The photographic illustrations are not as sharp as might be desired, but are numerous and interspersed thoughout 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

Young, Brad H. *Jesus and His Jewish Parables: Rediscovering the Roots of Jesus' Teaching*. Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press, 1989. viii + 367 pp. Paperback, $12.95.

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.

Young points out that the story-parable was a genre unique to Jewish Palestine, used only in the teaching technique of Jesus and the Palestinian rabbis. This fact makes Aristotelian literary canons and their application by Adolf Jülicher and his successors, C. H. Dodd and Joachim Jeremias, irrelevant for the study of the parables of Jesus. The nature of this genre and its relation to other genres, such as allegory, is to be determined only by an inductive study. Such a study is made more reliable by enlarging the corpus of specimens through including the large body of rabbinic parables (*meshalim*). Young is further at pains to argue that the eschatological emphasis which contemporary Gospel research places upon the teaching of Jesus and his parables, especially by Jeremias, is greatly overdrawn if not mistaken.

Young devotes a large chapter to a description of the rabbinic *mashal* and its setting in the rabbinic teaching tradition, illustrated with 23 specimens of the genre (18 ascribed to Tannaim, and the rest Amoraic). The discussion indulges in excessive repetition and interesting but diverting excursi. In the process, however, it seeks to establish that the difference between parable and allegory is not to be determined by counting the *tertia comparationis*, and that it is bootless to claim any direction of dependence between Jesus and the rabbis, a matter which Young takes up in a later chapter (pp. 236-281).

Another chapter lays out the Jerusalem school's scheme of Synoptic relationships. Luke has priority among the canonical Gospels, but it is based on earlier Greek sources which mediate a Hebrew *Urevangelium*. Since the other two Synoptic Gospels may draw from the earlier Greek sources, as well as from Luke, one cannot automatically say which parallel version of a pericope or parable is closest to the original; this must be determined case by case. Incidentally, Young favors the view that Jesus normally taught in Hebrew, and in a later chapter he essays a Hebrew reconstruction of several of Jesus' parables.

Young accepts the idea that the parables of Jesus were reapplied and interpreted by the early church, but he does not accept the reconstruction of Jesus' message popularized by Jeremias, which sees most of the parables as having an eschatological thrust. Young is concerned to reduce the distance between Jesus and the rabbis as much as possible by finding rabbinic dicta which sound like Jesus or by excavating the Gospel reports to find a noneschatological substratum. To be more precise, while Young pleads that such excavation should be done, he does not do very much of it himself. In a long chapter on the parables of the Kingdom, he argues that most of them were not originally such, and in those that were, the Reign of God simply meant keeping God's commandments, a teaching fully in harmony with rabbinic Judaism.

At this point Young anticipates the question which begins to gnaw at the reader: Why would Jesus have been crucified if his teaching was so conventional? His brief answer is that "the historian would do better to

search for political rather than theological motives when considering possible reasons for the betrayal and execution of Jesus under Pontius Pilate" (p. 296). Specifically, in a chapter dealing at length with such Gospel parables as the Wicked Husbandmen (Matt 21:33-46; Mark 12:1-12; Luke 20:9-19), Young maintains that Jesus' denunciation was originally directed at the Sadducean establishment which controlled the Temple.

The book appears to be little changed from its dissertation form. German quotations are printed without translation. Hebrew and Greek are sometimes transliterated, sometimes not, without any apparent consistency. Not only is there a substantial quota of typographical errors, but the editors have failed to correct the author's grammatical transgressions and other infelicities of language. (For example, see the mistranslation and fatal lack of punctuation in the introduction to the parable on p. 82: "A parable to a man who . . . .") The editors should also have worked harder to eliminate unnecessary repetition, imperfect organization, and Talmud-like rambling, not to mention some cases of special pleading. Nonetheless, the book has some important things to say and may serve as a corrective to much current thinking about the parables of Jesus. Some readers, however, may decide it is an overcorrection.

Andrews University ROBERT M. JOHNSTON