Another point to be commended is the authors' careful use of nonsexist language in their text and translations. As one example among many, on p. 385, no. 15, for Gen 9:6 we read: "Whoever sheds human blood, by a human shall his blood be shed."

One can find very few typographical corrections, considering the size and complexity of this work. Examples of typographical errors are found on p. 19, where the first t of "Peshitta" should be t, and on p. 128, no. 9, where the Hebrew word for "princess" should begin with a sin, not a shin. There are other errors, but their scarcity is evidence of the careful editorial work that went into this volume.

In a few places a small further explanation might have been added. For example, in a footnote on p. 277 regarding Hebrew numbers, mention might have been made of Reckendorf's theory on numbers in Arabic in his Syntaktischen Verhältnisse des Arabischen (1898), which holds good for all the Semitic languages, as the phenomenon of the "chiastic concord" of the numbers must have arisen in Proto-Semitic. No better hypothesis seems to have arisen, and this one does appear plausible.

On p. 679, concerning the oath idiom, one might have expected a comparison with the oath idioms in treaties of contemporary ancient nations, in which the apodosis contains a list of the gods and goddesses called to witness the vow to do or not to do something and to apply a specific punishment in case the vow was broken. Israelite religion being monotheistic, that clause is usually omitted, but is hinted at in such passages as 2 Sam 3:35, where David says: "The Lord do such-and-such to me, and more too, if I do . . . ." or "do not . . . ." This omission of the result clause is what necessitates translating a positive oath as strongly negative and a negative one as strongly positive. In the NT, this Hebrew idiom underlies the Greek in Heb 3:11 and 4:3.

On p. 681, qôl, used in Cant 5:2 (with a disjunctive accent) for "Hark!" or "Listen!" (literally, "A voice!"), could be footnoted as occurring also in Gen 4:10; Isa 13:4; Jer 10:22; 25:36; 50:28; 51:54; and Zech 11:3 (cf. especially the RSV).

These and other minor points and suggestions that could have been made do not detract from the tremendous accomplishment of the authors. One can only admire the erudition and diligence that produced this valuable work.

Andrews University

LEONA GLIDDEN RUNNING


This volume featuring the history of Persia from a biblical perspective is most refreshing. By taking seriously all ancient sources, including the
Bible, and by incorporating the latest archaeological contributions, the writer has produced a work of considerable value.

The approach Yamauchi uses is to survey clues to the origins of the Medes and Persians and then to devote a chapter to each of the Persian kings closely connected to biblical history—Cyrus, Cambyses, Darius I, Xerxes I, and Artaxerxes I. Then follow four chapters covering the major ancient sites or capitals of Persia—Susa, Ecbatana, Pasargadae, and Persepolis. There is also a chapter on Persian-Greek relations. The two final sections present lengthy surveys of Zoroastrianism and Mithraism, respectively, with a 25-page discussion of questions concerning the Magi interjected between them. The writer avoids taking dogmatic positions; his general approach is to canvass the opinions of various scholars, often not indicating his own preference. Thus, on the origin of the Old Persian cuneiform script he merely states the conflicting opinions.

Yamauchi has made this book both comprehensive and highly readable by integrating biblical and classical information and allusions with archaeological discoveries. The thorough footnoting and 23 pages of bibliography have great value in themselves. While these collected and integrated resources have not settled the current debate on early Persian history, they do enable a well-informed discussion and provide a basis for further research.

Examples of unresolved issues include the continuing debate over the function of the city of Persepolis. In spite of persistent interpretation of the city as a ritualistic center, alternate concepts which see it as representative of ultimate Persian kingship are being voiced.

Likewise, controversy over the identification of the king and prince on the Persepolis treasury reliefs (found in 1936) persists. The earlier view of them as representing Darius I and Xerxes has been increasingly challenged without a new consensus emerging.

The volume’s use of classical sources is cautious but thorough. For example, the evidence of Herodotus is evaluated, and quite frequently his descriptions are confirmed. However, Yamauchi denies that the walls and gates of Babylon were destroyed by Darius I, as Herodotus claimed.

As Yamauchi reaches out for all available information on ancient Persia, he is sometimes only on the periphery of Persian history, but the information is very interesting. Thus there is data on military organization, weaponry, and Greek army and navy ships. Another section deals with worship of the Apis bulls and the Serapeum near Memphis, in order to explain the significance of certain actions by Cambyses. The author also gives details of other Apis inscriptions from the Persian period.

The book has few typographical errors, but there appears, unfortunately, to have been a change in procedure for charts and illustrations during editing or production. Thus there are no identifying numbers below the illustrations. For example, the cross reference to an illustration on p. 360 is given as “chapter 4, fig. 29,” but the illustration, which can be found on p. 145, has no figure number.
The photographic illustrations are not as sharp as might be desired, but are numerous and interspersed throughout the text. The photographs are laid out so that the various panels of the Eastern Stairway of the Apadana at Persepolis can be studied and appreciated by means of a numbered diagram. Thus the details and relationships of the sections of the panels can be studied together. The Behistun relief portrayed on page 132 is unclear, but the pen sketch with annotations on the opposite page is helpful. Maps and archaeological sketches are excellent, but a frontispiece map of the entire country/region of Persia/Iran, showing the relationship of outstanding sites, would have enhanced the book.

The attention paid to religions with roots in Persia is gratifying, since the topic is not unrelated to biblical interests. Yamauchi has done an admirable job of collecting and correlating the many items of information on Persian-biblical relations. The Scripture Index is comprehensive, and reference to new discoveries yet to be elucidated—such as a newly-discovered palace of Cyrus 30 miles from the coast near Bushire—gives promise of future enlightenment. Perhaps the most helpful elements of the book are the topical arrangement, the chapters devoted to the leading kings, and the detailed survey of the four key cities.

Southwestern Adventist College

LLOYD A. WILLIS


It was once the fashion in Gospel studies and historical Jesus research to emphasize the discontinuity between Jesus and his Jewish environment, an approach typified by Bultmann's principle of dissimilarity as a criterion of authenticity. We are now seeing the tide running in the opposite direction; this book is one of the ripples in that flow. Young's book is partly a polemic against Joachim Jeremias' wedge driven between Jesus and his Jewish background and partly against Jacob Neusner's neglect of the Gospels as data for early Jewish forms of instruction (p. 3).

The book is based on the author's doctoral dissertation, done under the direction of David Flusser at Hebrew University, Jerusalem. The regard Young shows for his mentor, and perhaps even his dependence on him, is evidenced by constant references to Flusser's published works and oral communications, hardly ever dissenting. The result is that this book can be read as an authentic statement from what is now referred to as the Jerusalem school of NT research, exemplified by Flusser and Robert L. Lindsey and their disciples.