

us from one-sided theories that fail to satisfy the complete evidence.

He adds two short appendices which show implications of his study for other areas—the influence of early liturgies and the literary problems of Philippians.

The volume is a model for research. It is well-reasoned and written with clarity. The author's words are well-chosen and free from verbosity. His study of epistolary conclusions and its application to the integrity of Romans and his analysis and rejection of the Marcion hypothesis for the fourteen-chapter form stand out as real contributions in this area of study. While he seemed to have touched all bases, one question still remained in the mind of this reviewer. While the generalizing view may be valid for the origin of the fourteen-chapter theory, it is still not clear how this could be possible since the subject at the end of Rom 14 continues on to Rom 15:13.

Andrews University

SAKAE KUBO

Hayes, J. H., and Miller, J. M., eds. *Israelite and Judaeon History*. The Old Testament Library. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1977. 736 pp. \$25.00.

The eleven chapters in this book begin with an essay on historiography and then discuss in chronological order all the periods of biblical history from the patriarchs down to the fate of Judaism following the revolt of A.D. 66-74. Thus the last two chapters cover what could be classified as the historical background of the NT. Only the chapters on OT history are reviewed below.

The reader should realize that books currently written on this subject generally represent one or the other of two viewpoints: the historical-archaeological positivist approach represented by the American scholars W. F. Albright, G. E. Wright, and John Bright, or the form and literary critical negativist (sometimes nihilist) viewpoint of the German scholars A. Alt, M. Noth, and M. Weippert. Although this book is a composite consisting of contributions from a dozen scholars, the viewpoint from which these contributions were written is consistently that of the German school of writing on OT history. In evaluating the following review the reader should take into account the fact that the reviewer writes from the other historical point of view.

A considerable amount of useful information has been collected in the first chapter on historiography, but some of it is inaccurate and elsewhere it wanders wide of the point. The important survey of the 19th and 20th centuries is extremely brief and could have been expanded with profit at the expense of some of the preceding material. Conservative historians of the modern period are dismissed with the statement, "In the following chapters, practically no attention will be given to this view since it does not assume that one has to reconstruct the history of Israel; one has only to support and elucidate the adequate history which the Bible already provides" (p. 66). Curiously, when the authors of the next four chapters get through with Israel in the second millennium B.C., there is no history left here to reconstruct either.

In the first half of chap. 2 W. G. Dever, whose name was misspelled Denver in the Table of Contents, provides a very useful survey of Middle Bronze (MB) and Late Bronze (LB) archaeology as a background for the patriarchal period. As far as results are concerned, Dever does not find a place for the patriarchs in the MB or LB periods of Palestinian archaeology and suggests that we might find some information illuminating their circumstances in the Mari texts which refer to the activities of the pastoralists in the area. In the second half of this chapter W. M. Clark surveys the literary critical and tradition history views of the patriarchal narratives. His results are negative too. Clark prefers one of the fictional interpretations.

The major discussant of Joseph and Moses in the second chapter of this book is T. L. Thompson. In 1974 Thompson published a book entitled *The Historicity of the Patriarchal Narratives* (BZAW 133) in which he did not find any historicity to the patriarchal narratives. He comes to the same result concerning the narratives of Joseph and Moses. In one section of this chapter Dorothy Irvin discusses the literary motifs in these narratives. Some of her parallels from the ancient Near East are very interesting, but to reduce Joseph and Moses to mere literary motifs is a *reductio ad absurdum*.

Miller starts his discussion of the Israelite occupation of Canaan in chap. 3 by stressing, as Alt and Noth have done, the tension between Josh 1-11 (the conquest under Joshua) and Judg 1 (the story of the incomplete conquest). He then reviews the archaeological evidence from the Late Bronze and Early Iron ages that might be relevant in elucidating the history of the Israelite occupation of Canaan, but he does not find much here that is relevant. From these negative results he reviews the five different theories about how that occupation took place. He discards most, and ends up with a kind of modified Alt-Noth approach: "It was rather a matter of the pan-Israelite consciousness gradually emerging in Palestine among tribal groups which had their own individual origins and still were only loosely associated with each other at the time of the establishment of the monarchy" (p. 280).

A. D. H. Hayes's chapter on Judges begins with a literary critical analysis of the book and then continues on to a discussion of the Alt-Noth hypothesis of the presence of an amphictyony in Israel during this period. After reviewing current criticisms of this hypothesis, Hayes rejects it. This is the only clearcut departure from a view of the Alt-Noth school found in this book up to this point. G. von Rad's view of Holy War during the period of the Judges is modified. The first oppression and judgeship are considered unhistorical, but the second is accepted as reflecting an historical event. The prose and poetic accounts of the third episode are set in contrast, and even the old poem in Judg 5 is not considered to be a unity. Hayes admits that Jael killed Sisera, but the nature of the rest of these events is considered to be obscure, although it is admitted that there probably was a battle of some kind or other.

Much of the account of Gideon versus the Midianites is rejected, although Hayes believes that there probably was an historical kernel to it. He seems to accept the correlation of the archaeological evidence from Shechem with the Abimelech episode, but he refers to it in only one sentence. Most of the narrative describing Jephthah and the Ammonites is rejected,

though some kind of battle probably was fought between them. The chapters in Judges on Samson are never discussed, and the Benjaminite War receives the attention of only one page, with the account considered to be badly garbled.

To summarize this book thus far, it can be said of biblical history in the second millennium (i. e., from Abraham through the Judges) that this work represents a clearcut presentation of historical writing in the finest traditions of the Alt-Noth school. One wonders sometimes why scholars in this school even bother to write the history of this period, since there was none. A refutation of the views described above cannot be presented here because it would require a volume of almost equal length to do so.

Views on the history of the monarchy and its aftermath are not so widely divergent, so we will only spot-check a few points from this period. In spite of the fact that no direct Canaanite prototype for Solomon's temple has been excavated (the prototype really was the Tabernacle), and in spite of the fact that there was a vast functional difference between Canaanite and Israelite use of temples (Canaanites worshipped inside, Israelites worshipped outside), J. A. Soggin sees much Canaanite influence upon Solomon's temple (p. 368). In chap. 8, B. Oded rejects the theory that Sennacherib conducted two campaigns against Hezekiah (p. 451). For the alternative view on this problem, see S. H. Horn's discussion in *AUSS* 4 (1966): 1-28.

In some respects the discussion of the Ezra-Nehemiah problem is one of the more interesting in this volume. According to the theory widely held among critical scholars, Nehemiah preceded Ezra. In his presidential address to the Society of Biblical Literature in 1974, Frank Cross rejected that view and returned to the traditional order of Ezra-Nehemiah, dating Ezra's mission in 458/7. This was done largely on the basis of applying the principle of papponymy to the names of the high priests referred to in Ezra and Nehemiah. Cross elucidated this principle from the use of personal names in the 4th-century Samaritan papyri from the Wadi Daliyeh, which were entrusted to him for publication (*JBL* 94 [1975]: 4-18). In adhering to the classical critical order of Nehemiah-Ezra, G. Widengren has presented the first criticism that I have seen in print of Cross's views (pp. 503-509), hence scholarly discussion on the order of Ezra and Nehemiah continues.

Esther is dismissed with the sentence, "The book of Esther purports to be a narrative about events which took place at the Persian court during the days of king Ahasuerus (Xerxes), but it is primarily a piece of propaganda on behalf of the feast of Purim and without much historical value" (p. 496). For a discussion of Esther from the opposite point of view see my study, "Esther and History," *AUSS* 14 (1976): 227-246.

This volume contains an extensive collection of useful information on the subjects treated, but the reader should clearly understand the viewpoint from which that information has been incorporated into its history of the biblical period. Also, in general the format of the book is attractive, printing errors appear to be infrequent, and each section of each chapter provides the reader with a fairly extensive and quite up-to-date bibliography on the subject treated.