

One major point in Beegle's concluding chapter, "The Blessed Hope," has already been reviewed above. It remains here only to observe that this chapter also takes note very briefly of a number of groups and individuals such as Mormons, Jehovah's Witnesses, modern clairvoyants, Herbert W. Armstrong's Worldwide Church of God, British Israelism, etc. (see pp. 245-248).

All in all, Beegle's book does give a valuable overview of certain facets of the topic he has chosen to treat—superficial and one-sided as the treatment too frequently is. Perhaps the volume will serve in certain circles as a basis for "individual and group study," as the author hopes (p. 2). But as to the major objectives outlined in his Introduction on pp. 1-2, it seems to this reviewer that the publication has fallen far short—except possibly in its polemical tone. Regarding this tone, Beegle has evidently made an attempt to be kind, though naturally forthright, in his critique of other views, and this is commendable. However, there are a number of times when an evident overcharge of emotion shows through, in a way hardly appropriate for a work of this sort (as just one instance, I may mention the use on p. 174 of the expression "another weasel explanation"). Also there appears occasionally to be an over-colloquialism (as e.g., the phrase on p. 36, "the preacher's kid").

The bibliography is limited (pp. 257-258), but the book is rather well indexed in both its general and scriptural indexes (pp. 259-274).

Andrews University

KENNETH A. STRAND

Blenkinsopp, Joseph. *Prophecy and Canon*. Notre Dame and London: University of Notre Dame Press, 1977. xi + 206 pp. \$12.95.

Blenkinsopp's study has grown out of his dissatisfaction with the failure of OT studies to take adequate account of the complexity of the OT, a situation resulting from an inadequate methodology which has left the OT largely unexplained. It is Blenkinsopp's purpose to suggest ways that a consideration of the processes and forces involved in the formation of the Hebrew Bible may bear upon the questions of biblical theology and the emergence of Judaism.

Blenkinsopp's major argument is that the tension between "normative order" and prophecy contributes substantially to the origins of Judaism, and that the present state of the Hebrew canon reflects the way this tension was dealt with. The canon came into existence because of conflicting claims to authority, especially in the later monarchical period, involving the right to mediate and interpret the tradition. The claims of "free prophecy" to interpret the tradition for present situations is met with "official versions" of the normative order which eventually developed into the Pentateuch. Prophecy, however, had already established itself as a force to be reckoned with, a

situation to which scribalism reacted by assimilating and redefining prophecy in an attempt to incorporate prophecy into its own institutional framework. Scribalism, convinced of the inability of prophecy to provide a stable base for the community, actually contributed to the eclipse of prophecy through its official, authoritative, and prescriptive versions of the archaic normative order.

Thus, according to Blenkinsopp, the first stage in the formation of the canon and the beginning of the process that led to Judaism was the Levitical-scribal production of Deuteronomy. The second stage was the Priestly work which imposed its own institutional structure and concerns on the J E epos. A final stage of redaction involving the incorporation of the Deuteronomic law book into the Priestly expansion represents the last stage in the formation of the Pentateuch.

While prophecy declined in prestige and eventually disappeared during the period of the Second Temple, written works of earlier prophecy were being collected. The initial collections were probably made by the Deuteronomists, with later expansion and redaction of the prophetic materials revealing a shift towards eschatology, a process which contributed to the development of apocalyptic. Eventually the prophetic canon was placed alongside the Pentateuch, evidencing an unresolved tension and providing a balance between "law and prophecy," "institution and charisma," and "the claims of the past and those of the future."

The Writings reflect the rise of the sages to prominence during the Second Temple period and their successful claim to mediate revelation in their own literary forms. Except for Daniel, the Writings are examples of theocratically acceptable prophecy (as opposed to eschatological and millenarian interpretations which were excluded, lost, or destroyed). Once again the question of authority—what group is in power, and which is not—affected this development.

While Blenkinsopp speculates brilliantly about the origin and development of early Judaism in this work, of chief interest to the biblical theologian is the discussion of the effect of canon criticism on the question of biblical authority. Granting the validity of canon criticism, the unity and authority of the Bible cannot simply be understood as given theological data; rather the problem of authority is inseparable from the problems prophecy underwent during the later monarchical period. Careful attention will have to be paid to the question of the unresolved tension between religious claims. Rather than appealing to a canon for authority, we should look to the way it mediates the tradition.

This work is a response to the call to canon criticism in which Blenkinsopp applies a methodology derived from the social sciences to the complex documentary nature of the OT with its internal problems. Along with James A. Sanders' *Torah and Canon*, and *Canon and Authority* (George W. Coats and Burke O. Long, eds.), it provides an excellent example of this emerging

emphasis in biblical studies. Many conservative theologians will react negatively to nearly all aspects of this work, because the possibility of establishing biblical authority on a unified and consistent testimony of scripture has been put a little further beyond reach by this new development in criticism. Nevertheless, it should be recognized that Blenkinsopp is not rejecting the place of the canon in the discussion of authority from within the canonical process itself. Another plus for this work is the identification of the many problems where additional work needs to be done. This is of special importance for those wishing to contribute to this new field of criticism.

The following printing errors were noted: p. 107, "timer" for "time"; p. 125, "eleswhere" for "elsewhere."

Andrews University

A. JOSEF GREIG

Brooks, James A., and Winbery, Carlton L. *Syntax of New Testament Greek*. Washington, D. C.: University Press of America, 1978. vi + 179 pp. Paperback, \$8.50.

There has been for some time a need for a replacement of Dana and Mantey, *A Manual Grammar of the Greek New Testament* (New York, 1927). Blass-Debrunner-Funk, *Grammar of New Testament Greek* (Chicago, 1961), and Turner's volume on Syntax in the Moulton series, *Grammar of New Testament Greek*, vol. 3 (Edinburgh, 1963), continue to maintain their place as the standard reference works for syntax, but a volume more usable for the second-year student to replace Dana and Mantey has been needed. For this, Brooks' and Winbery's publication furnishes a decided improvement.

The volume is divided into three parts. Part I deals with the Substantive, Part II with the Verb, and Part III with the Greek Sentence. A Subject and Scripture Index complete the book. The most fruitful section is Part I. Parts II and III are helpful, but have largely what one would have expected.

Written by Baptists, the case system is that of Robertson, as might be expected, but cross-reference is made to the five-case system. This may prove somewhat confusing to the student brought up on grammars that use the five-case system and who may later have occasion to refer to Blass-Debrunner-Funk and Turner.

One decided advantage over Dana and Mantey is the fact that more examples have been provided to illustrate the usage of the different case-functions. The explanations are generally clear, but while it is helpful to list all the different types of case usage, it may be a bit overwhelming for the beginning student to find that there are thirteen different types of accusatives, not to mention the sub-groups under some of these.