It is also disappointing that Briggs has limited himself to the temple concept in Revelation, since the Revelation may draw more on accounts of the Mosaic tent-sanctuary than the Solomonic temple. A larger examination of the effect of the entire Hebrew cultus on the language of Revelation could have expanded the purview of Briggs's work in a helpful way.

There is no evidence in the book that Briggs took into account the cultic nature of the visionary introductions in Revelation. The visions of the seven letters, seals, trumpets, and bowls are all prefaced by introductory scenes containing cultic elements. The unnumbered section of Rev 12-14 is also prefaced by the ark-of-the-covenant passage in 11:19. So there seems to be a cultic or temple pattern in Revelation that goes without comment in Briggs's book, but which would seem to be extremely significant to his investigation.

While there are a number of questions that can and should be raised about Briggs's approach, assumptions, and conclusions, this book is valuable in that it is the most thorough attempt thus far to address the sources of the temple motif in Revelation. Briggs's conclusion that the primary source of the temple motif is found in the OT coheres with work by Beale, among others, on the general use of the OT and other ancient backgrounds in Revelation. While John was unquestionably a child of his times, he was above all a student of the Jewish Scriptures. Briggs offers us a unique, though limited, window into the impact of John's prior reading on his authorship of the book of Revelation.
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Scholarship in biblical studies during the last half of the past century has witnessed tremendous changes and reversals in the approach to the text and its application to the modern world. In the postmodern era the hermeneutics of the Hebrew Bible has witnessed a transformation to narrative, ideological, and social-scientific criticisms, feminist interpretation, poststructuralism, and even deconstructionism. Although the basic presuppositions of the historical-critical method remain at the core of current proposals, the trend to divorce the text from any history is gaining a strong position in current theological writing and training across North America, where core training in biblical and Ancient Near Eastern languages, archaeology, and cultural backgrounds is becoming a rare phenomenon. The historic work of David Noel Freedman stands in stark contrast to these current trends. A student of W. F. Albright and for decades professor of Hebrew Bible at the University of Michigan, Freedman is currently Chair in Biblical Hebrew Studies at the University of California, San Diego. His impact in biblical studies comes from a variety of perspectives. As a biblical scholar, he has written scores of articles and reviews and contributed to numerous reference works. He is
probably most well-known for his editing of the Anchor Bible Commentary series, the *Anchor Bible Dictionary* (1992), and the one-volume *Eerdmans Dictionary of the Bible* (2000). From the perspective of archaeology, he edited *BA* for nearly a decade (1975-1982) and served as president of ASOR and SBL. He has already had several *Festschriften* presented to him by students and friends. The present two volumes, edited by one of his students, provide a selection of sixty-two of his articles, ranging in original publication from 1949 to 1993.

The first volume contains essays under the rubric “Ancient Israelite History and Religion,” but as a brief overview will attest, it contains articles of considerably more wide-ranging content. Certainly the religion of ancient Israel is evident in articles such as “History and Eschatology: The Nature of Biblical Religion and Prophetic Faith” (72-81), “Kaufmann’s *The Religion of Ancient Israel* (review)” (94-95), “Temple without Hands “ (330-340), “‘Who Is Like Thee Among the Gods?: The Religion of Early Israel” (383-402), and “Yahweh of Samaria and His Asherah” (403-408). In the latter article Freedman suggests that the ungrammatical expression “YHWH and his Asherah” may be explained by YHWH’s defeat of Baal on Mt. Carmel, where, with the removal of Baal, Asherah became the consort of YHWH. This view of Asherah’s prominence throughout the land of Israel has been influential in other circles (see W. G. Dever, “Asherah, Consort of Yahweh? New Evidence from Kuntillet ‘Ajrud,” *BASOR* 255 [1984] 21-37; Saul M. Olyan, *Asherah and the Cult of Yahweh in Israel* [SBLMS 34; Atlanta: Scholars, 1988]).

Isaiah 47:7" [249-250], “Son of Man, Can these Bones Live?: The Exile” [251-266], “Dinah and Shechem, Tamar and Amnon” [485-495].


The major strength of these two volumes is that they have made available to the individual in a convenient format a collection of works from various sources during the better part of three decades. Many are accompanied by references to their prior reappearances. The only minor weakness is the lack of subject, author, and text indices that would have provided an added benefit to researchers. The fine editorial work is a tribute to John R. Huddlestun, who has fittingly honored Freedman and provided a benefit for all who relish the technical aspects of biblical and Ancient Near Eastern studies.
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My Presbyterian brother-in-law assures me that few of his denominational colleagues still subscribe to a belief in predestination. My friends at Westminster are still hard-core TULIP-fanciers, however; and a growing number of evangelical pastors, teachers, and seminaries are embracing the more extreme varieties of Calvinism’s most distinctive doctrines: [T]otal depravity, [U]nconditional election, [L]imited atonement, [I]resistible grace, and [P]erseverance of the saints.

Norman Geisler’s new book, Chosen But Free, aims to halt these shifts away from the traditional evangelical/fundamentalist “once saved, always saved” position. It is also meant to combat the influence of R. C. Sproul’s recent books