

Muller also points out some dissimilarities between post-Reformed orthodoxy and medieval thought. These are brought about, in his opinion, because of the movement in post-Reformed orthodoxy away from the *quadriga* of medieval practice towards a more literal exegesis through the use of the original languages and scientific/historical exegetical methodology.

Muller most certainly reminds one that the development of Reformation theology is far from the monolithic endeavor that it is sometimes assumed to be. Indeed, he has demonstrated that dogmatic positions are not usually independent developments that make a radical break with what was held in the past but an evolution of thought from the perspective of a different set of questions that are raised because of advancing knowledge of the world and of God's revelation. Hence, there is both continuity and discontinuity with the past. The former gives the Christian faith stability in that it is connected with past revelation and the understanding of that revelation by the church in terms of an orthodox belief system. The latter prevents the stagnation of Christian belief into a rigid traditionalism and orthodoxy that resists the unfolding revelation of truth, fossilizes Christian dogmatics, and thus makes it irrelevant to the changing world that it must evangelize.

While Muller's position appears to be fundamentally sound, his radical separation of the theological and historical tasks of understanding the development of Reformed dogma (4) creates a tension in his own work. First, he has ably proven that the theological developments of the Reformed view of Scripture are closely connected with its historical development. Second, if theology and historical development are to be radically separated, then there may be no need for the discipline of historical theology, calling into question the whole purpose for his work. The work could have been strengthened by the addition of a scriptural index, a subject index, and a bibliography.

In retrospect, Muller has most certainly produced a work on the history of the Reformers' doctrine of scripture that is informative and helpful in understanding the maze of theological developments that took place in this important theological locus. Two major strengths of the work are the voluminous references to the original works of the Reformation and post-Reformation, and the thesis that dogmatics must have stability (continuity with the past) and yet not become static (discontinuous with the past) so that it may remain relevant and open to new understandings of revealed truth.

Southern Adventist University  
Collegedale, TN 37315

BRUCE NORMAN

Muraoka, T. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint: Twelve Prophets*. Louvain: Peeters, 1993. xxii + 257 pp. ca. \$65.00.

When the first volume of *A Greek Lexicon of the Septuagint* prepared by Lust, et al., was published in 1992, it was the first of its kind in over 170 years (see *AUSS*, 31 [Autumn 1993] 249-251). Now we have another volume by the same name. As it happens, they are a study in contrasts.

There are two principal approaches to Septuagint (LXX) lexicography: translator's intent, and reading as a Greek document. Ironically, Lust and his

*confrères* chose the former approach, while Muraoka chose—and argues for—the latter. Thus, while not ignoring the (putative) Hebrew original, he focuses on “what sense a reader in the last few centuries before the turn of the era who was ignorant of Hebrew or Aramaic might have made of the translation” (viii). Consequently, he includes in the scope the witness of the daughter translations and the Greek patristic commentaries.

Given the decision to publish this as a pilot project, the choice of the Minor Prophets (MPs) is easily defended. First, Muraoka decided to work only with a Göttingen text. Thus the Pentateuch was not considered, since at that time Wevers had not yet completed publishing the text. Second, the consensus is that the MPs are the product of one translator, and hence a coherent corpus. Third, since the scope of vocabulary is limited, it was possible to undertake a fully-fledged lexicon.

When it comes to word meaning, there are again two approaches: translation equivalents, commonly known as glosses; and definitions. Muraoka opts for the latter approach. For instance,  $\text{בַּיִת}$  is typically translated as οἶκος and glossed as “house.” In this lexicon there are four definitions: “1. Building for dwelling, 2. Family, 3. Group of people descended from and named after prominent ancestor, 4. Community of residents in a certain locality” (167).

Modern lexical theory and practice have made significant inroads on just how a lexicon is prepared. Since Louw and Nida arranged their lexicon (P. Louw and A. Nida, *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament*, 2 vols. [New York, 1988]) around semantic domains, it is relevant to mention that Muraoka has chosen the traditional alphabetical ordering of the entries.

There are 2,018 entries in the volume. Where the use of a word is coextensive with the occurrence(s) in the MPs, the lexicon entry is complete for that word. In those instances where words occur in the MPs and infrequently beyond that, and all of the witnesses are available in the Göttingen edition, all of the uses are cited.

Each entry has four main sections. First, the headword is listed including relevant morphology for verbs. Next comes the main body of the entry where the sense of the word is defined and its usage described. Third, where appropriate, groups of words semantically associated with the headword are listed, along with relevant bibliography. In the final section the relationship between the LXX and the original Hebrew is explored. This work is based on Hatch and Redpath, although for subsequent work the evidence is in the process of revision.

I suspect the volume was typeset rather than prepared camera-ready on a computer. The layout presents well, and the various Greek typefaces are a joy to read, something that seems to be decreasingly true of Greek texts in general. Unfortunately, as with the *Lust* volume, typographical errors abound in the Introduction, causing one to wonder about the rest of the volume. However, subsequent use and study have not turned up any in the body of the lexicon.

This volume, then, is a useful beginning and harbinger of a valuable tool, should the complete work ever see the light of day. On the other hand, I would hope that this volume be *sui generis*, that no other partial lexicons, such as for the Pentateuch, be attempted short of the final goal.