editorial director of the Press have felt constrained to publish a defense and explanation of their publishing policy in a book release. And Neal F. Fisher, president of United Methodist-related Garrett-Evangelical Theological Seminary, has put together an edited volume *Truth & Tradition: A Conversation About the Future of United Methodist Education*, also published by Abingdon, in response to *Requiem*. At least four major articles relating to the book in one way or another, and six letters—about 16 pages in all—appeared in the *Christian Century* between March 1 and June 28, 1995. There is doubtless much more to come.

The two major issues this study forces upon the consciousness relate, in the first place, to the adequacy of Oden’s analysis of, and theological response to, contemporary patterns of thought; and in the second, to his critique of mainline Protestant theological education. It is the second that is center stage here and for which this book will be remembered. The religiously conservative reader is likely to be carried along by an emotionally-tinged affirmation of Oden’s critique. Upon calmer reflection, however, one wonders whether this critique is sufficiently qualified to protect it from misuse by extremists on the right? Whatever the judgment, like Barth’s *Römerbrief*, this book is like a bell tolling loudly at midnight awakening the entire Protestant community to issues that demand attention.

Andrews University

RUSSELL STAPLES


This work is a revision and amplification of the author’s doctoral dissertation. His stated objective is to discern the thematic linkages between the book of Isaiah and the first eight chapters of the Gospel of Mark. Taking guidance from the work of such scholars as Dodds, Lindars, Fitzmyer, and Kiley, Schneck proposes a method to discern the Old Testament allusions to Isaiah in Mark. The methodological steps in establishing allusions include contextual parallels, genre parallels, and verbal and thematic contacts.

Schneck then reviews passages from Mark 1-8 for their allusions to Isaiah. He discusses Mark 1:1-4a; 1:9-11; 2:7; 2:16-20; 3:27; 4:1-34; 5:1-20; 6:34-44; 7:1-23; 7:31-37; 8:14-21; and 8:22-26. He concludes that similar themes are indeed recurrent in Isaiah and Mark. The prologue of Mark and the prologue of Deutero-Isaiah (Isa 40) have seven points of contact which link them. Mark 1:10-11 links with Isa 42, which helps explain Markan Christology. Isa 58 explains the linking of disparate units of the Jesus tradition in Mark 2. Isa 49:24-25 has a similar message as that of
Mark 3:26-27. Just as YHWH rescues Israel, so Jesus defeats Satan. In Mark 4-8 Schneck sees parallels between Isaiah's obduracy and salvation themes and Mark's obduracy and healing themes.

In contrast to Juel, Schneck agrees with J. Marcus that the Gospel of Mark appeals to the whole context of an Isaian passage rather than giving mere atomistic exegesis. Contrary to Sundberg, who contends Mark has a predilection for Daniel, Schneck contends that Isaiah is Mark's favored Old Testament author. Alfred Suhl is correct in emphasizing the centrality of the Christ event in Mark, but he is mistaken in rejecting the pattern of promise and fulfillment as a significant paradigm in Mark. Dodd was correct: Jesus was the fount and master of the new process of freely adapting Scripture to the current situation, a process carried forward in Mark.

Schneck is conversant with the secondary literature in most cases and interacts well with it. His work is not burdened with endless discussions of scholarly positions. The focus is the text. His judgment of scholarship flows from his interaction with the text.

Schneck also favors the reader by periodically summarizing the discussion and succinctly stating his view based upon his research. These summaries help to focus attention on his major goals in the book. Endnotes are used throughout, a disappointment, since one must turn to the back of the work to find references. However, the endnotes are coordinated with the pagination of the book via headers at the top of the pages in the endnote section ("Notes to pages 57-60" for example) and this makes it easy to find the note in question.

The major difficulty with Schneck's work is in the area of the application of his methodology. Determining Old Testament allusions in New Testament passages is very much a literary art. Schneck has done well in pointing out various criteria for determining allusions, including contextual, genre, verbal, and thematic parallels. However, it would have been useful to see more explication of his method (rules for finding the parallels) before its application.

It is tempting to scientifically gather many parallels and point to numerous linkages as proof of allusion. But this may bypass the thrust of a passage's communication. For instance, does Isa 49 really parallel Mark 3 in so many instances (98-100)? The parallels which Schneck suggests often seem forced. The same can be said for parallels between Isa 57-58 and Mark 2.

We may also note the misidentification of Mark 3:26 as a second-class, contrary-to-fact, conditional statement (240), when in fact it is a first-class conditional statement, in which the protasis is assumed true. Reference to Tannehill's *The Sword of His Mouth*, which discusses the passage, would have been useful.
Schneck set forth on a worthy goal of showing the linkages between Mark and Isaiah. He succeeded in demonstrating a variety of linkages. However, a more nuanced usage of his criteria for establishing allusions would have strengthened the work.

Union College
Lincoln, NE 68506

TOM SHEPHERD


In his dissertation, Shepherd seeks to come to grips with the literary patterns in Mark, known as intercalations. He defines an intercalation as a reader-elevating storytelling method. Its function is to place the reader “with the narrator above the ironic situations of the story characters” (386). The dissertation is organized in five chapters. Chapter 1 is a review of the importance of the term “intercalation” in the literature and the justification of his own investigation. Shepherd pays attention to the following problem areas: (1) the definition; (2) the function and (3) the continuing debate on Markan themes and the relation to intercalated passages. Chapter 2 is devoted to the research method. He suggests that the rather recent method of narrative analysis is better suited to elucidate these literary structures than that of form-and-redaction criticism. Furthermore, the author is optimistic that this method of literary analysis “may be an important adjunct in the continuing search for a solution to the Synoptic Problem” (385).

He starts with the basic assumption that the use of the literary device of “intercalation in the Gospel of Mark follows a set narrative pattern.” In his opinion this pattern is characterized by the narrative definition of intercalation. He points out that the literary storytelling technique of intercalation found in Mark has not escaped the notice of scholars, who have not only been concerned with the question of the interpreter, but also with that of the precise location in the Gospel. Shepherd, following the consensus of scholars who were concerned with the latter, has singled out the following six passages in Mark for his investigation: (1) Mark 3:20-35; (2) Mark 5:21-43; (3) Mark 6:7-32; (4) Mark 11:12-25; (5) 14:1-11; (6) Mark 14:53-72.

Having provided a definition of narrative analysis, Shepherd then engages in a detailed examination of the great masses of these intercalations’ data. In his analysis of the materials he proceeds along the line of (1) the outer story; (2) the inner story; (3) the intercalation itself. He