arrangement of the texts itself, I consider these markings to be the best feature of the columnar synopsis. Orthographic variants are not highlighted, which indeed would be counterproductive given the sheer number of such variants.

A minor point regarding the layout is that text references are printed in the header near the cut where they function well as reference when readers thumb through the book. The page numbers are printed rather inconspicuously in the footer near the binding of the book, although I would regard it as preferable to print them in the footer outwards near the cut, where they would function better as an additional reference for the readers.

In the Introduction to this volume, the general features of the *Biblia Qumranica* series are explained. It also includes the usual list of editorial signs and abbreviations, as well as a "synopsis of the sequence of the minor prophets in the extant witnesses," listing the sequence in the MT, LXX, 8HevXII gr (the sequence of which agrees with the MT but is included for better comparison with LXX), and 4QXII*. The most interesting feature of the introduction is a list of 125 disagreements of the transcriptions in the *Biblia Qumranica* with the standard editions (compiled by A. Lange). The synopsis thus makes also a contribution to the transcription of the DSS manuscripts (e.g., E. J. C. Tigchelaar identified two additional 4QXII* fragments of Mal 3:11-12 and Jon 1:7). Unfortunately, the synopsis does not provide any explanations for these new transcriptions nor references to the pertinent scholarly literature.

There is no text-critical information or apparatus given for any of the transcriptions, which, of course, should not be expected for reasons of space. Hence, the synopsis does not save the text-critic the work of consulting the original editions.

In conclusion, it is safe to say that the *Biblia Qumranica* is an essential reference work for comparing the different manuscripts and identifying the text-critical points of interest. It will be an indispensable tool for those who investigate the textual variety and want to wrestle with the intricate issues of the textual history as raised by the biblical manuscripts of the DSS. I can only wish that the other fascicles will soon follow to complete this valuable series, and I have no doubt that they will be received with similar gusto.

Seminar Schloss Bogenhofen
St. Peter am Hart, Austria


This multiauthor volume addresses a number of important questions. How do NT writers make use of the OT? How do the OT writings function in the NT? Which version or versions of the OT served as Scripture for those who wrote the NT? Reflecting on these questions leads to interesting implications for the study of sacred texts today.

According to the editor, Craig A. Evans, the book was designed as an introduction and a reader on the subject of the NT's use of the OT. The book's introduction, written by Evans himself, orients the student (rather than the veteran scholar) to the larger issues and provides a survey of the principal primary and secondary literature. The rest of the book is composed of highly technical scholarly studies that advance the discussion and set forth new ideas.

The main part of the book opens with a pair of studies on how the Aramaic targums of the OT illuminate the meaning of the NT. In contrast to rabbinic literature, the targums are more reflective of the biblical interpretation of the common people in the synagogue. Bruce Chilton shows how the paraphrasing tendencies of the Aramaic OT clarify similar tendencies in the NT. He catalogs four main types of affinity between the targumim and
the NT. While available targumic documents are later than the first century, they retain some traditions familiar to the gospel writers. Evans focuses on the distinctive contribution of the Aramaic Psalter, which he understands to be the body of ancient tradition out of which our Psalms targums emerged. Compared to the Hebrew Psalms, the Aramaic versions exhibited a much greater emphasis on law, temple, prophecy, angels and demons, and the concepts of “redemption” and “redeemer.” The Aramaic versions of the Psalms help to clarify the points being made in some specific NT texts.

The next two studies explore the function of the OT Scriptures in the infancy narratives of Matthew and Luke. Rikk Watts probes the wider context of Isa 7:14, attempting to show that the name “Immanuel” and the corresponding phrase “God with us” express judgment at least as much as they express salvation. In other words, if the Israel of Matthew’s day rejects the baby Jesus, it will suffer the same consequences as ancient Israel, when it rejected the message of Isaiah. Robert Shedinger examines the interpretation of Mic 5:1 in Matt 2:6. He concludes that most examples of seeming misquotation in the NT are probably witnesses to early, pre-Christian textual variants. If that is the case, the Diatessaron and other early NT witnesses, where they quote the OT, can be helpful in the process of OT text criticism.

The two studies that follow examine the function of the OT in the Gospel of Luke. Simon Gathercole investigates the use and interpretation of Lev 18:5 in early Judaism to clarify several allusions to it in Luke, Romans, and Galatians. He challenges the understanding of these texts put forward by James Dunn, N. T. Wright, and Ed Sanders. According to Gathercole, early Judaism, with the apparent exception of Philo, generally taught that obedience was essential to eschatological salvation. He argues that scholars have overlooked the tension in early Jewish literature between gracious divine election and a salvation that is based on obedience. Michael Labahn explores the meaning of Isa 61 for Luke 7, especially in the light of the Messiahic Apocalypse (4Q521). The Qumran evidence suggests that the proclamation of good news in the context of eschatological salvation was not invented by the early Christians, but has strong Jewish roots. He concludes that the Q document, as far as we can make it out, is more interested in eschatology and the apocalypse than has been generally thought.

Arthur Droge provides the only study on the Fourth Gospel in the book. He offers several examples that to him illustrate a very free hand in the Gospel’s quotations of and reflections on the OT. These observations suggest to him that the Revealer of John is not only estranged from the religious leaders of his day, but also from the collection of sacred texts that they share. Droge draws the radical conclusion that the Fourth Gospel’s use of the OT is “nothing less than a revolutionary attempt to usurp the meaning of ‘the Scriptures’” (176). Whatever one’s opinion of this conclusion, Droge ends his piece with some powerful reflections on the way people relate to authoritative texts.

The next two studies explore how the OT is used in the Book of Acts. James VanderKam unpacks the OT background of the Feast of Weeks and its implications for Acts 2. While the festival does not seem especially important in the Hebrew Bible, later Jewish writings assigned much greater significance to it. There is little in Acts 2 that reminds one directly of what the OT says about the Feast of Weeks. Nevertheless, there are a number of points of agreement between Jewish traditions about the Feast of Weeks and the giving of the law on Mount Sinai and various details found in Acts 2. James Kugel notes that, at a number of points, Stephen’s sermon recorded in Acts 7 is at variance with the history recorded in the Hebrew and Greek texts of the OT. These variations can often be shown to reflect ancient midrashic debates about problems in OT interpretation. He concludes that early Christian writers almost never approached the text fresh; instead they perceived the text of Scripture through the lens of earlier Jewish interpretation.
The last two studies focus on the Pauline tradition. Brigitte Kahl offers a fresh interpretation of the Sarah and Hagar allegory in Gal 4, grounded in the “headline” and “conclusion” found in Gal 3:28 and 5:13. She suggests that “driving out the slave woman” is not an attack on Jews or Judaism, but is, rather, a call to end the hierarchal division of humanity into superior and inferior, excluded and included, that characterizes the present world order. The point of the allegory is that slavery becomes freedom when one freely exercises slave service toward others. Gary Anderson follows with a study of 1 Timothy’s argument relating to Eve’s being deceived, while Adam was not deceived. Early Jewish texts like The Life of Adam and Eve offer a wealth of information about what early Jews and Christians thought about the story. It appears that the author of 1 Timothy was familiar with traditions reflected in early Jewish expansions of the biblical account of creation and the fall.

The collection of essays is brought to a close with an epilogue by James Sanders. The epilogue considers the implications of the whole book and is geared more toward the student, as was the case with the introduction.

I must honestly say that I found this book to be a challenging read. Although attempts at a common agenda were made, there is much unevenness in the book. Some studies require an understanding of the original languages, others are broader and more theological in approach. Some, such as Droge, seem critical to the point of undermining a faith approach; others, such as Kahl, seemed apologetic as much as exegetical.

While the introduction promises a work of more general interest, the studies themselves are detailed and esoteric enough that I had difficulty following some of the arguments, in spite of the fact that my own dissertation explored these same areas. It required a second reading to appreciate most of the essays. The average reader will not be so patient.

By the time I was a little more than halfway through the book, I would certainly have set it aside had I not agreed to provide a review. I’m not saying that the studies have little value in and of themselves, but that they do not hang together as well as one would like, and the book has the feel of a journal where one picks and chooses and comes back mainly for tidbits of specialized research.

When I got to the article by Droge I was put off by what seemed to be an extreme skepticism in his handling of the Fourth Gospel’s attitude toward Scripture. But somewhere in the course of his article I saw deeper possibilities in what he was observing and began to get interested in the book. The remainder of the articles seemed much more fruitful and left me with a more positive feeling about the experience. I would encourage anyone interested in the topic of the NT’s use of the OT to read the introduction and conclusion first, then dig into the specific studies that seem most interesting to the reader’s research agenda.

In my opinion, the highlight of the book is the conclusion by Sanders. He does his best to reflect on the impact of the essays as a combined whole. First, the evidence presented moves Sanders to the conclusion that searching the Torah for guidance in ever-changing situations was fundamental to early Judaism. Such application did not require careful quotation or adherence to standards of text criticism. What counted was that the community recognized the reference and accepted its authority. Similar passages could be meshed together to create a compelling case for the author’s viewpoint. At stake was not the original meaning of the text but how the text’s authority interacted with the needs and concerns of the interpreter and his or her community.

A second contribution of the book, according to Sanders, underlined the ancient Jewish conviction that the Torah spoke directly to the end-time situation. Since first-century Jewish communities often believed that they were living in the end times, they
would assume that the Torah could speak directly to their situation. Few Jewish writers of the time were interested in what Isaiah or David really meant. Scripture did not belong to the past, but to the ever-changing present. The essays in the book demonstrate that the writers of the NT followed the same hermeneutic.

Sanders goes on to argue that conservative Christians today derive their hermeneutic from the examples in the Bible. Early Christians put the Prophets rather than the Writings last because they believed that the prophets foretold Christ, that they spoke directly to the situation first-century Christians found themselves in. Following this model today, conservative Christians tend to make creative use of the Scriptures to address social, political, and theological issues of current interest.

This leads Sanders to the probing question: "In what sense, then, can modern critical scholarship speak of the New Testament as the fulfillment of the Old" (256)? Sanders argues in response that modern scholarship serves as a constraint on adapting Scripture to say whatever anyone thinks it ought to say to believing communities today. Whether the viewpoint in question is liberal or conservative, it needs to be subjected to a critical reading of the Bible as a constraining factor in the discernment of its abiding truth. Its relevance for today must derive from a faithful and natural extension of what it originally meant.

In conclusion, it seems to me that devotional and creative readings of Scripture will always be the norm in most churches and synagogues. Such readings should not be discouraged as long as they build up individuals and the community in positive ways. But when the community becomes divided by interpretations of the Scriptures, the scholarly role of exegetical reading is a necessary arbiter to make sure that all players in the discussion are on the same page. Scripture was and is adaptable for life. But scholarship can play a healthy role in guiding such adaptation to the benefit of believing communities.

Andrews University

JON PAULIEN


The increasing influence of the Religious Right on American politics in recent elections and their attempts to break down the wall between religion and politics has created a need among Americans to reexamine the religious traditions of the American nation. This book has helped to answer some of the questions raised by the Religious Right about the role of religion in the formation of the nation. The focus of this book is to examine the faith of the Founding Fathers, namely Thomas Jefferson, James Madison, Benjamin Franklin, George Washington, and John Adams during the period 1776 to 1826.

The author, an Emeritus Professor of History at the University of California, Riverside, identifies seven varying perspectives that guided these men. He points out that although some of these perspectives were sometimes contrary, they were not necessarily contradictory. Some were held in creative tension, while others were seen as absolute dichotomies that ruled out neutrality. They all required decisions, judgment, and firm conviction, with the remarkable outcome that American religious life was affirmed and shaped for centuries without the spilling of blood or religious wars that were a common feature of the European landscape.

The first perspective was to view religion as an instrument of establishment and social order. The Founding Fathers viewed God's people as having the task of rescuing humanity from natural brutishness and anarchical selfishness. For them religion created order and stability.

The second perspective was like a muted counterpart to the first, for they affirmed