

Second, this book embodies an emphatically liberal approach to the Gospels. This is evident from the very first words in the book: "Once upon a time . . ." (1). It continuously uses the term "myth" in both its technical sense—something which communities develop to make sense of the cosmos—and its popular sense, as something which is historically untrue. For Mack, the myths of Christianity are the products of the early Christian communities, and have only the slightest historical base. As he says, ". . . authorship was not understood as we moderns understand it. In the modern sense of the term, the Jesus people were the authors of the sayings they attributed to Jesus" (202; cf. the reference to "collective thinking" on 163). He describes the "myth" of the accounts in the four Gospels as "fantastic" (225), and the later elaboration of it such as is found in the book of Hebrews as "an even more preposterous elaboration of the Christ myth" (221). The Gospel of Mark achieved a very successful "fiction" by joining the Jesus of Q with the Christ Myth (178). These "fictions" and "myths" include such Gospel accounts as the baptism of Jesus, his conflict with the Jewish authorities and their desire to kill him, Jesus' transfiguration, the last supper, his trial and crucifixion as king of the Jews, and the resurrection (247).

A third issue which will occur to most readers is that of methodology. The book is based on the assumption that the contents of Q are known well enough to distinguish within them a literary history embodied in three distinct strata. These are revealed by such features as "seams" and "thematic shifts" (107). Even laying aside the vehement debate current in scholarly circles as to the very existence of Q, it is to be wondered how confident it is possible to be about the exact extent of Q and about the "seams." Q has been reconstructed out of Matthew and Luke, which are assumed to have quoted from it, but how exact is that reconstruction? Q appears to begin with an account of the baptism of Jesus, but how can any modern reader know whether it included an account of the death of Jesus? Moreover, if Mark used Q, as Mack thinks, on what basis is the triple tradition excluded from Q? If either the crucifixion or parts of the triple tradition were in fact in Q, then much of what Mack says about its theology would need radical revision.

Mack has attempted to push back the frontiers of theoretical possibility on the basis of conclusions that have been reached in the research associated with the SBL Q seminar. One should not dismiss this attempt, but neither should one expect all his readers to share his conclusions.

Avondale College  
Cooranbong, NSW 2265, Australia

ROBERT K. McIVER

Mandell, Sara, and David Noel Freedman. *The Relationship Between Herodotus' History and Primary History*. South Florida Studies in the History of Judaism, no. 60. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1993. xiii + 204 pp. \$44.95.

Cicero called Herodotus the "father of history," and indeed his *Histories* was the primary exemplar for classical historians. The term Primary History

(PH) refers to the Torah and Former Prophets of the Hebrew Scriptures (Genesis-2 Kings). Mandell and Freedman found the two works to be surprisingly similar in size, scope, layout, and method. In this book they attempt to show intertextuality between the two works, finding that Herodotus is dependent either on PH itself or on the social and literary environment which produced PH in its present form. The book has two introductions and four chapters. The first introduction outlines the aims and methods; the second, techniques and methodology. The first chapter is a detailed analysis of the textual history and critical work done on Herodotus. The second chapter is a similar analysis of PH. In chapter three and the conclusion (chap. 4) the results are drawn together to synthesize how Herodotus is dependent on PH. There is a bibliography but no index.

Much of this work discusses issues of real author vs. implied narrator and implied reader vs. expected reader. Repeatedly the authors insist that the readers (ancient and modern) of Herodotus and PH who accept the narrators at face value are being deceived. These issues take up so much space in the book that soon the reader may find himself musing about what differences may lie between the real Mandell and Freedman and the scholarly personae they present in the book. Likewise one wonders what sort of scholars they actually expect to read this study and how this may differ from the readership they wish to imply. The heavy emphasis on these issues is distracting, if not deconstructive, and will turn away all but the most determined reader.

The strong-minded reader willing to reconstruct usable material from this book will find that in the third chapter the authors finally produce the analysis promised by the title. Less patient readers are advised to begin the book with chapter 3, perhaps skimming through chapters 1 and 2 if unfamiliar with recent scholarly activity in Herodotus and PH.

The authors follow somewhat traditional paradigms for the formation of PH, including such familiar figures as J, E, P, D, Dtr (1 & 2) and Ezra. The division of the conglomerate work into nine books is presumed to have occurred just prior to Ezra. Herodotus is believed to have redacted his work repeatedly during the writing, but its division into nine books is attributed to Hellenistic grammarians of the third to first centuries BCE.

Less traditional is the authors' refusal to accept either work as "history." Their method is rather anachronistic, applying modern definitions to ancient genres. The greatest anachronism is their use of Aristotle, who defined history and used Herodotus as an example. Mandell and Freedman approve of Aristotle's definition but not Herodotus as an example (66, 148). For Mandell and Freedman, Aristotle was inconsistent, but it is more likely they misunderstood Aristotle.

The basic parallels between Herodotus and PH are listed on pp. 160-161. They include a fifth-century date, parallel techniques and motifs, and east-west movement. In both works the first book prepares for a focus on Egypt, the second book focuses on Egypt, the fourth book occurs in a "never-never land," and the fifth book is a transition to the homeland events of the sixth to eighth books. The works then conclude with a sense of (impending) doom. The last

point is questionable. Mandell and Freedman read into Herodotus the coming Peloponnesian wars, though the book ends with the Greek victories over Persia. This is hardly equivalent to the Babylonian exile of Judah.

Both works are characterized by vividness which, apparently, is not compatible with true history (70). Both works treat the gods or God as real and involved in human events, rewarding and punishing nations and leaders (155-157), another "unhistorical" element. Divine fate, dreams, and other revelations are very important in both works. Herodotus and PH are treated as Greek-style tragedies with *hybris* playing an important role in the tragic flaw of the characters. In spite of a possible misuse of parallels, the relationship between the two works does seem to exist. In fact, this study may have contributed inadvertently to our understanding of ancient historiography. The common elements which Mandell and Freedman describe as *not* history may help define history as known in ancient Greek and Jewish cultures.

Most of the parallels are attributed to influences on Herodotus himself, who was born under Persian rule and may have traveled almost as much as his narrator persona claims. Included in his travels is a trip up the Nile as far as Elephantine (home of a Jewish-Persian garrison) and a trip through the Levant. However, the nine-book division of Herodotus was done by later grammarians influenced by PH in translation, either in a hypothetical Aramaic targum or in the Septuagint. This is an astounding claim for the influence of Jewish historiography on classical culture, and only time will tell how much of this influence the scholarly world will accept.

Madison, WI 53713

JAMES E. MILLER

Mather, George A., and Larry A. Nichols. *Dictionary of Cults, Sects, Religions, and the Occult*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1993. xii + 384 pp. \$24.99.

This popular but well-researched book examines the larger, better-known religious movements which originated—mainly in the nineteenth century—outside of mainstream American Christianity, as well as lesser-known fringe groups of more exotic and/or recent vintage. Without attempting to be complete, it contains comprehensive articles with relatively detailed sections about the history, beliefs, practices, and demographics of important groups. But it also offers a substantial number of shorter cross-referenced articles with brief definitions. The descriptions of the various movements and groups are followed by evaluations from an evangelical Protestant perspective. In their effort to avoid a specific denominational bias in these criticisms, the degree of adherence to and conformity with the ecumenical creeds of early Christianity has been used as the main criterion.

The authors have also included articles about the world religions. They correctly argue that the newer religious movements are usually related to or derived from these religions. As might be expected, they also incorporated a major article on Christianity. In addition to this there are numerous entries