

presently available editions of the Syriac NT. Most of the variants quoted above illustrate the futility of an edition without a critical apparatus. The whole spectrum of Syriac biblical text transmission can only be observed through a critical edition involving all manuscripts up to at least the twelfth-thirteenth century. Manuscripts after that date exhibit predominantly inner-Syriac variants, but there are exceptions to that rule. Without a fully reliable variant documentation, studies in manuscript relationship and translation techniques cannot easily be made. Nor is it possible to discuss meaningfully an Aramaic *Vorlage* of the NT, as the editors look forward to doing.

I would suggest that as a matter of high priority a list of NT Syriac manuscripts be published, similar to what has been done by the Peshitta Institute in Leiden, for the OT manuscripts. Also, textual reasons should be given for an inclusion or exclusion of particular manuscripts, for age alone is not the determining factor for the authority of a manuscript, neither is its script.

In conclusion, it may be said that the computer is a welcome tool in any undertaking of a critical edition in order to manipulate the myriads of details, also to make print in non-Latin alphabets available at affordable prices in combination with a pleasant aesthetic appearance. The team can be congratulated for that. However, in serious research, especially when involving controversial issues, we must use all known and accessible data. This text edition unfortunately gives less data in those portions of the NT where critical editions exist. As compared to these, the present work is a leap backward. When it comes to the portions of the NT for which there are no critical editions, the microfilms of the manuscripts used in this edition will give more information. The greatest desideratum in Syriac NT studies is an up-to-date critical edition covering the entire NT. Let us concentrate time, talents, and funds on that.

Andrews University

JOHANN E. ERBES

Cassidy, Richard J., and Scharper, Philip J., eds. *Political Issues in Luke-Acts*. Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis Books, 1983. ix + 180 pp. \$16.95/\$9.95.

Encouraged by the interest in, and the positive response to, the publication *Jesus, Politics, and Society*, its author, Richard Cassidy, and Philip Scharper from Orbis Books planned the present volume. *Political*

Issues in Luke-Acts allows several scholars to interact with Cassidy and to pursue their understanding of issues raised by him. This interaction provides interesting and informative reading by bringing together some of the most recent research in the area of Luke-Acts and its socio-political concerns.

The content of this volume can be reviewed by perusing the titles of the various essays. These titles and their contributors are as follows: Robert F. O'Toolle, "Luke's Position on Politics and Society in Luke-Acts"; Willard M. Swartley, "Politics and Peace (Eirēnē) in Luke's Gospel"; J. Duncan M. Derrett, "Luke's Perspective on Tribute to Caesar"; Frederick W. Danker, "Reciprocity in the Ancient World and in Acts 15:23-29"; Quentin Quesnell, "The Women at Luke's Supper"; J. Mas-syngbaerde Ford, "Reconciliation and Forgiveness in Luke's Gospel"; Charles H. Talbert, "Martyrdom in Luke-Acts and the Lukan Social Ethic"; Daryl Schmidt, "Luke's 'Innocent' Jesus: A Scriptural Apologetic"; E. Jane Via, "According to Luke, Who Put Jesus to Death?"; and Richard J. Cassidy, "Luke's Audience, the Chief Priests, and the Motive for Jesus' Death."

Andrews University

GEORGE E. RICE

Davidson, Richard M. *Typology in Scripture*. Andrews University Seminary Doctoral Dissertation Series, 2. Berrien Springs, Michigan: Andrews University Press, 1981. xiv + 496 pp. Paperback, \$8.95.

The thesis of this dissertation is that typology is a biblically based hermeneutical approach to OT Scripture; that it pertains to specific, detailed, divinely designated historical prefigurations in the OT; that it has a horizontal and a vertical dimension; that its NT fulfillment is determined by eschatological, christological-sociological, and ecclesiological dimensions; and that it is subject to a *devoir-être* ("must-needs-be") interpretation, i.e., the types are prophetic predictions of what must come to pass.

In developing this thesis, Davidson reviews the history of typological interpretation to the nineteenth century, and during the twentieth century. This brings into view the historical-critical opposition to traditional typological interpretation, as well as the so-called "post-critical neo-typology" of the twentieth century. Davidson distances himself from the former, due to its neglect of *bona fide* biblical typological structures, and from the latter, due to its denial of the predictive element in biblical