

Moore has chapters dealing with Mormons, Catholics, and Jews. Part two discusses "religions for average Americans." It has chapters on Christian Science, Adventism and other premillennial groups, fundamentalism, and the Black churches. The book also includes an introductory chapter and a lengthy postscript. These two chapters set forth the author's presuppositions and indicate the framework and significance of the chapters composing the body of the study. Moore did not seek to be exhaustive in his treatment of outsider bodies. Rather, he chose groups that illustrated major themes.

Moore's volume has several problems. One has to do with the complexity of his field. By its very nature, the implications of religious pluralism are much more difficult to treat than are those of a unified system due to the fact that its subject matter is diversity. That dilemma is compounded by the problem that there are few, if any, satisfactory models upon which to build. It is always more difficult to operate in relatively unexplored territory.

A second difficulty is intimately related to the first: the book lacks unity. Moore himself was somewhat disconcerted over this point. He notes that he started out to write a book but "wound up with a manuscript that in form resembles a series of essays" (p. vii). That does not mean that the individual essays are not enlightening. They are generally quite insightful, but they are not coherent in the sense that they consistently develop a unified theme. The volume's theme is most evident in its opening and closing discussions.

A third difficulty is that Moore seems to put too much sociological emphasis on the development of American religious diversity and not enough on factors related to belief. His statement that "the gulfs that religious Americans have invented to distinguish their various religious groups have not always, or even usually, had much to do with theology" (pp. 207-208) would probably be vigorously objected to by most of those Americans he is talking about.

In spite of its weaknesses, many of which might be expected, *Religious Outsiders and the Making of Americans* has cut new ground in American religious historiography. As such it is a useful contribution. It remains, however, for Moore and others in the future to more fully and coherently develop the theses set forth in the book.

Andrews University

GEORGE R. KNIGHT

Stein, Robert H. *The Synoptic Problem: An Introduction*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1987. 292 pp. \$17.95.

Dissatisfied with previous works on the synoptic problem and wishing to place a text in the hands of his students that approaches this topic from an evangelical point of view, Robert Stein has written a book that he calls

an introduction and a work manual. Committed to helping students work their way through the various problems presented by the Synoptic Gospels, Part I addresses the pros and cons of Markan priority and the existence of Q. Eighty-nine parallel passages are treated in the volume. These passages are used to illustrate various points regarding the synoptic problem. The student is encouraged to use a color code (blue, black, red, yellow, green) to aid in seeing the triple and double traditions, exact agreements in wording and order, agreements that are not exact, and so on. Thus this introduction also becomes a work manual.

Part II discusses the presuppositions and value of form criticism, as well as the general reliability of the oral tradition. Redaction criticism—its method, practice, and value—is treated in Part III. A short but useful glossary and scripture and subject indexes conclude the volume.

Part I (pp. 29-157) of *The Synoptic Problem* proves to be an apology for Markan priority and the existence of a written Q. All of the classical arguments in favor of the two-document hypothesis are presented with a convenient summation (pp. 87-88). Stein's most impressive argument is the appearance and position of parenthetical material. This argument suggests that it is highly unlikely for two or three writers to insert into their accounts exactly the same comments (or comments that are nearly the same) in exactly the same places (p. 37). This argument, however, is not included in his convenient summation.

In considering the arguments for Markan priority, one is impressed with the importance of Luke 1:1-4. Stein returns to these verses repeatedly in defense of his position. How one interprets this passage will determine his acceptance or rejection of Markan priority. Of all the gospels, Luke alone informs us of his sources. Stein early appeals to the "many" of Luke 1:1 who have written accounts of Jesus' life and ministry in defense of Luke's use of Mark's gospel (pp. 29, 42, 43). However, there is a serious question as to whether these "narratives" are identified by Luke as primary sources. In addition, how does one get from "many" to one (i.e., Mark's gospel), if indeed these "narratives" were primary sources for Luke? At what point does Luke suggest in the listing of his sources that he set aside all others and used only one (Mark) or possibly two (if Q is taken as a written document)?

Luke clearly identifies his sources—eyewitnesses and ministers of the word. If *paredosan* (vs. 2) is taken to indicate the oral transmission of information, Luke effectively removes himself from the two-document hypothesis. Although he states that he is aware of many others who are working at a task similar to his, he does not identify them as sources. Indeed, by the use of the pronoun *hemin*, Luke tells us that they tapped the same reservoir he did (eyewitnesses and ministers of the word) and that they received their information in the same way—by oral communication. As Stein progresses in his presentation, he increasingly acknowledges the importance of oral tradition and includes a chapter on its general reliability. In fact, in that chapter Stein recognizes the role of the eyewitnesses

and the ministers of the word in orally delivering the gospel traditions “before being written down” (p. 194). Luke tells us plainly that he got his information from these eyewitnesses and ministers of the word. Thus, on the basis of Stein’s own statement, Luke removes himself from the two-document hypothesis. It appears that Stein argues against himself.

For Stein’s position to be convincing he must show Bo Reicke’s (*The Roots of the Synoptic Gospels*) understanding of Luke 1:1-4 to be in error—that Luke and the “many” were writing simultaneously, that all were drawing upon the oral tradition, and that Luke does not hint at written sources with a single word (pp. 45, 46). Stein does not undertake that task. The similarities between Luke and Mark can be explained by the close personal relationship these two men enjoyed as a part of Paul’s missionary team (Reicke, p. 52).

Because Matthew does not contain a statement about his sources, one can build a stronger case for Mark’s priority. But in the process, one must take into account such works as that of John Rist (*On the Independence of Matthew and Mark*), who convincingly argues that “literary dependence is most unlikely between Matthew and Mark” (p. 107).

Although well written, *The Synoptic Problem* demonstrates many of the weaknesses within the two-document hypothesis. It is to Stein’s credit, as a defender of Markan priority, that he recognizes these weaknesses when he notes that “the two-source hypothesis was, is, and will always be a ‘theory.’ It must never be accepted as a ‘fact’ or ‘law’” (p. 136).

E. G. White Estate  
Washington, D.C. 20012

GEORGE E. RICE

Verhoef, Pieter A. *The Books of Haggai and Malachi*. The New International Commentary on the Old Testament. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1987. xxv + 384 pp. \$21.95.

The conservative NICOT series now has available—in addition to the present work—volumes on Leviticus, Deuteronomy, Joshua, Ezra and Nehemiah, Isaiah 1-39, Jeremiah, and the minor prophets Joel, Obadiah, Jonah, and Micah. The intent of the series is to use modern scholarship in explicating the books of the OT while recognizing the Bible as inspired and authoritative. The commentator provides his own translation of scripture. Pastors, scholars, and students are the intended audience.

Pieter Verhoef is Emeritus Professor of OT at the University of Stellenbosch in South Africa. The volume includes an excellent, well-focused ten-page bibliography that covers both Haggai and Malachi. One might now add Carol and Eric Meyers’ recently-published commentary on Haggai in the Anchor Bible.

Verhoef takes a conservative position on authorship of the book of Haggai, seeing Haggai as originally delivering the four messages, though