

guide to some current trends in narrative interpretation, he is less than comprehensive. Overall, however, he succeeds in alerting evangelical preachers to the imaginative dimension of biblical literature and to its use of metaphor, irony, ambiguity, aspects that have often sat uncomfortably with conservative perceptions of “inspiration.”

The homiletical theory that takes up the second section is profusely illustrated with examples taken from OT narrative. But anyone who has read Haddon Robinson’s *Biblical Preaching: The Development and Delivery of Expository Messages* will be in familiar territory. One can do far worse than take Robinson as a model, but his influence on this present volume is enormous. He is cited more often than any other homiletician, on average appearing on every sixth page of the first two sections. In addition, he contributes the book’s foreword and a sample sermon. Perhaps this influence is understandable, given that Robinson was Mathewson’s mentor at seminary, but the student seems to be in awe of his master.

Published sermons rarely deliver the punch of live delivery, so almost inevitably the five sample sermons that form the third main section of the book are disappointing. None more so, unfortunately, than Mathewson’s own contribution on Gen 22. The sermon’s main point that “the greatest thing you can do for your kids is to worship God, not your kids,” is fair enough in itself. However, I am less than convinced that there is enough exegetical anchor for it in the text of Gen 22, especially when read within the context of the Abraham story as a whole.

Appendix A, “Advanced Plot Analysis,” is an up-to-date summary of current thought. However, it requires a knowledge of Hebrew, is heavy going, and even granting Mathewson’s decision to relegate it to an appendix, is unlikely to appeal to the majority of readers. Indeed, they might well ask themselves why it should, given that two of the sample sermons are by preachers who admit to having studied no Hebrew at all (Paul Borden, 201; Alice Mathews, 225). Another uses an interlinear (Donald Sunukjian, 186), and even the revered and omnipresent icon Haddon Robinson admits that he is not as skilled in Hebrew as he would like to be (213). Mathewson alone seems to have the required linguistic skills.

Despite the reservations noted above, as a class text for homiletics I would rate this volume quite highly. In fact, I intend to use it as required reading in my “Preaching from the Old Testament” master’s-level course. The author is aware of the contemporary (American) intellectual climate in general, and his biblical and homiletical scholarship is up to date. He writes in a user-friendly style, regularly providing helpful summaries in tabular form. The numerous examples from Scripture make it extremely practical. Mercifully, he is also realistic, repeatedly reminding the reader that it takes a lot of hard work and perseverance to interpret and expound OT narratives well. Some might ask what the advantage is in using this book rather than reading a standard work on the poetics and interpretation of OT narrative (e.g., Berlin), coupled with Robinson’s classic volume. For those who have already done that, the gain in using this present volume will be modest. But for the novice evangelical preacher, especially one without a knowledge of Biblical Hebrew, Mathewson provides under one cover a coherent, profusely illustrated, user-friendly guide to preaching OT narrative that is likely to become a standard text for some time to come.

Newbold College
Binfield, Bracknell, Berkshire, England

LAURENCE TURNER

Mills, Watson E., ed. *Daniel*, Bibliographies for Biblical Research: Old Testament Series, vol. 20. Lewiston: Edwin Mellen, 2002. xviii + 103 pp. Hardcover, \$89.95.

Bibliographies on biblical books are always a valuable tool for biblical scholars. However, in the time of computerized research, when it is easily possible to download

in a relatively short time numerous entries, a printed bibliography needs to excel in many aspects, foremost in practicality.

The present bibliography on the book of Daniel in the Bibliographies for Biblical Research series (*BBR Daniel*) is volume 20 of a series of bibliographies on the books of the Bible and deuterocanonical literature that projects a total of ca. 55-60 volumes. According to the series editor, who also edited this bibliography on Daniel, each volume compiles "works published in the twentieth century that make important contributions to the understanding of the text and backgrounds of the various books" (ix).

The bibliographical entries in *BBR Daniel*, which are enumerated throughout the book, are arranged in three parts: citations by chapter and verse (410 entries), citations by an alphabetical list of different subjects (518 entries), and commentaries (77 entries). The array of languages from which the entries are drawn is commendable. Besides English, German, and French, the articles referred to are written in Afrikaans, Dutch, Italian, Norwegian, Portuguese, and Spanish. It is definitely a plus that Mills includes articles from more exotic journals which one may not so easily come across elsewhere. An author index concludes the volume.

Though the preface claims that the bibliography indexes publications dating from "the twentieth century through the early months of 2000," there are only eleven entries from the first half of the twentieth century, starting from 1931, and the most recent articles indexed were usually published in 1997. The bibliography contains only two essays from 1998 (entries #0509, 0510) and one article in 1999 in *BAR* (#0486, 0512, 0595, 0674). The latter (A. Malamat, "Caught between the Great Powers: Judah Picks a Side . . . Loses"—by the way, the bibliography fails to mention that Malamat's article appeared in no. 4 of vol. 25) cannot be considered as an important article for the understanding of Daniel, since it deals with the history of the final years in Judah from 609-586 B.C.E. Likewise, the two essays published in 1998 examine only peripheral issues for Daniel, one dealing with Neo-Babylonian royal inscriptions and the other with Nabonidus's origin. What about articles published in 1998-2000 that are clearly concerned with Danielic texts? A simple search in the ATLA Religion Index under Scripture Citation "Daniel" for the years 1998 and 1999 results in sixteen entries, of which about half appeared in major sources (*CBQ*, *JBL*, *SBLSP*, *VT*, *ZAW*). Mills's bibliography lists none of these sixteen articles. Hence, it is not as up-to-date as it claims to be. The situation is different with regard to the list of 77 commentaries that are published evenly throughout the twentieth century, starting with Farrar's *The Book of Daniel* (1900) and ending with Reddin's *Daniel* (1999).

I have several basic concerns about the present bibliography—selectivity and omissions, multiple entries, and inconsistencies—and I will start with the most serious one. An essential principle applied to the compilation in *BBR Daniel* is selectivity. Mills only wants to pick the "important contributions." He admits at this point that an individual compiler makes her/his specific contribution" (ix). No doubt selection is hard work, and space constraints could even force one to choose among the important articles. However, Mills does not only omit some of the important works (which in itself could be forgivable), but he also includes a number of irrelevant works instead. Let me illustrate this.

Readers of *AUSS* will be interested to know that the bibliography indexes ten articles of that journal. Except for one, all date from 1985 to 1996. Since *AUSS* has published in the years 1963-2000 at least thirty articles dealing with the book of Daniel or with some aspects relating to it, it is clear that Mills indeed presents only a selection of those articles. Unfortunately, he is omitting significant ones. For example, an article by J. Doukhan ("The Seventy Weeks of Daniel 9: An Exegetical Study," *AUSS* 17 [1979]: 1-22) is missing in Mills's collection, although it seems to be a rather essential

study on one of the major passages in Daniel. Similar observations can be made for other journals as well. In sum, the criteria by which *BBR Daniel* includes or excludes articles or essays are far from obvious to me.

The omission of some sources is a serious problem. For instance, there are no articles listed from *JATS*, particularly *JATS* 7/1 (1996), which contains eight articles on the book of Daniel. Other lapses are in the area of collected essays, e.g., the failure to list any of the articles in W. Bader, ed., "*Und die Wahrheit wurde hinweggefegt*": *Daniel 8 linguistisch interpretiert* (Tübingen: Francke, 1994), in which ten essays deal in depth with Daniel 8. Regarding commentaries, a simple comparison with the bibliography of 46 twentieth-century commentaries on Daniel in J. J. Collins, *Daniel* (Hermeneia, Fortress, 1993), 455-456, shows that Mills does not list twenty of those commentaries. Certainly, the important ones by R. H. Charles (Oxford: Clarendon, 1929), J. J. Collins (1984), and G. L. Archer (1985) would have deserved an entry. Finally, it is deplorable that there are no references to dissertations or to other books than commentaries to be found in *BBR Daniel*.

For quite a number of entries it is questionable whether they should really belong in a bibliography on Daniel. Again, two examples need to suffice. Christian Grappe, "Essai sur l'arrière-plan pascal des récits de la dernière nuit de Jésus," *RHPR* 65 (1985): 105-125, is cited under "Dan 6:11," "Dan 6:14," and "redaction criticism." However, the article refers to Dan 6:11, 14 in just one sentence on p. 114, to mention that the Gethsemane pericope in Mark 14 is probably modeled after the Jewish prayer of three times a day as found in Dan 6:11, 14 and 2 Cor 12:8. So much for Daniel Grappe's article. The second example is Abramowski's "Die Entstehung der dreigliedrigen Taufformel," *ZTK* 81 (1984): 417-446 (cited under "Dan 7" and under "word studies"), which refers on about two pages to Jane Schaberg's hypothesis that the threefold baptismal formula derives from a pre-Matthean Daniel midrash on Dan 7 (426-428). I regard this hardly as enough reason for the inclusion of Abramowski's article in a Daniel bibliography. At the most, the article could be cited in a specialized bibliography on the reception of Daniel. There are many other articles listed in *BBR Daniel* that deal with the reception of Danielic material, specifically in the Gospels and in the book of Revelation. However, I regard the usefulness of these articles for the research on Daniel itself as rather limited.

There are also wrong entries in *BBR Daniel*. The article by R. Fuller, "Text-Critical Problems in Malachi 2:10-16," *JBL* 110 (1991): 47-57 (#0042, 0727), has absolutely nothing to do with Daniel. And there is no article by Eugene Rosenberg, "Daniel Manuscripts from Qumran. Part 1," *BASOR* 268 (1987): 17-37 (#0015, 0725, 0839). This is an erroneous double entry for the article by Eugene Ulrich, which, by the way, immediately follows or precedes the wrong entries. One also wonders why Part 2 of Ulrich's article (*BASOR* 274 [1989]: 3-26) was not listed in the bibliography.

Another area of concern is the phenomenon of multiple entries. In the introduction to the series, Mills specifically mentions the possibility of duplication of the same entry in the scriptural citations and the subject citations, and the possibility of "multiple citations by scriptural citation . . . where relevant" (ix). An article can, therefore, be listed under several biblical references and/or under several different subjects.

A comparison of the author index with the entries in parts 1 and 2 shows the extent of multiple citations. I found that the 928 entries of the bibliography refer to a total of 381 publications. That means that on an average, a publication is listed 2.4 times; the maximum being eleven entries of Shea's "Further Literary Structures." In other words, if each publication would have been entered only once—which, of course, is not desirable—the 90-page bibliography of parts 1 and 2 would come down to ca. 37 pages.

In principle, such multiple entries need to be allowed for. They are even necessary

for articles that contain substantial discussions on several texts or on different themes. However, more sensitiveness could have been exerted to when a multiple entry is required and when it is redundant. A case in point is Shea's article "Further Literary Structures in Daniel 2-7: An Analysis of Daniel 4," *AUSS* 23 (1985): 193-202, which is found under chapter 4, 4:4-7, 4:8-9, 4:10-17, 4:18-19, 4:27, 4:28-33, 4:34-38, as well as under "chiasmus," "dreams," and "Nebuchadnezzar." The multiple entries in the subject category cannot be avoided, but to mention Shea's article eight times in the scriptural category in the range of just three pages lacks any justification. It seems to me that one entry under chapter 4 would have been sufficient. Another example is an article by P. Grelot that is listed three times in succession under 3:7, 3:10, and 3:15 (#0077, 0078, 0079). In the subject category similar things happen, e.g., the twelve entries under "Septuagint" are also found under "LXX." Such entries are redundant and only blow up the bibliography unnecessarily.

There are numerous inconsistencies in the arrangement of the entries. Two examples may suffice. Cacquot's article "Les quatre bêtes et le 'Fils de l'homme,'" as well as Casey's monograph *Son of Man*, are listed under "Dan 7" (#0179, 0201) but not under the subject "son of man," whereas other articles are listed under both, e.g., Mulenburg, "The Son of Man" (#0175, 0766). And Lust's essay on "Cult and Sacrifice in Daniel" is indexed under "sacrifice" (#0743), but not under "cult."

A brief comparison with another bibliography on Daniel may be helpful. In the preface, Mills acknowledges the *Bibliographic biblique* by Paul-Émile Langevin (1972, 1978, 1985), but, surprisingly, he does not mention Henry O. Thompson's annotated bibliography *The Book of Daniel* (New York: Garland, 1993). The entries in Thompson's bibliography are arranged alphabetically by author, and both a Scripture index and a subject index refer to the relevant entries. Two other sections list the journals with their articles and the dissertations relevant for Daniel. In the end, such a layout seems for me to be preferable and is certainly more economical. For example, whereas the two articles by Shea that are indexed in *BBR Daniel* occupy seventeen entries in Mills's bibliography, they are listed only once each in Thompson's bibliography.

In compiling scholarly bibliographies it is especially important to pay attention to details. It is disappointing to come across numerous slips as well as textual and formal errors in *BBR Daniel*. One can only wish that greater care would have been exercised.

A last word concerns the price. The publisher apparently intends the book to be a library acquisition, since for the individual customer the 100-page book is highly overpriced. In fact, containing references to 458 publications, of which 77 are commentaries, one pays 9 cents per entry, and 16.8 cents per indexed publication!

Mills's compilation of sources for Daniel can be consulted if one wants to find some of the newer sources, particularly those published between 1993 and 1997. Of course, a recent commentary or a computerized search of the ATLA Religion Database should do the same, if not a better, job. The fact that at the time of its publication in 2002 *BBR Daniel* is basically five years old—i.e., presenting relevant articles up to 1997—is difficult to comprehend. *BBR Daniel* helps certainly as additional bibliography; but, by far, it is rather disappointing for its arbitrary selectivity—one cannot be sure that all the important articles and essays have been referred to—and its unnecessary, repetitious material.

In the end, besides the basic necessity to be up-to-date, a bibliography for scholarly research is functional and meets its purpose only if it either strives to be comprehensive, so that the researcher can delve into the fullness of information, or if it selects the really important material to provide the researcher with a well-justified overview of the relevant

material, preferably even with brief annotations about the work's contents. *BBR Daniel* is not intended to fulfill the first task, and, in my opinion, it falls short in the second.

Berrien Springs, Michigan

MARTIN PRÖBSTLE

Nesbitt, Paula D., ed. *Religion and Public Policy*. Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira, 2001. xii + 278 pp. Paper, \$26.95.

When she organized a panel on "Religion and Social Policy for the Next Millennium" for the 1998 American Sociological annual meetings, Paula D. Nesbitt discovered "how globally diverse, far-ranging, and deeply embedded are religious issues, values, and themes in matters of secular public social policy" (xii). That recognition led to this collection of essays, which is organized around the assumption that religion is a "fundamental variable" (x) in the formulation of social policy. The increasing religious diversity of many societies around the world, Nesbitt believes, requires sociological analysis that also takes into account "gender, racial, and ethnic diversity, as well as socioeconomic inequality and political marginalization" (xii). The concerns shaping this volume reflect the editor's professional responsibilities, for she teaches Women's Studies and serves as director of the Carl M. Williams Institute for Ethics and Values at the University of Denver.

The volume is organized into three parts, with each individual essay accompanied by notes and a bibliography. Part 1, "Religious Freedom, Identity, and Global Social Policy," examines social policies in relation to minority experiences. These essays include: Otto Maduro, "Globalization, Social Policy, and Christianity at the Dawn of a New Millennium: Some Reflections from a Latin American Emigrant Perspective"; James T. Richardson, "Public Policy toward Minority Religions in the United States: A Model for Europe and Other Countries?"; James A. Beckford, "The Tension between an Established Church and Equal Opportunities in Religion: The Case of Prison Chaplaincy"; Tink Tinker, "American Indian Religious Identity and Advanced Colonial Malignancy"; and Ronald Lawson, "Tensions, Religious Freedom, and the Courts: The Seventh-day Adventist Experience."

Part 2, "Religion and Domestic Social Policies," emphasizes case studies of religious social service organizations. These essays include: Helen Rose Ebaugh and Paula Pipes, "Immigrant Congregations as Social Service Providers: Are They Safety Nets for Welfare Reform?"; Katherine Meyer, Helen Rizzo, and Yousef Ali, "Islam, Women's Organizations, and Political Rights for Women"; Nancy Nason-Clark, "Woman Abuse and Faith Communities: Religion, Violence, and the Provision of Social Welfare"; Clare B. Fischer, "Work and Its Discontents: Two Cases of Contemporary Religious Response to Unemployment"; and Adair T. Lummis, "Regional Judicatories and Social Policy Advocacy."

Part 3, "Further Local and Global Complexities," addresses a variety of issues, including the effort by religious organizations to become more fully multicultural. These essays include: Katie Day, "Putting It Together in the African American Churches: Faith, Economic Development, and Civil Rights"; Brenda E. Brasher, "The Civic Challenge of Virtual Eschatology: Heaven's Gate and Millennial Fever in Cyberspace"; Alan Myatt, "Religion, Race, and Community Organizing: The Movimento Negro in the Roman Catholic Church in Brazil"; Yvonne Young-ja Lee, "Religious Syncretism and a Postimperial Source of Healing in Korea"; and Paula D. Nesbitt, "The Future of Religious Pluralism and Social Policy: Reflections from Lambeth and Beyond."

Many readers will find Lawson's examination of Seventh-day Adventists especially interesting. The author, who teaches at Queens College and is working on a book-length sociological study of international Adventism, argues that in the United States Adventists have learned how to use the court system to protect many of their religious