this new understanding of Judaism is the insistence that distinctive Jewish observances such as circumcision, the food laws, and the Sabbath are necessary in order for a person to be part of the covenant. But for Paul faith in Jesus Christ has taken their place. The law thus served as a boundary marker and identifier of the covenant people and excluded Gentiles.

Dunn has written a stimulating series of articles. He is at his best in analyzing a passage showing its different contexts. His treatment of Paul’s relationship to the Jerusalem apostles (Gal 1) is superb. His treatment of Gal 2 is also excellent, although I would not agree with all his points. Some of his arguments appear strained because they seem to support a general theory which he has accepted (Sanders’ proposal) and thus he needs to explain a passage in harmony with this conclusion. This is especially so in chaps. 8 and 9. Dunn’s exegesis of Gal 3:10-14, which he calls a test case, is difficult to follow. He explains the curse of the law, not simply as the condemnation on those who break the law and fail to keep it, but especially on those who confine God’s favor on nationalistic terms, based on boundary and ritual markers. Then Dunn says that Christ put himself under the curse and outside the covenant. It is not clear on the basis of the previous understanding how Christ becomes a curse. Does he become one who confines God’s favor to the Jews exclusively? Yet Dunn says he puts himself outside the covenant. How does he do this if the curse is on one who thinks that God’s grace is exclusively for the Jews?

The jury is still out as far as Dunn’s proposal is concerned. And since it is based on Sanders’ thesis, this, too, remains to be confirmed. Dunn himself has pointed out some of the weaknesses in Sanders’ thesis.

Chico, CA 95926

Sakae Kubo


Tell Gezer has been excavated by two major (and one minor) archaeological teams. The earliest of these excavations were conducted by R. A. S. Macalister (1902-1909). Suffering from too many workers and virtually no supporting staff, Macalister’s work is only slightly useful for interpretive purposes. The second, and certainly more significant, series of archaeological investigations began in 1964 sponsored by Hebrew Union College (HUC) in Jerusalem.

This book is the first report of Phase II of the HUC excavations at Tell Gezer. Phase I of those excavations was initiated by G. Ernest Wright. The major part of the excavations was directed by William G. Dever (1966-
Although innovative and most helpful in defining some of the earlier archaeological periods, Phase I of the HUC excavations did not clarify Tell Gezer's later history (Late Iron II, Persian, and Hellenistic Periods). Thus, the Phase II excavations (Field VII) were launched with the express purpose of deciphering the chronology and history of Tell Gezer during those periods. Phase II excavations were directed by Joe D. Seger (1972-1973) and Gitin's book is a partial report of those excavations (27).

Gitin's work is divided into two volumes: Text and Data Base and Plates. The text is subdivided into three sections. "Part I: The Stratigraphy" outlines the balk/debris-layer method of the excavators and explains their record-keeping process, the stratigraphy of Field VII, and the basis for the developed chronology of the findings. "Part II: The Corpus" describes how the ceramic finds were processed and selected for publication. The final section of the text volume, "Part III: the Analysis," focuses on the classification of ceramic horizons and their parallels.

Although a few items of general interest are scattered throughout the book (e.g., dog burials, 20, 31; four-room houses, 15-16, 29-30; and a cache of farming tools, 23), Gitin's Gezer III will not appeal to a reader with a casual interest in archaeology. Gitin's book is designed for use by the research scholar. It is a detailed site report.

Following the superior traditions established in the earlier HUC Gezer volumes, the book excels many similar reports. Gitin seems to be aware, more than most, that archaeology is a destructive art. He painstakingly explains the method of the excavation and the rationale of each aspect of the project. Perhaps the detailed description of methodology is due to this book's derivation from Gitin's thesis (ix). In any case, the scholarly reader is well served.

Another significant aspect of this work is that the author references more than just comparable pottery plates at other sites. Gitin also discusses specific issues that affect his interpretations (e.g., the date of the destruction of Lachish III, 106, especially footnote 2). Such discussions, plus clearly defined specific chronological and historical assumptions (e.g., 16-18), make this work useful to all researchers.

Plans appearing in Part IX, "Plans (Master Sections, Field VII) and Phasing Plans, Field VII West," are clearly drawn and easily used with the text. This section is secured in a pocket inside the front cover of the Data Base and Plates volume. Parts IV-VIII—which include charts, indices, and plates—are in the same volume. The photographs are clear and illustrate the text well.

In short, Seymour Gitin's Gezer III is an excellent example of a well conceived and clearly written excavation report. Gitin has designed this report in such a way that those not physically present during the excavations can vicariously reexamine the project through the evidences he presents in this book. Gezer III will be a constant reference for those
interested in the Late Iron II through Hellenistic periods and for researchers desiring a guide for crafting excavation reports.

Andrews University

David Merling


In this book, Harvey reopens the study of the sayings of Jesus after Bultmann's "brilliant analysis," which, even if unintentionally, seems to have rendered the teaching of Jesus irrelevant to Christian ethics. As a result, today "the church and the entire structure of Christian moral theology" (17) has proceeded to devise guidelines for Christian living based on natural law. Others who are outside "the church," like Gandhi, Tolstoy, and Bernard Shaw (16), have recognized a distinctive ethic of Jesus.

Harvey acknowledges that "in what situation, or with how much emphasis, elaboration or repetition Jesus would originally have spoken them [his sayings] we shall never know" (38). Still, he wishes to establish "within which framework of thought such teaching would have been given and what response would have been expected from its hearers" (20). Here he does with the ethical teachings of Jesus what he did with his ministry and passion in *Jesus and the Constraints of History* (see my review in *AUSS*, 22 [1984]: 269-271). His argument is that the moral teaching of Jesus finds its most logical context in the aphoristic sayings of the Wisdom Tradition, even if at times it shares with *Koheleth* an antiwisdom stance. It also shares with Cynic teachers the desire to give moral instruction to the masses, rather than limiting itself to the leisure class.

The author makes a good argument for a Wisdom framework of thought, thereby rejecting both the Pharisaic project of building a fence around the law and the Essene constitutionalizing of a sectarian "rule." It seems, in fact, that Harvey's main concern is to deny that the ethic of Jesus was intended, or should function, as a "community rule" (27). Thus, while admiring those Christians who through the centuries have taken the strenuous commands of Jesus seriously, because they function "as a judgement on those more liberal and world-affirming Christians who have settled for an 'ethic of intention,'" Harvey criticizes them for having converted Jesus' instructions into "rules" (202).

According to Harvey what is distinctive about Jesus is the way in which he placed the Wisdom moral tradition at the service of his gospel of the kingdom. Some elements which are central to the Wisdom tradition, like the importance of a good reputation, the value of moderation, and the significance of friendship (67), are absent from Jesus' teaching. But what