

points: the kingdom of God, the identity of Jesus, the theological meaning of the crucifixion, the mission of the church, ethics, and eschatology (34-337). This analysis is completed by a survey of Paul's knowledge of Jesus' life and ministry (338-372), and a final chapter summarizing the author's conclusion on the relationship of Paul and Jesus (373-410), with an additional note on the form of Paul's gospel (411).

The evidence assembled on the continuity between Paul and Jesus is impressive, although not equally strong for every point. However, the author succeeds in proving that despite the differences of circumstances and vocabulary, the teachings of Jesus and Paul are remarkably similar. Many examples are quite conclusive regarding Paul's dependence on Jesus, e.g., the story of the last supper (1 Cor 11), the resurrection narratives (1 Cor 15:3-5), the teachings on divorce (1 Cor 7:10-11), the teachings about preachers being paid for their work (1 Cor 9:14; Mt 10:10; Lk 10:7), "a word from the Lord" on the second coming (1 Thess 4:15), and the statement "I know and am persuaded in the Lord that nothing is unclean" (Rom 14:4 in relationship with Mk 7).

The arguments for Paul's avoidance of kingdom language, although less conclusive, are particularly interesting. It seems quite reasonable to accept that Paul's teaching on righteousness is parallel to Jesus' teaching on the kingdom of God, and that Paul seldom used the term because he wanted "to avoid the potential political overtones of kingdom language" (79).

Most of the other assumed connections are equally attractive but remain still hypothetical: namely the relationship between the story of Jesus' temptations and Paul's doctrine of Jesus' sinfulness, the allusions to the beatitudes of the sermon on the mount, the connection between the references to the "son of man" and the teachings on the new Adam, the reminiscences to the parable of the prodigal son, or to the account of the ascension, etc. (385). However, the aim of the author is certainly reached in proving that "Paul saw himself as the slave of Jesus Christ, not the founder of Christianity, and that he was right to see himself in that way" (410). One important question still remains unanswered: if Paul depends so much on the teachings of Jesus, why does he so seldom refer to Jesus' life and ministry?

Since the book attempts to address both scholars and a wider audience (xiv), the technical comparison of texts often seems a little lengthy for the general readers and somehow superficial for the specialists. In any case, this work constitutes the most extensive treatment of this subject thus far and the best comprehensive contribution to the discussion on the relationship between Paul and Jesus. It will certainly need to be taken into consideration in further research.

Faculté Adventiste de Théologie
Collonges-sous-Salève, France

ROBERTO BADENAS

Wolfers, David. *Deep Things Out of Darkness: The Book of Job: Essays and a New English Translation*. Kampen, Netherlands: Pharos; Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1995. 552 pp. \$35.00.

David Wolfers, M.D., dedicated the last twenty years of his life to the study of the book of Job. His magnum opus, *Deep Things Out of Darkness*, the result of this dedication, makes a bold statement indeed. Its title, from Job 12:22, quoting

Job's wonder at Deity's inscrutable omnipotence, signals from the start how aggressively a similar commitment to disruption and disclosure drives Wolfers' investigative effort.

The book consists of three main divisions: (1) an introduction (19-80) which lays out the author's thinking not only on the provenance of the book of Job, but, more significantly, on theories and strategies of translation; (2) a topical commentary (81-313) which treats, by theme rather than by chapter sequence, the major questions of the book—the nature of Job's illness and the fate of his children, the identities of Job, his comforters, 'the wicked,' Behemoth and Leviathan, and the Satan; and (3) an independent new translation exclusively founded on the MT (315-513), with translation notes occupying the major portion of this second section (375-513). The book concludes with indexes of biblical references (515-549), and a list of frequently used abbreviations (551-552).

Wolfers presents himself as a champion of independent scholarship. Medical doctor and no biblical scholar, he would heal the book of Job of the ages of affliction foisted upon it by the academy of biblical scholarship. Before him, the unfortunate victim of a book "has been misunderstood and mistranslated with unerring consistency for as far back as our knowledge stretches" (25).

Now Wolfers knows that "To speak of mistranslation . . . is . . . unmannerly" (27). His intention is not to antagonize the academy. Also, he is aware that "there is no such thing as an exact translation, . . . only a better or worse compromise" (ibid.). His rage against the exclusiveness and bungling of biblical scholars exposes a fellow seeker, rigorously committed, not to the beatification of the hoary or the new, but to the verification and vindication of the true. We welcome his warnings against any attitude, act or activity which frustrates that common purpose. For example, we concur with his sensible indignation at the misguided resolve to deny the text "all geographical, historical, national and religious specificity" (28). We admire the courage of his conclusion, after twenty years of research into "the mysteries of this deepest of books" (13), against multiple authorship. We affirm his verdict that apparent contrast between the prologue-epilogue and the dialogue it encompasses is "*deliberate*" (62, emphasis his); that "One may infer a whole dinosaur [sic] from a single toe-bone, but there is not even a finger-nail upon which to build the ancient folk-tale of Job" (63). We laud his "horror" (28) at the usurpation which emends to smooth sense, rather than struggles with an interpretation of the text as it is.

Wolfers' views are at serious odds with those of many Job scholars. They are also worth serious consideration. For the book of Job is no reasoned treatise, the arid thing to which philosophical streamlining attempts to convert it. It is the book of the words of angry men who lie and belie their own words and dignity in the heat of flaming argument. It is, warts and all, the most accurate representation of verbal war the biblical record could ever have documented. Neither its fervid religiosity nor our stale philosophizing will ever successfully obscure that.

Wolfers' zealous essay against the (atrocities of the) academy serves his own three point agenda of: (1) the legitimization of his intervention as an outsider, (2) the vindication of his own singular translation approach, and, as already mentioned, (3) the exposure of critical flaws in other scholarly work whose translation process exhibits such traits as the following litany enumerates: dependence upon

previous Job scholarship; the anti-poetic spirit of the present age; theories of a non-Hebrew original; invention of quotation; grammatical distortion (e.g., misuse of the jussive); notions of foreign words, or general inclination to believe in non-MT input; literalistic interpretation ("denaturing the idiom"); positing textual corruption, etc. His tendentiousness notwithstanding, translation specialists and trainees everywhere would do well to review and be advised, not necessarily by his hostile tone, but surely by Wolfers' exhaustive list of blunders possible within the interpretive exercise. And a translation which solves its cruxes by looking almost exclusively within the MT is radical enough to deserve special attention.

Besides his assault against mistranslation Wolfers offers several intriguing suggestions about the book itself. His first suggestion is for the allegorical significance of (1) Job, (2) his children, (3) the wicked, (4) Leviathan, (5) Behemoth, and (6) the river Jordan, respectively, as (1) some Jewish noble, (2) Judah or God's children, (3) Judah's enemies, (4) the Assyrian king, (5) Job and Judah, and (6) the king of Judah and all his glory. Despite his many strengths, Wolfers' allegorizing undoes him as soon as we seek an identification for the three friends. In the text, grief at Job's pain shocks them to speechlessness. In the allegory they are Kenizzites, a despised minority who experience Judah's misery as the avenging of centuries of racial discrimination. The identification both contradicts the friendship of the text and the historical data on Israel's relations with their Calebite cousins. Similar mental sophistry shows the Satan "as adversary not of man or Job, but of God Himself" (202), an accurate insight, but also "as but a facet of God's personality" (205), an attempt to eat your cake and have it too.

His second suggestion is Isaianic authorship, because (1) the learned literary genius who authored Job lived later than 701 B.C.E. and must have produced other works, and (2) Isa 38-39, when interpreted as allegory, parallels in sentiment and vocabulary, various portions of the book of Job.

His third interpretive suggestion is that Job is not a Wisdom composition, because (1) its turbulence contrasts with Wisdom's laid back detachment, (2) it abounds in non-Wisdom considerations such as despair, longing, terror, pride, etc.; and (3) it treats, not of how women and men should relate, but, "tells how God should deal with man. It weighs Him and finds Him wanting, exploring theology to the depths" (50). As to genre, Job is surely *sui generis*. But how Wolfers would exclude such emotion as despair and still include Qoheleth and the "Babylonian Job" in Wisdom literature remains unclear.

The layout of Wolfers' text suggests insufficient planning, perhaps in the rush to place the first proof copy in his hands before his passing in September 1994. For example, almost none of so-called "footnotes" (375-513) correspond to any in-text marker. Duly marked, they would still be mere endnotes, not real footnotes. Be that as it may, the work itself attests monumental effort and accomplishment—in which context such objections amount to but minor perplexities to be corrected in subsequent printings. The genius who authored the biblical work failed to bequeath us his own second edition. And yet, who knows? By its combination of irritating flaw and intellectual mastery, Wolfers' and his editors' work may now reflect more of that original genius than they themselves intended. Who knows?