the philologist suggests (234). In Book I, Augustine explicitly discusses the
fact that his earlier anti-Manichean Genesis commentary was an avoidance
tactic, used because he did not, at that time, have an adequate understanding
of the “literal” meaning. With the passing of time, Augustine claims, the
importance and attainability of the task of understanding the literal meaning
became evident to him. Augustine makes it clear through painful repetition (a
structural feature that Fladerer should have picked up on) that the figurative
meaning must be grounded in the historical reality presented by the literal
meaning of the text (e.g., De Gen. ad lit. VIII; IX.12.20).

While he sometimes claims that his interpretation of the literal meaning
is tentative, Augustine is a long way from saying that the literal meaning is
irrelevant. In his later commentary, in addition to suggesting what the literal
meaning is, he is very clear in saying what the literal meaning definitely is not
because he knows that it can have destructive consequences. If the literal were
irrelevant, he would have had no problem with the literal meanings proposed
by the Manicheans with whom he formerly shared company—meanings which
the commentary is clearly meant to counter. It is not an issue of the importance
of either one or the other for Augustine, but an issue of both/and. The real
issue to explore is the question, What does “literal” mean for Augustine?
More useful than scrutinizing words, phrases, and minute structures would
be an examination of the exegete’s broad hermeneutical presuppositions. It is
essential to understand that for Augustine “literal” might not mean “verbally
equivalent” or “univocal,” but it does mean “historically real.”

As a work in philology, *Augustinus als Exeget* seems rather impressive to a
theologian not well acquainted with the theories and debates of the field of
semiotics. Within its own field, it may well be an innovative and useful work
worth acquiring. But for those interested in historical-theological matters, who
seek a work with clear-cut summaries and theological implications, *Augustinus
als Exeget* is a volume that one might be content merely to peruse, as it seems
to obfuscate more than enlighten.

Kalamazoo, Michigan

JAMIE G. BOUCHER

Halpern, Baruch, and André Lemaire, eds. Matthew J. Adams, assoc. ed. *The
Books of Kings: Sources, Composition, Historiography and Reception*, Supplements
to Vetus Testamentum 129. Leiden: Brill, 2010. xvi + 710 pp. Cloth,
$262.00.

The book under review, *The Books of Kings*, edited by Baruch Halpern and André
Lemaire, appears as volume 129 in the Supplements to the Vetus Testamentum
series and, following the usual practice of this esteemed publication by Brill,
presents a collection of studies focusing on a particular biblical theme or book.
The volume reviewed here addresses historical issues surrounding the books
of Kings and contains a rich collection of twenty-nine essays that represent, when viewed together, a state-of-the-art treatment of these canonical books. The contributors are a distinguished group of twenty-seven scholars and each addresses a specific aspect of this great biblical work in their respective essays. Many of the authors are recognized experts in their particular fields. Several authors, such as coeditors Baruch Halpern and A. Lemaire, as well as A. R. Millard and K. A. Kitchen, wrote multiple chapters. A four-year delay in publication necessitated updating some of the early submissions. However, with a few exceptions (noted below), the essays generally account for any dialogue with current scholarship pertinent to their topic and often offer fresh insights in their treatments. There is little doubt that this volume will serve as a standard reference for the books of Kings for quite some time.

The editors wisely chose to combine all references into a cumulative bibliography. This welcome feature, appearing with increasing frequency in edited works, avoids redundancy, eases the process of tracking down sources, and economizes on space by streamlining an already thick volume. Three indices covering subjects, biblical sources, and authors complete the book. The overall production of the volume is simple, yet attractive, although a few formatting issues are noted, such as kerning issues that are the result of attempting to justify margins and the odd insertion of Hebrew letters in place of the publishers’ names in the bibliographic entries for W. Rudolph and K. Rupprecht (652).

The book is divided into six parts. Part 1 contains three studies regarding the textual traditions of Kings from the Septuagint, Qumran, and Josephus, which are authored respectively by A. Schenker, J. Barrera, and É. Nodet. Part 2 consists of five studies addressing the literary aspects of Kings and includes chapters on redaction history (G. Knoppers), two studies on characterization and composition (R. L. Cohn), one on literary structure (Halpern and Lemaire), and another considering outside sources cited in Kings (Millard). Millard not only discusses the royal annals, the letters sent between kings, and the sacred literature referenced in Kings, but also argues for a wide degree of literacy even in rural towns and military posts during the Iron Age. He argues that these earlier sources were both known and available to the author of Kings. Millard concludes that the books of Kings have proven to be historically reliable wherever comparisons with contemporary historical sources have been possible to make and that there is little doubt that the books of Kings were drawn from these earlier sources. Some of these test cases are discussed further by Millard and M. Liverani in their valuable essays found in Part 3, which compares Kings with other extrabiblical historical texts and attempts to place the work in its ancient Near Eastern historiographical context.

Part 4 is devoted to nine people groups mentioned in Kings and includes essays on the Moabites (P-E. Dion and P. M. M. Daviau), the Edomites (Lemaire), the Ammonites (W. E. Aufrecht), and the Arameans (H. Sader)
to the east; the Egyptians and Arabians to the south (K. A. Kitchen); the Philistines to the west (S. Gitin); and the neo-Hittites to the north (Kitchen). The Phoenicians are represented in E. Lipiński’s essay on Hiram of Tyre and Solomon. While partially treated by Liverani and Millard, summary discussions of Assyria and Babylonia, as depicted in Kings, are conspicuously absent. The Levantine kingdoms felt the ominous presence of these great empires when they first appeared on the scene during the ninth and late eighth centuries, respectively. The survival of Israel and Judah was directly related to Assyria by the middle of the eighth century, and Judah’s fortunes were inexorably linked with Babylonia by the final decade of the seventh century until the fall of Jerusalem in 587/586 B.C. It is, therefore, puzzling why the editors failed to treat these two empires that had such a major impact politically and theologically upon the two Hebrew kingdoms, the exilic community, and, by extension, the authors of Kings.

Deserving special mention in this section is S. Gitin’s masterful historical and archaeological survey of the Philistines, complete with color plates. Gitin, who for many years has been involved with excavations at Gezer and Ekron (the latter became one of the five main Philistine centers), is a noted authority on the Philistines and is uniquely qualified to write about the most famous of the five “Sea People” groups. His sixty-four-page treatise goes beyond the books of Kings and is, as far as I know, unparalleled as a source for comparing biblical and Philistine history and culture. His chapter became, for this reviewer, one of the highlights of the entire book.

Part 5 consists of seven essays focused upon detailed issues in Kings. E. Ben Zvi treats the role and image of the prophets to the initial readers of Kings. How the books of Kings represent the priesthood and cult is demonstrated by W. Zwickel. G. Galil discusses dates and calendars, and R. Westbrook investigates law as depicted in Kings. In her chapter on “Officialdom and Society in Kings,” I. Eph’al-Jaruzelska attempts to determine the domains of various officials and their expressed roles as far as the biblical data allow. She takes a novel methodological approach by separating officials recorded during the united monarchy from those who later served in Israel and in Judah. Eph’al-Jaruzelska potentially treats each official title three separate times. By doing so, she attempts to discover subtle differences in duties and functions between the three kingdoms.

Drawing upon his research at Ashkelon and expanding Stager’s Bronze Age “Port Power” paradigm, D. Master discusses Iron Age trade institutions as depicted in Kings. Master’s chapter utilizes a strange combination of APA and SBL styles (e.g., 514-515), which should have been rectified during the editing process. However, he does a notable job in highlighting the importance of trade and the control of trade routes for tax revenue. Especially significant is the amount of detailed data present in the books of Kings that reveal the local and regional struggles faced by the populations of these kingdoms and
how closely trade relationships were tied with prosperity. One may assume that trade between the inland kingdoms and Mediterranean port cities was mutually beneficial since the limited agricultural hinterland controlled by the coastal cities, coupled with a labor force fully engaged in seafaring, provided receptive markets for food products and conversely provided inland kingdoms such as Israel and Judah with much-needed manufactured wares and raw materials. This economic arrangement can be viewed in the relationship between Hiram and Solomon, the ninth-century economic and marriage ties between Phoenicia and the Omrides, as well as those between Jeroboam II and Uzziah during the eighth century, but perhaps also during the seventh, when similar trade relations were quite possibly renewed during Manasseh's reign (cf. 2 Kgs 21:3, 13). This point is overlooked in Master's assessment (510-511).

While Master correctly notes the importance of Hazeva, a huge border fortress and trading hub in the Arabah, recently uncovered by Rudolph Cohen and Y. Yisrael and usually identified with Tamar (cf. 1 Kgs 9:17-18), he mistakenly cites Cohen's encyclopedia entry (which itself is incorrectly dated and lacking pagination) on Kadesh Barnea, rather than referencing one of the late Israeli archaeologist's summary publications on Hazeva (506, n. 20). Control over both sites was undoubtedly critical for extracting duty from Arabian caravans.

Finally, W. Dever's contribution considers the role of archaeology as an outside test source for considering the veracity of the sources found in Kings. Once again, he debunks the Copenhagen and Sheffield “minimalist” (or worse, “nihilist”) school, which endeavors to mythologize Israelite biblical history in part by dating its historical writings to the Hellenistic period. Dever's eloquently presented arguments amply demonstrate that writers or redactors living during the Persian, much less the Hellenistic Period, could never have known the historical details preserved in Kings; many of these details are only now confirmed through archaeological excavations. While Dever holds that the biblical record of the monarchy is “largely accurate,” he also writes that “biblical writers and editors, like all ancient historians, did not hesitate on occasion to embellish their stories, or even to invent details, if this was needed to further their ideological agenda” (521, emphasis supplied). He illustrates this point later, labeling it “authorial intent” (530) and noting the scant biblical references to Lachish in comparison to the importance and promotion that Assyria placed upon this major Judean city. Furthermore, his assertion that the pîm weight, an Iron Age monetary term, only reflects the realia of the eighth and seventh centuries (Dever's accepted composition date of Kings) and provides an excellent antidote against a late Hellenistic date for Kings. Nevertheless, his apparent refusal to place the pîm weight in any pre-eighth-century contexts (e.g., 1 Sam 13:19-21) constitutes an argument from silence, which is notoriously weak and need not be considered seriously. Dever ought to exercise caution when making assumptions on the part of the biblical...
authors. This reviewer would argue that these ancient writers were faithful to their sources and more accurately shaped their histories by selectivity in their accounts, rather than embellishing and fabricating details.

I agree with Dever’s attribution of the eighth-century tower and palace-fortress at Ramat Rahel (Aharoni’s stratum VB) to Uzziah’s reign; in this, he follows Aharoni’s early conclusion. Dever’s view challenges the interpretation posited by Ramat Rahel’s current excavators, who, it seems, follow the minimalistic ideology arising from Copenhagen and Sheffield by envisioning the site as an Assyrian and Babylonian, rather than Judean, administrative center that was founded no earlier than the reign of Ahaz. Unfortunately, several inaccuracies tarnish Dever’s chapter. Two blatant errors are noted here:

First, in his example of correlations between Shishak’s raid and the biblical text, Dever claims that “the complete victory stele of this Sheshonq, now [resides] in the Cairo Museum” (520). No complete victory stele recounting a raid by Shishak/Sheshonq to Palestine is known to exist. Perhaps Dever confused Shishak’s Bubastite Portal inscription, which includes a toponym list carved on the southern entrance of the Karnak temple of Amon, with the earlier, but more famous Merneptah stele (itself the topic of several Dever papers). Only a fragment of a stele bearing Shishak’s name, long displayed at the Rockefeller Museum in Jerusalem, was unearthed at Megiddo.

Likewise, contrary to Dever (530), no “Babylonian-Assyrian coalition” existed in 609 B.C. and Necho II marched north to fight the Babylonians, not “join” them, as Dever states. In actuality, the Saite ruler attempted to assist the collapsing remnant of Assyria in an ill-fated alliance directed against the resurgent Babylonians. Dever’s long familiarity with these well-documented historical sources makes lapses such as these puzzling.

Part 6 contains three studies that discuss the reception of Kings during the Second Temple Period and later antiquity. S. Castelli writes about the books of Kings as portrayed by Josephus, a discussion that shares inescapable points of overlap with the chapter by É. Nodet in Part 1. M. Zetterholm presents a study on the books of Kings as interpreted by the NT, and K. Hedner-Zetterholm writes on Elijah and the books of Kings in Rabbinic literature.

When evaluating the books of Kings with Chronicles in the preface, the editors hold the latter work as “far more simple and less intellectually challenging than Kings . . . more a comic-book version.” Regrettably, this sweeping verdict is itself an overly simplistic appraisal and one with which this reviewer differs. Despite acknowledging that the nonsynoptic accounts in Chronicles “certainly offer an interesting subject in themselves” and that Chronicles encompasses “a wider historiographic tradition” than Kings, the editors discount the mounting evidence regarding the Chronicler’s use of early sources and mistake his overtly theological presentation as historical fiction. Concerning the nonsynoptic issues, arguments have long been made suggesting that both Kings and Chronicles utilized the same Judean archival
sources. Recently, G. J. Brooke (“The Books of Chronicles and the Scrolls from Qumran,” in Reflection and Refraction: Studies in Biblical Historiography in Honour of A. Graeme Auld, ed. R. Rezetko, T. H. Lim, and W. B. Aucker, VTSup 113 [Leiden: Brill, 2007], 35-48) has raised this theory again, utilizing evidence from Qumran. Others have contended that it was often the compiler of Kings who edited out material from his account that the Chronicler chose to include; for example, L. L. Grabbe (“Mighty Oaks from [Genetically Manipulated?] Acorns Grow: The Chronicle of the Kings of Judah as a Source of the Deuteronomistic History,” in ibid., 155-173, esp. 170). Consequently, the nonsynoptic portions of Chronicles must be evaluated not simply as a chronistic invention, but as a possible source of supplemental historical information unattested in Kings that was present in a common annalistic source used by both authors. R. F. Person Jr. (“The Deuteronomic History and the Books of Chronicles: Contemporary Competing Historiographies,” in ibid., 315-336) argues that the Deuteronomistic History and Chronicles were written contemporaneously with each other, namely, during the Persian Period.


When appraising the history of scholarship regarding the books of Kings, the contributions and lasting influence of Martin Noth cannot be overlooked. Indeed the work of this doyen of German OT scholarship continues to be analyzed and assessed in the volume reviewed here, forty-two years after his death. Noth was thoroughly familiar with archaeological data and integrated archaeological results into his writings. However, he recognized from both
personal experience and by observing others that archaeological “facts” were provisional and subject to change and, furthermore, that archaeological interpretations were often subjective and slanted to correspond with the excavator’s (and his or her disciples’) own historical position or ideology. Consequently, Noth was critical and cautious about utilizing archaeology as a tool for appraising biblical history, particularly when making correlations with the Deuteronomistic History. Nevertheless, this reviewer believes that the high level of scholarship, the presentation of so much carefully analyzed archaeological data, and the overall quality of scholarly inquiry and analysis demonstrated in this book are exemplary, making it worthy of appreciation even by the late German master himself.

Berrien Springs, Michigan

Jeff Hudon


Four hundred and sixty-five years after his death, Martin Luther continues to impact the world by the originality and genius of his ideas and the power and passion by which he expressed them. The Global Luther attempts to reinterpret and assess the monumental impact and the relevance of Luther’s ideas on the modern world. The book is divided into five major themes consisting of sixteen essays written by sixteen authors and an introduction by the editor.

The first section, “Luther’s Global Impact,” written by Risto Saarinen, Peter C. Hodgson, and Munib A. Younan, focuses on Luther’s global impact, moving between historical interpretation and contemporary concerns. Saarinen describes the significance of Luther’s life as an urban “legend” in theology, modern literature, and philosophy. Hodgson contextualizes Luther’s view of freedom, especially in the West and particularly in the American civil-rights movement. Younan describes and recontextualizes Luther’s views on the relation of Christianity to other global religions.

The second section, “Living in the Midst of Horrors,” alludes to Luther’s hymn, “In the midst of life we are to give expression to the task, challenge and despair of living in the world today” (8). The essays in this section contextualize Luther’s life and work by wrestling with what it means to be human in the face of experiences that defy meaningful explanation. James Jones explores Luther’s doctrine of justification through his academic discipline of psychology by analyzing Luther’s psychological and emotional makeup. Volker Leppin struggles with Luther’s doctrine of God in the face of life’s horrors. Krista Duttenhaver works out a theology of suffering in the dialogue between Luther and the twentieth-century thinker Simone Weil. Jacqueline A. Bussie ends the section with a message of hope in a world filled with despair and suffering. This hope we have in the possession of promises that are not yet completed.