

created existence implies that sexual life is good. Thus, the moral presumption apparently may be used to evaluate the Pauline message. The trouble is that Wogaman does not develop a methodology which would allow some biblical passages to be used to support moral presumptions, which presumptions may in turn be used to evaluate the moral worth of other biblical passages. Yet, in spite of this lack of methodological clarity, Wogaman does not hesitate to reassure the reader that a particular moral presumption is "solidly biblical."

On this point, Wogaman's work would surely have been strengthened by some timely advice from two of his colleagues at Wesley Theological Seminary, Bruce Birch and Larry Rasmussen. In their provocative book, *Bible and Ethics in the Christian Life* (Minneapolis, 1976), they discuss the problem of relating the field of biblical scholarship to contemporary Christian ethics. "It is time," they say, "to make the connections between these fields and to assist in the functional relating of Bible and ethics in the Christian life" (p. 12). For all of its admirable clarity and thoroughness, Wogaman's book needs strengthening in this area. No method of moral judgment called Christian is likely to be deemed plausible so long as the role of the Bible is not clarified.

Walla Walla College  
College Place, Washington

GERALD R. WINSLOW

Wolff, Hans Walter. *Joel and Amos. Hermeneia—A Critical and Historical Commentary on the Bible*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1977. xxiv + 392 pp. \$22.95.

This is the second OT volume to appear in the new Hermeneia commentary series, the preceding volume, *Hosea*, also being written by Wolff. This new volume was originally published in German as vol. 14/2 of the *Biblischer Kommentar Altes Testament* (of which Wolff is the editor), and three North American scholars cooperated in its translation. Wolff has also published another study on Amos, *Amos the Prophet* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1973 [originally *Amos' geistige Heimat*, 1964]), which deals largely with matters of introduction and form criticism.

The present volume begins with eighty pages on Joel and concludes with 270 pages on Amos. It includes an updated bibliography and indexes of biblical citations, ancient sources, modern authors, Hebrew words, and topics treated. Each passage of text proceeds through a fourfold treatment: translation with notes, form-critical observations, interpretation or exegesis, and aim or theology. This format was also followed in Wolff's work on Hosea, and it seems to provide a useful layout of information with which to study these prophets.

As far as content is concerned, most of my remarks will deal with Amos, but brief mention should be made of Joel. Wolff has argued forcefully for the unity of Joel, and he has summarized succinctly the important theme of the Day of Yahweh. The date of Joel is a controversial point in OT circles, and one can find almost any date imaginable suggested for it. Even for so controversial a subject, however, Wolff's date in the first half of the fourth century seems too late to me.

Wolff holds that Amos' career was relatively short but not ultrashort, a conclusion with which I concur. He also holds that Amos may have prophesied in several centers of the northern kingdom, but I would prefer to see this prophet's ministry restricted to Bethel. The richness of Amos' language and poetic style have been explored well by Wolff in his introduction. Chiasm could be added to the catalogue of poetic techniques of which Amos was fond, for I count more than thirty chiasmic bicola in his work. As far as the final form of the book is concerned, Wolff sees this as the end product of a long history of literary growth, a natural deduction from Wolff's form

critical work on Amos, which emphasizes the individual units in the text. I see much more of a structural design to the book than Wolff does and would therefore put considerably greater emphasis upon that structure as having originated with Amos.

As an example of this type of structuralism, it should be noted that the foreign oracles of judgment at the beginning of the book are balanced by the foreign oracles of promise at the end of the book. Attention to this correspondence would have avoided the common pitfall, followed by Wolff, of separating the final prophecy of promise to Israel from the rest of the book and disrupting this structural correspondence. As another example of such a correspondence we may note that the five past judgments in Chap. 7 are balanced by the five visions of future judgment in the last two chapters. Moreover, the three Creator Hymns are evenly spaced throughout the book, etc. An examination of the structure of Amos requires a separate study which I hope to present on some future occasion. My disagreements here do not detract from the general overall worth and usefulness of Wolff's commentary on Amos. Scattered throughout its pages there are many valuable form-critical, exegetical, and theological insights with which the careful reader will be rewarded.

Andrews University

WILLIAM H. SHEA