

xl), it is precisely the question whether a second-century date is compatible with divine inspiration that will be at the forefront of criticism.

So what is the place of this commentary in comparison with others? Lucas's *Daniel* cannot and does not replace the major commentaries by Goldingay (WBC, 1989) and Collins (Hermeneia, 1993) which have more detailed introductions and comments and more extensive bibliographic references; but it certainly complements them. The strengths of Lucas's commentary are the more holistic approach to the text, the careful attention to literary features and the Mesopotamian background of Daniel, and the faith-based explorations of the text's broader biblical and historical context, including possible implications for today. It should be considered as a possible choice for classroom adoption as long as one is aware of Lucas's idiosyncratic suggestions regarding the composition of Daniel.

Seminar Schloss Bogenhofen
St. Peter am Hart, Austria

MARTIN PRÖBSTLE

McLay, R. Timothy. *The Use of the Septuagint in New Testament Research*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003. xiv + 207 pp. Paper, \$30.00.

At the time of the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls, LXX studies were clearly in decline. It was commonly believed that the latter was, for the most part, a poor paraphrase of the Hebrew Bible, and had little to offer in the study of the MT. The Scrolls have had wide impact on both Hebrew and Greek textual studies, attracting bright young students trained in modern linguistics and related fields. McLay is part of this new wave of LXX scholars. His dissertation from Durham University was published as *The OG and Th Versions of Daniel* (SCS 43), and he has written several articles in this field of study.

Unfortunately, the implications of the renewed interest in the LXX have generally not been adequately recognized in NT studies, and it is to this issue that McLay gives his attention in this volume. Since at least Reformation times, the scriptural background for the NT has normally been sought in the Hebrew Bible/MT—or in translation, in the OT. Recourse to the LXX is had only when the reference is not found in any of those places, such as the reference to Deut 32:43 (LXX) found in Heb 1:6. McLay argues—and demonstrates—that precisely the converse is the approach that should be adopted. By NT times, apart from the Scribes into whose care the Hebrew Scriptures were committed, few could read Hebrew. The Bible of the Christian church was the Greek LXX.

In the Introduction, McLay lays important groundwork, carefully explaining the interrelationship between concepts such as "Scripture" and "canon" and defining terminology. To some, this may seem like splitting hairs, but the distinctions are important. To follow McLay's reasoning, one must be able to distinguish clearly, for instance, between "Septuagint" and "Old Greek," and "Masoretic Text" and "Hebrew Bible." From the outset, some will be tempted to skip or pass quickly over the more technical discussions found as

early as in the introduction, but it is important to follow through and understand the basic concepts.

Chapter 1 begins the study in earnest, with an example from Acts 15:16-18. In his summation at the Jerusalem Council, James quotes Amos 9:11-12. The question is, what source is he quoting, since the words do not match exactly either the MT or the Old Greek? While McLay does not hesitate to use the original languages, English translations are also provided. The argument can be followed in English alone, if necessary.

Acts 15:16-18 is an excellent starting point, and McLay discusses the different possible scenarios under which the differences from the MT and Old Greek may have arisen, such as: text corruption, *Tendenz*, different *Vorlage*, reinterpretation, and quoting from memory.

Chapters 2 and 3 are the heart of the book, centering on the discussion of translation technique. McLay's stated purpose is "to describe the way in which individual translators engaged in the process of translating a unit of Scripture for a community" (45). Since it is the LXX that is the translation of the Hebrew Bible, this portion relates to that text. For the last two decades, translation technique has been an important topic among LXX scholars. McLay carefully lays out the issues, citing the relevant sources, and even taking them to task when he believes this is necessary.

Chapter 3, "A Model for Translation Technique," highlights just how difficult translation is. Even within two Indo-European languages such as Greek and English, the process of translation is difficult enough; when a third element consisting of a Semitic language is added, the results are very complex; finally, add to that the changes over time in the various textual traditions and one can appreciate why translating has been called an act of hubris. It is not that meaning cannot be conveyed, but rather that something is lost in translation and elements are added in the translation to meet the balancing demands of the source language and the target language.

A note of caution is due. Chapters 2 and 3 will easily seem like dry theory if one is not familiar with the field and language of textual criticism; however to skip them—and the temptation will be real—will render the rest of the book basically pointless. After all, it is the failure of NT scholarship in general to wrestle with the issues that necessitated the writing of the book in the first place. Since McLay has dialogued with the key sources, the footnotes provide the major references needed to understand translation technique. Anyone who attempts to work in NT textual criticism with the hope of establishing the earliest readings must understand these issues when working with quotations from the Hebrew Bible, OT, Old Greek, and LXX.

Chapter 4, "The Origin of the Septuagint and Its History," which is more practical in nature than the previous two chapters, is replete with examples. However, there is a great deal of theory. The reason for this is that the translations and recensions subsequent to the original Old Greek translation have in turn impacted the Greek NT at various points. This is much like finding that a modern

author has consistently quoted the NRSV, except for references to the NIV, and attempts to quote the KJV from memory. McLay observes:

The fact that there was no standardized text [of the Hebrew Bible] prior to the second century [A.D.] helps us to understand better the nature of the Old Greek translation of a particular book in the Hebrew Bible. Since there was no standardized text, the Old Greek translation of a particular book provides a snapshot of a particular text form of the Hebrew book that existed at that time" (121).

Finally, in chapter 5, "The Impact of the Septuagint on the New Testament," we come to what many will have expected the whole book to have been about. The problem is that translation technique has never had such a thoroughgoing, consistent approach before, and it takes time and space to do so. Again, this chapter addresses the deeper issue of the canon. At the time the NT was written, what the writers considered authoritative will, for some, seem a surprisingly wide range of sources outside of the (later, traditional) Jewish canon. Thus McLay, in his own way, is close to the point of Martin Hengel (see my review of Hengel, *The Septuagint As Christian Scripture: Its Prehistory and the Problem of Its Canon*, AUSS 41 [2003]: 315–317) in arguing for—and demonstrating the lack of—any clear canon for any corpus into the Christian era. However, the two differ in that Hengel accepts that the Hebrew canon was settled by a Jewish Council at Jamnia/Jabneh. McLay—in contradistinction to Hengel, and in agreement with the consensus position for the current generation of scholars—correctly understands that this putative Jewish Council in fact never took place, but was a construct of Christian authors to provide a point parallel to the later Christian councils that determined the extent of the NT canon.

There is no question that Judaism centered in the Jewish Scriptures, and that the NT church, under divine inspiration, reinterpreted the Hebrew Bible in the light of the work and ministry of Jesus Christ. McLay's book opens to the reader the nature and complexity of that process. Since so much in the book will be new to many readers, the issue is not whether McLay is correct, but whether he is headed in the right direction; the answer is in the affirmative. McLay has made a significant contribution. He and others will refine the process, but the way ahead is now clear.

Loma Linda, California

BERNARD TAYLOR

Osborne, Grant R. *Revelation*. Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2002. xx + 869 pp. Hardcover, \$49.99.

Grant R. Osborne is Professor of New Testament at Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, Deerfield, Illinois, and editor and one of the authors of the Life Application Bible Commentary and the InterVarsity Press New Testament Commentary Series.

The present volume is a section-by-section commentary on the book of Revelation, which is based on an exegesis of the text. It is written from the evangelical perspective in accordance with the objectives of the whole commentary