

a mold which is *a priori* to a study of the historical Jesus (van Buren, Tillich). His criticism of these writers from the historical point of view is devastating.

Several major points underlie Keck's argument: (1) The historical Jesus is crucial for the believer, the preacher, and the theologian; (2) "The Gospels have solid information though the present form of the material may not be historically accurate" (p. 24); (3) The relationship to Jesus is better understood as trust rather than faith since the opposite of this relationship is not disbelieving something but lack of trust, and it is personal and social; (4) The historical data concerning Jesus permit trust without requiring it; (5) Trust is not possible without some kind of knowledge but not the inevitable outcome of accurate information. Experiential not intellectual truth leads to trust; (6) The total life of Jesus including his death and resurrection must be considered and his paradoxical teachings must be held in tension; (7) Trusting Jesus is salvific; (8) Trusting Jesus leads to trusting God.

One of the significant contributions of this study is showing how trust is a more meaningful definition for one's relationship to Jesus than faith and the carrying out of this relationship with respect to traditional Christian concepts of conversion, repentance, and salvation. Another important contribution is Keck's effective rebuttal of Bultmann's contention that the search for the historical Jesus is salvation by works.

Keck continually affirms that the Gospels "provide us with sufficient data about Jesus that the contour of his life as a whole can come into view," but unfortunately he nowhere systematically presents this "contour." While he argues persuasively for the need of historical criticism, he does not explicitly perform this task in detail so that one is not altogether clear as to what the "sufficient data" are. The direction in which he would move is clear when he suggests that the Gospels have solid information though not historically accurate, when he opposes "the tyranny of the negative criteria" and insists on the "characteristic Jesus" rather than the "distinctive Jesus," and by what he accepts as solid data in his evaluation of Mk 1:16-20 (p. 24). It is unfortunate, also, that the book contains numerous typographical errors. A list of these would take up too much space.

The reader will find in this book a cornucopia of provocative ideas and suggestions. Throughout the reviewer found himself writing on the margin, "Should expand further." There are many latent ideas waiting for further development. This is a wide-ranging book and a short review cannot do full justice to it.

Andrews University

SAKAE KUBO

Kenyon, Kathleen. *Royal Cities of the Old Testament*. New York: Schocken Books, 1971. xii + 164 pp. 28 Figures. 103 Plates. \$10.00.

Here we have another of the popular books on the results of archaeological work in Palestine of which the author has given us two before—*Digging Up*

*Jericho* (1957) and *Jerusalem: Excavating 3000 Years of History* (1967). The book under discussion deals with those cities which can qualify for the title "royal," such as Jerusalem and Samaria, the capitals of the two kingdoms of Judah and Israel, and such other cities—Hazor, Megiddo, and Gezer—which merit this title because Solomon paid special attention to these three cities and carried out much building activity in them (see p. 53, and I Ki 9:15). Excavations have been conducted in each of these five cities in recent years, thus increasing our knowledge about them. Since the author was on the staff of one of the Samaria expeditions and was director of the Jerusalem expedition from 1961-1967, she is eminently qualified to write on this subject.

After an introductory chapter and one on the historical background, the author presents eight chapters that deal with the five cities mentioned during the 600 years of history when Judah and Israel were a united kingdom or were separate kingdoms. The task which the author placed before herself is well done. With the help of plans, sectional drawings, diagrams, and more than 100 excellent photographs, the reader who is interested in either biblical history or archaeology is given a fine description of the history and growth of these cities, their fortifications, residential quarters, water works, and palaces, as far as they have been discovered during the excavations. In this connection, two remarks may be allowed. If Fig. 13 on p. 64, the reconstructed plan of Palace 1723 at Megiddo, had been reproduced upside down it would be much easier to follow the author's explanation and her comparison with the excavator's plan of that palace in Fig. 12 on p. 63. And, on p. 21 the author says that up to 1961, when her excavations of Jerusalem began, it was "usually accepted" that the city of Jerusalem under the monarchy had covered the west as well as the east ridge. It is true that one could name several scholars of fame who defended this view as late as 1961, but a growing number had already accepted the minimalist view, according to which the city had been principally limited to the east ridge in OT times (see M. Avi-Yonah's survey in *IEJ*, 4 [1954], 238, 239).

The author draws on the results of her own excavations, on published excavation reports, unpublished information obtained from excavators, and literary sources—mainly the Bible—for her presentation. But in regard to one of the five cities—Gezer—Kenyon regrettably has not done justice to the available information. She mentions the city repeatedly, and also correctly states that its earliest excavations were carried out during the pioneering years of Palestinian archaeology when the archaeological methods were so primitive that a complex stratigraphy, such as the one existing at Gezer, could not be correctly interpreted. Furthermore she mentions the fact that Y. Yadin had recognized part of a Solomonic city gate in R. A. S. (not R. A. G., p. 68) Macalister's "Maccabean Castle" (p. 69). However, she fails to mention the fact that the Gezer expedition under the direction of William G. Dever began a re-excavation of Macalister's "Castle" in 1965 with annual continuations that have progressively corroborated Yadin's hypothesis. Since brief progress reports and pictures of the excavations of the Solomonic gate at Gezer appeared annually in the *RB* (75 [1968], 387; 76 [1969], 365, 366, Pl. XXVII; 77 [1970], 395, Pl. XVIII) and the *IEJ* (19 [1969], 241, 242; 20 [1970], 226, 227), her book should have included the

available information on these important excavations which had been completed by the time this book was published in 1971. (See now Dever's preliminary report on the Solomonic gate at Gezer in *BA*, 34 [1971], 112-120, Figs. 1, 2, and 8.)

A few remarks about chronological dates used in this book may be in order. It is well known that ancient chronology is a controversial subject, and that not all dates for ancient events are well established. Hence, one cannot expect an archaeologist to provide the last word on ancient dates. I would therefore not quarrel with the author for using 926-925 B.C. (p. xi) as the date for Solomon's death had she given that as her opinion. But when she calls it "the first fixed date" (p. x)—a date about which such experts as E. R. Thiele (931 B.C.) and W. F. Albright (922 B.C.) disagreed by nine years—her claim requires an explanation or defense, which she does not provide, and must therefore be questioned. In one place she speaks of a "destruction" of Jerusalem by the Babylonians in 598 B.C. (p. xi) and claims in another passage that "the Temple had been partially sacked in 598 B.C." (p. 148). The facts are that we have not the slightest evidence that the Babylonians even partially destroyed Jerusalem or its Temple at that time, although they carried away many Temple treasures, the young King Jehoiachin who had surrendered with his family, and 10,000 other soldiers and craftsmen (2 Ki 24:8-16; 2 Chr 36:9, 10). Furthermore, the date of this event is March 597 (not 598), according to the Babylonian Chronicle published by Donald J. Wiseman in 1956. The completion of the Jerusalem Temple under Zerubbabel took place in March/April 515 B.C. (in Adar of the 6th year of Darius I), according to Ezr 6:15, and not in 516, as is said on p. 150; thus the [circa] preceding the correct date 515 on p. 40 is superfluous. Nehemiah rebuilt the wall of Jerusalem in the 20th year of Artaxerxes, which would be 444 B.C., and not 440 (p. 150), if Artaxerxes I is meant in the book of Neh. Samaria was captured not by Sargon III (p. xi), but by Sargon II.

The few remarks of criticism made in this review should not overshadow the fact that Kenyon's *Royal Cities* is an excellent book which cannot be too highly recommended.

Andrews University

SIEGFRIED H. HORN

Kraus, Hans-Joachim. *Die Biblische Theologie: Ihre Geschichte und Problematik*. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1970. xvi + 407 pp. DM 44.00.

This is a book of major importance dealing with the history and problems of the discipline of biblical theology. It grew out of the present crisis of biblical theology and the aim is to come to grips with the question of overcoming the split between OT theology and NT theology into which biblical theology was divided since the beginning of the 19th century.

Professor Kraus believes that the first steps in the direction of a biblical theology comprising both the Old and New Testaments must be taken by