

Antioch was the place where Peter triumphed over Paul by holding the middle ground between Paul and James, and that Rome was the place where a more mature Paul moved closer to Peter's position and where both of these apostles together became martyrs at the hands of extremists to the right of James. The authors, to their credit, admit all along that they are "surmising," "suspecting," "proposing," and "conjecturing." And, indeed, they are.

In the case of both Brown and Meier, the most hypothetical element in their reconstruction is the second generation. The linking of Matthew to Antioch, and of Hebrews to Rome, is not quite convincing. And Meier's reconstruction of the first generation at Antioch from two verses in Galatians is, to say the least, quite audacious. Even while agreeing with Meier about Paul's defeat, Brown is more cautious on the question of Paul's later ties to Antioch. But Brown, on the other hand, wishing to find in Romans and in 1 Peter antecedents for the prominence given to church structure in 1 Clement, compares Romans and 1 Peter on this motif (pp. 138-139) by bringing in the pastorals as evidence!

In his typology, Brown has made a significant suggestion, worthy of further exploration. If it is well received, the way in which early Christians are to be classified within these coordinates will, I am sure, remain the subject of much debate.

If (a well-used word throughout the book) the objective of the authors is to encourage greater tolerance within modern Christianity by recognizing diversity within primitive Christianity, then the point is well made and valid. If, on the other hand, the objective is to say that in the universalizing of apostolic succession, an ecclesiastical hierarchy, and the preservation of the levitical ideals, Clement and Ignatius preserved what is central to the gospel and created a Christianity that could survive—as if survival were the ultimate criterion—, then the point is neither made nor valid.

Saint Mary's College
Notre Dame, Indiana 46556

HEROLD WEISS

Craigie, Peter C. *Psalms 1-50*. Word Biblical Commentary, vol. 19. Waco, Texas: Word Books, 1983. 378 pp. \$19.95.

This commentary on the first third of the Psalter is one of a number of volumes that have already appeared in this new commentary series. The other two commentaries on the Psalter are by other authors, one of them having already appeared.

The present volume begins with a rather brief introduction to the Psalter. This introduction is mainly of interest because eight of the thirty

pages deal with the subject of the use of Ugaritic texts in the translation and study of the Psalms. The position adopted by the author represents largely a rejection of the rather far-reaching work of M. Dahood (recently deceased), in which Ugaritic was incorporated into the study of the Psalms on an extensive scale. This rejection is all the more interesting because Craigie is noted also for his contributions to that field of study.

The format employed in the body of this commentary is quite serviceable. Each psalm is introduced with a brief bibliography, followed by the author's own translation of the text, and then translational notes in fine print. Next, the first of three main sections dealing with each psalm bears the title "Form/Structure/Setting"; it describes the type of psalm and gives an outline of the psalm. The second main section in treating each psalm is labeled "Comment"; it contains what might be called "exegesis," in the broader sense of the term. Finally, the study of each psalm ends with a section called "Explanation," wherein are presented theological observations on the psalm.

The theological stance of the author, and of this commentary series in general, is what might be classified as "middle of the road," with some leanings toward a conservative position. The thought content of the studies on the individual psalms can be strongly recommended for containing a generally rich variety of observations and insights on the text at all levels of investigation. As with any work of this scope, there naturally are many items upon which one could make comment; but just a few of these may here be noted.

The analysis of Ps 2 as a royal psalm is especially good, and it has received one of the longer treatments in the commentary (pp. 62-69). Craigie's messianic connections for this psalm are, however, a little more indirect than this reviewer sees them. It would appear that Craigie has employed the analytical outlines from H. Ridderbos's commentary, more than any other, but these outlines are generally quite good.

A theme which Craigie likes to emphasize, where it crops up, is the self-destruction of the wicked. The anguish of the one suffering from an illness has been captured well in Ps 6 (p. 93), but in the theological comment on this psalm, the author gets carried away with the subject of Sheol, which really only occupies one bicolon in the poem (vs. 6). With respect to Ps 8 (pp. 104-113), I differ with Craigie as to where the poetic units of vs. 2 should be divided, but he has correctly noted—in contrast to other commentators—the chiasmic use of the verbal tenses in vs. 7.

As a general observation on this commentary, I would say that the type of Hebrew characters used in it is not very attractive. Also, Craigie does not always appear to be consistent in the number of stress accents he assigns to construct chains. Furthermore, at times he translates the same Hebrew word with different English words, thus disrupting the connection

which the original poet had in mind. The treatment given in Ps 12, vss. 2 and 6, provides a case of this (pp. 135-136).

In Ps 13, Craigie sees the distress depicted there as being brought on "perhaps by grave illness" (p. 141), but there is no clearcut indication in the text for that sort of connection. Also, the movement from the singular to plural enemies in vs. 5 of this poem could simply be a case of poetic numerical progression, rather than the other explanations that are here provided (pp. 142-143). And with regard to the differences between the duplicate psalms, 14 and 53, whereas Craigie prefers the explanation of a corrupt text (p. 146), I would favor editorial preference as the explanation for these differences.

In regard to Pss 20 and 21, a stronger case than is presented in this commentary could be made for a direct connection, on either historical or thematic grounds, between these two psalms (pp. 184-193). The first of these psalms describes the king going out to battle, and the second describes the king coming in from battle. Even the distribution of the poetic units in the outline of these two poems is quite similar. Craigie hints at this relationship, but he never quite latches onto it.

With respect to Ps 22 (pp. 194-203), I view this psalm as more directly messianic in prophetic character than Craigie does. For Ps 23 (pp. 203-209), he follows D. N. Freedman in seeing the Exodus motif as foremost, whereas I would see it as secondary. A stronger view of Ps 24 (pp. 209-215) than the one expressed in this commentary would propose that this psalm was written directly, in part at least, as a polemic against Canaanite religion. Regarding Ps 25, Craigie rejects the Möller-Ruppert hypothesis that this poem was written according to a chiasmic literary structure (see pp. 217-218), whereas a more detailed study of the psalm appears to provide further evidence in support of that hypothesis.

Craigie's treatment of Ps 29 (pp. 241-249) is especially good. This is a psalm on which he has written twice previously. He adopts a minority view that this psalm was not originally written as a Canaanite/Phoenician composition, but that rather it was written as a Yahwistic composition from the outset. This position is soundly argued and seems to me to be correct. In the bibliographical references at the beginning of his treatment of this psalm, he lists Freedman's excellent structural analysis of this poem, but he does not appear to have made much use of this analysis in his own treatment of Ps 29.

The foregoing few passing observations represent only random remarks, of which many more could obviously be made concerning a publication of this scope. These observations, moreover, should not be taken as so negative as to detract from the generally excellent quality of this commentary. Indeed, this volume is, to my way of thinking, the best medium-sized commentary on the Psalms presently on the market. It is

suitable as a textbook for seminary-level classes, a purpose for which I have personally already used it. The high level of treatment also makes this commentary suitable for the more general reader, though this reader may find some of the semi-technical language a bit difficult in spots.

A final criticism that may be of help to the publisher for any future printings takes the form of a comment on the inferior quality of the binding on my personal copy of this book. The binding broke open at the spine after only two weeks of heavy classroom use, and this revealed that but one small spot of glue had been placed there in the binding process. The bindings of my students' books appear to have held up better; but, of course, their copies of the commentary may not have been used to the same extent as mine!

Andrews University

WILLIAM H. SHEA

Falk, Marcia. *Love Lyrics from the Bible: A Translation and Literary Study of the Song of Songs*. Bible and Literature Series, no. 4. Sheffield, Eng.: Almond Press, 1982 (U.S.A. Distributor: Eisenbrauns, POB 275, Winona Lake, IN 46590). 142 pp. \$19.95/\$9.95.

The substance of this delightful book, now published in revised form by Almond Press, was originally a doctoral dissertation written under Edwin Good and submitted to Stanford University in 1976. As the title indicates, it is divided into a section with the unpointed MT on left-side pages and the author's original translation on right-side pages, followed by a section with six foundational linguistic and literary essays: "Translation as a Journey"; "The Literary Structure of the Song"; "Types of Love Lyric in the Song"; "The *wasf*"; "Contexts, Themes, and Motifs"; and "Notes to Poems." A well-selected 6½-page bibliography closes the study.

The translation in its entirety, but without the Hebrew text or critical study, was published by Harcourt Brace Jovanovich in 1977 under the title *The Song of Songs: Love Poems from the Bible*. Falk calls her fresh translation "a kind of journey; a 'carrying across' from one cultural-linguistic context to another" (p. 54). Thus, the aim of her dynamic translation is for fidelity "not to isolated images, but to the meanings of images in their cultural contexts and to the effects they might have had on their earliest audience" (p. 6). In the hands of less-skilled scholars, this sort of more-subjective approach is often disastrous, but Falk achieves her purpose brilliantly. While incorporating—or at least being sensitive to—all the important insights of scholarship, both old and new, her translation has succeeded where most of her predecessors have failed: Hers reads like authentic poetry.