“and increasing obedience” (192)—evidences that reveal whether or not someone is among the truly elect (192). Writing from a Reformed perspective, Hafemann says these characteristics are not based on church members’ “own decision or fortitude, but [on] God’s self-generated eternal decree, which unleashes a chain of consequences that begins with God’s foreknowledge and predestination and climaxes with their glorification” (100), leaving “no excuse for . . . continuing, habitual disobedience” (159). One wishes Hafemann would have provided tangible examples of what “continuing conversion,” “increasing conformity to the image of Christ,” and “increasing obedience” look like in the real world—continually increased giving to charity, Bible reading, prayer, involvement in Matt 25:31–45-type activities? And if these same qualities were also evidence of election in the OT era, how could they have been manifested in one’s life apart from the presence of the Spirit who purportedly came after the cross?

Hafemann is to be commended for his well-argued insistence that Paul’s message and ministry are grounded in the new covenant, though it would have been an even more coherent defense had he integrated the experiential dimension of the covenants. He also includes many additional insights that this brief review could not explore but that readers will find valuable on themes that are tangentially related to his primary thesis—e.g., his exegesis of Exod 32–34 of the meaning of Moses’s “veil” as Paul used it in his argument on the covenants (2 Cor 3:13–18), his assessment that Paul’s assurance of the Second Coming of Christ formed “the foundation and motivation” for his “insistence on . . . ethical transformation” (189), and so forth. Scholars will appreciate this book, which attempts to integrate many of Hafemann’s written works on Paul into a unified covenant perspective.

Berrien Springs, Michigan

Skip MacCarty


In what way do the Dead Sea Scrolls (DSS) adapt and expand the legal content of passages taken by them as authoritative Scripture? What constitutes authoritative Scripture for them? Do they see a difference in authority between various texts seen by them as Scripture? What hermeneutic strategies and exegetical techniques do they employ when they reuse scriptural legal passages? And how do the DSS fit into legal discussions in ancient Israel? These are key questions as Jassen develops his arguments in his rich and penetrating book, Scripture and Law in the Dead Sea Scrolls. The book provides a valuable contribution to the study of legal texts among the DSS, a study that only recently is beginning to receive the attention it deserves in scholarship.

The first third of the book gives a very valuable overview of research done on the legal discussions in the DSS and how the concept of authoritative Scripture developed. Over one hundred pages follow that are devoted to Isa 58:13 and the Sabbath restrictions against speech and thoughts of labor in the DSS and their contemporary Jewish milieu. Then some forty pages are
devoted to a discussion of Jer 17:21–22 and the Sabbath carrying prohibition, and finally a chapter on the use of non-Pentateuchal passages in the same mentioned texts. Immediately, such a narrow textual scope might appear too specialized. Very soon, however, the readers see how this allows Jassen to fine-tune his discussions, leaving us with the clearest exposition of reuse in the DSS of non-Pentateuchal legal passages that I have seen. Jassen’s book nicely complements other recent publications on related topics.

Having worked primarily on the intrabiblical legal reuse, it strikes me how Jassen’s analysis of the DSS seems very close to what is taking place within the HB itself, while the rabbinic discussions are more removed. It seems that the cases Jassen discusses give basis for speaking of continuity rather than discontinuity between reuse of scriptural legal passages in Scripture itself compared to similar reuse in DSS. Yes, the scriptural sources are rewritten with their ambiguities being replaced by more precise locutions. On this level, Jassen points to a discontinuity. But this seems to take the form of close scribal reading to extend the scriptural passages into their own time and setting. In this way, the goal is not to undermine the scriptural authority, but rather to bring these passages into a Lebenswelt where they can be acted upon. On this more basic level, there is, therefore, a continuity. It is an appropriation intent to clarify practical issues of application, even when the new formulation itself might problematize the possibility of its own fulfillment. An example here would be the pious man in Leviticus Rabbah 34:16, who is not able to resist thinking about his vineyard on the Sabbath, as discussed by Jassen.

Bernard Levinson and Jeffrey Stackert, scholars that Jassen himself draws upon (62–64), have emphasized a “hermeneutics of concealment” in intrabiblical legal reuse, where the borrowing text usurps the authority of the scriptural source text only to replace it with concrete regulations. To me, the cases Jassen discusses, however, seem to support the view that, even when new elements are introduced or altered, the intent of the ancient Israelite scribes was to appropriate the texts, clarifying issues when needed, in order to facilitate a framework in which the community could see themselves as loyal to Torah practice. As far as I can see, Jassen’s study seems to corroborate a model of continuity rather than discontinuity on the question of legal reuse in ancient Israel.

I should mention that I wanted more discussion by Jassen of how to differentiate between a shared tradition, common literary source, and direct literary reuse between two sources. Some scholars place prime emphasis upon the analysis of individual cases and the intuition of the scholar in each case to determine whether there is reuse or not. Others create a list of criteria that specific cases need to conform to in order to be said to be cases of reuse. Jassen seems closer to the former. Both approaches have their weaknesses, and, in my opinion, the better approach is possibly to be found somewhere between the two. This results in Jassen, at several points, claiming that a common lexeme (often a very frequent Hebrew word like רבד and אצי) together with a shared theme provides sufficient basis for concluding there is direct literary reuse (cf. 77, 81–82, 89, 93–95, 112, 156, 181, 187, 207, 210). In my opinion,
this is a weak basis and calls for more reflection on how scholars approach the question of literary reuse in ancient Israel. As an analogy, many scholars deny literary reuse based on comparable parallels between the eighth-century prophets (Amos, Micah, and Hosea) and Torah. This raises the questions of why we seem to find such an accumulation of more elusive cases of reuse in ancient Israelite literature, and how to deal properly with these. When are we entitled to call something literary reuse, and when not? And when can we say that differences are intentional modifications?

Jassen ends the book by writing: “Thus, even as these texts turn to scriptural material for authority, they are free to change the very wording of the authoritative texts. In so doing, the Second Temple texts are themselves contributing to the formation of the canon and its textual character. In contrast, the rabbinic approaches to many of the very same scriptural passages respect their textual integrity even as they dramatically transform their meaning and practical application through midrashic reformulation” (252). Maybe these two approaches are not best described in general through terminology such as “concealment” (62) or “subversive” (65). While some reuse may be subversive, DSS reuse through rewriting and rabbinic reuse through commentary may also reflect a deep loyalty to their sources. As it seems difficult to call everything either subversive or loyal, each case needs to be studied independently on its own merits. Further, I am somewhat unsure whether the one approach is “contributing to the formation of the canon” more than the other. The rewriting of the DSS was not included in the canon as such. And both approaches testify to the authority of their sources. While one appropriates through rewriting and the other through commentary, this difference does not itself seem to be the key to understanding canonization. Both hermeneutical approaches could have been used both in the process of canonization itself and after its completion. To me, it is not clear that DSS rewriting itself is “contributing to the formation of the canon.” Rather, the accumulated attribution of authority over time seems gradually to stabilize the canon.

This said, Jassen’s book is rich and thorough, and any reader interested in intrabiblical, Second Temple, or rabbinic reuse of Scripture will be rewarded in reading it.

Grimo, Norway

KENNETH BERGLAND


The book under review represents the second and concluding volume of the final report for the well-known salvage excavation of an Iron Age IIA-B *faviya* or cultic repository pit, extremely rich in finds, discovered on a hill just north of Tel Yavneh in Israel. The first volume appeared in 2010 (for a content summary of this earlier report, see my review in *Near East Archaeological Society*...