

with the sacrifice of Christ. "Christian worship," Young concludes, "was increasingly assimilating the religious features of a dying paganism" (173).

These two chapters can be read as an excellent summary of the status of the academy's understanding of the development of the Christian ministry in the second through fifth centuries. The greatest critique, in our opinion, lies in the brevity of the chapters. The strength of Hayes's sharp focus on his three cities is his demonstration of the diversity of ministry from place to place, but the weakness of such a focus is the lacunae of times and places not covered. For instance, the later development of mystagogy in the West, such as the homilies of Ambrose, is not mentioned; and the early strength of the presbyters as church leaders in at least some parts of the East, as represented in the writings of Polycarp and Ignatius of Antioch, is also omitted. Thankfully, Young crosses over from the Greek writers to discuss Cyprian in her presentation of the development of the ministry into the priesthood.

The final section of the book focuses on the shape of the Christian community and ministry "in the Church today." Each of the three chapters focuses on one of the three major forms of contemporary Christian ministry: episcopal, presbyterian, and congregational. Each of the authors is well suited to talk from the inside of each of these forms. John Webster writes on "The 'Self-Organizing' Power of the Gospel: Episcopacy and Community Formation." David C. Hester presents "The Sanctified Life in the Body of Christ: A Presbyterian Form of Christian Community." Miroslav Volf shows "Community Formation as an Image of the Triune God: A Congregational Model of Church Order and Life." Each of these chapters emphasizes the community of believers in the church as found in its various forms, but the shape of each community pictured is quite distinct. Of course there are numerous current church communities that do not exactly fit any of these three models or that have elements of all three. This is not surprising in view of the suggestion in the earlier chapters of this book, correct in our opinion, that the early Christian communities had a variety of shapes, none of which exactly prefigured the current shapes of Christian communities.

Andrews University

TERESA L. REEVE AND JOHN W. REEVE

Moskala, Jifí. *The Laws of Clean and Unclean Animals in Leviticus 11*. Berrien Springs: Adventist Theological Society, 2002. 484 pp. Paper, \$19.95.

Jifí Moskala's Ph.D. dissertation, "The Laws of Clean and Unclean Animals in Leviticus 11" (Andrews University, 1998) is probably the most comprehensive on the subject. He begins with a lengthy review of everything written (1.1-111), followed by an analysis of the approaches taken in this literature (2.112-159), before applying his own analysis of the structure of these laws (3.160-280), their theology (4.281-344), and his conclusions (344-381). His work contains 10 tables and an overwhelming bibliography of about 1,330 items (382-484).

Moskala makes one major error throughout the dissertation. The seven pairs of clean animals that Noah brought on the ark (Gen 7:1-2) were only for sacrifice, not for food. When Noah offered sacrifice (Gen 8:20), he already followed an accepted practice (Gen 4:4). Only *after* the flood was Noah conceded the right to eat meat (Gen 9:3). This concession includes the entire animal kingdom, "every living thing that moves." If it were limited to pure animals, the text would have said so. The alimentary restriction to pure animals is first commanded to Israel in Lev 11: only quadrupeds qualified for the altar are eligible for the table.

Three main errors also stand out. "The impurity of unclean animals" (276-277; i.e., of carcasses) is indeed contagious (cf. Lev 11:26b, 27b, 28). Also, the dietary regulations are not applicable to aliens (278, 352-353), with the exception of the blood prohibition (Lev 17:10, 13) and the need to undergo purification after eating dead or torn animals (Lev 17:15). Furthermore, all priests are holy, even if they are blemished (227). Similarly, the dietary laws help Israel attain holiness even if they are blemished.

If these errors can be corrected, the dissertation could be published as a book. The blue pencil, however, should be applied generously, especially to the repetitive style in the theology section (chap. 4).

Some of my work will be helpful. For example, Moskala is absolutely correct in rooting the dietary laws in creation. He will find confirmation in *Maarav* 8 (1993): 107-116, where I demonstrate that the distinction between *šeqes* and *tâme* animals is rooted in the six days of creation. Also, since only *visible* defects disqualify priests and sacrificial animals (Lev 21 and 22), so too the rabbit family (Lev 11:5-6), which *appears* to be chewing its cud, and the camel (Lev 11:4), which *appears* to possess no split hoof.

University of California
Berkeley, California

JACOB MILGROM

Ryken, Leland. *The Word of God in English: Criteria for Excellence in Bible Translation*. Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2002. 336 pp. Paper, \$15.99.

Among English teachers, Leland Ryken is the best-known conservative writer on the Bible as literature. My wife and I both used his textbooks when we were in college thirty years ago, and he is still writing and teaching English at Wheaton College.

The Word of God in English is influenced by the experience Ryken gained in the past few years serving as the literary stylist for the English Standard Version of the Bible. His assignment was to read through the entire Bible, making changes that would heighten the literary beauty of the version. The ESV is the prime example of Ryken's theories in action. The version reads well aloud, as Ryken meant it to. The language tends toward elevated diction meant to set it apart from more mundane writing.

Ryken has divided his book into five sections: "Lessons from Overlooked Sources"; "Common Fallacies of Translation"; "Theological, Ethical, and