

As a book, *Paul and the Popular Philosophers* is somewhat repetitive and lacks cohesion. What is offered here is a reprinting of essays published in sundry places between 1968 and 1986. That they are brought together between hard covers is an indication of their enduring value and of the new interest in the exploration of the non-Jewish literary context of early Christianity on the part of NT scholars. One could question the need for this publication, arguing that scholars interested in these matters have access to the original publications. It can be argued also, however, that these essays, in spite of their scholarly seriousness, do read very well, and nonspecialists will find profit and delight in them. Their publication in this more accessible form, therefore, is most welcome, even if scholars in the field will find here nothing new.

With Malherbe, the reader enters primarily the social world of the Cynics with its "hard" and "soft" philosophical versions and its locales at street corners and classrooms in well-to-do homes. Most of the essays deal with rather innocuous phrases, like Paul's *mē genoito* ("God forbid," "by no means," or some other idiomatic equivalent), his war and siege metaphors (2 Cor 10:3-6), his claims to have "fought with beasts at Ephesus" (1 Cor 15:32), or his declaration to have been "gentle . . . , like a nurse suckling her own children" at Thessalonica (1 Thess 2:6-7). Two of the essays represent fundamental studies for the forthcoming commentary on the pastoral epistles, which Malherbe is writing for the Hermeneia series. They explicate the polemical stance of these letters. One essay takes up Paul's claim, in his own defense (Acts 26:26), that Agrippa should already be well aware of his activities, since Paul had not carried out his ministry "in a corner."

This book does not give us a broad, sweeping argument for understanding Paul—and the disciples who defended his heritage—in a brilliant new way. Rather, we are given most balanced and careful studies of significant pointers to a more nuanced understanding of the most misunderstood Christian apostle. Anyone who is intent on coming to a better understanding of Paul's role in the early Christian movement is indebted to Malherbe for these exquisite distillations of his scholarly research.

Saint Mary's College
Notre Dame, IN 46556

HEROLD WEISS

Mann, C. S. *Mark: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. The Anchor Bible, vol. 27. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1986. xxv + 715 pp. \$20.00.

The merits of the Griesbach hypothesis, as revived by W. R. Farmer (that the Gospel of Mark was written after Matthew and Luke, and that it used them as written sources), have been vigorously argued for at least the

last twenty years. While it has been steadily attracting more adherents, it is only now that commentaries which use this hypothesis as their underlying assumption are appearing. C. S. Mann's commentary on Mark openly and enthusiastically espouses the Griesbach hypothesis, although the commentary is written in a manner that does not exclude readers who do not share Mann's position on the Synoptic problem.

For Mann, the Gospel of Mark should be interpreted against the background of the rising political tensions which eventually bore fruit in the first Jewish revolt of A.D. 66. He dates the first draft of the Gospel to approximately A.D. 55 (p. 76). As he believes that Mark used both Matthew and Luke as written sources, it will not surprise the reader that Mann acknowledges a great debt not only to William Farmer and Bernard Orchard (prominent advocates of the Griesbach hypothesis), but also to John A. T. Robinson (famous for his redating of the NT documents to dates prior to A.D. 70). For Mann, "the evangelist was confronting not a false christology but a gnawing and growing doubt in a steadily deteriorating situation, as to the legitimacy of the new faith and the ability of Jesus to save" (p. 83). The Gospel is consequently written with a great sense of urgency, an urgency which led to the elimination of the long teaching discourses of Matthew and many of the parables of both Matthew and Luke. Jesus is presented in conflict with, and victorious over, all evil powers.

As in the other commentaries in the Anchor Bible series (including the one which Mann, together with W. F. Albright, wrote on the Gospel of Matthew), there is a comprehensive introduction followed by a commentary which is divided into comments and notes. Each section of the introduction is provided with a bibliography, and there are a few additional bibliographies scattered at points throughout the commentary section, in addition to the general bibliography which precedes the introduction.

Aside from the bibliographies, the introductory section is probably the most valuable part of the commentary. Mann's comments range over the whole field of Gospel studies: he provides a short introduction to the Synoptic problem; discusses the period of oral transmission and the disciplines of form, redaction, and tendency criticism; and looks at such issues as the historical value of the Gospels (which he rates highly), the dating of Mark, and Mark's theology. In the commentary proper, the comments sections generally give brief introductions to the different subdivisions, and most of the space is taken up in the detailed comments of the notes sections.

Mann's commentary is not always easy reading. One does not, for example, find here the clarity of expression which characterizes Raymond Brown's commentaries on the Johannine corpus. Overall, though, it does make a significant contribution to the study of Mark. The long-term importance of the contribution will depend to some extent on the future acceptance or rejection of the Griesbach hypothesis. Whatever happens,

Doubleday is to be congratulated for publishing this commentary, which will further add to the reputation of the Anchor Bible series as one in which innovative and exciting commentaries may be found.

Avondale College
Cooranbong, Australia

ROBERT K. McIVER

Mazar, Amihai. *Archaeology of the Land of the Bible: 10,000-586 B.C.E.* New York: Doubleday, 1990. xxx + 572 pp. \$30.00.

Until the publication of this volume by Amihai Mazar, currently one of Israel's leading archaeologists, the most prominent books available as introductions to Syro-Palestinian archaeology were W. F. Albright's *Archaeology of Palestine* (rev. ed., Gloucester, MA, 1971), K. M. Kenyon's *Archaeology in the Holy Land* (4th ed., London/New York, 1979), and Y. Aharoni's *Archaeology of the Land of Israel* (Philadelphia, 1982).

While each of these earlier books was written by a leading scholar of the time and remains a classic in its own right, these works tended to interpret the archaeology of Palestine largely from the perspective of the authors' own excavations without always making the reader aware of alternate interpretations. For beginning students this could be confusing and frustrating. While Mazar is inevitably influenced by his own field work (what field archaeologist is not?), his book does a better job of alerting the reader to key issues and alternate interpretations than previous treatments, both within the text and in notes at the end of each chapter.

Chronologically the book spans the archaeology of Palestine from the Neolithic to the Iron II period (ending with the fall of Jerusalem in 586 B.C.). Each chapter focuses on a specific archaeological period and is organized into various sections discussing such items as pottery, architecture, fortifications, technology, burial practices, weapons, art, and so on, although the same sections do not appear in each chapter, nor are they covered in the same order.

Space does not permit a comprehensive review of Mazar's stimulating and sometimes provocative viewpoints, but some of his opinions on current topics of debate and interest to biblical scholars include the relationship of the archaeology of the Early Bronze Age (ca. 3100-2000 B.C.) to the biblical traditions. As a specific example, Mazar notes the attempts by some scholars (such as van Hatten and Rast) to relate the archaeological remains at sites such as Bab edh-Dhra^c and Numeira, southeast of the Dead Sea, to the biblical "cities of the plain." Although Mazar does not endorse any specific theory of integrating the archaeological data with the biblical material, he does allow for two possible models: first, the possibility that a "severe catastrophe," which destroyed these five cities, was "remembered and trans-