

good Samaritan she allows the Lucan context to lead her to conclusions concerning the "meaning of Jesus' answer" which are foreign to the illustration itself, namely, with respect to the problem of justification (see pp. 55 f).

At times our author flies in the face of *communis opinio*. Take for instance her long note (almost four pages of fine print) in which she says frankly, "In my opinion there is not one saying of Jesus that speaks expressly of the nearness of the kingdom of God the authenticity of which is not at least disputed" (p. 132, n. 26). Surely this calls for further discussion.

Linnemann's *Jesus of the Parables* is at once a most interesting and important book. It is alive to the contemporary discussion concerning the meaning and significance of the parables of Jesus and makes a significant contribution to that discussion. The serious expositor of the parables, be he teacher or preacher, who will ignore this book will do so to his own loss.

Andrews University

JAMES J. C. COX

Schwantes, Siegfried J., *A Short History of the Ancient Near East*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker Book House, 1965. 191 pp. + 5 maps. \$ 4.95.

The aim of this book, as the author explains in the foreword, is to supply the need for a short and yet substantial history of the ancient Near East in the English language. With a background of sound scholarship in language, literature and history, the author has admirably met this need. Indeed, the uniqueness and appeal of the book centers on the fact that, unlike far too many academic textbooks, the work under review does not regard the pre-classical Orient as an historical prelude leading up to a more detailed study of the explosive fifth century and the birth of classical Greek civilization. Rather, the author presents early Near Eastern civilizations, prior to the advent of Alexander the Great, as possessing significance and fascination for their own sake. It is a majestically sweeping view of a world of long ago. To have the political histories of the various regions of the ancient Orient authoritatively brought together under one cover is an exceptional rarity reminiscent of James H. Breasted's popular textbook for high-school students: *Ancient Times: A History of the Early World*. Tastefully offered, augmented by striking illustrations (including a synoptic chronological chart), the book recommends itself for popular consumption both for those who desire an introductory acquaintance with ancient history and for those who simply may want a concise summary of the salient highlights of specific chapters of that history.

Perhaps the most valid complaint which can be offered has to do with the unavoidable results which are imposed by the compactness of the history. Since a wide time range must be compressed to fit under one cover, some conclusions come with arbitrary abruptness. Sargon

I is spoken of as possibly having crossed the Taurus Mountains into Asia Minor (p. 27). The historical implications of that tradition in light of the reference to Sargon made some seven centuries later by the Hittite king Hattušiliš I are not discussed (see H. G. Güterbock, *JCS*, XVIII [1964], 1-6). The complementary, archaeological lines of evidence which demonstrate that the Philistines came from the island of Crete—such as linguistic traces and architectural remains—are reduced to a passing remark concerning the Aegean affinity of Philistine pottery (pp. 160, 161). The intriguing chronological problem posed by the Biblical story of the Israelite Exodus from Egypt is given a tantalizingly brief analysis, but without offering a definitive conclusion as to just when that event took place (pp. 156-158). The hotly debated historical question of whether or not there existed a coregency between Amenhotep III and Amenhotep IV is not considered (p. 89). Nor is there an alternative theory supplied in answer to the mystery of who slew the son of the Hittite monarch Šuppiluliuma (p. 46)—other than to suggest that the wicked deed was instigated by Pharaoh Eye. Was the culprit Haremhab, who seemingly headed an Egyptian army in Syria at the time? Needless to say, the peculiar historical difficulties which surround that infamous international murder are avoided. While King Josiah's annexation of the Assyrian provinces of Samaria, Gilead and Galilee is duly noted (p. 172), the recent discovery that he also expanded his hold on territory to the west of Judah is neglected (see J. Naveh, *IEJ*, X [1960], 129-139). Recent discussions as to the identity of the Babylonian king Kandalanu also are by-passed (pp. 132, 134). In the reviewer's opinion, the name "Kandalanu" may have been the Babylonian throne name for the Assyrian ruler Assur-eṭil-ilāni, Assurbanipal's son and successor (see Elizabeth von Voigtlander, *A Survey of Neo-Babylonian History*, Unpublished Doctor of Philosophy dissertation, University of Michigan, 1963, pp. 6-8). Such disappointing briefness in the narrative, though sad to the heart of a true historian, is perhaps inevitable if the work is to remain a short history.

Items against which the reviewer would take particular issue include the oft-heralded theory of a constant Bedouin pressure upon the sown (pp. 11-12). A refutation of this commonly held thesis (that Arabian nomads continually emerged from the desert upon the more fertile sedentary cultures) is conveniently provided by J. M. Grintz (*JNES*, XXI [1962], 186-206) and more recently by J. T. Luke (*Pastoralism and Politics in the Mari Period*, Unpublished Doctor of Philosophy dissertation, University of Michigan, 1965). Nor can the reviewer agree with the author's contention that the god of Pharaoh Akhenaten (Amenhotep IV) was formed by syncretism. The unprecedented religious revolution of Akhenaten was out of temper with the religious mood of his times (H. Frankfort, *Ancient Egyptian Religion* [New York, 1948], p. 3). Furthermore, a study of the earlier and later titular name of the god Aten reveals a religious revolution formed by "exclusion" rather than by "syncretism" (B. Gunn, *JEA*, IX [1923],

168-176). That the Hyksos introduced the horse into Egypt is another common assumption which until recently seemed to be based on good evidence (as brought out on p. 78). Recently, however, Walter B. Emery has found the burial of a horse lying directly on the brick pavement of a Middle Kingdom rampart (*Lost Land Emerging* [New York, 1967], pp. 111, 112). The implications of that find are possibly reflected in the statement made by the Egyptologist Keith C. Seele in the *Chicago Tribune* ("Books Today," July 16, 1967, p. 13): "There is no evidence that the horse and chariot were introduced into Egypt by the Hyksos."

The following corrections may be noted. The *ka* is not to be confused with the *ba* (p. 65); it is the latter that is represented as "a bird fluttering in the air." The Bethshan stela of Seti I is not the first time an Egyptian source mentions the word "Canaan" (p. 94); the term already is found as early as the reign of Amenhotep II (15th century B.C.). Azriyau was not a usurper who made himself king of Sam'al (p. 153), but is rather to be identified with Azariah-Uzziah of Judah (see especially E. Thiele, *The Mysterious Numbers of the Hebrew Kings* [Grand Rapids, 1965], pp. 93, 94). The general of Cyrus, who is also called the governor of Gutium, was not Gubaru (Greek "Gobryas") as is postulated (pp. 139, 143), but a certain "Ugbaru" (the cuneiform possibly is to be read "Ukmaru"). The Theban king who reunited Egypt during the Middle Kingdom is not Mentuhotep II/III (p. 70), but rather Mentuhotep I (see Sir Alan Gardiner, *Egypt of the Pharaohs* [Oxford, 1961], p. 120). Amenhotep III reigned 38 years (J. Černý, *JEA*, 50 [1964], 37), not 36 years (p. 86), and he probably did make periodic visits to Egypt's Asiatic provinces (in contrast to the remark on p. 87). Until recent years, letter 116 of the Amarna correspondence had been interpreted as supporting the contention that he did not go (lines 61-63). The crucial lines, however, have been retranslated (*Chicago Assyrian Dictionary*, III, 21; H. W. Helck, *Die Beziehungen Ägypten zu Vorderasien im 3. und 2. Jahrtausend v. Chr.* [Wiesbaden, 1962], p. 174), and it consequently appears that Amenhotep III indeed did visit Canaan. The remark that the dates of the reign of Ramses II "can be fixed between 1301 and 1234 B.C." (p. 95), must be modified in view of the fact that chronologists have narrowed the accession year of Ramses II down to either 1304 or 1290 B.C. (M. B. Rowton, *JNES*, XXV [1966], 240-258).

Because of the rapid increase of available archaeological information, which is a continuous process, a number of changes in the dating of ancient literary works has become mandatory. The *Execration texts* (to which a third series now can be added, G. Posener, *Syria*, XLIII [1966], 277-287), previously dated to the early Middle Kingdom (p. 72), should now be dated toward the end of the Egyptian Twelfth Dynasty (S. H. Horn, *AUSS*, I [1963], 53-55, although W. F. Albright would place the Sethe, Mirgisseh, and Posener texts to an overall date of ca. 1925-1825 B.C.; *BASOR*, No. 184 [1966], 35, *appendum*). The *Admonitions of Ipuwer* (misspelled "Ipur-wer," p. 67) possibly are not to be dated to

the end of the Old Kingdom, but to a time following the catastrophic collapse of the Middle Kingdom (J. Van Seters, *JEA*, L [1964], 13-23; followed by Albright, *BASOR*, No. 179 [1965], 41). The Gudea statues and inscriptions are not to be dated as being contemporaneous with the Third Dynasty of Ur (p. 31), but to a time preceding Ur-Nammu (S. N. Kramer, *The Sumerians* [Chicago, 1963], pp. 66-67). Finally, the seven tablets of the Babylonian Creation epic, *Enuma elish*, probably are not to be dated to the first Babylonian dynasty (pp. 37, 38), but to the fourth dynasty when Nebuchadrezzar I (ca. 1100 B.C.) raised Marduk to the supreme position in the Babylonian pantheon (W. G. Lambert, "The Reign of Nebuchadrezzar I: A Turning Point in the History of Ancient Mesopotamia," *The Seed of Wisdom, Essays in Honour of T. J. Meek* [Toronto, 1967], pp. 3-13).

The above criticisms are not meant to distract from the value of the study under review. As a popular work it remains a unique and needed contribution. Undoubtedly the book will arouse in many a desire for a deeper study into the history of antiquity. The "Selected Bibliography" (pp. 177-179) should thus be expanded to include not only such histories as are published under the "Ancient Peoples and Places" series, but also the pertinent fascicles of the revised edition to *The Cambridge Ancient History*. Other general works, such as Sir Alan Gardiner, *Egypt of the Pharaohs* (Oxford, 1961); Sabatino Moscati, *The Face of the Ancient Orient* (Garden City, N.Y., 1962); Martin Noth, *The Old Testament World* (Philadelphia, 1964); A. L. Oppenheim, *Ancient Mesopotamia* (Chicago, 1964); and Georges Roux, *Ancient Iraq* (London, 1964), are but a few suggestions to be added to the list.

Andrews University

S. DOUGLAS WATERHOUSE

Vahanian, Gabriel, *No Other God*. New York: George Braziller, 1966.

xxi + 114 pp. Paperbound. \$ 1.50.

Vahanian begins by asking the question whether the age of religion has come to an end. His answer is an unambiguous "no." He feels Bonhoeffer made a mistake when he replaced the dichotomy between faith and religion with the dichotomy of atheism and theism, the religious and the secular, thus substituting the traditional transcendental millenarianism with an inner worldly millenarianism (p. 21). In affirming the secular, the inner worldly, Bonhoeffer rejected the religious. Vahanian's intent is to make the religious relevant again.

The problem with the religious has been that it has been conceived either as sacral or as supernatural, and therefore it has been denied relevance in the religious life of the world. Bonhoeffer, then, in an attempt to establish the relevance of Christianity for the world, treated with contempt "the religious." The result has been that his disciples have become eager to proclaim the necessity of a secular, atheistic Christianity.

Against this, Vahanian affirms that faith is not "the juxtaposition