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others to research and write on the history of Christianity with a broader global prospective.

Andrews University TREVOR O’REGGIO


There are a few moments in scholarship when one should stop, step back, and just look on in wonderment. The completion of Milgrom’s monumental Leviticus commentary in the Anchor Bible series is one of those moments. While I will comment predominantly upon the final two volumes of the set (3A and 3B), the larger picture needs to be kept in mind. Milgrom, Professor Emeritus of Old Testament Studies at the University of California at Berkeley, has worked for nearly two decades on the publication of this commentary. Ten years passed between the publication of the first volume (1991) and that of the third volume (2001). Leviticus, as the third book in the canonical sequence, was originally designated as volume 3. Now it has become three books, with volume numbers 3, 3A, and 3B. The total commentary includes 2,714 pages. In breadth, scope, and erudition, there is nothing comparable in Leviticus studies.

Obviously the division into three books, whose later sections had not yet been written when volume 3 was published in 1991, has some drawbacks. First, opinions or positions change. Second, large quantities of new, important studies are being published and need to be taken into consideration, which either strengthen or challenge the position adopted earlier. Third, indices and a final bibliography are not available until the last volume. This is especially trying in the case of volume 3A, which does not contain either a bibliography or an index. In order to get a workable index and complete bibliography, one has to buy the entire set, coming to $160.00.

On the other hand, there are some definite advantages to publishing as one advances. Long-term publication has allowed Milgrom to interact with his reviewers and correct misprinted, misformulated, or simply incorrect information. Milgrom does this in numerous appendices in volume 3B (2437-2468), where he responds to criticism and issues raised by Henry Sun, Baruch Levine, Israel Knohl, Adrian Schenker, Victor Hurowitz, Howard Eilberg-Schwartz, and Hyam Maccoby.

Milgrom follows the standard layout of the Anchor Bible commentaries, including his translation of the entire text of Leviticus MT. In volume 3A (Lev 17-22), after the translation of Leviticus as a whole there follows a section concerning the structure, vocabulary, extent, and date of Holiness ("H") material (1319-1367) and discussion of H’s theology (1368-1443). This serves as an introduction to the second part of Leviticus (17-27). Milgrom argues for a pre-exilic date of “H” as well as Pentateuch” (“P”), which was “supplemented and redacted by H” (1362; cf. I.
Knohl). This is a major step forward in Pentateuchal studies (although some may regard it as a step “backward”), as it shakes up and overtures to a certain degree the quietly accepted consensus (if one can speak of any consensus in Pentateuchal studies!) of traditional historical-critical dating paradigms. Recently, Wilfried Warning (Literary Artistry in Leviticus, Interpretation Series 35 [Leiden: Brill, 1999], 167-180) has suggested, based upon the macro- and micro-structure of Leviticus, that the distinction between P and H is “seemingly irrelevant.” Milgrom is aware of Warning’s work, but does not really interact with him on a content level (1367, 2082, 2337). Perhaps this is due to the fact that Milgrom finished work on the final volumes in April 1999 (see preface to vols. 3A and 3B). Milgrom’s contribution to the theological study of Leviticus is much appreciated, since it is based upon philology and the literary structure of the text itself. For him, theology is not simply a collection of high and dry ethical principles or statements about God, but rather is rooted in the reality of ancient Israel and can be made visible to the modern student of Leviticus (1375-1391). Law is theologically significant as a means to focus upon holiness.

Discussions of individual chapters or passages follow a predictable layout. First, comes a translation, which is then followed by a short note on composition and structure of the unit. Milgrom does not spend an unwarranted amount of time on the issue of composition, as is customary in most continental commentaries. Sometimes he does not even mention the composition question (1516, on Lev 18). In my earlier evaluation of Milgrom’s treatment of Lev 8 in his first book (Gerald A. Klingbeil, A Comparative Study of the Ritual of Ordination as Found in Leviticus 8 and Emar 369 [Lewiston: Mellen, 1998], 70-73, 80-82, 87-89), I noted that Milgrom wants to work with the text, not with supposed sources or compositional layers. His focus is clearly philological, comparative (including a generous amount of ANE material), and theological. The same approach can be seen in volumes 3A and 3B of the Leviticus commentary.

The next section, entitled “Notes,” should be considered the most important because here he presents his rich discussion of the usage of terms, phrases, and structures; rabbinic and comparative ANE material (where applicable); and relevant archaeological data. Following conventions of the AB series, Milgrom utilizes in-text references rather than footnotes, which makes reading slightly tedious. The amount of data included in this section is amazing and promises to be a gold mine for future generations of scholars. Following “Notes” are the “Comments,” which deal with larger issues at stake in a given unit. His reasoning and language are logical and clear. Often he presents his arguments in list form, which makes following his train of thought much easier.

Volume 3B does not include a separate introduction because Lev 23-27 is regarded as belonging to H, which was introduced in the second book (3A). This book contains an impressive bibliography of volumes 3A and 3B that lists commentaries from medieval and precritical periods, critical commentaries, and other works. Then come four indices covering all three books (subjects, foreign language terms, authors cited, and sources cited), including rabbinic and extrabiblical sources. These indices provide magnificent access to Milgrom’s encyclopedic work, and Doubleday should be applauded for its faithful production.
Milgrom’s contribution to the study of Leviticus cannot be overestimated. His hundreds of individual studies have finally been brought together in this *magnum opus* of one of Old Testament Studies’ greatest contemporary scholars. While not everyone will agree with every conclusion Milgrom puts forth in his commentary, Milgram’s fascination with and passion for the text is manifest and contagious. Students of Leviticus will need to consult this work carefully or risk being considered superfluous or careless. May Milgrom continue to produce and contribute to ongoing research of the fascinating conceptual world of ritual, law, and narrative in Leviticus and the rest of the Torah.

River Plate Adventist University
San Martin, Entre Rios, Argentina

**Gerald A. Klingbeil**


Christianity’s challenge, according to Søren Kierkegaard, is to forge a balance between being a religion of “cognitive revelation” and being a religion of “concrete revelation.” The work of Mark Taylor, who teaches Theology and Culture at Princeton Theological Seminary, may be read as a contemporary theologian’s response to that challenge. Like his earlier projects, *Remembering Esperanza* and *Beyond Explanation*, which combined sober analysis of classical theological symbols with a sophisticated grasp of current anthropological theory, *The Executed God* is a journey into the soul of America.

According to Taylor, Christ was killed because he opposed the terror-ridden logic of an empire that brought social and spiritual death to its victims. With regard to contemporary American culture, Taylor highlights the ways in which idolatrous lifestyles, the search for respectability, rigid nationalism, uncritical patriotism, and empire consolidation subtly conspire to produce a society in which certain identities are routinely and systematically blamed, victimized, imprisoned, and even executed. These repressed identities constitute a sacrificial population within a culture that views the scapegoating of this group as justified and its punishment as warranted. This approach is reproduced by xenophobic attitudes and reinforced by uneven social and juridical codes that often legitimate the tendency to view dark skin color as an index of evil.

*The Executed God* is divided into two parts. In the first part, Taylor argues that contemporary American culture is pervaded by a lockdown mentality, in which the security of its individuals and institutions is defined less in terms of social responsibility and trust and more by a festering anxiety toward difference and otherness. The inevitable social consequence is a culture of terror buttressed by a fortress mentality that typically masks its fears by projecting them onto an unwanted population. For Taylor, “Lockdown America” is a society perpetually imprisoned by its own creation, a reptilian culture of fear constantly biting off its own tail in order to survive.

According to Taylor, as an economy of domination based upon gender, racial, and economic hierarchies, those who benefit from prevailing arrangements legitimate the perpetuity of the system and thus their own prosperity by utilizing the sanitized language of freedom and security (the rhetoric of law and order),