

Edward McComiskey, who until his death in 1996 was presiding fellow of the American College of Biblical Theologians. McComiskey wrote the commentary on the book of Zechariah, J. Alec Motyer on Zephaniah and Haggai, and Douglas Stuart on Malachi.

The authors approach the biblical books from an evangelical perspective. In their general introductions to each biblical book they examine such issues as its date, genre, theology, and other background, and briefly outline and analyze the book's themes and contents. The commentary and exposition follow and flesh out the specific points raised in the introductory outline.

Each textual unit created by the outline begins with two translations of the passage under study: a literal one of the Hebrew by the commentator and the other from the NRSV. Each commentary page employs a two-part and user-friendly format. The detailed exegesis and linguistic data of the passage appear in the upper portion of the page, while the author's exposition, which builds upon the exegesis, occupies the bottom half. The authors keep the two approaches separate, but proximity of the two approaches allows the reader to quickly integrate them, if desired. Each author set his goals to be utilizing the highest standards of scholarly exegesis and interacting with the current literature). At the same time, the reader can concentrate on the message of the text without getting sidetracked by philological details. Each of the four biblical-book sections has a separate bibliography, and the volume as a whole contains a Scripture index.

The commentators provide a thorough discussion of the message of the minor prophets. They are most interested in what the texts say, not how they came to be. The authors reveal a good grasp of ancient Near Eastern and biblical backgrounds, while carefully and faithfully seeking to reconstruct the situations in which the prophetic messages might have first appeared. The commentators sought to allow the minor prophets speak to today's world by exploring the larger significance of each biblical passage. (For examples, see the commentary on Mal 2:16 and Mal 3:8-10.)

This volume is a solid resource for both student and pastor. It provides a demonstration of what evangelical scholarship can do as it honestly wrestles with the text.

Review and Herald Publishing Association
Hagerstown, MD 21740

GERALD WHEELER

Merling, David, ed. *To Understand the Scriptures: Essays in Honor of William H. Shea*. Berrien Springs, MI: Institute of Archaeology, 1997. xxx + 330 pp. \$15.00.

This Festschrift opens with a biographical introduction of Dr. Shea's career, followed by a bibliography of his publications. The articles are arranged in five sections. The first section, on Hebrew Scriptures, is also the longest, followed by a section almost as long devoted to the book of Daniel. Following are three shorter sections of two or three articles each on Greek Scriptures, ancient history, and theology. Helpful subject and Scripture indexes conclude the volume.

As with other Festschriften, this one contains a wide variety of essays. Although the editor has arranged the contents by general category, clearly the

submissions are quite independent of each other. Though not cohesive, the papers in this Festschrift do reflect the breadth of interest and the publications of William Shea, the scholar whom they seek to honor.

Offerings in a Festschrift tend to be uneven in quality and scope, and much of the material presented in this Festschrift may be found in standard commentaries or other reference works. Davidson's study on Ezekiel is solid on comparisons at the beginning and end of his argument. However, as he moves inward, his case grows weaker. In particular, the second oracle against the ruler of Tyre in Eze 28 does not seem to function as a pivot for the book. Rather, it is a contrasting parallel to the previous oracle of the same length. Rodriguez's paper on jewelry is the only paper which references the Song of Solomon, yet the author left out such casual references to jewelry as 1:10-11 and 4:9, where decorative jewelry is assumed to be part of the woman's attractions. Overall, the OT shows more than mere "tolerance" (117) for jewelry.

Stronger contributions may be found in the Daniel section. Roy Gane accurately observes that the original readers of Daniel, even if we allow for a late date, would have read few, if any, of the other apocalypses available to us. Therefore, it is somewhat artificial for us to understand the book of Daniel primarily through its successors (142). Donn Leatherman's article on textual discontinuity, though primarily a study in negative evidence, wisely avoids arguing strong positive conclusions, but rather sticks to consolidating the caveats with which we should read critical studies on Daniel. Waterhouse's revisionist understanding of the politics of the Persian Empire add an important piece to the puzzle of Darius the Mede. Waterhouse shows that the Persian emperors, beginning with Darius I, cast the rise and rule of Cyrus and Cambyses in a distinctly negative light, and their propaganda was preserved in the work of Herodotus. In contrast, Xenophon, the book of Daniel, and Josephus present an alternative history which is at least no less trustworthy than the later official history, and which leaves room for a predecessor and co-uler of Cyrus in his uncle Cyaxares. Though Waterhouse's study is not conclusive, it presents a very intriguing and far more plausible theory than most reconstructions of the enigmatic Darius the Mede.

One repeated problem in the papers of this Festschrift is the argument from silence. Though such arguments should not be excluded *a priori*, they do require substantial effort to show that the proposed silences are compelling ones and not merely accidental or incidental. Du Preez's article on polygamy and the levirate marriage is a case in point. Du Preez warns that "arguments from silence are inherently suspect" (283), but he repeatedly uses such arguments throughout the paper. For instance, he argues that because no other wives are mentioned in the dilemma of the bride of seven brothers (Matt 22:23-28 and parallels), therefore there was no polygyny (284). But polygyny was not addressed at all. In contrast, polyandry was unthinkable and therefore the Sadducees insisted that the resurrected woman have one husband only. Silence need only indicate that unexceptional practices occurred, and insofar as polygamy was unexceptional it would remain unmentioned unless it impacted directly on the narrative.

Proofreading was not evenly practiced, though this usually is not a problem except for an occasional misleading bibliographic reference. I did find myself occasionally adding in a missing dot under the transliterations of *beth*, and the repeated

use of *samekh* for final *mem* on pp. 291-299 was a bit comic. Also, some papers rely on rather old references when more recent studies on an issue are available and easily accessible. Such problems are common among Festschriften, however.

More important is the due honor paid to a most prolific and creative scholar, Dr. William Shea. This Festschrift only begins to attest to his legacy of training Christian scholars.

Madison, WI 53703-2678

JAMES E. MILLER

Mounce, Robert H. *The Book of Revelation*, rev. ed., New International Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998. xxxvi + 439 pp. \$44.00.

Since the first edition of this commentary has already been critiqued in the past, this review will mainly concentrate on a comparison between the two editions. The new edition not only contains more pages as compared to the former edition, it is also larger in physical size. Additionally, the foreword, the preface, the list of abbreviations, and the bibliography are counted with Roman numbers instead of Arabic numbers. Both the former and the present edition have indices. Unfortunately, however, the revised edition has omitted the index of extrabiblical literature.

The author uses many more footnotes than he did previously. The footnotes are more extensive, but rarely cover half a page (190, 262, 367). The increase in the number of footnotes is due to the fact that in the revised edition the scholarly discussion is carried on in the footnotes. Oftentimes, names and references have been eliminated from the text and moved to the footnotes (168). Furthermore, including new literature published on the Apocalypse automatically expands footnotes.

The "Select Bibliography" contains 90 new entries. While the first edition listed books and articles up to 1976, the revised edition covers material up to 1995. Unfortunately, Lohse's *Die Offenbarung des Johannes* has been entered twice (xxiii, xxxiv).

The Bible translation used in this edition is the NIV instead of the ASV (1901). One of the advantages of this change is that hymns, for example, are indented in the NIV and are therefore easily discernable. G. D. Kilpatrick's critical apparatus has been replaced with that of the twenty-seventh edition of Nestle-Aland, and abbreviations now correspond with the 1994 JBL guidelines.

Within the "Introduction" a brief chapter on the language of Revelation has been added. When discussing apocalyptic literature, the book of Daniel is referred to only in passing. Mounce has slightly changed the outline of Rev 17:1-19:5. A thorough investigation of Daniel, however, could lead to a different perception of apocalyptic literature and its origins in the scholarly world.

The section "Text, Exposition, and Notes" differs from the former edition which—except for the headers and the subheadings—were numbered to correspond with the chapters of Revelation. The revised edition consistently follows his basic outline and the major sections the author suggests for the Apocalypse (e.g. 170-171). Therefore, the chapters dealing with text, exposition, and notes have been cut down from twenty-two to eleven.

Taking a look at the exposition itself, one finds that paragraphs have often been