

better. This awkward use of transliteration only hinders Allen's goal of making Middle Egyptian accessible to nonspecialists.

In addition to its detailed index, *Middle Egyptian* could use a glossary of the grammatical terms used in the textbook. This would help students locate terms without searching through the chapters for their meaning. The table on pp. 24-25 introduces a good overview of biliterals, but a list of biliterals and trilaterals should be included with the sign list near the dictionary to make searching for words easier. Although Allen's examples and exercises mostly come from actual Egyptian texts, there are few vertical texts or diagrams (244) and no photographs of monumental or other inscriptions. Some actual inscriptions in diagrammatic or photographic form like those used in Collier and Manley, *How to Read Egyptian Hieroglyphs* (1998), should be included toward the end of the book. Such examples or exercises could place special emphasis on monumental offertory and funerary texts that frequently appear in museums and would give students practice with actual inscriptions. The summary pronoun chart on p. 50 and the *smd*f forms in the table on p. 295 should be expanded, enlarged, and include hieroglyphic examples for each. These would make great reference tools like the pronoun and verbal charts that appear at the back of most Near-Eastern grammars. A bibliography with complete references, particularly for Lesson 26, would be helpful. A reference to Polotsky's (1971) *Collected Works* should be included.

Allen's book is a good Middle Egyptian grammar for those who are leaning away from the traditional and standard grammatical theories of Gardiner and Polotsky. This book has the potential for becoming the new standard for Middle Egyptian textbooks based upon the current Egyptological theory, but its use of the European transliteration, but its lack of diagrammatic or photographic reproductions of actual monuments limits its appeal to beginning students and interested nonspecialists.

Berrien Springs, Michigan

ROBERT D. BATES

Carson, D. A., Peter T. O'Brien, and Mark A. Seifrid, eds. *Justification and Variegated Nomism*, vol. 1, *The Complexities of Second Temple Judaism*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament. 2 Reihe. 140. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001. xii + 619 pp. Paper, \$44.99.

This collection of sixteen essays (including Carson's introduction and conclusion) is the first of two volumes seeking to clarify the discussion of Paul's perspective on the law and justification. The specific purposes of this volume are to reexamine the idea of "covenantal nomism" as presented in E. P. Sander's *Paul and Palestinian Judaism: A Comparison of Patterns of Religion* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1977) and to call "for a new understanding of the complexities of the Judaism of Jesus' (and Paul's) day" (back cover).

The main strength of this book is that it tries to build a bridge between two disciplines that have engaged each other only superficially, namely, study of the Second Temple period and Pauline studies. In most cases, the contributors are top-notch intertestamental-period scholars, and their mastery of the primary and secondary literature is extensive, up to date, and impressive. Moreover, the book is

comprehensive, covering nearly every piece of Jewish literature that has anything to do with the period. The comprehensive indices provided with the book are particularly helpful. The editors are to be congratulated for this groundbreaking effort.

Perhaps precisely because of these strengths, however, the book comes with several weaknesses. One drawback is that it may be too technical, particularly for those who are unfamiliar with study of the Second Temple period. The literature covered is vast, and there are few who are versed in every piece. Aside from this issue of accessibility, there are two main problems that plague the book: internal contradictions and conflicting goals.

Carson admits that "these scholars are not all in perfect agreement" (543), but the contradictions within the book are too serious to be overlooked as diversity. Perhaps many of them could have been avoided if the contributors of the volume had read each other's essays and engaged one another in discussion. Explicit evidence for such discussion is lacking in the book, although it is conceivable that some interaction may have occurred in some other forum. In a volume that is intended as a symposium, the near complete lack of engagement between the participants is unfortunate, by contrast with Troels Engberg-Pedersen, ed., *Paul Beyond the Judaism/Hellenism Divide* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2001).

The essays by Roland Deines and Martin McNamara exemplify such contradiction. After a rather involved discussion about 4QMMT (460-474), Deines opines that all of the major writings of the period need to be classified as belonging to the Pharisees, the Sadducees, or the Essenes (477). By contrast, McNamara contends that the Aramaic paraphrases of Targums, which he dates to the Second Temple period, cannot be associated either with the Sadducees or the Pharisees, and he mentions nothing of the Essenes (352). If Deines is correct, the credibility not only of McNamara, but of many of the other contributors is undermined. In a book meant as a fresh review of E. P. Sanders's concept of "covenantal nomism," the contributors should have engaged Deines on this crucial point.

The collection of essays also suffers from conflicting goals. On one hand, the scholars had to do justice to their specialized fields of study. On the other hand, they had to determine whether Sanders's idea of "covenantal nomism" fairly represents the religious pattern of Second Temple Judaism. It is not easy to do justice to both of these concerns in a single piece. From a reading of the essays, it quickly becomes evident that although Sanders's concept of "covenantal nomism" has been important to Pauline research, it seems to have had virtually no impact on intertestamental scholarship. Consequently, the authors' comments concerning Sanders's views, which range from cordial to disparaging, are almost always peripheral. It is as though they had to break away from their discussions to say something about Sanders.

David M. Hay's essay on Philo of Alexandria is a good example of this. In this encyclopedic piece, the discussion on Sanders's concept of "covenantal nomism" is isolated to one paragraph on p. 370 and Hay's evaluation of Sanders rests on three points that are not specifically argued in the essay: Philo says little about God's covenants with Israel, Philo's framework of religious thought is not soteriological, and Philo is not a good "representative of 'covenantal nomism.'" It is difficult to escape the impression that Hay has relegated Sanders to the sidelines. Furthermore, if these three points were all that was going to be said about Sanders,

one wonders whether such an extensive discussion of Philo's works was necessary. For instance, what do the merits of Naomi Cohen's views on Philo's relationship to rabbinic literature (376) have to do with "covenantal nomism"?

To some extent, it is understandable that the contributors chose to spend more time dialoguing with peers in their own specialized fields than with Sanders because scholarship on Second Temple Judaism has been developing by and large without reference to NT scholarship, let alone Sanders. This book is a reminder that scholarship on Second Temple Judaism is a discipline in its own right and not simply a background discipline for NT scholarship. Even so, the failure of this volume to deal with the major question of salvation and the human plight, the issue at the heart of Sanders's paradigm of "covenantal nomism," is difficult to understand. Certainly, the collection has provided ample evidence that Sanders's paradigm of "covenantal nomism" is inadequate to cover all facets of Second Temple Judaism. In fact, it has done much to underscore the present scholarly consensus that there is no single paradigm that can cover every facet of Second Temple Judaism. But what, then, is the alternative? The essays are often too preoccupied with technical and atomistic detail to address such a broad question. It remains to be seen on what basis the second volume will proceed.

His contribution remains. Even if Sanders's concept of "covenantal nomism" eventually proves to be flawed because he persuaded NT scholarship to discard the age-old classical notion that Judaism is a lifeless and legalistic religion. Indeed, Carson himself agrees to this monumental contribution of Sanders (v). However, in a volume ostensibly dedicated to a fresh and comprehensive look at Sanders's "covenantal nomism," the other elegant and erudite discussions of the contributors often look like an escapade in the realm of esoteric intertestamental scholastics.

Andrews University

P. RICHARD CHOI

Catholic University of America. *New Catholic Encyclopedia: Jubilee Volume, The Wojtyla Years*. Detroit: Gale Group, 2001. xiii + 681 pp. Hardcover, \$95.00.

Publication of the *New Catholic Encyclopedia*, coinciding with the beginning of a new century and millennium, provides more than a supplement to the well-known encyclopedia and is announced as a preamble to a revised edition of the *NCE* that should follow in due course. This Jubilee volume covers, as its subtitle indicates, the pontificate of Karol Wojtyla from 1978 to 2000, but more specifically it is a registry of events, issues, and people that shaped the Roman Catholic church in the period after Vatican II.

The volume has two distinctive parts. The first is a series of insightful interpretative essays that survey the development and analyze the principles that have caused changes in the church during the pontificate of John Paul II. These twelve essays describe a man whose spiritual and intellectual life, and whose sensitivity to political and social forces, prepared him well for his role of pope. The essays cover such diverse topics as the history of Poland during Wojtyla's lifetime and his personal love for poetry and the arts. A number of essays discuss his contributions to philosophy, theology, economics, and human rights, and his interest in ecumenical and interreligious dialogue. One essay addresses the church's