

Jon D. Levenson expounds 1 Kgs 8 in "From Temple to Synagogue: 1 Kings 8" (pp. 143-166), treating this text as a pivotal one in the transition from Israelite faith to Judaism and Christianity.

A traditio-historical investigation under the title "From Egypt to Egypt: Dtr¹ and Dtr²" (pp. 167-192) is provided by R. E. Friedman; and a structuralist approach is found in the essay, "Reporting Speech in the Book of Deuteronomy: Toward a Compositional Analysis of the Deuteronomistic History" (pp. 193-211), by Robert Polzin. "Satire and Symbolism in the Song of Jonah" (pp. 213-246) is treated by James S. Ackerman; and the topic of "The Origin of the Idea of Resurrection" (pp. 247-321) is discussed at length by Leonard J. Greenspoon in such passages as Dan 12:2; Isa 26:14, 19; Jer 51:39, 57; Job 14:12; Ezek 37:1-14; Isa 53:10-12; 1 Kgs 17; 2 Kgs 13; Hos 6:1-3; Deut 32:39; 1 Sam 3:6; and 1 Kgs 18:27. Greenspoon examines, in addition, alleged extrabiblical connections relating to his topic.

"The Samaritan Problem: A Case Study in Jewish Sectarianism in the Roman Era" (pp. 323-350) is tackled by James D. Purvis, while John J. Collins describes "Patterns of Eschatology at Qumran" (pp. 351-375) and Adela Yarbro Collins seeks to determine the date of the book of Revelation as having been produced after 70 A.D., in her essay entitled, "Myth and History in the Book of Revelation: The Problem of Its Date" (pp. 377-403).

The volume concludes with a "Bibliography" of Frank M. Cross, Jr., from 1947 through December 1979. A "Subject Index," an "Author Index," a "Scripture Index," and a "Language Index" provide easy access to the contents of this book.

The thinking reader will be rewarded by the amount of stimulation received, as well as by the diversity of subjects presented. No one will be expected necessarily to agree with the various conclusions presented, but the various essays will be rich stepping stones for further reflection and study.

Andrews University

GERHARD F. HASEL

Harvey, A. E. *Jesus and the Constraints of History*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1982. viii + 184 pp. \$23.00.

Harvey, a fellow at Wolfson College, Oxford, has made a valiant attempt to give the quest of the historical Jesus a new lease on life. He wishes "to give a new turn to the argument" because he feels that theologians have not been looking for "the bare bones of Jesus' biography." Rather, they have been involved with obtaining information about

“such subtle and intimate matters” that they have left us with “no reliable historical knowledge about Jesus with regard to anything that matters” (p. 6).

In order to give the quest this “new turn,” Harvey proposes that in real life individuals are faced with a limited number of options, which are the givens of their particular historical circumstances. Harvey’s proposal is to recreate the options made available to Jesus by his historical time and place, and then determine which alternative Jesus opted for and why. Clearly, Harvey is reverting to the old quest in that he is interested in Jesus’ interior life.

Harvey divides Jesus’ landscape into several segments. As a public figure projecting an image, Jesus had some options. As a Jew living under the law, Jesus had other options. As someone with a story to tell, he also had certain options. As someone with divine power at his disposal, he had more options. As someone who knew himself well and needed to describe himself with a name, he again had options. And as someone who lived in a strongly monotheistic religious environment, he had definite constraints.

As one surveys this landscape, it becomes clear that the study assumes the divine nature of Jesus, so that the person here being considered is not at all a historical person but a supernatural being, now somehow confronted by historical constraints, and forced to make what are tantamount to “human” decisions. How or why this is necessary or possible is never explained.

According to Harvey, given the choices available to him, Jesus turns out to have been a scribe, a Pharisee, a prophet who performed miracles, not to buttress his teaching (p. 113), but in order to challenge his audience to attempt the impossible (p. 115), and who spoke of the end only because all stories need an ending (p. 72) and his audience expected a new age (p. 83). He knew himself to be divine, and the agent of God on earth; thus, during his lifetime he was called “Messiah,” but this description was used without any messianic overtones (p. 140), since it meant “appointed to an office” (apparently that of prophet). He also claimed for himself the designation “Son of God,” which brought about the charge of blasphemy under which he died (p. 171). In the meantime, his followers, being “instinctive monotheists,” did not risk to call him “Son of God” during his lifetime, and “there is no unambiguous evidence that the constraint of monotheism was effectively broken by any New Testament writer” (p. 178).

What is most disconcerting about Harvey’s “new turn” is his complete deletion of apocalypticism as a live option to the historical Jesus. What since the time of J. Weiss and A. Schweitzer has been at the forefront of NT research, both on the European Continent and in America, cannot be dismissed with but a couple of lines. We are told by Harvey that there were no apocalypticists in Jesus’ time, apocalypticism being purely a literary phenomenon (p. 57). He is not, of course, the first to suggest this.

But those who have said so have received strong arguments to the contrary. Therefore, the matter cannot be presented as settled. It may be convenient to avoid having to deal with apocalypticism as an option for Jesus, but doing so is certainly not an option for any modern quester of the historical Jesus.

Harvey also fails to take seriously the thorough hellenization of Palestine, as argued by Tcherikover, Hengel, and others. What Harvey presents as the only options within the constraints of law and monotheism, therefore, proves artificial. How would he explain the signs of the zodiac that have been found in the mosaic floors of the synagogue at the Hot Springs of Tiberias? His efforts to discuss the teachings about the Kingdom of God without a single reference to eschatology is a *tour de force* that fails. He grants that Jesus was mistaken about the time of the kingdom, and from that he decides that Jesus was not really serious about time. Therefore, the apparent tension between the "already" and the "not yet" is dismissed by Harvey as a modern misunderstanding, the whole thing having to do with the fact that Jesus was talking about normal circumstances as if they were an emergency (p. 92). What Harvey fails to do is to provide the key for doing this transposition.

At first, this book may appear impressive because of the tightness of the argumentation. But it collapses because of the many unexamined presuppositions, and because of the way in which evidence is selectively presented or ignored, or at times even twisted. Thus, for instance, in discussing the title "Son of God," Harvey refers us to John 20:28, Thomas' confession, where the words are actually "My Lord and my God." Furthermore, according to Harvey, the Gospel of John does not present a challenge to monotheism. One is consequently left to wonder how he would explain the argumentation of John 5. In another connection, we are told that the arguments for persecutions in NT times have been proven to be circular (p. 88, n. 70). But the question of persecutions in the NT is not an argument, it is a stated fact for which there is too much evidence in the NT to allow the matter to be dismissed in this fashion.

One could go on raising objections about details, but this would be superfluous. The book fails, because it has reduced history to a very narrow and somewhat convoluted corridor, with very few doors opening onto it. Can one really believe that Jesus had to become either a zealot or a Pharisee because these were the only options history had to offer him? It is to Harvey's credit that he at times sees Jesus creating options for himself. But if that is so, then the "notion of historical constraint" (p. 6) which is basic to the whole argument of this book has failed to provide the promised "new turn" to the quest for the historical Jesus.