If it seems that a study on OT soteriology must deal with the full range of OT theology, this book confirms that idea. The book differs from other OT theologies primarily in emphasis. It is also highly selective in the passages chosen for exegesis. Though the passages chosen cover a wide array of concerns, one major omission leaves this study exceptionally incomplete. Farris has chosen to leave out the Psalms because a study of soteriology in the Psalms would constitute a major work by itself (17, n. 11). Other major passages were omitted as well, though they are briefly discussed in the conclusion (290-294). Thus *Mighty to Save* is a rather incomplete study in OT soteriology.

The primary methodological difficulty of *Mighty to Save* is that Farris assumes "the superiority of the New Testament revelation over the Old" (13). As with other canon-within-the-canon paradigms, the "superior" canon is even smaller than stated and consists of a few favored authors and passages. For instance, when discussing Abraham's faith in Genesis 15:6, Paul is quoted and James 2:23 is pointedly ignored (78-79). Also, when forcing OT constructs into NT molds, Farris is sometimes rather unbelievable. For instance, he imposes the dichotomy between faith and works on the concept of *listen/obey*, and finds the OT terminology completely on the side of "faith," in effect dismissing the dichotomy which he imported into the text.

Farris also imports his own theological biases into the texts and terms under study. For instance, he rejects "cleanse" as a definition for *kipper* because he cannot accept the concept that the mercy seat and altar may be polluted and thus need cleansing (144, n. 19). Perhaps Hebrews 9:22-23 lies outside of the "superior revelation" which he finds in the NT. One bias which may be felt throughout the book, but which is not stated until pages 219-220, is that Farris assumes Lindsell's plenary-verbal inspiration model for Scripture. Apparently Farris assumes that his readership works from this model, because he does not bring up the topic to defend verbal inspiration, but rather to discuss how exegesis works within the model.

Overall, Farris' book is not a work designed for the scholar or graduate student, but rather the advanced undergraduate. As a study on soteriology it is severely compromised by the author's biases. However, the excurses on exegetical methods may recommend the book for undergraduate use. Balanced with other works on OT theology, this book could be an asset in the classroom.
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In this volume, Everett Ferguson has assembled nineteen previously published essays on the general topic of early Christianity and Judaism. Five articles seek to define the Jewish element in early Christianity: R. A. Kraft, "In Search of 'Jewish Christianity' and Its 'Theology': Problems of Definition and
Methodology" (1-12); Marcel Simon, "Problèmes du Judéo-Christianisme" (13-29); Georg Strecker, "On the Problem of Jewish Christianity" (31-75); Robert Murray, "Disaffected Judaism’ and Early Christianity: Some Predisposing Factors" (77-95); and A.F.J. Klijn, “The Study of Jewish Christianity” (97-109).

Two articles consider the phenomenon of Jewish Christianity: J. Munck, "Jewish Christianity in Post-Apostolic Times" (111-124); and H. J. Schoeps, "Ebionite Christianity" (125-130).

Five articles explore the influence of Judaism on early Christianity: Halvor Moxnes, “God and His Angel in the Shepherd of Hermas” (131-138); W. Rordorf, “Un chapitre d’éthique judéo-chrétienne: les deux voies” (139-158); F. Gavin, “Rabbinic Parallels in Early Church Orders” (159-171); O. S. Rankin, “The Extent of the Influence of the Synagogue Service upon Christian Worship” (173-178); and Joseph Gutmann, “Early Synagogue and Jewish Catacomb Art and Its Relation to Christian Art” (179-216).


In discussing the reason for this book, Ferguson refers to an earlier work by Jacob Neusner—Judaism and Christianity in the First Century (1990)—and says, “the present volume extends the story of those relationships into the fourth and fifth centuries.”

The merit of this volume lies mainly in the convenience it provides to anyone studying the issue of early Christianity and Judaism. One can find here a variety of essays on the topic. However, Ferguson has contributed little to the endeavor beyond selecting the ingredients. His introduction of two-and-one-half pages and ten reference notes mainly introduces the broad categories into which the articles fall and contributes little or nothing to the discussion. The articles themselves were merely photo-reproduced from the journals or volumes in which they first appeared. Of course, the original page numbers, margins, fonts, and type sizes are retained. This gives the volume an unevenness and inconsistency that may disturb some readers. The inclusion of a set of running page numbers for the book itself potentially adds to the confusion.

Of greater concern may be the content of this collection. Rather than containing a set of commissioned essays on the present state of the discussion, this volume represents something of a history of that discussion. It seems to be more of a museum than a laboratory. The earliest of the pieces was originally published in 1893 (Krause). The most recent come from 1985 (Murray, Drijvers). The rest are scattered between 1929 and 1984, with eight articles from the 1970s.
Because serious researchers in this area will usually have access to the original essays, this volume will be most useful to others who want to gain an overview of the discussion of early Christianity and Judaism during the last one hundred years.


This is a companion volume to the previously published *Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels*. Both of these works are Evangelical and conservative in orientation. This means that the editors of this volume have selected writers who share this viewpoint and base their articles on conservative presuppositions. This does not mean, however, that the topics are not treated comprehensively or objectively or that liberal points of view are immediately set aside.

The rationale given by the editors for the publication at this time is that it provides for those interested in Paul and his letters a reference source through which they can interact with the “new look” on Paul. The “new look” arises from the reappraisal of Paul and his theology necessitated by the publication of E. P. Sanders’s *Paul and Palestinian Judaism* (1977). The traditional view that Paul was attacking a Judaism characterized by legalism and that the term “works of the law” is thus pejorative is challenged by Sanders. After more than fifteen years of debate, critique, evaluation, and reflection over this issue, the scholars who contributed to this volume present an evangelical reaction, “whether positive or cautious,” (ix) to Sander’s proposals.

Reading selected articles I found that the authors generally had a good grasp of their topics, dealt with the major issues involved, and treated different points of view objectively but critically. I mention particularly the articles on “Paul and His Interpreters,” by S. J. Hafeman; “Works of the Law,” by T. R. Schreiner; “Christology,” by B. Witherington, III; “Theology of the Cross” and “Justification,” by A. E. McGrath; “Hermeneutics/Interpreting Paul,” by G. R. Osborne; and “Law,” by F. Thielman. Not all the articles are of the same quality, but this is not surprising with so many contributors. Unexpected, but in some sense unavoidable, is the duplication of material; e.g., “Center of Paul’s Theology” is a main topic that is also treated as a subtopic in the articles “Hermeneutics/Interpreting Paul,” and “Paul and His Interpreters.”

In reading the article on “Center of Paul’s Theology,” I expected a careful treatment of the various proposals set forth with their pros and cons, but found instead a somewhat cursory discussion of the different views. S. J. Hafemann in his article on “Paul and His Interpreters” gives a much more satisfactory treatment of this topic though this is only a subtopic under the larger heading. I also was disappointed that Ralph Martin, who wrote the article, injudiciously