as being an innovation at about that time and the connection of this idea with Darby are not, of course, in dispute.)

The volume presently under review begins with a reiteration of the author's theory about the origin of Darby's pretribulation-rapture concept, but then moves into an analysis of the present-day situation regarding dispensationalism. There is discussion of four different groups of "Tribulationists" (chap. 2) and presentation of a case for "Post-Tribulationism" as being the majority view (chap. 3). Next, attention is given to such matters as the following: an incipient anti-Semitism which MacPherson thinks he sees in pretribulationism; Hal Lindsey's writings; inconsistencies in interpretation that are evidenced among various advocates of pretribulationism; etc. (chaps. 4-8).

MacPherson's publication is popular in nature, rather than scholarly, and it abounds in colloquialisms. Its obviously strong polemical overtones and especially its sardonic remarks tend to impair its value, at least from a scholarly point of view. For instance, what benefit can possibly be derived from the following comment on p. 56 about Hal Lindsey's differentiation between Christ's coming "in the air" and "to the earth"?: "Does he [Lindsey] think that when Christ comes to earth he won't travel 'in the air'? (Maybe he'll travel through layers of water!)"? Surely, a publication such as that by George E. Ladd, The Blessed Hope (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1956), provides a more objective and scholarly analysis of dispensationalism.

Nevertheless, MacPherson's *The Late Great Pre-Trib Rapture* will undoubtedly fulfill a useful role for many seminarians and pastors, for it may rightly be recognized as constituting, in a practical way, a helpful source book and compendium on some matters. There is no question but that this author has done a great deal of careful research and analysis; and aside from unnecessary witticisms, sarcastic remarks, etc., the insights and documentation he affords in chaps. 5 and 6 ("The Lindsey Legend" and "A House Divided") are often interesting and useful.

Andrews University

KENNETH A. STRAND

Mays, James L. Micah: A Commentary. The Old Testament Library. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1976. xii + 169 pp. \$10.95.

Professor Mays of Union Theological Seminary (Richmond, Va.) has provided the student of the OT with another commentary on an 8th-century prophet. His commentaries on Amos and Hosea appeared in the same series in the year 1969.

Mays suggests that the historical Micah was active for "a relatively short time" (p. 15) in the latter part of the eighth century B.C. (p. 21), although the dating of Mic 1:1 allows a minimum span of public activity of 46 years. The reason for the suggestion of such a short period of ministry is supported by the critical conclusion that genuine sayings of Micah are found only in the first three chapters: 1:3-5a, 8-15 (with additions); 2:1-5 (revised); 2:6-11

(v. 10 is revised); 3:1-4, 5-8, 9-12. The remaining sayings in chaps. 4-7 derive from various later periods of time, particularly around 600-586 B.C. However, "the latest material in the book comes from the post-exilic period after the temple had been rebuilt (515 B.C.)" (p. 21). This assessment of the lengthy growth of the book does not follow the contemporary trend of scholars who have emphasized the unifying features of the book (e.g., J. T. Willis, B. A. Copass and E. L. Carlson, A. Weiser, W. Beyerlin) but the criticism of the previous generation (A. Stade, K. Marti, W. Nowack, et al.). The return of an older position is also reflected in the twofold division of the form of the book into Part One: 1:2-5:15 and Part Two: 6:1-7:20 (H. Ewald, et al.). It seems that the suggestions for a threefold division (J. T. Willis et al.) are not seriously considered.

The commentary as such (pp. 36-169) is not extensive in length considering the complexity of the content of the individual sayings. The pattern of his earlier commentaries is followed here again, with a lucid translation of the Hebrew text into English followed by a commentary on each unit translated. The interpenetration of both translation and interpretation (exegesis) is a typical characteristic of this work. Although the book of Micah has a remarkable range of theological themes and "in many respects is a miniature of the book of Isiah [sic]" (p. 1), one misses the treatment of the theology of Micah.

Mic 4:1-5 is one of the best known passages in the OT which has its parallel in Isa 2:2-4. H. Wildberger has argued forcefully for an Isaianic origin of Mic 4:1-5 (Jesaja [Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1972], pp. 76-90) as did H. Junker shortly before him. Mays does not think that this unit originates with Isaiah or Micah (so E. Cannawurf) but with an anonymous post-exilic prophet. "Perhaps the original saying was first spoken after the completion of the temple in 515 B.C." (p. 96).

The promise of Mic 5:2-4 has been understood to be Messianic by many, even to the present (A. Weiser, W. Beyerlin, S. Herrmann, C. Westermann). Mays does not share this position. He conceives it as a saying about the inauguration of a new ruler whom Yahweh will make great in the midst of the whole earth.

As regards Mic 7:8-20, the author follows H. Gunkel's study of 1928. This unit is made up of prophetic liturgies from a late compiler during post-exilic times.

On the whole, no significant new ground is broken in this commentary. It follows more or less the patterns established by critical biblical scholarship. As is expected, Mays is sensitive to form-critical and traditio-historical emphases. As a result he conceives the supposedly long history of the formation of the book of Micah as a veritable guide to the history of prophetic proclamation and thus the course of the prophetic movement. It remains to be seen whether this reconstruction will be sustained in future studies on Micah and the ancient Israelite prophetic movement.

The book as a whole is relatively free from typographical errors. Only the following were noted: p. 1, "Isiah"; p. 112, 4.1-4 should be 5.1-4; and p. 155, "luturgical." The usefulness of the book would have been enhanced by the addition of indexes on authors (the bibliography on pp. 34-35 is painfully brief) and on subjects.