came to an end in 722 B.C.

The most speculative part of the book is that in which Hammershaimb attempts to reestablish the mentality of the historical Amos. There is no doubt that something of Amos' personality comes across in the book that bears his name, but it is doubtful if we can reconstruct a biography to the extent here attempted.

Altogether this work of Hammershaimb follows the style of his other learned works. The proposed scale of the book does not enable him to discuss the issues at length, but it provides a sound basis of interpretation from which fresh thinking can be done.

Los Angeles Valley College, Van Nuys, California

ZEV GARBER


The work under discussion is a reworked doctoral dissertation accepted in 1968 by the University of Cambridge. Its origin as a piece of thorough research is internally betrayed first by the wealth of footnotes—almost 2000—which cover approximately 125 pages, or more than one-third of the text; and second, by a bibliography of 46 pages.

Hoehner's Herod Antipas is the first scholarly, book-length treatment of the sovereign who killed John the Baptist and under whom Jesus lived. Other forerunners of this work have been either chapter-length studies of this king in connection with publications dealing with all the Herods, or popular books such as those by V. E. Harlow (1954) and G. Schofield (1960).

The book is divided into three main parts, to which are added ten appendices, a bibliography, and indices. The first part deals with Antipas' youth and struggle for the kingdom; the second with the geography, population, and economy of his realm; and the third with the history of his 43-year reign. In this last part, the longest in the book, much emphasis and space have been devoted to Antipas' dealings with John the Baptist, Pontius Pilate, and Jesus Christ. The author examines the available evidence—Josephus, the Bible, classical statements, church fathers, etc.—from every conceivable angle, and brings into play each proposed theory that has been voiced in recent years. In most cases, after thoroughly examining all pros and cons, he generally leans toward acceptance of the gospel writers' narratives. However, Josephus, his main source for Antipas, does not always fare so well, and Hoehner is in most cases probably right when he questions Josephus' historical accuracy.

The appendices deal with a number of subjects in greater detail than was possible in the text. Hoehner, in the first appendix, isolates six different wills of Herod the Great, while other scholars usually recognize only three or four. Appendix III treats one of the most tantalizing and fascinating subjects of ancient history, the size of the population of Galilee and Perea, the two parts of Antipas' tetrarchy. Along with every sensible modern scholar he rejects
Josephus' figure of three million inhabitants for Galilee, and finally opts for about 200,000, or approximately 266 people per square mile. This figure seems reasonable. The population of Perea he estimates to have been between 125,000 and 135,000 in Antipas' time, which means that Antipas ruled over a realm of an estimated one-third of a million subjects. Several appendices are devoted to the thorny problems of chronology. Here, Hoehner will not find too many scholars who will agree with all his dates, especially with those given for John the Baptist's death—A.D. 31 or 32—and Jesus' trial and crucifixion—A.D. 33.

Having done no checking, I cannot say how reliable are the thousands of references which are presented in the footnotes and in the bibliography. Reading through the book, I was impressed with the lack of sense-destroying typographical errors which mar so many scholarly books. On p. 239, n. 2, however, a small but serious error was noted. In line 2 the second of should be an or in order to give meaning to the statement made.

Andrews University

Siegfried H. Horn


The problem of the meaning, as distinct from the truth, of theological speech, is the peculiar and most radical problem of the theologian of our time. Jenson's concise, lucid, and scholarly treatment of this problem is most welcome. The "problem about God" has two roots: (1) the "intellectual policy" introduced by modern science, of demanding that any meaningful assertion about the world be open to correction by appeal to events, and the relation of assertions about God to this language-policy (p. 18); (2) the commitment of historical science to the idea of relativity. "It is the nature of historical study to put everything into a particular place in history" (p. 20). That involves that statements purporting to be universal are put in their place.

Jenson's study is both historical and systematic. A descriptive account is given of Origen's theology and the usage of the concept of "image" within it as the key to the solution of his problem—to preserve the distance between two levels of reality, and, at the same time, to show the possibility of contact between them. Without this meeting of the levels there could be no talk about God. By means of the image concept Origen can bridge the gap between being and non-being, God and man. But Christ is no Gnostic figure for Origen; the "image" spans the temporal as well as the ontological order. The history of Jesus Christ, to which witness is given in Scripture (to the interpretation of which Origen devoted his primary attention), is thus the clue to the future. The Law is a shadow of what is to come. The Gospel "teaches a shadow of the true mysteries of Christ" (p. 53). Origen does not have to be made into a theologian of hope. He simply needs to be claimed as one.

The claim about Thomas Aquinas is quite explicit: his language is eschatological in that it posits transcendence, and looks to the *eschaton* for the verification of its sentences. Since the knowledge of the essence of God