

Scripture, and obedience to the Word, I fail to see in Scripture some of their basic presuppositions—headship from creation and prohibition of women's teaching ministry. Perhaps my view is overly tinted by 35 years of teaching young ministers—most of them males. On the other hand, I may simply have been acting as a "mother in Israel," not a seminary professor, and am thus exempt from the prohibition.

Andrews University

NANCY J. VYHMEISTER

Guthrie, George H. *The Structure of Hebrews: A Text-Linguistic Analysis*. NovT Supplement, no. 73. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1994. xix + 161. Cloth, \$90.00.

Despite the popularity of new approaches in biblical studies, the field of linguistics, and more specifically text linguistics, has been largely neglected by biblical scholars. This study may represent something of a turning point. Text linguistics, better known in the U.S. as discourse analysis, has been neglected by the guild of biblical scholars. Its application has been largely confined to the realm of Bible translators. As a result many have not had access to its benefits for exegesis. Only in the form of structuralism and semeiotics have text-linguistic approaches had much impact. Only outside of North America (e.g., in South Africa and Scandinavia) has text linguistics been applied to more traditional exegesis of the Bible. But now we are beginning to see a bridging of this gulf and the consequent entry of discourse analysis into the larger academy as an increasing number of works presenting the fruit of discourse analysis are appearing on the market. Guthrie represents an important step in this trend and an important contribution both to the study of Hebrews and the discipline of discourse analysis.

The Structure of Hebrews is the published version of Guthrie's Ph.D. dissertation completed in 1991 at Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary under Bruce Corley. Lane, in his WBC commentary, gave fairly extensive discussion of the unpublished version of Guthrie's dissertation. It is good to see the work available to the wider public in its full form.

The work consists of two parts and seven chapters. The first section, consisting of two chapters, discusses and evaluates past proposals on the structure of Hebrews from the *kephalaia* system of divisions found in early Greek MS of the NT, down through the recent work of Linda Lloyd Neeley, Walter Übelacker, and Harold Attridge. He does not take note of the revised edition of F. F. Bruce's commentary nor the more recent commentaries of Paul Ellingworth and H. F. Weiss; presumably his manuscript was completed before he could get access to the latter two. The second section provides an application of text linguistics to the structure of Hebrews. After laying out his method, he attempts to isolate units through "cohesion shift analysis." He next tests his findings there by studying the use of the ancient rhetorical device of *inclusio*. Chapter six uses the text-linguistic study of lexical cohesion to determine the interrelationship of the various units identified. The final chapter discusses the resulting structure of Hebrews.

In his delineation of the structure Guthrie finds it necessary to maintain a distinction between the exposition and the exhortation, not subsuming the former to the latter as most do. Thus he traces the flow of thought in the expositional unit and then considers developments within the hortatory material. Only then does

he discuss how the two genres work together to convey the author's message. He offers unique assessment of the structure with two side-by-side columns of exposition and exhortation. The exposition is presented in outline format; the exhortation, however, while laid out in a column, is treated as a chiasm. His presentation is highly creative and will command attention. It is the most significant treatment since that of Vanhoye and surpasses his. His discussion of transitions in chapter 6 is also particularly helpful.

His application of cohesion-shift analysis in chapter 4 is his most significant methodological contribution, advancing not only biblical scholarship but text linguistics as well. Guthrie develops here an objective approach to the study of structure that eliminates much of the subjectivism of more traditional topical approaches. He analyzed shifts in 12 "cohesion fields" (genre, topic, spatial markers, temporal markers, actor, subject, verb tense, mood, person, number, reference, and lexical items). The chapter is weakened significantly, however, by a failure to lay out the data adequately. Guthrie does provide a sample chart on p. 60 (fig. 13), but this should have been done for the entire book, at least in an appendix, and not just for 1:1-5—a passage which does not even receive significant discussion in the chapter. He gives only a discussion of high-level shifts and in several of these he does not make clear in which fields the shift takes place (between 2:18 and 3:1, 3:6 and 3:7, 3:11 and 3:12, and 6:12 and 6:13).

Furthermore, the methodology could use some refinement. While he weights shifts in genre and topic more heavily (counted as two, not just one), more attention needs to be given to the relative value of the various fields. Should the various verb categories—tense, mood, person, and number—be weighted equally with other items? And maybe lexical cohesion should be weighted more heavily as well? There are overlaps between categories as well. Frequently the subject and verb person fields are identical; should they then be treated differently and given equal weight? Guthrie's distinction between subject and actor is also problematic. He bases this on M.A.K. Halliday and Ruqaiya Hasan's *Cohesion in English* [London: Longman, 1976]; unfortunately he misses their point. They discuss the ambiguity of interpreting pronominal reference, and note that it is determined not by grammar (actor and subject are two aspects of grammar: transitivity and mood) but by semantics. Hence his giving equal weight to these two categories when they reflect different aspects of the same phenomena is problematic. Even more problematic is the identification of a shift when the grammatical subject changes, but cohesion is effected by pronominal reference. Another problem is boundary shifts that do not reflect the overall trend of the passage. The temporal reference throughout 1:1-4 is past—only at the end of vs. 4 is there a brief shift; of how much weight then can the shift *back* to past in vs. 5 be? Isn't the overall cohesion of a unit more significant than a temporary shift that happens to occur at the boundary of a unit?

While Guthrie significantly advances the discussion, there are areas for further work. First his treatment of 2:5-9 as transitional is, in my opinion, problematic. The passage consists mainly of a midrash on Ps 8:4-6; thus it is an integral element in the subsection 2:5-18 and not merely a transition. It does not compare at all structurally to the unit he likens it to, 8:1-2. Further consideration of the role of 3:1-6 within the larger hortatory unit of 3:1 to 4:13 is necessary. Is

it totally unrelated to the midrash which follows in 3:7 to 4:11 or is it in some way connected to it? His treatment does not explain adequately why it is placed where it is or what role it plays in the author's overall purpose. What is the force of the $\delta\iota\acute{o}$ in 3:7? After the helpful insights on passages such as 6:13-20, I was disappointed with his discussion here.

There are a number of typographical errors. There are two lines missing near the bottom of page 85 in my copy. The "which" in note 14 on page 93 should probably be "while." And $\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\acute{o}\omega$ in note 22 on page 99 should be $\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\acute{\epsilon}\omega$.

Despite the needed improvements noted above, this is a major contribution to the study of Hebrews which should be required reading. The text is readable enough that it could be profitably used even by advanced students on the undergraduate level. This is a work which no scholar on Hebrews can afford to ignore.

Spicer Memorial College
Pune, India

MATTHEW KENT

Hendrix, Ralph E., Philip R. Drey, and J. Bjørnar Storfjell. *Ancient Pottery of Transjordan: An Introduction Utilizing Published Whole Forms—Late Neolithic through Late Islamic*. Berrien Springs, Michigan: Institute of Archaeology/Horn Archaeological Museum, Andrews University, 1996. xii + 342 pp. \$18.95.

Students embarking on a study of the ancient Near East must have a pottery guide. So far they have not had the good fortune to be well provided for in this regard. For Mesopotamia, Ann Louise Perkins' *The Comparative Archaeology of Early Mesopotamia* (1949) has never really been superseded. For Palestine, Ruth Amiran's *Ancient Pottery of the Holy Land* (1969) has (too) long been standard for beginners, while L. G. Herr and W. C. Trenchard have recently provided the specialist with a valuable, though unillustrated bibliography, *The Published Pottery of Palestine* (1996).

The authors of the book under review, all archaeologists at Andrews University, with the help of a team of specialist consultants, now break new ground with a guide to the pottery of Transjordan aimed specifically at introductory-level students. Their aim was to produce a tool for pottery study—initially devised as a set of "pottery flashcards"—which would standardize pottery terminology and provide basic introductory material. An enormous amount of research using primary publications went into this, and the authors provide a measure of their effort by informing the reader of the exact number of entries in their bibliography, the number of pottery types considered, the number of sites and periods represented.

The book is divided into five chapters which build on each other. Chapter 1, "Researching Pottery Morphology," briefly describes why archaeologists collect and study pottery. To the list of contributions provided to archaeology by pottery analysis, the authors could perhaps have added data from changes over time in wares and manufacturing techniques, allowing glimpses of economic and social trends that can help interpret and be interpreted by other archaeological and written sources.