Using feminine imagery is more faithful to the fullness of the texts' understanding of God, although Cooper does not put it quite this way. The problem, as he sees it, is that incluvisists have seized on the feminine or possibly feminine figures of speech for God and used them inappropriately and confusedly to argue that it is right and proper, even perhaps necessary to address God as a woman to redress women's grievances.

To demonstrate this misuse of Scripture, the central chapters of the book examine the various figures of speech–similes, metaphors, analogies, personification–that Scripture uses. His conclusion is that many of these legitimately liken God's actions and attitudes to those traditionally associated with women, like Isa. 49:15 that likens God's love for Israel to the love of a nursing mother for her infant. Others, however (like Isa. 66:7-9) Cooper says do not refer to God but to Jerusalem and so its use for inclusivist purposes is illegitimate. This particular instance was a poor choice. For verse 9 indeed does refer to God as giving birth. In addition, even if Jerusalem is the referent, clearly

Jerusalem stands for Israel. There needs to be further careful work exegeting each text before conclusions are warranted

Arguing over specific texts, however, would not affect Cooper's basic argument. Scripture always treats God as male, never as female. The feminine imagery is always figures of speech that portray a male God's feminine attitudes and actions. At no time does Scripture identify God directly as a woman, not even Proverb 8:22, which, although it personifies wisdom as a woman, is like considering justice to be a woman. Neither is about the being of God but a way to best understand the actions or attitudes of God.

Without saying so directly, the argument is that inclusivists are eisegeting a female God into Scripture, and this is illegitimate and idolatrous. The argument proceeds with much more agility than space permits us to discuss here. It may be a fair riposte, if we could agree on the interpretations of the texts, but Cooper has forgotten one detail. Christianity began its hermeneutical career eisegeting Christ into the Old Testament with Paul (Rom. 9:32b,f; 1 Cor. 10:4). Paul also reinterpreted Scripture to read gentiles as the people of God, when clearly Israel is meant by the text (2 Cor. 6; Gal. 4). In fact, inclusivists are on firmer ground in their ideological misreadings, since they at least are dealing with actual feminine imagery in the texts, while Paul and later classical Christian exegetes had absolutely no linguistic grounds for christologizing the Old Testament. Clearly, Paul himself was not working under the rules Cooper employs.

Some parts of the argument are stronger than others. He notes that the claim that male language for God translates into male abuse of women is not based on empirical evidence, but himself brings no empirical evidence for the counter claim that it is likely a lack of theological perspective that enables men to abuse women. Similarly, he argues for a biblically high view of women based on Genesis 1:27, but fails to note that Christian tradition did not always see it this way, being encumbered both by other scriptural passages that seemed to impugn this equality, and by a primitive biology that lacked knowledge of the contribution the ovum makes to reproduction.

Despite these limitations, the book makes a positive contribution toward helping conservative Christians think through feminine language for God. He should have taken time to read Julian of Norwich's treatment of Christ as our mother. He would have found there support for his views and a lovely example for his readers. In the end, he offers a set of rules for employing feminine imagery in public worship, private devotion, Christian education, evangelism, and pastoral counseling. One of the most interesting is that it is permissible to address the Holy Spirit as "it" or occasionally "she." It is occasionally permissible to say, "God is our mother" when used as a predicate metaphor as Calvin did in a comment on Is. 46:3.

Feminine imagery for God is advised so long as it does not transgress its subordinate status. While for conservative Christians who are allergic to feminism this should be good news, it will be bad news to other ears. Let us hope that Cooper does not suffer the fate of many mediating voices to be plagued by both houses.

ELLEN T. CHARRY
Princeton Theological Seminary
Princeton, New Jersey

Pohl, Christine D. *Making Room: Recovering Hospitality as a Christian Tradition.* Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1999.

In a time in which many scholarly works are both hastily written and of dubious significance, Christine Pohl's fine work on hospitality is quite the opposite on both counts. It will stand as the benchmark work on this subject for a long time to come.

This is a work in ethical archaeology. Pohl digs through the centuries' layers and discovers hospitality as a way of living out the Gospel that was once central to Christian experience but for several centuries has been marginalized. She argues convincingly that the church needs to recover the practice of hospitality, not only because it meets the needs of the poor but also for the church's own sake.

The biblical demand for hospitality, Pohl shows, is clear in both Old and New Testaments. The people of God are aliens and strangers whom God has welcomed into the "household of faith." In turn, God's people are to "make room" for the stranger, not only in the community of faith but also in their own personal households. This is the biblical meaning of hospitality—making room for the stranger, especially those in most acute need. Such care must not be reduced to mere social entertaining nor may it be self-interested and reciprocal; instead, biblical hospitality reaches out to the abject and lowly and expects nothing in return. Hospitality is not optional, nor should it be understood as a rare spiritual gift; instead, it is a normative biblical practice that is learned by doing it.

Hospitality is implicitly subversive in the way it shatters social boundaries, especially those boundaries enforced by table fellowship. When we eat with the lowly and welcome strangers and "sinners" to our table, we topple social expectations and bear witness to the kind of love God has for all his creatures. It is not coincidental that Jesus perhaps most scandalized his critics in his practice of table fellowship. "He eats with tax collectors and sinners"—this was not a compliment. And it was precisely the radical nature of Christian hospitality, Pohl shows, that characterized the early church, helped spread the Gospel, and healed the dramatic social barriers that initially confronted the church as the Gospel permeated the Greco-Roman world.

The connection between hospitality and Jesus is indeed rich and mysterious. As Pohl shows, in New Testament perspective Jesus is simultaneously guest, host, and meal. He is guest whenever we welcome and care for the stranger and the broken (Mt. 25:31-46). He is host, for example, when he hosts the Last Supper, during which "we…celebrate the reconciliation and relationship available to us because of [Jesus'] sacrifice and through his hospitality" (p. 30)—and when he will host the Great Supper in the Kingdom. And he himself, as our Paschal sacrifice, is the meal we eat, not only in Communion but in ongoing Christian experience as we feed on his life to nourish our own.

In tracing out the history of the Christian practice of hospitality, Pohl marshals an array of quotations from such church leaders as Chrysostom, Lactantius, Augustine, Luther, Calvin, and Wesley, as well as 20th-century practitioners of hospitality such as Dorothy Day and Edith Schaeffer. It is clear from the historical account given here that extraordinary attention was paid to hospitality as a normative Christian practice through the entirety of church history until relatively recent times.

Interestingly, the decline of hospitality as a widely shared tradition is in part traceable to

the specialization of hospitality under the pressure of human need. I was reminded that such institutions as hospitals, hostels, hospices, and even hotels—note the shared etymology of all these words as well as "hospitality"—all were developed by Christians as they responded with increasing specialization to various forms of human need. Yet the specialization and eventual bureaucratization of care weakened hospitality as an aspect of everyday Christian practice. Today most Christians do not welcome refugees or the homeless into their homes; if we are concerned at all about such people, we most often send money to help fund specialized efforts undertaken by someone else.

Yet hospitality is a practice that is good for the Christian soul. We lose something of the distinctive nature of Christian discipleship when we delegate the work entirely to specialists. This Pohl most appealingly demonstrates in the latter chapters of her work, as she walks through what might be called a "thick description" of the actual practice of hospitality as it exists today. Her visits to several contemporary Christian communities that practice Christian hospitality—such as L'Abri and the Catholic Worker—infuse this work with the warm wisdom of hospitality's most experienced practitioners in our present day.

My family has extended itself more in recent years than previously to welcome the stranger and I resonated deeply with Pohl's description of the difficulties as well as the rewards of hospitality. It was clear that Pohl herself has undertaken extensive hospitality efforts and thus writes out of a base of experience rather than dispassionate research. This is the rare academic effort that one could easily see occupying a valuable place in the thinking of those who actually do hospitality most extensively.

If the discipline of Christian ethics is to serve the church well in years to come, we must do more of this kind of work—retrieving aspects of the Christian moral tradition for contemporary application, writing both out of personal moral practice and richly researched scholarly effort. We must be both moral archaeologists and practitioners. Christine Pohl's *Making Room* can be a model for such efforts in the years to come.

DAVID P. GUSHEE
Union University
Jackson, Tennessee