

about whether the failed, extravagant claims of restoration prophecies should apply to the church or to a religiously-revived modern Israel (the prophetic literature itself, in my opinion, allows for other alternatives) and moves to questions of greater significance. These have to do with the language of restoration itself and with form-critical categories involving cultic pilgrimage songs. He argues in favor of a creative transmutation from motifs of exodus and redemption from Egypt to those of pilgrimage and procession toward Zion. Although based on a fairly quick and cursory treatment of available sources, the point is worth further investigation.

Returning to the book as a whole, two notes on problematical details deserve mention. The volume has no indexes, an omission which is always unfortunate and that typically diminishes the practical usefulness of a work like this. Scripture and subject indexes would have proven helpful. Typographical errors, although rare, did appear in a few places.

Overall, the book merits our attention and represents well the tradition of evangelical, biblical scholarship influenced to a large degree by the mentor of many of these students of scripture, Roland K. Harrison. It provides a fitting tribute to him and his work.

Walla Walla College  
College Place, WA 99324

DOUGLAS R. CLARK

Guelich, Robert A. *Mark 1-8:26*. Word Biblical Commentary, vol. 34A. Dallas, TX: Word Books, 1989. xliii + 454 pp. \$24.99.

The first volume of Robert Guelich's commentary on Mark continues the tradition of producing multi-volume works on relatively short biblical texts. The decision to divide the two volumes at 8:26 is, of course, determined by the location of the confession of Peter at Caesarea Philippi (8:27-30), which introduces the Marcan passion narrative. Furthermore, it approximates the center of the Gospel (1:1-8:26 contains 311 verses, while 8:27-16:8 has 355). Guelich assumes Marcan canonical priority and the existence of the Saying's Gospel (Q). Both premises affect the types of observations and arguments that follow. Guelich's regular observations of source and redaction critical issues, combined with a proposed historical setting for the Gospel (a Christian community under duress and struggling with questions of faith), gently but firmly coax hesitant readers to observe Mark's adaptation of traditional Jesus materials in order to address the new and different needs of a Christian community that already finds itself removed from the world of Jesus in significant ways.

Bibliographic materials apparently extend from 1907 to 1987. Unfortunately, Burton L. Mack's *A Myth of Innocence* did not appear until 1988 and is not engaged in the dialogue. Guelich is conversant with the literature

on the Gospel of Mark. His helpful orientations to the basic positions scholarship has taken historically will be appreciated by those who have not followed carefully the rise and development of these positions.

Contrary to some recent works on Mark, this commentary has followed traditional format by handling the text sequentially. While this format has the advantage of affording ease in locating discussion of a given verse, it has the twofold disadvantage of complicating the presentation of *topoi* more effectively presented thematically and of obscuring for the casual reader the necessity and forcefulness of critical observation.

I characterize Guelich's commentary as conservative, conversant, and coquettish—conservative, since his approach is affirmative of the foundational essence of the gospel story for Christians; conversant, because his bibliographic materials and discussions interact with scholarly work on the Gospel of Mark at all levels; coquettish, because he repeatedly flirts with provocative ideas but regularly returns to secure conventions that do not compromise the “historical roots” (see, for example, discussions of the possibility and concomitant denial of Marcan- or community-created pericopae for Mark 1 on pp. 18 [“wilderness”], 23-24 [“the Greater One”], 30-31 [revelatory scene at baptism, cf. 35], 37 [temptation story], 44 [content of Jesus' preaching], 49 [content of Mark 1:19-20], 68 [content of Mark 1:35-39] etc.).

However, since Guelich frequently admits to theological and redactional editing of the texts by their authors/editors, it seems relevant to ask (whether one's perspective be fundamentalist, evangelical, or liberal) whether this manipulation has not already compromised whatever “historicity” was supposed to be protected. This appears to challenge, if not render meaningless, those frequent assurances that “traditional” material goes back to Jesus' own ministry. Thus Guelich's confidence in the accessibility of the historical Jesus is at times surprising. He is well aware of the likelihood of these criticisms and mentions that he expects to satisfy neither the liberals (because he did not go far enough) nor the conservatives (because he went too far).

Guelich is to be praised for his efforts at engaging dialogue between conservative believers as readers of the Gospel of Mark and Marcan scholarship, and for attempting to integrate the issues of Marcan scholarship within the conservative tradition. The difficulty of this undertaking is evident in the pages of this volume.

This commentary should provide a gentle introduction to the range of textual, cultural, historical, and theological issues that are encountered when one attempts to hear the text of Mark within its context rather than assuming the composite interweaving of all four Gospel accounts that has been so much a part of typical popular treatment of the second Gospel.

Guelich's work continues the series' tradition of producing conservatively-oriented, high-quality biblical scholarship that is conversant with the

history of scholarship, candid with the serious questions, yet committed to the significance and relevance of the text for modern readers.

Walla Walla College  
College Place, WA 99324

RONALD L. JOLLIFFE

Hartley, John E. *The Book of Job*. The New International Critical Commentary on the Old Testament. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1988. xiv + 591 pp. \$27.95.

One opens each new volume of a major commentary series with anticipation. Does the author have enough new material to warrant another commentary? John Hartley's volume is a welcome answer in the affirmative. It is good enough to make the standard works on Job appear ancient.

The commentary, in good evangelical tradition, proposes to meet the needs of pastors, scholars, and students. It succeeds by balancing technical information with devotional and homiletical suggestions.

The commentary's fairly extensive introduction has the usual comments on date and authorship, etc., but it also includes an interesting section citing parallels with other ancient literatures of the East. Another useful section charts the affinities of the book of Job with other OT books—especially Isaiah. The introduction concludes with a helpful seven-page bibliography of the most important works. This is the only bibliography in the volume, though the text has references that are not in the bibliography.

The subject index is followed by an index of authors quoted and a scripture index. Intertestamental works and nonbiblical texts are indexed as well. Concluding the indexes are one listing Hebrew verbs and another composed of extrabiblical words (Akkadian and Ugaritic). These are features of thorough work and enhance the volume's usefulness.

The main commentary consists of an introduction to the section of Job under discussion, the text, and exegesis. The comments are fairly brief but insightful. Most of the technical data are relegated to the somewhat extensive footnotes.

Hartley says that the author of Job "has no sacred cows to protect" (p. vii). A similar type of openness can be credited to Hartley, who often refrains from taking a position.

In discussing authorship, Hartley enumerates the characteristics of the author, but fails to name a possibility. He concludes that the author has a large vocabulary, is acquainted with nature, is knowledgeable of Egypt, etc.; but he does not even mention the tradition of the Jews and the early church that sets forth Moses as the author. In addition, the chart of parallels between the phraseology of Job and other OT books does not list parallels with the Pentateuch.