

abilities." This commentator's existential concern is further demonstrated by his choice of whimsical titles, such as "God Has No Grandchildren (2 Tim 1:3-5)," "Hanging Up the Spikes (4:6-8)," and "When Everyone Lets You Down (4:14-18)."

Although I personally found much of the material in this commentary to be somewhat superficial, there were some high points that I found greatly rewarding. The author's comments on Onesiphorus (2 Tim 1:15-18) and on the soldier, athlete, and farmer imagery (2:3-7) were enriching and challenging to me personally, and, by themselves, made the time spent in examining this volume well repaid.

Initially, I had considerable concern that the New KJV had been selected as the source for the biblical text. But as I used this volume in an adult Bible class, I felt better about the choice. The KJV is still the version of preference for a large number of churchgoers, and the New KJV retains both the literary beauty of the old English and the basic text of the KJV while modifying the language where it is no longer readily understood. Thus, for the audience of *The Communicator's Commentary* the choice would appear to work quite well, even though the New KJV is not based on the best manuscripts.

Demarest's approach is basically conservative. He accepts Pauline authorship of the Pastoral Epistles, and considers the Bible to be God's inspired word in a very high sense. He appears to be a former dispensationalist who is now open to other approaches to the biblical text. Nevertheless, he is still sympathetic to the dispensationalist approach, and individuals of that persuasion will not find this volume offensive. On the other hand, those who are not comfortable with dispensationalism will find his openness to other perspectives sufficient to appreciate the book, even in his discussion of 2 Thess 2. After all, his main concern is practical Christianity, not theological fine-points.

While this commentary does not reach the heights of Barclay's famed NT commentaries, it does reflect some of the more recent insights of NT scholarship; and I feel that I can recommend it as a valuable addition to the library of any preacher or lay person who wants to be more effective in communicating biblical insights to modern-day Christians.

Andrews University

JON PAULIEN

Jones, Gwilym H. *1 and 2 Kings*, vol. 1. *The New Century Bible Commentary*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1984. lii + 300 pp. Paperback, \$7.95.

Following an extensive bibliography of thirty-eight pages, Jones takes up different aspects of technical introduction to the books of Kings. The

first major topic he discusses is textual criticism. Here he rather uncritically accepts F. M. Cross's particular theory of local Hebrew text types. One line of his support for this is found in the next section of the commentary, where Jones accepts the theory of Cross's student J. D. Shenkel that the Old Greek chronology preserves evidence for a more original Hebrew *vorlage* than does the MT. Some balance to this one-sided presentation is given in the third section, where Jones has noted D. W. Gooding's studies indicating the distinctly secondary nature of a number of passages in the LXX.

Jones turns next to the subject of chronology (pp. 9-28). This section is out of the order in which it should appear. It would more logically have followed the next section, which treats literary criticism (pp. 28-77), for Jones's method of handling the chronology of Israel becomes clear only when one understands his views on literary criticism. Chronological discrepancies are expected—yes, even demanded—by Jones's theory (pp. 41, 62, and *passim*). With this qualification in mind, we can examine his chronology.

As Jones points out, English works on the period of the Divided Monarchy commonly follow either the chronology of Edwin R. Thiele or that of W. F. Albright. German works make more use of the system of Joachim Begrich. Jones himself adopts, instead, the system of K. T. Andersen, with some of his own modifications. To pose the problem here, Jones begins by citing the excess of regnal years when they are measured by the synchronisms between the two kingdoms. He is inaccurate in the third of the three cases he cites, for the excess from Hezekiah to Josiah is a decade, not two years (pp. 11, 26; cf. D. N. Freedman, *The Bible and the Ancient Near East*, p. 277). He also cites the date of Sennacherib's campaign against Judah as 705 B.C., probably a typographical error for 701 (p. 11).

Chronological principles are examined next. The first is that of antedating and postdating. Contrary to what Jones states here, antedating was practiced throughout Egyptian history, not just "during certain periods" (p. 12). He holds that the northern kingdom held to antedating throughout its existence, and places the transition to postdating in Judah in the mid-seventh century. He next moves to the principle of "rounding off years." By this, he means that fractions of years were rounded off to the next lowest number. This view contradicts the biblical evidence, for inclusive reckoning (never mentioned by him) rounds off fractions of years to the next highest number (cf. 2 Kgs 18:9-10).

Jones is two-thirds correct for the calendars employed. He accepts a spring calendar for the northern kingdom and a fall calendar for the southern kingdom. In this he is correct, except that he switches to a spring calendar for the southern kingdom, which is not correct. Internal evidence and external correlations with Nebuchadnezzar's chronicle indicate that Judah continued to use a fall calendar until it came to an end (cf. S. H. Horn, in *AUSS* 5 [1967]: 12-27, an article not cited in Jones's bibliography).

Jones rejects the proposal of Thiele that coregencies were employed in the ancient kingdom of Judah, and his failure to employ this principle naturally makes him unable to reconcile a number of the chronological data in Kings. Jones goes along with J. M. Miller (*JBL* 85 [1966]:441-454, and 86 [1967]:276-288) in favoring a number of divergent chronological readings from the LXX over those of the MT, and holds that when one does this, there is no chronological necessity for coregencies (p. 21). This observation is quite inaccurate. In the period from Jehu onwards, there are no divergencies between the LXX and the MT, but major chronological discrepancies remain there if one does not employ coregencies to resolve them.

In fact, this is the most difficult period of OT chronology, and the LXX does not help at all. Jones's denial that there is any evidence for coregencies in Kings (outside of Jotham's coregency during Azariah's leprosy) leads him to the LXX when he comes to the double dates in the MT for the accession of Jehoram of Israel. But in smoothing out the data, he disregards one of them. The other way to look at this set of double dates is that they are evidence for a further coregency, as are the double-dated inscriptions in Egypt.

Two chronological errors occur in the discussion of the period from 841 to 722: Jehoash paid tribute to Adad-nirari in 805, not 796 (Shea, *JCS* 30 [1978]:101-113); and Hoshea paid tribute to Tiglath-pileser in 732, the year that Damascus fell, not in 731.

As a conclusion to the section on chronology, Jones provides a chart for his dates for the kings of Israel and Judah. Only a few of the problems present in this list can be noted here: (1) Jones dates the death of Ahab in 854, a year before he fought Shalmaneser III at the battle of Qarqar (at which Ahab was present, according to Shalmaneser's own inscriptions). (2) Jones dates the accession of Jehoash as 799, when the stela of Adad-nirari indicates that Jehoash was already on the throne by 805. (3) Jones dates Hezekiah's rule from 715 to 697, in spite of the fact that 2 Kgs 18:2 assigns this ruler a reign of 29 years. All in all, a distinctly inferior chronology has been produced here.

The next major section in the volume deals with literary criticism (pp. 29-77). This is an up-to-date and thorough synthesis of German thought on this subject. In general, Jones is a maximalist in terms of the number of sources and redactors for which he makes allowance as lying behind the present form of the canonical text. He rejects Martin Noth's concept of one deuteronomic history (pp. 25-40), he rejects the two editions of the deuteronomic history as held by F. M. Cross (pp. 31-34), he rejects the two-source and two-redactor theory of A. Jepsen (pp. 42-43), and he finally ends up with the three lines of deuteronomic sources proposed by R. Smend, Jr.—DtrH(istorical), DtrP(rophetic), and DtrN(omistic). This procedure sorts out the materials in Kings according to the categories into which they fall: history, prophecy, and law. To hold to such literary-

source exclusivism seems simplistic, since it means that one writer or his school could not have written or collected materials about both law and prophecy, another about both prophecy and history, and another about both history and law. The result is one of having narrow literary furrows indeed.

Given the extent of this section of the book, only a few passing observations concerning it must suffice here. The first impression that comes is what a provincial exercise this is. The interpretation of recent German OT scholarship is given in extensive detail, while contributions made by British, French, American, and Israeli scholars on this subject are negligible (and when they are mentioned, they are only of peripheral interest to the author).

Second, it is of interest to see how little attention Jones pays to recent conservative scholarship on the book of Deuteronomy. Since he follows a standard literary-critical date of the seventh century for D, some cognizance should have been taken of the covenant structure of Deuteronomy which points towards a much earlier date for it, as has been called to the attention in the studies of Meredith Kline, K. A. Kitchen, and Peter C. Craigie.

Third, there are some transparent contradictions in this kind of work. One example of this is the Succession Narrative in 1 Kgs 1-2. Jones insists that this narrative should be retained with 2 Sam 9-20 as part of the Court History (p. 49), but then he goes on to give an extensive description (pp. 50-57) of the ways in which 1 Kgs 1-2 differs from 2 Sam 9-20. If there is such a great difference, why should the former be retained with the latter?

Fourth and finally, note should be taken of the extent to which this approach to literary criticism produces an excessive atomization of the text. A classic case in point here is the Elisha cycle. Concerning this, Jones follows the maximalist approach of H.-C. Schmitt (p. 73), which breaks down the Elisha cycle into so many bits, pieces, sources, redactors, and places of origin (pp. 69-73) that it is difficult to imagine how all the king's men could have gotten this humpty-dumpty back together again. If this approach is correct, then one more miracle should be included in the Elisha cycle—the miracle of how all these disparate pieces could ever have come together in their present canonical form.

The brief introductory section on the theology of Kings does not really present a theology of these books. Rather, it presents theologies of the different sources which are thought to have gone into making up the books of Kings (based on Jones's ideas set forth in the foregoing section on literary criticism). Jones ends up closest to, but not completely accepting, R. D. Nelson's dual theology of an optimistic pre-exilic (Josianic) source, and a pessimistic exilic source (p. 81).

Only random observations may be made on select points in the verse-by-verse commentary which follows the introductory sections. The commen-

tary in this first volume on 1 and 2 Kings carries only from the reign of Solomon to that of Ahab in 1 Kgs 16. (Vol. 2 takes up at that point.)

The literary-critical theories treated in the introduction are regularly taken over into the commentary section. As an example, the treatment given to Solomon's encounter with God at Gibeon, as recorded in 1 Kgs 3:1-15, may be noted. Concerning this encounter, Jones observes, "The kernel of the present narrative is the vision in vv. 4-15; but in its present form it is not a literary unit, and has clearly been expanded" (p. 120). He goes on to suggest a three-stage compilation of it. Also, Jones considers the story of Solomon and Sheba to be an exaggerated tradition from a popular legend (p. 220), and he poses at least three stages in its development, too.

This kind of literary critical work leads to some very negative historical judgments. Jones is at pains to eliminate all gold from Solomon's temple, attributing all such references to later sources (pp. 169, 171, 178). One of the most bizarre and nihilistic theories cited here is the one taken over from K. Rupprecht, who has, according to Jones, "convincingly argued" (p. 162) that neither David nor Solomon had anything to do with building a new temple in Jerusalem; they simply took over and renovated a Jebusite temple that was already standing in the city before their time (p. 152). Nathan's part in the succession narrative of 1 Kgs 1 comes off very poorly, too: "Many points in the narrative suggest that the oath is completely fabricated by Nathan, who was taking advantage of David's senility; it seems to be a case of Nathan suggesting the oath, rather than Bathsheba remembering it" (p. 93).

We have already noticed above how Jones's literary criticism has affected his chronology. This shows up in the body of the commentary in a somewhat contradictory fashion, in the case of both the accession and death of Solomon. In his comment on Solomon's death, Jones notes, "The death of Solomon cannot be dated with certainty; proposed dates vary between 926 B.C. . . . and 932 B.C." (p. 247). Yet, in his earlier chronological chart he places the accessions of Jeroboam and Rehoboam at the death of Solomon in 932 B.C., without qualification (p. 28). The datum for the commencement of the construction of the temple at the beginning of Solomon's reign receives a similar kind of treatment. For Jones, the 480 years mentioned in 1 Kgs 6:1 are an "editorial concoction" (p. 162).

The argument from silence is also abused in this commentary. Jones's treatment of the Queen of Sheba provides an example. Here he first notes, correctly, that the queens of the Arab tribes located to the south of Palestine were mentioned in Assyrian texts of the eighth and seventh centuries B.C. But then he goes on to say that these "are dated in a later period; there is no attestation to a queen in Arabia in Solomon's time" (p. 221). What he fails to mention here is that there are no South Arabian inscriptions from the tenth and ninth centuries B.C., and Assyrian references to the people

there in that period are lacking because the Assyrians were not in contact with them at that time. Of similar nature is Jones's comment that because Tartessos does not occur in inscriptions until the end of the ninth century B.C., Solomon's ships could not have traded with it in the tenth century B.C. (p. 228).

Jones correctly identifies Siamun as the most likely candidate for the Pharaoh who gave his daughter to marry Solomon (p. 123). He also correctly identifies several of the officers' titles in Solomon's court as deriving ultimately from Egypt (p. 137). (Incidentally, a map for the provincial districts of Solomon would have been helpful.) For historical inaccuracies, however, one may note the ultra-high date for the Ahiram sarcophagus from Byblos, ca. 1299 B.C. (p. 153; why not ca. 1300 B.C.?). Concerning geography, ancient Joppa is located under modern Jaffa, not at Tell Qasile, which was only an Iron I settlement of Philistines (p. 157). And the Sumerian word for palace is transliterated incorrectly on p. 168.

In general, Jones gives a rather negative evaluation of the character of the individuals mentioned in the narratives of 1 Kings. The case of Nathan has already been noted above. In addition, we may observe such items as these: Solomon comes off as a bloodthirsty powermonger in 1 Kgs 2 (pp. 107-118), and the Testament of David was inserted here later to rationalize his conduct (p. 106). Jones's literary criticism has, however, exonerated Solomon from any guilt in connection with the idolatry of his wives: "It may be that the king's wives and his idolatry were not linked together in the original tradition, nor were they necessarily condemned" (p. 233).

Jones gives rather short shrift to ancient Israelite ingenuity, and he favors a Phoenician origin of the temple plan. Even though it is "impossible to point to an exact replica of the Solomonic construction" outside of Israel, to Jones it still is certain that "Solomon was dependent upon the tradition of temple building in the Syro-Phoenician area for the architectural design of his Temple" (p. 162). As a matter of fact, the measurements of the temple really were multiples of those taken from the tabernacle; but, of course, Jones would naturally consider that a late literary creation too. He misunderstands the nature of the use of three Phoenician month names in the temple construction narrative (pp. 173, 193). These actually are evidence for an early date, rather than a late one, for these references in the text.

Jones also thinks that Solomon's ships did not go very far during their three-year journey on the Red Sea. However, the pattern of travel of Solomon's fleet fits rather well with the same pattern followed by Egyptian ships sailing on that same body of water, because of the nature of the shifts in the winds and tides that occur there.

The two main problems with this commentary are its excessively enthusiastic acceptance of literary-critical and tradition-history theories, and its

excessively negative evaluation of the historicity of the biblical narratives. It would be difficult in the extreme to write any kind of history of Israel during the times of the kings using this commentary as a basis for its historiography. This commentary is mainly useful for its up-to-date review of the literary-critical theories on the deuteronomic history and their application to individual passages in Kings. It is generally inferior, however, to previous commentaries on Kings and to the other new volume in this same series (Ezra-Nehemiah-Esther) reviewed elsewhere in this journal.

Andrews University

WILLIAM H. SHEA

Oberman, Heiko A. *The Roots of Anti-Semitism: In the Age of Renaissance and Reformation*. Philadelphia, Pa.: Fortress Press, 1984. xii+ 163 pp. \$13.95.

This volume is an eminently readable English translation of Oberman's *Wurzeln des Antisemitismus. Christenangst und Judenplage im Zeitalter von Humanismus und Reformation* (Berlin: Severin und Siedler, 1981). The author originally intended to write on the topic "Luther and the Jews," but found it necessary to broaden the scope to "Europe and the Jews" (pp. ix-xi). The publication is divided into three main divisions, with six chapters in each.

In Part I (pp. 17-64), the author covers broadly, in five chapters, the attitudes towards the Jews just prior to, and concurrent with, Luther's own expressions concerning them, his sixth chapter being devoted to the topic "Luther Speaks Out." The earlier chapters in this main division give attention to the stance and remarks of such prominent figures as Johannes Reuchlin, Johannes Pfefferkorn, and Desiderius Erasmus.

The era was one of considerable social ferment, and in Part II (pp. 65-87) Oberman duly takes note of the social situation as evidenced in social protest, anti-Jewish sermonizing, agitational literature, etc. Among his six chapters in this division of the volume, the following topics are included: "Luther and the *Zeitgeist*," "Agitation and Jew-Baiting," and "Fear of the Jews: Between Piety and Superstition" (chaps. 9, 11, and 12, respectively).

Luther's own expressions and attitudes receive a significant portion of Oberman's treatment, especially in Part III (pp. 93-137). Among specific topics treated in this final main division of the work is "The Harshness of the Old Luther" (chap. 16), a topic which has gained an increasing amount of attention in recent years.

This somewhat slender volume is well documented with endnotes, and five short indexes cover "Persons," "Places," "Subjects," citations of "Authors/Editors," and citations to the "Weimar Edition of Luther's