

will focus on the book as a whole, rather than on the views of individual (excerpted) contributors. Long has attempted to include a broad selection of views. Both minimalists, such as T. L. Thompson and N. P. Lemche, and maximalists, such as W. H. Hallo and A. R. Millard, are represented. As Long himself admits, his own views, which are positive toward the historical character of the biblical texts, have clearly influenced the selections and the arrangement of this book. This is not a problem for him because he assumes that complete objectivity is an unreachable goal. He cites J. M. Miller's statement that "any history book reveals as much about its author as it does about the period of time being treated" (283). Those who disagree with Long's theistic worldview would perhaps have chosen a different arrangement of chapters and selected material differently.

Since Long's "overarching perspective" (xiii-xiv) is a philosophical one, a section dedicated to articles dealing with the interplay between philosophy and historiography in general would have been a useful addition to the book. It should also be noted that Long's views were previously presented in his 1994 monograph, indeed sometimes with more detail, and he does not propose much that is new in this present work. However, the present volume has a different intended audience and purpose. Thus, it must be evaluated in the light of Long's intended goal. He has succeeded in gathering together some of the most significant recent contributions to the current debate and in summarizing the basic issues of presuppositions and methodology. This volume is an excellent introductory survey, which can serve both as a textbook for a course on the historiography of ancient Israel, as well as a resource for scholars working in other subdisciplines of biblical studies.

Hebrew Union College
Cincinnati, Ohio

TARSEE LI

Maag, Karin, ed. *Melanchthon in Europe: His Work and Influence beyond Wittenberg*. Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1999. 191 pp. Paper, \$17.99.

Karin Maag, the director of the H. Henry Meeter Center for Calvin Studies in Grand Rapids, has authored and edited three other volumes on the Reformation. The present volume, *Melanchthon in Europe*, is part of the Texts and Studies in Reformation and Post-Reformation Thought series, edited by Richard A. Muller. The series is designed to fill some of the gaps in our knowledge of the Reformation and the era of Protestantism with special emphasis on the late sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

The eight essays in this volume reflect the increasing interest among historians in the life and work of Philip Melanchthon. This interest was further sparked by the conferences and colloquia held during 1997 to mark the 500th anniversary of Melanchthon's birth. In her introduction to this volume, Karin Maag reminds us that recent Melanchthon scholarship has focused on his work as a humanist. He integrated his emphasis on rhetoric and dialectics, as practiced in the classical world and by Bible writers, with his theology. The editorial oversights in the following sentence are not characteristic of the volume: "In doing so, these scholars have underlined once again that the German Reformation did come to an end [*sic*] with

Luther's death in 1547 [*sic*], nor was it set in stone forever after." (16). Maag's major point is that the German Reformation did *not* come to an end with the death of Luther. The later Melanchthon was "a major Reformer in his own right." (17). And Maag is undoubtedly thoroughly aware that Luther died on February 18, 1546.

The volume's first essay by Timothy Wengert discusses "The Epistolary Friendship of John Calvin and Philip Melanchthon." Wengert takes issue with the earlier assessment of the correspondence between Calvin and Melanchthon by such historians as Philip Schaff and James T. Hickman who recognized basic friendship despite some theological differences. On the contrary, Wengert argues, there were profound tensions between the two Reformers, even though their correspondence followed the mores of Renaissance letter-writing etiquette. On the questions of predestination, church practices, free will, and the Lord's Supper, although the correspondence between the two Reformers demonstrated moderation and respect, it also demonstrated the great divide between them. "It is finally this hermeneutical divide that continues to mark the differences between these two great streams of the Protestant tradition and between their ablest spokesmen." (44). Certainly the limitations of space dictated Wengert's brevity, but one could wish for a more detailed development of the theological positions held by the two Reformers.

The second essay by Bruce Gordon discusses the relationship between "Melanchthon and the Swiss Reformers." (45). Gordon points out that the Swiss theologians never recovered from Luther's rejection of Zwingli's theology. Gordon outlines Melanchthon's correspondence with Oecolampadius, Grynaeus, Bullinger, and Myconius. The Swiss respected Melanchthon's humanist scholarship and regarded him as the *Praeceptor Germaniae*, even though they felt that separated from Luther's influence he would support their theological positions. Thus "it was the bitterest of blows . . . when in April 1557 Melanchthon put his name to a document at the Worms Colloquy which explicitly condemned Zwingli's theology." (53).

The third essay by Amy Nelson Burnett considers "Melanchthon's Reception in Basel." Burnett's point is that, although Melanchthon never visited Basel and had few personal connections with the Swiss city, he maintained contact with the Basel humanist circle and with its printing industry. The break between the German and Swiss theologians over the Lord's Supper in the 1520's resulted for a time in neglect of Melanchthon's writings. But later in the century the Basel printers recognized the profits and educational benefits to be gained from disseminating his humanist writings.

The fourth essay by Deszo Buzogany studies the relationship between Melanchthon's humanist scholarship and his theology. Melanchthon saw the classical writings as providing "a useful service in the better understanding and clearer transmission of God's Word." (87). Specifically he regarded rhetoric and dialectics as invaluable tools in the study of God's Word.

Lyle D. Bierma's fifth essay argues against identification of Melanchthon's influence on the Heidelberg Catechism (composed in 1562 two years after his death). Bierma seeks to establish that the similarities between the HC and Melanchthon's writings do not necessarily indicate the latter's influence on the former.

The sixth essay by Richard A. Muller investigates the influence of Melanchthon's theological method on Calvin's progressive reorganization of his *Institutes*. Muller identifies the methodological relationship between Calvin's 1539

Institutes and Melanchthon's *Loci communes theologici* of 1521 and 1536, seeing this relationship as important to an understanding of both documents.

John R. Schneider's seventh essay discusses "Melanchthon's Rhetoric As a Context for Understanding His Theology" (141). Schneider makes the pertinent observation that Melanchthon's understanding of rhetoric and dialectic, developed early in his career, explains his approach to theology, to biblical exegesis, and to his progressive expansion of the *Loci communes*. Melanchthon systematically integrated dialectics into his concept of rhetoric. In fact, he stated that rhetoric was but "a part of dialectics." (149). This view influenced his approach to Scripture, since he identified rhetorical and dialectical approaches in the writings of the Bible, especially in Paul's epistle to the Romans.

The final essay by Nicole Kuroпка emphasizes that Melanchthon's concept of rhetoric fused Renaissance and Reformation ideals. "Melanchthon's rhetoric has the double aim of decoding sources and reforming politics." (161). The revival of ancient literature in Florence aimed at both exegesis and political improvement. Likewise, Melanchthon saw the Reformation as having both a linguistic and a civic dimension. Biblical exegesis is designed to change lives and transform society.

These eight essays whet our appetites for a more expanded version of each topic. Each could profitably be the subject of a detailed monograph. There are so many questions left unanswered or only partly answered. For example, more specifically and in more detail what does the correspondence between Calvin and Melanchthon reveal concerning their differences on predestination, church practices, free will, and the Lord's Supper? What does Melanchthon's relationship with the Swiss Reformers reveal about his attitude to Zwingli's theology and later Swiss theology? What were the differences between them, and did Melanchthon change over time? To what extent, if any, did he part from Luther on such questions as the Lord's Supper, predestination, justification, and so on? In more detail, how did Melanchthon's concept of rhetoric and dialectic influence his biblical exegesis and his application of the classics to his contemporary society?

Angwin, California

ERWIN R. GANE

O'Brien, Peter T. *The Letter to the Ephesians*. Pillar New Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999. xxxiii + 536 pp. Hardcover, \$40.00.

After a hiatus of some seven years, O'Brien's commentary on Ephesians marks the first of several new commentaries slated to appear in the Pillar New Testament Commentary series. According to the editorial preface, the goal of the PNTC series is to avoid "getting mired in undue technical detail," but at the same time to provide a "blend of rigorous exegesis and exposition, with an eye alert both to biblical theology and the contemporary relevance of the Bible" (viii). Written by O'Brien, this commentary undoubtedly accomplishes the goal of the series. O'Brien, currently vice principal and senior research fellow in NT at Moore Theological College in Sydney, Australia, provides the same diligent, lucid, and probing exegesis in this commentary that he demonstrated in his commentaries on Colossians and Philemon (Word Biblical Commentary), and Philippians (New International Greek Testament Commentary). While the commentary takes a deliberately conservative viewpoint, it does not sacrifice