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“What does God have to say about alcoholism, poverty, unjust courts, and insensitive corporate bosses? What about taking care of pets, or balancing our checkbooks? The Book of Proverbs is God’s response, and The Practice of Wisdom is a tool to lead you to the biblical answers” (book jacket). The authors, a businessman and a pastor, have organized the material in Proverbs under 42 headings, and under each heading are several verses quoted in full under subtopics. For example under “Discipline” are these subtopics: “Discipline and the Lord,” “Discipline and Children,” “Discipline and Blessings,” “Discipline and Punishment,” “Discipline and the Mocker,” “Discipline and the Fool,” and “Discipline and the Wise.” A brief paragraph introduces each of the 42 major themes. In each verse a word is highlighted in boldface type, and to the right is a reference number keyed to the NIV Exhaustive Concordance, which directs the reader to the Hebrew word(s) being translated by the highlighted word. Major themes range from animals and insects to death, nutrition, the tongue, and wickedness. This is a helpful topical guide to a Bible book filled with divine treasures.

Roy B. Zuck


This work has three authors because of the untimely death of Peter Craigie in 1988. He wrote the introduction and material on Jeremiah 1–7, Kelley wrote on chapters 8–16, and Drinkard wrote on Jeremiah 17–25. Craigie believed that the contents of the book took place during or late in the lifetime of the prophet (p. xxxii). Contrary to some modern-day writers (e.g., Robert P. Carroll, Jeremiah: Commentary [Philadelphia: Westminster, 1986]), Craigie affirms that Jeremiah was a historical character (p. xxxvii). To Craigie the argument that the Septuagint represents a text superior to the Masoretic text (a current view) is still a theory (pp. xli-xliv).

Craigie recognizes the complex history of the book in the sections on form/structure, yet he does not follow the radical approach of those who argue for a “deuteronomist” hand in the composition. On the other hand this book fails to see some of the macro units assembled after the fall of Jerusalem. For example Drinkard says that Jeremiah 18–20 is linked together from a literary point of view (p. 240) and that chapter 21 is a separate unit (p. 283). However, though 21 was separate originally, the action and name of Pashhur in chapters 20 and 21 allow a literary linking for theological purposes. The first Pashhur violently rejected the warning of Jeremiah, while the second Pashhur came in the midst of the fulfillment of that prophecy.

The same principle holds true in Jeremiah 21:11–23:40. Happily Drinkard links 21:11–23:8 as messages against the kings of Judah, but why not include 23:9-40 as part of a macro unit against leadership in general? This unit would then be an argument that Jerusalem fell because of poor leadership. Chapters 24–29 should also have been
linked as messages of challenge, warning, and hope to those in exile.

The critical literary and structural issues of Jeremiah 25 deserve much more attention than they are given in this commentary. Drinkard links the “oracles against the nations” with this chapter. There must be some linkage but the difficulty is that chapters 50–51 are negative prophecies against Babylon, whereas references in chapter 25 are positive or at least neutral (with the exception of v. 12).

This is a most helpful volume. The work of Kelley and Drinkard is much appreciated, but it is unfortunate that Craigie was not able to finish the work.

Homer Heater, Jr.

_The Aramaic of Daniel in the Light of Old Aramaic._ By Zdravko Stefanovic Sheffield Sheffield Academic Press, 1992 128 pp $47.50

Modern biblical scholarship reflects a consensus with regard to dating the Book of Daniel. In its present form the book dates to about 165 B.C. This date is based in part on a view that the prophecies of the Book of Daniel are to be understood as _vaticinia ex eventu_, that is, as pseudoprophecies written after the fact. Arguments sometimes adduced to argue for a late date for Daniel include appeals to alleged historical errors in the book, theological views thought to be too advanced to have originated in the time of the sixth-century prophet, and linguistic features that are said to betray a late date. With regard to this last argument, a number of scholars have sought to show affinities between the Aramaic of Daniel and that of certain Aramaic documents from, for example, the second and first centuries B.C.

Stefanovic has challenged the conclusions of scholars who maintain that the language of the Aramaic portions of Daniel (2:4b–7:28) demonstrates a late stage in the development of the language. This volume is a revision of his PhD dissertation accepted at Andrews University under the title “Correlations between Old Aramaic Inscriptions and the Aramaic Section of Daniel.” Stefanovic’s thesis is simple. The Aramaic of Daniel shows important affinities with Old Aramaic inscriptions mainly from the ninth, eighth, and seventh centuries B.C. The demonstration of this thesis, however, is somewhat complex. The primary data that forms the grist for Stefanovic’s mill are the following Old Aramaic inscriptions: the bilingual Tell Fakhriyah inscription, the Bir-Hadad inscription, the Zakkur inscription (and graffiti), the Sefire inscriptions, the Hadad and Panammu inscriptions, the Barrakab inscriptions, the Nerab stelae, and the Ashur ostracon.

Stefanovic discusses these Old Aramaic inscriptions and their linguistic relationship to the Aramaic of Daniel under three categories. Under “literary correlations” he presents similarities of structure and vocabulary that were characteristic of the early phase of Aramaic literature. Under “grammatical correlations” he deals with matters of orthography, phonology, and morphology where Old Aramaic and the Aramaic of Daniel are similar. And under “syntactical correlations” he adduces similarities in syntax between Old Aramaic and the Aramaic of Daniel. By his own admission (p. 95), this section is more problematic than the others.

Stefanovic draws these conclusions: (1) Old Aramaic is not as uni-