KING'S THEOLOGICAL REVIEW

Volume II Number 1 Spring 1979

incorporating The Kingsman

visual aids to language teaching and the fact that much less grammatical information is required than was formerly thought before a student may begin working on a text in a foreign language, our whole approach to language teaching might be due for review.

Finally, Nida remarks that modern linguistics has great relevance for the business of Bible translation; this, of course, is his primary concern. Translation, however, can hardly be done independently of exegesis, and this is where linguistics is of such importance. The intention of any translator should be to render in the "target" language the substance of what was written in the original, with as much of the associative meaning preserved as possible. This approach, known as "dynamic equivalence" translation, allows for the primacy of the sentence as the bearer of meaning and concentrates on the total message conveyed by a complete utterance, of whatever length, style or level of writing. Since this aim entails more than word equivalence, it would seem appropriate that knowledge of some linguistic insights be required of any student of foreign texts.

In conclusion, it is to be hoped that the foregoing article has at least shed a little light on the field of linguistic science. The writer certainly hopes that he has set out the grounds for the autonomy of linguistics, and the necessity for it to develop its own proper procedures, just as theology and, more particularly, Biblical studies must. This is absolutely essential for interdisciplinary work to be carried on at a valid level, for only then can it become, as it should, a necessary prelude to hermeneutics and, which is probably of greater significance to readers of this *Review*, to teaching and preaching.

NOTES

1 For example, in an excellent article by A.C. Thiselton, 'Semantics and New Testament Interpretation', in I.H. Marshall (ed) *New Testament Interpretation*, Exeter, 1977.
2 The twelve being: Hittite and Toccharian (no longer represented by any spoken language), along with Indian, Iranian, Slavonic, Baltic, Germanic, Celtic, Italic, Illyrian, Thraco-Phrygian and Greek.
3 F de Saussure, *Course in General Linguistics*, Glasgow, 1974.
4 J. Barr, *The Semantics of Biblical Language*, Oxford, 1961.
5 T. Boman, *Hebrew Thought Compared with Greek*, London, 1960.
6 J. Marsh, *The Fulness of Time*, London, 1960.
7 J. Pedersen, *Israel; Its Life and Culture*, London, 1926.
8 W.C. van Unnik, 'Reiseplåne und Amensagen', in *Studia Paulina* (Festschrift for J. de Zwaan), ed J.N. Sevenster, Haarlem, 1953.
9 T.F. Torrance, *Royal Priesthood*, Edinburgh, 1955.
10 E. Jacob, *Theology of the Old Testament*, London, 1958.
11 In *God and Rationality*, Oxford, 1970.
12 Cf. the work of Karl Popper in the philosophy of science and, for a convenient introduction, Bryan Magee, *Popper*, Fontana Modern Masters, Glasgow, 1975.
13 Stephen Prickett, 'What Do the Translators Think They are Up To?', *Theology*, November 1977.
14 L. Bloomfield's major work, *Language*, was published in New York in 1935.
15 N. Chomsky's work still continues across a wide field. His seminal linguistic works are *Syntactic Structures*, The Hague, 1957, and *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax*, Cambridge, Mass., 1965.
16 E.A. Nida, 'Implications of Contemporary Linguistics for Biblical Scholarship', *JBL* 1972.
17 R.J. Coggins, 'Hebrew?—It's All Greek to Me!', in *The Kingsman*, No. 19 (1976-77).
18 J.F.A. Sawyer, *A Modern Introduction to Classical Hebrew*, Oriel Press, 1976.

BOOK REVIEWS

EXPLORATORY WILES: OR HOW TO BEAT ABOUT THE BURNING BUSH.

Stuart Hall

"The earlier part of my career as a theologian", writes Professor Wiles, "was spent in studying and teaching the early history of Christian doctrine. My approach to that early patristic tradition, including the creeds, was the same as that of any serious biblical scholar to the biblical texts. One treated them as the writings of fallible human beings seeking as best they could to record, to interpret and to make sense of their experience in terms of the knowledge and culture of their day. In the case of the Fathers that involved understanding the Bible very differently from the way in which it is understood by Christians today and working out their convictions in terms of a philosophy very different from our own. How could such an approach,

I found myself reflecting, however faithfully fulfilled, be thought to provide an unchanging framework of truth for all time? To conceive that it could was not so much an expression of faithfulness to God and to his revelation; it was more like a refusal to take history seriously, more like making an idol out of particular forms of words. Just as the nineteenth century found itself committed to the painful but necessary task of 'biblical criticism', so it seemed to me was our age committed to the equally necessary but equally painful task of 'doctrinal' or 'credal criticism' "[1]. This piece of autobiography is very illuminating if we are to understand what Wiles has done, in this book and elsewhere. He has moved from an historical discipline to what he would call 'critical'. In doing patristic history he is lucid and proficient, and the final essay in this book on "Sacramental unity in the early church", being largely historical, is the best (despite a lapse in presenting Sozomen's narrative on p. 101; read Sozomen!). He sometimes takes for granted a level of patristic information which his readers may not have (e.g. 47), but that is an error on the right side. It is when he gets to 'critical theology' that the touch becomes insecure, there is a remarkable absence of secondary documentation (did not the great Ritschlians such as Harnack attempt this same reworking of creed and dogma in the light of massively documented history?, and the content threatens always to evaporate to nothing. And yet it is the core of this, as of the author's other recent books, and his avowed goal.

The book consists of lectures and papers from various dates, one as early as 1963. Three, on the role of critical theology and its relation to christology and to world religions, and a fourth on the patristic appeal to tradition, are all recent and previously unpublished. The remainder, on the historical element in Christianity and on Holy Spirit, scriptures and eucharist, have all appeared before. But they all illustrate the theme of 'doctrinal' or 'credal' criticism. Before getting into detail, we should perhaps note the disjunction. Doctrinal and credal criticism are not necessarily the same. It is one thing to say that a particular creed such as the Nicene is not verbally infallible, needs to be understood in its historical context, might have been expressed differently, is capable of conflicting interpretations, and omits features of Christian faith which at other times and places seem of vital importance. That is credal criticism. It is quite another thing to attempt to disentangle the Gospel from broad areas of doctrinal belief howsoever expressed, which is what 'doctrinal criticism' might be taken to mean. The ambiguity was there in *The myth of God incarnate*, and on the ambiguity that book chiefly foundered. Its authors never seemed to know whether they were discussing the belief that God was personally incarnate (enfleshed) in Jesus, or every kind of doctrine which gives him a personal divine status or a pre-existence; whether they were attacking the refined metaphysical propositions of Chalcedonian type, or the earliest Christian preaching for which we have first-hand documentation, the heaven-sent Son and exalted Lord of St Paul. Wiles himself seems to embrace the more radical alternative.

In the oldest chapter, "The Holy Spirit in Christian theology", he pleads for a restatement of the doctrine of the Holy Spirit in terms of the transcendent holiness of God on the one hand, and the communion of God with man (Spirit to spirit) on the other. "Thus to know God as Holy Spirit is to know him as the absolutely other entering into the most intimate conceivable relationship with man" (68). The traditional approach is at fault in "attempting to understand the Holy Spirit in too direct and isolated a manner. This has led to the hypostatization of the idea of the Holy Spirit as a distinct third person of the Godhead" (70; I think he must mean "the hypostatization of the Holy Spirit" not "of the idea"). This may lead us to relegate Holy Spirit to a partial, peripheral or secondary place in our understanding of God, instead of the total, central and primary (71). Wiles draws conclusions about the effect of this on our understanding of the Spirit's relation to scripture and sacraments: mention of Holy Spirit warns us that the matter is "part of the activity of a God who is absolutely transcendent and yet at the same time enters into the most intimate conceivable fellowship with men" (72). That is clear, forceful, and to those with a peripheral view of the Holy Spirit salutary. It anticipated when first published the elaboration of similar

[1] Maurice Wiles. *Explorations in Theology 4*. SCM Press, London, 1979. xii + 115 pages. £3.50. p. 51. All subsequent references, in parentheses, are to pages of this book unless otherwise stated.

ideas by Geoffrey Lampe in *God as Spirit*. But from another point of view it is flat and jejune. It lacks the vitality which bubbles over in New Testament texts about the Spirit, and which underlies even the more prosaic definitions of the church fathers. For them, the intimacy with God transcendent is finally and immeasurably given to man *in Christ*. "God sent the spirit *of his Son* into our hearts crying 'Abba, Father' " (Gal 4,6). And that is not an isolated verse. Not only the apostles and believers, but even the ancient prophets, were thought to have received the Spirit because they spoke of Christ. We shall see that such an omission of the Christ-element, whether deliberate or unconscious, is highly characteristic of Wiles' explorations. But, not to be distracted, the point we are now making is that his treatment of the Holy Spirit illustrates how radical the criticism is. It is not just credal, and not just verbal. It takes doctrine to bits, and tries to make something new of it.

This is the place to quote the favourable reference to a passage of Ray Hart: "Tradition must be dismantled to see what it mediates, what it handed around and hands on. Mediating only in dissolution, tradition furnishes debris for building up the structure to house what it could not hold against the flood of time" (quoted p.52). Stirring words. But we have stumbled on another problem. Even on this formulation, tradition mediates something, houses something, and that something is what you expect of it. But what is it? Wiles himself allows there is something; he even calls it "the truth we have received" which must be guarded from error (52). It emerges at one point in an historical context. He speaks of the impact of platonism on early Christianity, and seems to imply that these are two sets of beliefs of comparable status. The result was a "platonic or platonized form of Christian belief, one which incorporated distinctive insights of platonism and interpreted its own beliefs from a recognizably platonic angle" (39). There is, apparently, some sort of "Christian belief" apart from its platonic expression. To find what that is in the mind of Wiles, one might look to page 61. There, in order to make progress in detaching Christianity from its commitment to historical events, he takes as a "working definition of what is essential to Christianity" the expression "faith in God through Jesus Christ." "And let me begin", he proceeds, "by spelling out a bit more clearly how I understand 'faith in God through Jesus Christ'. At its heart is the conviction that there is a God of love who is the ultimate source of the world and in whose hands its ultimate destiny lies, that men and women are able to respond to that God and by his grace can be empowered to overcome both the evil of their own sinful devising and that which the world metes out to them" (61). There is surely some sleight of hand here. The "through Jesus Christ" of the definition has vanished from its exposition. Proceeding from this "definition" of essential Christianity to the question, "Does such a faith in God stand or fall by certain particular happenings in the past?", inevitably the answer is going to be "No". If you studiously erase Christ from the premise, you cannot expect him to pop up in the conclusion.

Relegating Christ to the category of the inessential is no momentary slip. Study closely the second chapter, "Christology in an age of historical studies", and you find christology whittled away, partly by inadvertence, partly by design. Christology is first rightly distinguished from Christianity: "Christology is not Christianity. Christology is the church's attempt to give some unified account of Jesus of Nazareth and of its apprehension of God through him in the experience of Christian faith" (21-2; the last six words are presumably an apologetic sop to naive empiricism, since faith is not an experience). Jesus' teaching, character and death are then presented as a symbolic action like those used by the ancient prophets to reinforce their words, only "in a far more comprehensive way" (24). If we accept a literary discipline that recognizes the imaginative element entwined with the historical in the books, "incarnational language understood in a properly mythological way will prove to be a powerful pictorial way of affirming the most fundamental truths about God's ways with the world" (25). What are these fundamental truths? "In the life of Jesus . . . we have an enacted parable of the love that embraces all people and will not let them go, of the God who unites people to himself in a relationship of the most intimate union, who shares their sufferings and holds them even in and through the tragedy of death" (25; does the last clause imply life after death or covertly sanction its denial?). Such pictorial interpretation excludes metaphysical christology, which would see Jesus' acts as in any direct sense acts of God (24). It can be applied successfully to the diverse features in the

gospels which if treated christologically produce unnecessary doctrinal problems. The irreconcilable presentations of Jesus should be interpreted "within the setting of a *theo*logy or theology of history" (26). Many christological problems will then vanish, or be transferred to other parts of the doctrinal agenda. Wiles expects (though with proper caution) that historical criticism will erode the last bases of traditional christology, and offers his solution in the hope that it might provide a positive way forward (26-7). That Hegel, Baur and Strauss once said similar things and made similar offers is not indicated. Perhaps it should have been.

By relegating Christ to the pictorial fringe of the "essential" or "fundamental" divine truths (a place not altogether unlike that from which Wiles would rescue the Spirit), the way is opened to the bold embodiment of non-Christian religions in Christian theology. For now we may even envisage the possibility of forms of Christian theology "in which insights central to Buddhism and Islam . . . will have been allowed to mould and modify Christian belief in a way which will illuminate and deepen aspects of belief implied but only imperfectly realized in other forms of Christian theology" (39). This seems to mean that the fundamental divine truths derived from the Jesus-pictures are to be supplemented by others drawn from Islamic and Buddhist pictures. While in favour of serious attempts to come to terms with world religions in doing our theology, I must express a doubt whether Wiles' weakened version of Christianity will in fact do more than palely surrender to the nearest vivid myth or legend from the holy books of others. This point will come out again in the next paragraph.

Wiles emphasizes the foreignness of the biblical world-view from our own (8; his authority is a letter of Lord Hailsham to *The Times* of 1976, a citation reiterated on 33 and 36; a touch of the cap to the great Bultmann would have been welcome). He also reminds us (aptly quoting Schweitzer) that "the Jesus-component of our Christ-figure is likely to be an uncomfortable alien in our contemporary world" (17). Nevertheless, it is precisely to the human Jesus and his religious beliefs that Wiles appeals for his model of the "fundamental truths" of God: "a sense of God's immediacy to the world and himself, openness toward God and other men, trust in God and a sense of being commissioned by him, forgiveness and faithfulness through suffering even to the point of death" (22-3). The strangeness of the biblical world is referred in the context, but simply not allowed to interfere with the picture. It is as if the writer never read Nineham's chapter in *The myth of God incarnate*, which shows how desperately insecure such a procedure is. Nor, one would think, is it necessary to Wiles' thesis. If Christology is purely symbolic of more general theistic truths, one need not be tied to the symbol of the gentle Jesus, but could go for the kerygmatic certainties that Paul made central: "Christ died for our sins according to the scriptures and was buried, and rose again the third day according to the scriptures" (1 Cor 15, 3-4). If we are to have a Christ who is pure symbol, there is no apologetic gain in discarding the cross and physical resurrection as Paul sees them. The same applies, *mutatis mutandis*, to the miraculous signs and wonders which dominate the narratives of Jesus in the gospels. The fact that Wiles still wants to base his divine symbolism on a reduced liberal-modernist Jesus induces the suspicion that he wants to have his cake as well as eat it; to accord objective verifiable historical reality to the merely symbolic, lest it deceive him. But he may be left with the worst of both worlds, a symbol at once subjective and impotent.

Glimpses of the rich lifeblood of the Gospel still break through. A quotation from Simone Weil rejects a vague religiosity in interfaith studies: "We must have given all our attention, all our faith, all our love to a particular religion in order to think of any other religion with the high degree of attention, faith and love which is proper to it" (37)—an echo of the wholehearted, exclusive love which Jew and Christian alike owe their jealous Lord. Another from Luke's account of Jesus is similar: "If any man comes to me and does not hate his own father and mother and wife and children and brothers and sisters, yea even his own life, he cannot be my disciple" (12). But that is quoted to show that God deserves an absolute devotion higher than the very best things on earth, which become idols if made absolute. The best must be sacrificed for God (for whom Jesus is apparently the symbol). But observe the punchline: "So it is with our beliefs". So the Christian (I almost wrote "believer") is in this book called to the supreme sacrifice—of the beliefs he holds most sacred. That is itself significant for understanding what these "Explorations" are about.

The point is reinforced when the writer has occasion to allude to the mighty saying that "the one who would save his life loses it, while the one who loses his life gains it" (52). The context is again tediously academic: tradition must be demolished if it is to do any good, and "the Christian has to live in a dialectical situation between critical attention to the ancient tradition and equally critical attention to what makes sense in our life today" (52). That interpretation may or may not make sense in itself. But to suggest that it is a legitimate application of the saying of Jesus is at best in poor taste. The saying comes from a precious passage in Mark 8, 31-5, where Jesus reveals his own suffering destiny in fulfilment of the scriptures, and requires everyone who will go with him to take up his cross and follow. It is a far graver matter than the status of traditional religious language. The world is not full of prejudiced and blinkered believers needing only to make the supreme sacrifice of their religious convictions in order to win eternal life. The saying concerns the highest matter of God himself, a matter inseparable in the New Testament texts from bearing witness to and confessing Jesus the Son of Man, for which testimony (again I follow the gospels) Jesus was himself sentenced to death. I am not here advocating an excessively christocentric version of the Gospel, which ignores the Father and centres devotion on Jesus alone. That would, and does, cut off the Gospel from natural theology and from the divine perspectives of creation and world-destiny. We must speak of God, and not merely of Christ. But the central point remains: either God spoke fully and finally in Christ, or all Christianity's foundation documents are perverse.

Perhaps it was all a mistake from the start. Perhaps the Son of Man was never worth shedding blood for, not even in Jesus' case. Faced with the persecutor's challenge, "Curse Christ", perhaps we should say, "One has to live in a dialectical situation between critical attention to ancient tradition and equally critical attention to what makes sense in our life today." The persecutor might be satisfied. But while someone goes on asserting that God was *in Christ* reconciling the world to himself, some idiots like me are going to believe it. They may also go on attributing their belief to the miraculous operation of the Holy Spirit who makes Christ known. My hope and prayer is that they will not all be obliged to run off to those sects and churches (like the well-known one near Professor Wiles' own college) where brain is banished, where theology if not entirely despised is confined to predestined grooves, and where intelligent students drown their doubts in the pure milk of sacrificial fundamentalism. But if they look to the accredited spokesmen of ecclesiastical theology for bread, and get only stones, or for meat, and they cast forth ice like morsels, who can blame them? If they find there not a dying and risen Lord Almighty, but a pale pictorial Nazarene, are they not right to go elsewhere? If we are offered only the symbolic gestures of a well-meaning rabbi for our salvation, and not the mighty work of God himself, the wise among us will not even take up an arm-chair to follow him, let alone a cross. Caiaphas got it right.

GUIDE TO OLD TESTAMENT PROPHECY. By Harry Mowvley. Lutterworth Press, 1979. pp 153. £3.95.

Time was when a title such as this would have implied a book which aimed to show how this prophecy was fulfilled in Jesus, that one in some aspect of the life of the church, and yet another foretold the end of the world. But most students of the Old Testament can no longer treat prophecy in quite that way, and so it is not surprising that the book under review is a more workmanlike, though perhaps less exciting, volume. It is a serviceable text-book, written by the tutor at Bristol Baptist College, and likely to be particularly useful to those coming as students for the first time to the critical study of the Bible, and needing orientation as to the main types of question raised about the prophets, and some of the answers offered.

The book is in four parts. The first deals with the phenomenon of prophetism in Israel and the Ancient Near East, with an estimate of its significance in religious and social terms. The second

explores some of the problems posed by the development from the spoken word of the individual prophet through the written form of the prophetic book to the establishment of a prophetic canon. The third relates prophets to other groups in Israelite society, with some reflection upon the question of cultic prophets, and considers the prophetic attacks upon the cult and upon some other aspects of Israel's life. Finally, some outline of prophetic teaching is offered, inevitably of a rather sketchy character in a book of this size.

All in all, then, this is an unexciting but useful outline. It is somewhat old-fashioned in its main approach, with little reference to recent developments in study of the prophets. This may, however, not be a bad thing in a work of this kind, and in any case an exception should be made for a useful short section warning against too ready an identification of the prophets as covenant preachers in the way that was fashionable a few years back. There are subject and biblical indexes, but no suggestions for further reading, though the diligent will find plenty of ideas in that direction among the footnotes. It is a pity that several slips inaccurate references and the like survived the editorial stage; details that would not be important in a work primarily intended for those already familiar with the field become more serious in a basic text-book. Despite this, Mowvley's work will form a useful complement to Heaton's *Old Testament Prophets* as a guide to the basic issues in study of the prophets.

Richard Coggins

MATTHEW: A COMMENTARY FOR PREACHERS AND OTHERS.
By Jack Dean Kingsbury.
S.P.C.K. 1978. pp xii + 116. £2.50.

This book is not a traditional verse by verse commentary on Matthew but an exposition for a wide audience of some of the evangelist's theological themes. About half of it is an abbreviated version of the author's *Matthew: Structure, Christology and Kingdom* published by SPCK in 1976. Kingsbury's first book, *The Parables of Jesus in Matthew 13*, was published by SPCK in 1969, with a paperback edition in 1977. He now promises a fourth book on Matthew, a 'comprehensive overview of the theology of Matthew'. Four books on Matthew is surely a *tour de force* by any standards!

The present book reflects a thorough knowledge of recent Matthean scholarship, though many readers will miss discussion of other scholarly approaches to disputed points: for that they will need to consult the longer book. The first chapter provides a useful introduction to modern Matthean scholarship. Later chapters discuss Matthew's Christology, his understanding of God and his ecclesiology.

Most of the author's own conclusions are widely shared by other scholars: Matthew has used Mark and Q; he writes for a 'well-to-do' community in Antioch about 85-90 AD; the evangelist depicts Jesus as abrogating at points both the law and the tradition of the elders—but Jesus is also depicted as upholding both to the extent that they do not conflict with his teaching of the will of God; Matthew's community is made up of Jews and Gentiles and lives in close proximity to Judaism, but it is no longer within Judaism.

Kingsbury is convinced that the key to the structure of Matthew is to be found in the phrase 'from that time on' which is used only at 4.17 and 16.21. I am not persuaded that this is correct. 4.17 does not mark the beginning of a new section and Matthew's five 'set-piece' discourses are central in the evangelist's design. Kingsbury stresses that the evangelist is addressing Christians of his own community and shows effectively just how many passages in Matthew are related to one another. But he interprets Matthew without reference to first century Judaism and with hardly a reference to first century Christianity. The reader is given the impression that with the aid of a concordance it is possible to reconstruct a systematic account of Matthew's theology. Unless this is done on the basis of rigorous source critical work (which

is conspicuous by its absence), it is impossible to judge to what extent Matthew develops his own *distinctive* theological emphases. The author shows convincingly that the evangelist was a sophisticated and skilled writer, but Matthew did not write in a historical and theological vacuum.

Graham Stanton

THE ETHIOPIC BOOK OF ENOCH.
A NEW EDITION IN THE LIGHT OF THE ARAMAIC DEAD SEA FRAGMENTS.
Vol 1: Text and Apparatus; Vol 2. Introduction, Translation and Commentary.
By M.A. Knibb, with the assistance of Edward Ullendorff.
Clarendon Press: Oxford University Press, 1979. pp XVI-428; VIII-260. £30 the set.

The book of Enoch has its importance in various contexts. The oddity of the reference to the figure of Enoch in Gen.5.24: 'Enoch walked with God; and he was not, for God took him', gives an all too tantalising allusion to what must evidently be a tradition of considerable importance. The parallel with the 'taking' of Elijah (2 Kings 2.10 - the same verb; and cf. also Ps. 49.15 (Heb. 16); 73,24) points by its very rarity to such a tradition. It is therefore perhaps not surprising that a wealth of later writings has survived in which Enoch has become the recipient of divine revelations and the explorer of the secrets of the heavenly realms. As part of that great mass of non-biblical writings known to us from the period 200 B.C. to A.D. 150, it has come in for renewed study with the upsurge of interest provoked by the Dead Sea Scrolls, which include some Aramaic fragments of Enoch. That upsurge of interest could better be seen as a renewed concern with the whole religious and cultural scene of the Palestine of the first Christian century. If emphasis earlier tended to be on what might be learnt for Christian origins—and the problem of the 'Son of Man' involved the Enoch literature very specially—it is now much more directed towards the wider range of the developing life of the Jewish religious community and of the Christian movement within that community and separating from it. The book of Enoch, like the book of Jubilees, has a further particular interest in the light of contemporary study of the biblical texts. It was accorded canonical status in the Ethiopian church; and this serves as a reminder that the concept of canonicity, so often thought of in narrow and fixed terms, is in fact a much more fluid one. The borderlines between canonical and non-canonical are not to be seen as rigid.

The importance of the Enoch literature is matched by the difficulties of handling it; and of these the primary ones are those of text and language. It is therefore of the greatest importance for the study and use of the book of Enoch, that Dr Michael Knibb, lecturer in Old Testament Studies at King's College since 1964 and responsible for the area of Intertestamental Studies, should have produced this new scholarly edition of the text, and provided a new translation with commentary.

It is, indeed, with the second volume that most readers will be concerned. The introduction here sets out the textual problems, relating these to the actual presentation of the text in the first volume; where the chosen manuscript, Rylands Ethiopic MS 23, is produced photographically in small sections, with the textual apparatus below, a superb piece of detailed scholarship demanding the most meticulous work. The second volume continues with a bibliography, and then the translation with its accompanying notes. There are numerous points here at which cross-reference to other and related literature indicates the wider importance of the Enoch material. But this is strictly an edition of the text, and the translation and the notes to it are directed to the problems of precise meaning, the relationship between the Ethiopic, Greek and Aramaic forms of the text.

This is therefore a basic work of scholarship, and it is superbly done. It is on such a sound foundation that the superstructure of exegesis can be satisfactorily built.

Peter R. Ackroyd