scope of text encompassed on the disk. (I hope not all disks have a damaged picture file like mine, which prevented me from viewing past photo number five in the twelve-picture Mediterranean set.) There are some areas in which the CD could be improved. For example, it is not always clear when or where further clicking will bring up another item. One often has to move the cursor around to different objects or text portions looking for whether or not the cursor turns to a hand in order to know whether or not one has exhausted the possibilities on the screen. Some cue needs to be provided to indicate to the viewer when the interaction is complete and it is time to move to the next screen. There are places where the content could also be improved or corrected, but I will note here only one significant error that needs to be corrected. Under “The Middle East: History: The Rule of Herod’s Descendants,” Philip is shown ruling Galilee and Perea, while Antipas rules Iturea and Trachonitis. This should be reversed.

For those teachers interested in additional teaching aids, an Instructor’s Resource Manual, with lecture outlines, master transparencies, media resources, tests, and suggestions is also available separately. A collection of primary source readings related to the NT, entitled Readings from the First-Century World: Primary Sources for New Testament Study is also available from the publisher as a complementary part of the series.

In summary, this is the best, most useful college textbook for introduction to the NT that I have seen. It covers all the essential areas of such a course with clarity, scholarship, and a pleasing visual appeal. It has about as many extra features as one could reasonably expect, with the compact disk as an added bonus. I highly recommend this text to all teachers and students who want to understand the NT while remaining confident of its inspired authority and power to transform the individual. Pastors and all Bible students will also benefit from this fine work.

Adventist International Institute of Advanced Studies

EDWIN REYNOLDS

Silang, Cavite, Philippines


In this bibliography by the Institute for Biblical Research (IBR), the three explicit editorial considerations which delimit Peter Enns’ work are first, a commitment to present the five hundred or so most significant works in the fields of OT poetry and wisdom; second, the need to avoid irrelevance by a focus on those works which are of current significance; and third, the choice to work with English material—a five-percent limit being imposed on titles not translated into English (10). An author’s Preface reiterates the sensible disclaimer against exhaustiveness, pointing the reader to standard bibliographic works such as Religion Index One and Two, and OT Abstracts.

The book is composed of two unequal parts, “Wisdom” (15-108; 484 entries), and “Poetry” (109-163; 300 entries). An opening chapter, which deals in general with the wisdom genre in ancient Israel, presents its titles under eight defined rubrics: Anthologies, Introductions, Origins and ANE Influence, Social Setting, Theology, Wisdom Influence Outside Wisdom Literature, Wisdom and
Apocalyptic, and Wisdom and the Feminine. A ninth subheading also appears, indeterminately listed as “Other,” to accommodate material which demands attention, but defies categorization. Chapters 2-4 catalogue important studies of the OT’s principal sapiential works, Ecclesiastes, Job, and Proverbs. Major subheadings vary according to the biblical book under review, but four recur with respect to all three. These include “Introductions and Anthologies,” “Origins and ANE Influence,” “Theology and Teaching,” and “Structure.”

Part II (chaps. 5-8) first lists studies on ancient Hebrew poetry, grouped into contributions before 1960, and others, thence forward, by decade. It concludes by mentioning those titles which deal, in order, with Psalms, Song of Songs, and Lamentations. Subheadings vary more widely in Part II, including a unique grouping of 20 entries on “Use of the Psalms Today,” and another singularly titled assembly of material, “Meaning” (three books and eleven articles), which offers clarification of the powerful sensuality of Song of Songs.

Enns calls upon an adequate variety of sources, and, in the flexibility of his groupings and astute concession to the limitations of labels—witness his “Other”—displays sensitivity to the range of prevailing and emerging trends in the field. He answers, with competence, the standard claim against bibliographers, anthologists, and collectors in general, the criticism of arbitrariness. Yet, in some small but significant way, this bibliography features quite a celebration of one particular item, viz., J. G. Gammie and L. G. Perdue, eds., *The Sage in Israel and the Ancient Near East* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1990). This anthology achieves the distinction of some twenty-seven separate citations, of the whole work as well as its individual essays, throughout a survey designed to encompass a limited number of the most representative works in OT poetry and wisdom. Besides this, it receives, in its first appearance, some of the most elaborate reviews of the entire bibliography. Only four other items are commented on at greater length, including two works by Perdue, one by Michael Fox, and one by W. G. E. Watson, of which Watson’s volume of comprehensive analysis (*Classical Hebrew Poetry: A Guide to Its Techniques*, JSOT Supp. 26 [Sheffield: JSOT 1984]) is most understandably given such prominent notice.

It is true that Enns’ preface asks us to expect a “a fair degree of overlap” between anthologies as general introductions and their individual articles as theme- or book-specific (11). Still, my own appreciation for Gammie and Perdue’s collection or that of J. L. Crenshaw, *Studies in Ancient Israelite Wisdom* (New York: KTAV, 1976), which enjoys 18 annotations, competes with my surprise at the difference between the IBR Series’ stated goal of presenting a total of about 500 titles per bibliography, and the 784 entries we encounter in the current volume. Such extravagant violation of a stated goal may find stronger justification in wider introduction of titles than in re-citation of those already mentioned. With reference, again, to the goals of the series, his single non-English title falls rather short of the thirty-nine (5% of 784) or twenty-five (5% of 500) which the series Preface would allow.

On Ecclesiastes, John Barton’s illustrative exposition might have justified its inclusion in titles on that book because of its effective comparison and combination of a variety of approaches often atomistically employed by other commentators (see *Reading the OT: Method in Biblical Study* [Philadelphia:
In part II some articles on poetry may lack the depth which their recommendation suggests (e.g., two cited at item #516, 117). On Psalms, notwithstanding his layman’s disclaimers, C. S. Lewis’ *Reflections on the Psalms* fits wonderfully and qualitatively into the category called “Other.”

Negligible, but significant, typographical miscues compare Murphy O’Connor (#533) with Kugel (#534) instead of with Kugel (#535) on technical arguments against notions of meter and parallelism in Hebrew poetry; McDaniel (#762) with Kaiser (#773), on Sumerian influence upon Lamentations, instead of with Gwaltney (#775) who, in turn, is mistakenly contrasted with Gurewicz (#761) instead of with McDaniel (#762). Bosman (#781), on structural analysis of Lamentations, is cross-referenced to Moore (#776), rather than to Renkema (#778). Then, there is the inconsistent transliteration of Hebrew terms (cf. #20, #153, #168). Beyond these, the mischief of printer’s devils is limited enough to quickly cite: Elihu “a spokesmen” instead of “spokesman” (88), “Contique” for “Cantique” (156), and page header “Larnations” for “Lamentations” (161, 163).

But these are trivia, insufficient to detract from Enns’, IBR’s, and Baker Books’ service to OT scholarship. Because of their work, OT wisdom and poetry research now possesses a very useful survey, and is certain to profit again when its sequel appears in five years’ time.

Andrews University 


For many people, postmodernism and pluralism seem deeply inhospitable to truth. Relativism, if not nihilism, seems like a disturbingly common outcome of attachment to postmodern thought. Any approach to life that renders us unable to protest the torture of children, the rape of the land, the degradation of women, the random dissolutions of families, or the proliferation of warfare, terrorism, and gang violence is worth rejecting. If every option is acceptable from someone’s perspective, then we have no way of resisting evil. And, if the inability to resist evil is the price of endorsing postmodernism, it is too high a price to pay.

“Postmodernism” is a notoriously fluid term. But what all the varieties of postmodernism have in common is their rejection of the Enlightenment as a final resting place for human thought. Enlightenment thinkers believed that the post-Reformation religious conflicts that claimed so many lives could be avoided if people could find a basis for moral action and political choice that was independent of religious convictions. Because religious disagreement lay at the root of so much violence, it would be impossible to avoid this violence by appealing to religious convictions which were themselves in dispute. What was needed instead, said the thinkers of the Enlightenment, was an account of normative judgment that exhibited the rationality people believed was typical of science. On the basis of such an account, it would be possible to craft moral and political standards that would appeal to people whatever their religious beliefs. As a result, social harmony would be possible despite profound religious disagreement.