

Tuckett's approach to the NT material itself might be said to be representative of mainstream critical scholarship. His discussion and conclusions are judicious and are not overburdened with references to other scholars, although his footnotes to each chapter show he is well-versed in the most recent scholarship in English. He first treats the epistles, devoting one chapter to the views of Paul as reflected in the undisputed letters, one chapter to the deutero-Pauline letters, with separate sections on Colossians, Ephesians and the Pastorals, and one chapter to Hebrews. The chapter on Paul focuses primarily on the titles, Christ, Son of God and Lord, on Adam typology, on the corporate Christ and on the use of Wisdom language. If anything, Tuckett is slightly minimalist in his approach, siding with Dunn in finding no notions of Christ's pre-existence in passages such as Gal. 4:4, Rom. 8:3 or even Phil. 2:5-11. He is also very cautious about drawing any far-reaching conclusions about Christ's relationship to God from the fact that OT texts about Yahweh are applied to Jesus or from the fact that Paul's letters indicate that Jesus could be prayed to or could be the object of worship. While acknowledging Paul's exalted claims for Jesus, Tuckett prefers to see these as not requiring any radical modification of the apostle's clear-cut Jewish monotheism.

The Synoptic Gospels are tackled next, with a chapter devoted to each and with Acts drawn into the depiction of Luke's Christology. Tuckett is well aware of the criticisms levelled against concentrating on titles attributed to Jesus and knows that narrative Christology of the Gospels entails broader considerations. Nevertheless, he finds that titles do play an important narrational role and so organizes his treatment around these. So, for example, in Mark Son of man, with its ideas of suffering and subsequent vindication taken from Daniel 7, is seen as qualifying the titles Messiah and Son of God, which could be misconstrued in triumphalist vein, but it is the narrative as a whole, culminating in Jesus' death in weakness on the cross, which makes clear his true identity and the nature of his messiahship and sonship.

The last section of the NT material discussed is the Johannine literature and here a chapter each goes to the Gospel, the Johannine Epistles and Revelation. In regard to the Gospel of John, Tuckett is clear both that its treatment of Jesus is less historically reliable than the Synoptics, because it is so highly coloured by the views and setting of the evangelist, and that, of all the NT writings, this treatment, with its high claims for Jesus in relation to God, is the most determinative in setting the agenda for subsequent Christological debates.

In the discussion of the historical Jesus' self-understanding, Tuckett, in line with many others, talks of an implicit Christology, in which Jesus sees himself as occupying a special place as the agent through whom God's eschatological activity is taking place and holds that prophet and Son of man were the key terms for Jesus' own view of this role. Jesus also claimed a close personal relationship to God in terms of sonship, yet this was a

relationship he wanted others to share with him.

Having kept to his historical agenda throughout the book, Tuckett does allow himself a brief postscript in which he tackles the question whether the gap between Jesus' self-understanding and the views of the NT writers about him invalidates the latter. Among his observations here are that it should not be surprising if a fully human Jesus had ideas that turned out to be in some sense incomplete or 'wrong', that Christian claims about Jesus always have to be more than a repetition of Jesus' claims about himself, and that they involve an interaction with the whole event of Jesus' life, death and resurrection in the light of later changed circumstances and of beliefs about God and the universe. The book as a whole, therefore, offers students a lucid and careful overview of the results that can be obtained and some of the questions that will be raised in taking a moderate critical approach to the New Testament and its Christology.

Andrew T. Lincoln, Cheltenham, England

*The Madness of King Nebuchadnezzar:
The Ancient Near Eastern Origins and
Early History of Interpretation of Daniel 4
(Supplements to the Journal for the Study of
Judaism, 61)*

Matthias Henze

Leiden: Brill, 1999, xii + 296 pp., 91.00 Euro, hb.,
ISBN 90-04-11421-1

SUMMARY

The author investigates the literary prehistory and Wirkungsgeschichte of the description of the madness of King Nebuchadnezzar, arguing that this part of Dan. 4 is based on the experiences of his successor Nabonidus. Henze offers valuable contributions to the history of Jewish and Christian reception and interpretation of Daniel, and he is to be thanked for his survey of the references to actual Babylonian history and to the conceptual background, which appears in the imagery employed in the description of Nebuchadnezzar's madness. He accepts the critical consensus of a second-century BCE dating of Daniel, even though the evidence could also be taken to support an early date. Regrettably, he fails to provide a detailed exposition of Dan. 4 in its literary context of Dan 1-5.

ZUSAMMENFASSUNG

Der Autor untersucht die literarische Vorgeschichte und die Wirkungsgeschichte des Berichtes vom Wahnsinn Nebukadnezars. Er tritt dafür ein, dass dieser Teil von Dan. 4 auf den Erfahrungen seines Nachfolgers Nabonidus beruht. Henze bietet einen wertvollen Beitrag zur jüdischen und christlichen Rezeptionsgeschichte des Danielbuches und verdient unseren Dank für seine Untersuchung zu

den tatsächlichen Hinweisen auf die babylonische Geschichte und deren konzeptuellen Hintergrund. Er stimmt dem kritischen Konsens einer Datierung des Danielbuches ins zweite vorchristliche Jahrhundert zu, obwohl die Beweislage auch eine frühere Datierung unterstützen würde. Bedauerlicherweise bietet Henze jedoch keine detaillierte Auslegung von Dan. 4 in dessen literarischem Kontext von Dan. 1–5.

RÉSUMÉ

Cet ouvrage traite de l'arrière-plan littéraire et de l'histoire de la réception du récit de la folie de Nabuchodonosor. L'auteur pense que le chapitre 4 du livre de Daniel est en fait basé sur l'expérience de Nabonide, successeur de Nabuchodonosor. Il apporte une contribution intéressante à l'histoire de l'interprétation juive et chrétienne du livre, et on peut lui être reconnaissant pour l'apport d'informations sur l'histoire babylonienne et l'arrière-plan conceptuel qui transparaît dans le langage utilisé pour décrire la folie de Nabuchodonosor. Henze adopte la position de la critique radicale, qui situe la rédaction du livre au II^e siècle avant notre ère, bien que les données pourraient être prises comme appui pour la situer à une époque plus ancienne. Il manque à l'ouvrage une analyse détaillée du chapitre 4 et de ses liens avec le contexte littéraire des chapitres 1 à 5.

* * * *

Henze presents an interesting study of the literary pre-history and the *Wirkungsgeschichte* of a little-studied and enigmatic part of the fourth chapter of Daniel. After the introduction, he deals with the problem of the relation of the MT to the Old Greek version, concluding that 'the versions do not display any signs of textual dependence . . . and are not easily reducible to a linear chain of development . . . the relation between the two is best described as collateral in nature' (pp. 3, 47–48).

Next Henze argues for the origin of the chapter in the cuneiform literature of the Ancient Near East: 'the biblical author did not create his fabulous tale about Nebuchadnezzar's (N) madness *ex nihilo*, as it were, but rather was informed by his cultural, i.e., his literary environment, the eastern Jewish diaspora, when he composed his story' (p. 52). Henze traces these elements back from the biblical text into cuneiform literature and describes the transformation that took place in the process. He begins with a survey of the Neo-Babylonian dynasty to which N and Nabonidus, the last of the Neo-Babylonian emperors (626–539 BCE), belonged, comments on N's madness and Nabonidus' reported exile and surveys the Babylonian imagery occurring in the text. He concludes:

The fabulous account of N's madness is not a medical record of a rare disease. It is a piece of Babylonian mythology, borrowed by the ancient Israelite author, turned upside-down, and applied to King N, Isra-

el's enemy of the first rank. The ironic twist, if not sarcasm, in the biblical account of having the king of Babylon, apex of all civilisation, transform into an animal could hardly be put in stronger terms. (pp. 99, 206)

The following three chapters are devoted to the chapter's reception in Judaism and Christianity. They are valuable contributions to the history of Jewish and Christian reception and interpretation of Daniel. The focus on little-known interpretations in Syriac language is laudable and points to an interpretative tradition, which is often neglected and ignored. The volume closes with three appendices on Daniel at Qumran, Dan. 4 in the MT and the Old Greek (a survey of the significant differences in both versions discussed in ch. 1) and Jacob of Serug's (451–521) *Homily on Daniel 4*.

Henze is to be thanked for his survey of the references to actual Babylonian history and to the conceptual background, which appears in the imagery employed in the description of N's madness. While the evidence is open to Henze's interpretation, it could also be taken to support the traditional evangelical position on Daniel and perhaps fits better with this position (cf. the lucid exposition in G. Maier, *Der Prophet Daniel* [Wuppertal: R. Brockhaus, 1986²], pp. 43–66 and R.K. Harrison, *Introduction to the Old Testament* [London: Tyndale, 1969], pp. 1110–34).

Henze locates the author's cultural and literary environment in the eastern Jewish diaspora. However, despite the significance of N in Jewish history as the destroyer of Jerusalem and its temple and the agent of the Babylonian exile, can a Jewish author in the second half of the second century BCE somewhere in the Eastern Jewish Diaspora really be credited with the detailed references to Babylonia and the Persian kings that we find in Dan. 1–6 as well as the inclusions of Babylonian concepts and imagery (Dan. 4 is perhaps for good reasons presented as a report not of the Jewish author but of the Babylonian king himself)? Does Henze's assumption, following the critical consensus, take the major changes brought about by the Hellenisation of Babylonia and Persia in the fourth century BCE sufficiently into account? Would the Babylonian 'Lokalolorit' not more easily support the historicity of the account and the traditional early date?

Henze's (by no means new) thesis that the account of N's madness is based on the experiences of his successor Nabonidus (p. 204) is not undisputed (cf. e.g. J. Lebram, 'Dan-iel/Danielbuch', *TRE* 8 [1982], p. 331). Despite some similarities to Dan. 4 in 4QPrNab (cf. F. García Martínez, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Translated* [Leiden: Brill, 1994], p. 289), the prayer also contains *major differences*: the king was afflicted by a 'malignant [skin] inflammation' (cf. Job 2:7), not with madness and turned into an animal, but 'banished far from men'; after his prayer to God Most High, Nabonidus was forgiven and exhorted by a Jewish exorcist (Daniel does not appear after 4:27, which is not understandable if the

account were based on the traditions also reflected in the prayer); during his expulsion, Nabonidus is featured as a devout idolater ('prayed for seven years to all the gods of silver and gold', a theme that would have gone well with Dan. 3 and 5:4, 23), while N is portrayed as fully insane (cf. the discussion of Nabonidus' sojourn in Arabia and of such differences in E.M. Yamauchi, *ISBE* III, pp. 468-79). Thus it is problematic when Henze supports his case by stating that 'the key evidence in support of the Nabonidus Hypothesis comes from Qumran in form of the *Prayer of Nabonidus*' (p. 204).

When the events of the life of Nabonidus are taken to have provided the backdrop of N's madness, one needs also to account for the fact that the self-laudation of N in 4:27 (N as the master builder of Babylon), which cannot be isolated from the madness-restoration account in 4:1-37, fits well with what is reported about him and in statements of himself in ancient sources (Maier, *Der Prophet Daniel*, pp. 47-48). Again one might ask whether a second-century author, even if living in the Eastern diaspora, would have known of the major achievements of N's kingship, i.e. an architect rather than a military commander, especially as N appears in non-Danielic biblical accounts almost exclusively as a military campaigner.

The interesting Babylonian conceptual background suggested and sketched by Henze (pp. 73-90) is also apparent in N's dream in Dan. 2. What Henze interprets as a pointer to the source of the account could also be understood as God's condescension to meet N, so to speak, on his own turf (through dreams, visions and with experiences understandable in the framework of the ancient Babylonian mythology known to N) in addition to the direct revelation through the prophetic ministry of Daniel. Such condescension appears elsewhere in the OT and is attested by many testimonies from the history of mission.

From a methodological viewpoint, it is unfortunate that Henze focuses on merely a section of Dan. 4. In the description of God's dealings with N (Daniel is hardly the protagonist!), chapters 1-4 form a unity and should be seen together, as Dan. 4 describes the climax of a longer development, sketched in masterful strokes from Dan. 1 onward, and as Dan. 4 presupposes throughout the narrative building of the character of N in the preceding chapters (cf. J.A. Darr, *On Building Character: The Reader and the Rhetoric of Characterization in Luke-Acts* [Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1992]). The focus of Dan. 1-4 is not the triumphant humiliation of N, but his conversion in finally recognising and acknowledging the living God as the source of his power and glory (cf. the summary and application in 5:18-23). In addition, a comparison with the characterisation of Belsazzar in Dan. 5 would have been instructive, as both chapters are closely linked through the reference in 5:18-23.

It is unfortunate that Henze does not provide detailed exposition of the actual chapter itself, with all

the interesting historical and theological (e.g. the sapiential themes) issues it raises.

Christoph Stenschke, Bergneustadt, Germany

J.C. Ryle, First Bishop of Liverpool: A Study in Mission amongst the Masses

Ian D. Farley

Carlisle: Paternoster Press, 2000, xiv + 258 pp. £19.99, pb., ISBN 1-84227-017-6

SUMMARY

Farley's well-written study presents Bishop Ryle as a man of many contrasts. His staunchly Evangelical beliefs are treated as well as his interest in worship (production of several hymn books) and his impact during his episcopate. The book is of interest not least because of its relevance to the present day.

ZUSAMMENFASSUNG

Farleys gut geschriebene Studie präsentiert Bischof Ryle als Mann vieler Gegensätze. Sowohl seine unerschütterlich evangelikalen Ansichten als auch sein Interesse an gottesdienstlicher Musik (Herausgabe mehrerer Gesangbücher) sowie die Auswirkungen seiner Bischofszeit werden behandelt. Das Buch ist nicht zuletzt wegen seiner gegenwärtigen Relevanz von Interesse.

RÉSUMÉ

Cette étude bien rédigée présente l'évêque Ryle comme un homme de nombreux contrastes. L'auteur souligne ses fermes convictions évangéliques, son intérêt pour le culte (il a produit plusieurs recueils de cantiques) et son influence durant son ministère. L'ouvrage a un apport intéressant pour la situation présente.

* * * *

Ian Farley's study of J.C. Ryle is rooted in an extensive range of primary sources, which are listed in detail at the back of the book. Ryle emerges from Farley's study as a man of many contrasts. From his early days at Helmingham in Suffolk to the end of his days as first Bishop of Liverpool, he remained a staunchly Protestant and Evangelical churchman of the 'Recordite' school.

Ryle's beliefs were staunchly Evangelical. He held firmly to the plenary inspiration of Scripture, the centrality of the cross and the substitutionary atonement. 'There is more to be learned at the foot of the cross', he wrote, 'than anywhere else in the world'. Ryle was a strong supporter of Evangelical societies, most notably the Church Missionary Society, for which he preached annually, and the Society for the Promotion of Christianity Among the Jews. Ryle had a particular liking for what he felt was good worship and produced several hymn books. Ryle was much in demand as a preacher