

have brought it more into synchronicity with the Greek world-view“ (17) dürfte ein bereits stattgefundener „change in Greek thought that led to its accommodation of the exorcist (Near Eastern influences on Greco-Roman thought and practice)“ zutreffender sein. Diese Alternative würde dem bibl. Befund besser gerecht und dem religionsgeschichtl. Phänomen der Ausbreitung verschiedener oriental. Kulte und rel. Vorstellungen vom Osten her über das röm. Reich. Verschwimmen die richtig beobachteten Unterscheidungen der Frühzeit zwischen Griechentum und altem Orient nicht schon mit dem Beginn des Hellenismus durch beidseitige Übernahmen? Der Befund der Apg, die teilweise in dieser griech.-röm. Welt spielt, wird nicht berücksichtigt („... exorcism of demonic spirits appears explicitly only in the writings of the synoptic gospels“, 166). Man denkt jedoch sofort Apg 13.10?; 16.16-18 und 19.12-17, dazu H.-J. Klauck, *Magie und Heidentum in der Apostelgeschichte des Lukas*, SBS 167; Stuttgart: KBW, 1996 und Schnabel, *Urchristl. Mission*, 1104f, 1167f, 1495). Die Rahmung des Exorzismusberichts in 19.13-17 durch Hinweise auf magisches Danken und Handeln (19.12) und durch das entsprechende Zuhörer (19.19) lässt aufmerken. Konnten die urchristl. Missionare ggf. schon auf die „Transferleistungen“ anderer jüd. Exorzisten (Apg 19.13; Lk 11.19; vgl. E. Eve, *The Jewish Context of Jesus' Miracles*, JSNT.S 231; Sheffield: SAP, 2002, 326-376) zurückgreifen – falls dieser Rückgriff überhaupt beabsichtigt war?

Problematisch scheint ferner, dass im Abschnitt über den griech.-röm. Befund die hellenistische Volksreligiosität nicht gebührend berücksichtigt wird; vgl. den Überblick bei W. Foerster, *ThWNT* II, 1-8, der zwischen einem animistischen Volksglauben und der Vergeistigung in der (Religions-) Philosophie unterscheidet, und H.-J. Klauck, *Die religiöse Umwelt des Urchristentums*, Bd. I: *Stadt- und Hausreligion, Mysterienkulte, Volksglaube*, KStTh 9.1; Stuttgart etc: Kohlhammer, 1995). S. kommt auf die Magie und Apollonius v. Tyana im Kapitel über den altkirchlichen Befund zu sprechen (177-89) und nicht in der Hintergrundstudie für das NT. Selbst wenn die entsprechenden Zauberpapyri tatsächlich nur aus dem ersten Jh. n. Chr. stammen, zeigen sie und andere Hinweise m. E. doch, dass man zumindest innerhalb der synkretistisch-bestimmten Volksreligiosität durchaus einen Verstehenshorizont für die urchristlichen Exorzismen hatte – auch wenn die E. sicher nicht immer im Sinne der urchristl. Exorzisten verstanden wurden! – und die vertretene These einer Anpassung für die ntl. Zeit unnötig ist. Lassen sich im ersten Jh. die „magical practices that lurked on the fringes of their societies“ und die „publically sanctioned cults“ (223) sauber trennen – zumindest im zugegebenermaßen schwer zu eruiierenden Verständnis der einfachen Leute?

Zu fragen wäre auch, ob die urchristl. Missionare überhaupt darauf bedacht waren, in ihrem exorzistischen Handeln dem griech.-röm. Verständnis entgegenzukom-

men oder ob man nicht eher mit einer bewussten oder in Kauf genommenen Konfrontation rechnen muss, die die Zeugen mit ihren bisherigen Vorstellungen in Frage stellt. Gerade die Gleichsetzung der heidnischen Götter mit den Dämonen (1Kor 10.20), in gewisser Übereinstimmung mit dem heidn. Verständnis, „Grundsätzlich ist die gesamte griech. und hell. Dämonenausschauung dadurch charakterisiert, daß alles Dämonische mit dem Göttlichen gleichgeartet ist“, *ThWNT* II, 8.35-37) und die beherzte Auseinandersetzung mit den heidnischen Göttern deutet nicht auf eine angestrebte Anpassung hin, sondern zeigt, dass man nicht unbedingt den heidnischen metaphysischen Überbau zu verändern suchte (vgl. den altkirchl. Befund bei W. Reinbold, *Propaganda und Mission im ältesten Christentum*, FRLANT 188; Göttingen: V&R, 2000, 317-22).

Eine Aktualisierung des altvorderoriental., frühjüd. und bibl. Befundes fehlt. In einer Zeit, in der von Dämonen und „dem Dämonischen“ wieder mehr die Rede ist, sie z. B. durch Filme, Bücher, Kinderzimmer und Videospiele spuken und der Okkultismus teils schaurige Urstände feiert, darf durchaus auf die Aktualität des Themas hingewiesen werden (vgl. etwa G. H. Twelftree, *Christ Triumphant: Exorcism Then and Now*; London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1985).

Christoph Stenschke
Wiedenest, Bergneustadt, Germany

*The Trustworthiness of God:
Perspectives on the Nature of Scripture*
[eds. Paul Helm and Carl Trueman]

Leicester: Apollós, 2002, xiv + 289 pp., £14.99, pb,
ISBN 0-85111-476-8

SUMMARY

The Trustworthiness of God is a helpful collection of essays that explores the relationship between God and his words in Scripture. The initial essays argue that God's trustworthiness is a recurring theme of the Pentateuch, the Wisdom Literature, and the Prophets. This theme is then traced through the New Testament, in essays that examine Jesus' and Paul's views of Scripture, and is confirmed from historical, systematic, and philosophical perspectives. The book concludes with two responses providing insightful criticism.

ZUSAMMENFASSUNG

The Trustworthiness of God ist eine hilfreiche Sammlung von Artikeln, die die Beziehung zwischen Gott und seinen Worten in der Schrift untersuchen. Die ersten Artikel argumentieren, dass Gottes Vertrauenswürdigkeit ein Thema ist, das wiederholt im Pentateuch, in der Weisheitsliteratur und in den Propheten vorkommt. Das Thema wird dann durch das ganze Neue Testament hindurch in Artikeln, die Jesu und Paulus' Sicht von der Schrift darlegen, verfolgt. Weitere Bestätigung kommt von historischen,

systematischen und philosophischen Perspektiven. Das Buch schließt mit zwei Antworten, die einsichtsreiche Kritiken bieten.

RÉSUMÉ

Cet ouvrage sur la fiabilité divine est une collection d'essais utiles qui examinent le rapport entre Dieu et ses paroles dans l'Écriture. Le premier essai montre que la fiabilité de Dieu est un thème récurrent du Pentateuque, des écrits de sagesse et de la littérature prophétique. D'autres essais présentent la conception de l'Écriture de Jésus, puis celle de Paul. D'autres encore abordent le sujet sous l'angle de l'histoire, de la dogmatique et de la philosophie. Le livre se termine par deux réponses apportant des critiques pertinentes.

* * * *

The Trustworthiness of God examines the age-old *quaestio* of first theology, not from the perspective of which should come first, the ontological (God) or the epistemological (Scripture), but from the perspective of the relationship between the two. Is the epistemological faithful to the ontological? In other words, does Scripture give us an accurate representation of God as he is really? The answer to this question must be yes if God is to be trusted, or, according to several of the contributors, if he is to be God at all. A God who claims to be something that he is not can only be a deceiver and is not worthy of our trust.

This book is comprised of a collection of essays designed to demonstrate that God is in fact trustworthy. The opening section seeks to show that his trustworthiness is a consistent theme of the Old Testament. Deuteronomy, for example, plainly depicts a God who is reliable and faithful in his words and actions [Gary Millar]. And Jeremiah presents itself as the words of God spoken through the prophet. The idea that Jeremiah's speech is the very speech of God is requisite to its authority. Because God is true and trustworthy, his words are true and trustworthy and valid for all time [Gordon McConville]. But Micaiah's seemingly false prophecy and the account of the 'lying spirit' sent out to deceive Ahab in 1 Kings 22, appear to call this into question. P.J. Williams exonerates God and upholds his trustworthiness by pointing to the context of the 'false' prophecy, which clearly teaches that God's words are always fulfilled. Because verse 15 cannot be separated from this context (or from verse 16 in particular), the 'dialogue as a whole is entirely truth-illustrating, somewhat akin to Solomon's "wise" initial ruling that the baby whose parentage was being debated should be cut in half' (p. 63). The 'lying spirit,' on the other hand, proclaims God's sovereignty in a way reflective of Job 1. Craig Bartholomew's essay on the Wisdom Literature, though an interesting article, is out of place in this opening section; it does not fit in with the theme of the overall book.

The Old Testament witness to trustworthiness is rein-

forced in the second section of essays from a New Testament perspective. In the first essay, a lucid presentation of Jesus' use and view of Scripture, we see that Jesus, in line with his Jewish contemporaries, appeals to the Old Testament as the final authority in controversies and believes that the words of Scripture are the very words of God, which cannot be broken [Donald Macleod]. Paul too shares this same outlook. Because Scripture is the 'oracles of God', it is wholly trustworthy, an idea that is seen clearly in Romans 9-11: despite the partial hardening of Israel, God remains faithful to his promises to the elect [Drake Williams]. God's faithfulness to his promises is also the theme of Hebrews. According to Hebrews, the Old Testament is fulfilled in and through the person and work of Jesus. Readers of the epistle are thus invited, by frequent exhortations, to respond to God in light of his faithfulness in Christ [David Peterson]. In order to clarify further Paul's approach to Scripture, and to protect its trustworthiness, the final essay of this section deals with one particular passage in which he appears to use allegorical interpretation, 1 Corinthians 9:9-11. David Instone-Brewer argues that Paul is not using allegory here, which would affect the objective interpretation of Scripture (and thus its and God's trustworthiness); rather, Paul is interpreting 'do not muzzle the ox' literally, as a first-century Jew would, to mean any animal or even a human servant.

The third section contains contributions from historical, systematic, and philosophical perspectives and begins with an evaluation of the church fathers' practice of allegorical exegesis. Through this evaluation, we learn that biblical interpretation is a difficult and many-faceted enterprise [Gerald Bray], a fact that is confirmed by the sheer diversity of Scripture. The wealth of genres alone in Scripture testifies to the unfathomable nature of the God who stands behind it [Timothy Ward]. God's trustworthiness is the particular emphasis of essays written by the editors, Trueman and Helm. It is the unconditional promises of God, according to Trueman, that prove he is worthy of our trust. Because the God who is able and willing to fulfil his promises, stands behind them, they, and he, can be trusted. Helm expounds on what it means for God to be able and willing to keep his promises. It means God must be omnipotent (with power over secondary actions), omniscient (with a knowledge of those secondary actions), and infinitely good (not using his power and knowledge malevolently).

In the fourth and final section, Colin Gunton and Francis Watson provide responses to the arguments of the book. Much of the same ground is covered in both responses. Their chief criticism, a legitimate one, is that more attention should be given to how the person and work of Jesus highlights God's and Scripture's trustworthiness. If the promises of God are central to establishing his trustworthiness, and if those promises are 'yes and Amen' in Christ (2 Corinthians 1.20), then a discussion of God's trustworthiness should emphasize Christ more than a discussion of others of his attributes; should

it not? Granted, the essay on Hebrews does cover this ground to some extent, as I mentioned above, but, in spite of this, perhaps more attention could have been directed here. No doubt at least part of the reason why Gunton's and Watson's essays are included as part of the collection is to provide this needed attention. Having said that, this book is both stimulating and helpful, therefore heartily recommended.

Guy Richard
Edinburgh, Scotland

*Habakkuk: A New Translation with
Introduction and Commentary
(The Anchor Bible 25)*

F. I. Andersen

New York: Doubleday, 2001, xxii + 387 pp., US
\$45.00, hb, ISBN 0-385-08396-3

SUMMARY

This commentary on the book of Habakkuk by a seasoned scholar provides a wealth of material, particularly relating to literary features and general historical background, as well as a brief introduction to Hebrew poetry. But it is not very well organised and theological issues are not explored in any depth. It has a lot to offer to Old Testament scholars and students although its usefulness for theologians and preachers is limited.

ZUSAMMENFASSUNG

Dieser Kommentar eines Gelehrten, der bereits andere Kommentare zu prophetischer Literatur und Beiträge zur hebräischen Poesie geliefert hat, bietet reichhaltige Erörterung der literarischen Eigenheiten des Habakukbuches nebst einer kurzen Einführung in die hebräischen Poesie und zeigt gute Kenntnis des allgemeinen historischen Hintergrundes. Der Kommentar ist jedoch nicht besonders gut organisiert und zeigt sich wenig interessiert an theologischen Fragen. Er hat Einiges zu bieten für Alttestamentler und Studenten, doch sein Wert für Theologen und Prediger ist begrenzt.

RÉSUMÉ

Ce commentaire sur le livre d'Habaqouq par un spécialiste aguerri est riche en informations, et présente un apport particulier pour ce qui concerne les procédés littéraires et l'arrière-plan historique général. On y trouve aussi une brève introduction à la poésie hébraïque. Il n'est cependant pas très bien agencé et les questions théologiques ne sont pas abordées en profondeur. Il est d'un grand intérêt pour les spécialistes de l'Ancien Testament et les étudiants, mais d'une utilité limitée pour les théologiens et les prédicateurs.

* * * *

"The interaction between Habakkuk and Yahweh documented in Hab 1:2-2:6a retains in its literary presenta-

tion some of the liveliness and untidiness of actual experience," (222-23). This comment on the first part of the book of Habakkuk could be applied to Andersen's commentary itself. The commentary invites readers to participate in the author's interaction with the biblical text in all its liveliness and some of its untidiness. It contains a wealth of material and offers the excitement of studying Habakkuk with a mature scholar but the lack of a strong finishing touch sometimes leaves one confused and enlightened at the same time.

Andersen has a strong interest in the poetry of the text and offers helpful discussion of it. But our understanding of ancient Hebrew poetry is far from certain and Andersen does not see the need to explain his presuppositions. His principles for establishing the line-division are unclear, as the line-division in the transliterated Hebrew text offered frequently diverges from that adopted in his translation. While we are given interesting ideas, there is no fully coherent system to apply or closely argued case to contend with.

Andersen seeks to address "the general reader as well as the professional scholar" but while on some occasions he takes great care explaining new concepts, at others he presumes a fairly detailed knowledge of grammatical terms and concepts or is in danger of losing general readers by using Hebrew script. It also needs pointing out that in keeping with the series, Andersen's "general reader" is more interested in literary than theological matters. Those wrestling with the theological implications of violence and other topics addressed in the book are likely to be disappointed.

As regards specific interpretative decisions, the following may be of interest: Andersen follows the straightforward and traditional reading of chapters 1-2 as the report of a dialogue between the prophet and Yahweh. While he allows for the possibility that 1:5-11 are a quotation within a speech extending from verse 2 to verse 17, he considers such a move unnecessary and suggests that moderns may be asking for more logical coherence than readers in antiquity. Andersen fails to see how "we shall not die" (traditional Hebrew text in 1:12) could be meaningful in context and decides that the reading "you won't die" is the better. He recognises, however, that the traditional reading cannot easily be explained as a pious correction and puts forward the idea that the consonantal text could be read as a niphal participle (rendered as "one who is not dead"), in which case "you won't die" corrects a misunderstanding of the consonantal text. In 2:2 Andersen proposes that "and explain it upon the tablets" may be a reference to dictation. There is no interaction with Tsumura's discussion of Akkadian evidence and argument in favour of understanding the second imperative as "make plain."

In 2:4 Andersen follows an idea that has recently gained popularity among commentators, namely to link "faith/fullness" not with the righteous person but with the vision, or possibly Yahweh. As Anderson wavers between the two, readers will find support both for "he"