toy shop, busy doing and making goodies that Santa (the minister) will give out" (153).

I could take issue with Engen in a few instances, but I agree with the main thrust of the argument (which I will put in my own words), "the local church is not everything; it's the only thing!"

Spring Hill, FL 34608

CHARLES E. BRADFORD


Professor Moshe Weinfeld of the Hebrew University of Jerusalem deserves commendation for having prepared a fine commentary on Deut 1-11. As a principal expositor of Deuteronomy, Weinfeld is highly competent to assess the present state of research on this important book of the Pentateuch. The bibliography in this volume (85-122) includes no fewer than fifty-six different entries of the author's scholarly publications.

In the preface to the book, Weinfeld explains the rationale behind the division of his work into two volumes (chaps. 1-11 and 12-26). Three reasons justify the division: (1) the chapters covered in this first volume are of historical and homiletic character while the rest of Deuteronomy is legal; (2) the presence of the Decalogue deserves an in-depth treatment; (3) the introductory articles are included in this volume.

There is an innovative feature in the organization of this volume. The usual way of presenting the material in the Anchor Bible series is Text-Notes-Comment, but the author of this volume divided the Notes into "Textual Notes" and "Notes." I hope that this new feature will find place in subsequent volumes.

Regarding the origin of Deuteronomy, Weinfeld differentiates between two layers of tradition in the present form of the book. Chapters 4-30 are said to come from the Deuteronomic historiographer, while 1-3 and 31:1-8 belong to the Deuteronomistic framework. The overall genre of the book is Moses’ "farewell speech," coupled with covenantal and testamentary implications. Even though, according to the author, the present editorial shape of the book dates to the seventh century B.C.E., Deuteronomy is dependent upon previous tradition which was revised after "the principles of Hezekianic-Josianic reforms" (1). It was customary in the ancient world to ascribe speeches to national leaders and heroes; this point Weinfeld reinforces by examples from extrabiblical texts. There is no doubt in the author's mind that the book discovered during Josiah's reform in Judah is that of Deuteronomy (65), so the *Sitz im Leben* of the book is firmly set in the seventh century B.C.E.
Much of this argumentation fits into the framework of the Deuteronomistic school. Yet Weinfeld suggests a number of fresh and constructive ways to approach various issues in Deuteronomy. For example, the second-person singular and plural shifts in Deuteronomy, he says, should not be explained on literary-critical ground only. A likely purpose behind these changes may be either didactic in order to impress the listener, purely literary for the sake of stylistic variation, or else they could be parts of the quotations.

The lengthy comparison between the text of Deuteronomy and "the priestly material of the Tetrateuch" (19-37) may be of some value and use, even to those readers who do not follow the author's methodological presuppositions. Furthermore, Weinfeld's clear distinction between the Decalogue and the other laws of the Pentateuch (249) is valuable, as is his rejection of the idea that the Deuteronomic version of the Decalogue is older than that of Exodus (243). The author's remark that the liturgical proclamation of the shema (Deut 6:4) is not inherently monotheistic, but is made so by its setting within the Decalogue and Deuteronomy is correct.

The Decalogue is divided into two pentads; the first is characterized by the formula "YHWH your God," while the second contains no occurrence of the Tetragrammaton at all. The subtitle, "First Pentad," is missing on p. 284 (cf. 313), while the treatment of the individual "words" (commandments) of the second pentad is regrettably too short (314). Other works on Deuteronomy treat this subject more comprehensively, especially "the sixth word" which prohibits the acts of murder, whose object Weinfeld briefly describes as "any possible object, [or] any human being (including suicide)" (314).

The reader might wish to find a little more explanation of the statement that Deuteronomy is dependent on Hittite and Assyrian models of covenant (9). The similarity with these first-millennium documents cannot be taken for granted and needs substantial evidence. Likewise, substantiation is needed for the statement that "ancient authors were collectors and compilers of traditions rather than creators (83)." This phrase should have been more tentative and accompanied by appropriate examples. Regarding the presence of different sources, one wonders if the method which fragments the text based on the use of different words in close proximity (Deut 1:3; 125) has not become outdated. Lastly, on p. 15 the author illustrates his point by quoting from the Aramaic texts of Sefire. Since the reference in the main text directs the reader to J. A. Fitzmyer's classic study of these texts, one would expect the author to follow the standard numbering system of the Sefire texts, found in Fitzmyer's work. Also, Fitzmyer's translation of the Aramaic phrase in question, "you will have been false," is to me preferable to "you will trespass (15)."
These minor remarks and suggestions can in no way diminish the excellent quality of Weinfeld's work, which contains a number of strong points. The book is, therefore, heartily recommended to anyone interested in the study of Deuteronomy.

Adventist International Institute
Silang, Cavite, Philippines

ZDRAVKO STEFANOVIĆ


Gosnell L. O. R. Yorke, formerly from Atlantic Union College and now chairman of the Theology Department of Eastern Africa University in Kenya, gives us in this book a revision of his doctoral thesis submitted in 1987 to the Faculty of Religious Studies of McGill University in Montreal, Canada.

The issue of concern in this book is whether the body of Jesus Christ or the human body was the metaphorical referent for the Pauline definition of the church as the "body of Christ." Pauline scholars are divided on the subject. Most of them say the referent is the "once broken and now divine" body of Christ. On the other hand, R. Gundry, H. Ridderbos and a few others seem to show "a more excellent way": the human sōma is used by Paul as the term of comparison to define the church as the body of Christ.

Gosnell Yorke seeks to solve this undefined situation. To accomplish it he takes a new "systematic grammatico-historical and exegetical" look at the related data. This kind of study has not been done in the past. Yorke's conclusion is that the human sōma, not Christ's personal body, is used consistently "as the tertium comparationis for the church as sōma." This conclusion rules out any mystical or physiological understanding of the church as Christ's sōma and Christ as the kephalē of the church.

The book contains seven chapters: the state of the question, the somatic ecclesiology of the New Testament, the somatic ecclesiology of I Corinthians, the somatic ecclesiology of Romans, the somatic ecclesiology of Colossians, the somatic ecclesiology of Ephesians, and the summary and conclusion.

Each one of the four central chapters has an introduction, in which the author relates his thesis with the references of sōma in that particular epistle, along with considerations on its integrity chronology, authorship, and authenticity. Then, as a second section, there is a description of the church to which the epistle is addressed. The third section is an exegetical study of the references to sōma in the letter. Finally, there is a summary statement. In a clear, straightforward style one argument flows from the