French, German, Spanish, and English, as well as Italian.

In his preface the author states: "Stimulated by today's contributions of biblical exegesis and the varied approaches of psychology and anthropology, I began about ten years ago to concern myself with woman in the inspired scriptures, publishing partial studies here and there. The insistence of women students and friends impelled me to gather and rework what was already in print and integrate it with new contributions. It is not an encyclopedia of biblical feminism, but only thirteen chapters that illustrate perhaps the more significant aspects of the argument. . . . There is lacking, for example, a chapter on Mary of Nazareth and another on the priesthood of women" (p. 13).

The epilog tells of the author's acquaintance with Margit Sahlin, author of two books and one of three women first ordained as Lutheran priests in Sweden in 1960. She is in charge of the parish of Engelbrekt, the largest in Stockholm, and among her four assistants is one of the other first-ordained women, Christine Odenberg, a nationally famous horsewoman. The final paragraphs of the epilog sum up the author's viewpoint throughout his book: "The feminism of the Bible has a lesson to impart to men and to women. To men it teaches to throw into the sea the unjust and unjustified superiority complex and to be doubtful of many common attitudes, not excluding that of psychoanalysis which accuses women of passivity, narcissism and masochism. To women it recalls the duty of recognizing ever better, and living and defending, her own identity—'male and female made them' God Himself (Gen 1:27); in Jesus 'there is no male nor female' (Gal 3:28)—even at the cost of renouncing the privileges accorded to them in the centuries of machismo. . . . I wish wholeheartedly to the male and female readers of these pages the blessing of hearing and practicing the Word" (p. 316).

Leona Glidden Running
Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI 49104


Tov begins by discussing the aims and the limits of textual criticism (he seeks a diplomatic rather than an eclectic text). Though he professes to find truth in the theories of both Kahle and Lagarde on Septuagintal textual history, his own theory of "multiple textual traditions" is heavily Lagardian. His discussion of literal and free translation techniques provides useful criteria for analyzing the relative literalness of a given text (chap. 1).

Most differences between LXX and MT can be attributed to the exegesis of the translators or to inner Greek corruptions (chap. 2). His essay on how to reconstruct the Vorlage of the LXX when there are true textual differences is masterful (chap. 3). Here and throughout the book he cites numerous biblical examples and punctuates his discussion with references to the best relevant secondary literature. An excursus to chap. 3 deals with the use of the Hatch and Redpath concordance and carefully shows the strengths and weaknesses of this often-used, but frequently misunderstood tool. After a discussion of elements not expressly indicated in the Vorlage of the translators, such as vocalization, word-divisions, and sense-divisions (chap. 4),
Tov concludes Part I of the book with a classification of all the deviations between MT and LXX. There are variants (pluses, minuses, transpositions, differences in words), but also non-variants (the kinds of readings discussed in chap. 2). A category called variants/non-variants deals with grammatical items on which we can never be sure whether the deviation is to be attributed to the Vorlage or to the translators. Pseudo-variants are those deviations which can be retroverted into a Hebrew text, but in fact existed only in the translator's mind (chap. 5).

Part II deals with the evaluation of the Hebrew variants reconstructed from the LXX. He questions whether the Vorlage of the LXX ought to be attributed to an Egyptian provenance, and he urges considerable caution on evaluating the relationship between the Qumran texts or the Samaritan Pentateuch and the MT and LXX. Conclusions about 4QSam should wait until the texts are completely published. While SP and LXX do often agree, the agreements between SP and MT are even more numerous, and textual theory should take these statistics into account. What Frank Cross terms proto-Lucianic is, in his opinion, Old Greek (chap. 6).

Finally, he presents the "rules" of textual evaluation. He rejects all external considerations and supports fully only one internal consideration: the appropriateness of the reading in its context. Lectio difficilior and lectio potior are held to be of very limited use. Tov argues that the LXX and 4QJer reflect an earlier edition of the book of Jeremiah rather than a different textual form or recension. A similar interpretation is given to the two versions of the Goliath story, the chronological systems in the books of Kings, the transition between Joshua 24 and Judges, and the list of princes and Levites in Nehemiah 11 and 12. He cannot decide whether the variations between MT and LXX in other cases are based on inner-translational changes or whether they reflect Hebrew variants. (Russel Nelson's recent Harvard dissertation suggests the latter for Exodus 35-40.) Since the variants in a book like Jeremiah were not created by the normal processes of textual transmission according to Tov, the shorter edition of the LXX of Jeremiah is not to be preferred, just as the pre-deuteronomistic form of Kings is not to be preferred over its present canonical form. The apparatus of BHS is methodologically wrong, therefore, when it notes in Jeremiah: "absent from LXX, an addition."

It is this final point which would seem to be the most debatable section of the book. Further work is needed to refine the distinction between a recension and an edition. Were not many of the expansions in the longer text of Jeremiah, including the conflations, the additions of subjects and objects, and the filling out of the divine name, scribal or textual rather than redactional in nature? Is the comparison of the expansionist text of Jeremiah with the deuteronomistic editing of Kings or Jeremiah really apt?

Tov does not refer at all to the Cambridge edition of the LXX, let alone explain how to use it. This is unfortunate since it is the only available modern edition for the textually crucial books of Judges, Samuel, Kings, Chronicles, Ezra, and Nehemiah. He errs when he states that all his citations are from the Göttingen LXX or Rahlfs (p. 13). He is clearly quoting from the Cambridge LXX when he refers to minuscules in Samuel on pp. 91, 94, and 215. Students who want to know about the effects of the Hexapla or the character of the katage recension will have to look elsewhere. His rejection of external considerations, especially the assumption that in cases of doubt the MT is to be preferred, is perhaps too brusque. In his Anchor Bible commentary on I Samuel, P. Kyle McCarter, Jr., occasionally remarks that there is no
criterion by which to decide between MT and LXX, but then he often goes on to prefer the LXX. I doubt whether Tov would follow him and that because of external considerations.

These slight defects aside, this is an extraordinarily solid and reliable introduction to text critical use of the Septuagint.

Ralph W. Klein
Christ Seminary–Seminex, St. Louis, MO 63103


This title is somewhat misleading; the book is more than a history of monarchical Israel and Judah. That is simply Part I. Part II ("The Enemies") is a description of those peoples who had an impact on these kingdoms. Parts III and IV are shorter summaries of the prophets and their message and of the faith of Israel. "History" in the broadest sense, however, provides the theme and unity for all four sections.

The author's presuppositions for writing history are not those of the standard histories (Noth, Bright, Herrmann). Emerson's "there is properly no history; only biography" is quoted with approval in the Preface (p. xvii). Indeed, the "great man" theory is much in evidence, and historical causation is often sought for in the psychology and motives of the Davids, Ahabs, and Elijahs of the story. Another quotation from the same page: "Scant attention [is] paid to such questions as the date and authorship of the Old Testament books. . . . [I]t is surprising how rarely the answers to historical questions depend on the answers to literary ones." The major result of this startling principle is the book's injudicious overuse of Chronicles (see, for example, pp. 91–92 on the campaign of Amaziah from 2 Chronicles 25). Form-critical terms (fairy tale, legend) are used loosely and pejoratively. Lightning is invoked over Elijah's Carmel sacrifice (p. 81, also pp. 232–33).

The other three sections of the book would be useful in certain educational settings, especially Part II. The theology is Christian and conservative. It is perhaps not carping to point out that Josephus Ant. 10.21 cannot really be quoting Berossus, as stated (p. 112).

Richard D. Nelson
Lutheran Theological Seminary, Gettysburg, PA 17325


In his introduction, Dockx explains that source analysis of Genesis 2–3 has resulted in "almost complete anarchy" (quoting J. B. Pritchard, p. 6). Confusion reigns because of anomalies in the received text, including contradictions and confusing doublets, i.e. stating twice that the garden was planted (Gen 2:8–9) or the tree should not be eaten (Gen 2:16–17 and 3:3). Given these textual problems, Dockx