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Paul’s primary intention for this commentary is to provide a unique exegetical exposition of Isaiah 40–66 that focuses on “philological, poetic, literary, linguistic, grammatical, historical, archaeological, ideational, and theological” elements (ix). Furthermore, Paul holds that this commentary comprises a detailed examination of Isaiah 40–66, with special attention given to intertextual (Paul refers to this as “inner-biblical”) material and extrabiblical influences upon the text of Isaiah 40–66 (ibid.). Another underlying purpose of this commentary is Paul’s cogently presented position that the book of Isaiah clearly divides itself into two discrete segments comprised of chapters 1–39 and 40–66. While he accepts that there are two Isiahs, he rejects the possibility of a third Isaiah (1-12).

Throughout the commentary, Paul cites extensively both biblical and extrabiblical sources. A unique aspect of this commentary is his ability to discover the so-called influences of other biblical writers such as Jeremiah on Isaiah 40–66. Much of this type of material is presented in numerous tabular comparisons throughout the commentary, but especially in the introductory chapter. For instance, there is a table comparing shared linguistic and ideological elements between Jeremiah and Isaiah 40–66 on pp. 53-55. He also cites extensively from extrabiblical sources such as the Ugaritic works (59-61) and Jewish sources (63-66). The use of varied sources enables him to situate the prophecies of Isaiah 40–66 within a larger milieu.

Paul has written a truly monumental commentary on Isaiah 40–66, lived up to his stated intentions, and provided a plethora of exegetical materials pertaining to the prophecies. The commentary’s strengths include (1) the extensive use of tables that help the reader rapidly locate materials and follow Paul’s thought with relative ease, (2) an introduction to Isaiah 40–66 that is at once succinct and comprehensive, (3) an extensive use of Hebrew throughout that allows the reader to closely follow the original text, (4) the absence of footnotes that allows for a more consistent reading of the commentary and provides an easier path to learning, and (5) various analyses of literary features (e.g., inclusos, semantic and linguistic allusions, and specific devices such as assonances) that provide a deeper and broader reading of the text. I find this particular feature the most beneficial aspect of the book. Paul’s ability to uncover literary connections between different parts in the book of Isaiah offers a macro view of the biblical text that is much needed.
However, there is one notable oversight: Paul cogently and convincingly argues that there is no division after Isaiah 55, thus eliminating the idea of a third Isaiah (5-12). He states emphatically: “I maintain that chaps. 40–66 are one coherent opus composed by a single prophet” (12). Along similar lines, he assembles an impressive array of materials to demonstrate the close links between Isaiah 40–66 and Isaiah 1–39 (350-352). Furthermore, he clearly points to the tight bond between chapters 65–66 and Isaiah 1 (590-591, 610). He posits that “the relative abundance of terminology” that exists between these three chapters evidences a literary framework that envelopes the book of Isaiah (590). Nevertheless, he contends, the book of Isaiah is comprised of two distinct segments, with Isaiah 1–39 composed by Isaiah ben Amoz of Jerusalem,” and Isaiah 40–66 by “an anonymous prophet” (1). In presenting the case for the two Isaiahs, Paul simply recites well-established critical arguments, addressing linguistic, conceptual, and historical differences between the two segments of Isaiah. Paul’s position raises questions about the acquiescence to critical assumptions that fly in the face of internal evidence. To establish the literary unity of the book so convincingly and then deny unified authorship weakens the overall impact of the commentary.

Nevertheless, I find this commentary invaluable and commend Paul’s contribution to the study of Isaiah, particularly regarding literary analysis, intertextual data, and extrabiblical materials. It is a valuable tool for seminarians and those who teach Bible at the tertiary levels. I strongly recommend Paul’s *Isaiah 40–66: Translation and Commentary* to every serious student and teacher of the Word.
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Maurice A. Robinson, Senior Professor of New Testament at Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary, Wake Forest, and Mark A. House, Professor of Biblical Studies at New Geneva Theological Seminary, Colorado Springs, revise and update Pershbacher’s *New Analytical Greek Lexicon*, which is based on Robinson’s corrected and expanded computer database of the Greek NT. This new work varies in a number of significant ways from the Pershbacher’s edition. Some of these changes are improvements, while others are of debatable value. For example, there is no table of paradigms with explanatory remarks at the beginning of the lexicon. These have been replaced by a series of appendices at the back of the new lexicon, namely; “Appendix III: Greek Word Tables.” The publishers observe that Wigram’s explanatory notes were “overly detailed and technical, making it difficult to navigate the vast territory of Greek grammar in order to find the information needed to analyze a particular Greek word” and that Wigram “included many forms and grammatical details that were relevant to broader Greek, but not particularly