

1991

## Review: Hosea: An Introduction and Commentary

Homer Heater

*Liberty University*, [hheater@liberty.edu](mailto:hheater@liberty.edu)

Follow this and additional works at: [http://digitalcommons.liberty.edu/lts\\_fac\\_pubs](http://digitalcommons.liberty.edu/lts_fac_pubs)

 Part of the [Biblical Studies Commons](#), [Comparative Methodologies and Theories Commons](#), [Ethics in Religion Commons](#), [History of Religions of Eastern Origins Commons](#), [History of Religions of Western Origin Commons](#), [Other Religion Commons](#), and the [Religious Thought, Theology and Philosophy of Religion Commons](#)

### Recommended Citation

Heater, Homer, "Review: Hosea: An Introduction and Commentary" (1991). *Faculty Publications and Presentations*. Paper 309.  
[http://digitalcommons.liberty.edu/lts\\_fac\\_pubs/309](http://digitalcommons.liberty.edu/lts_fac_pubs/309)

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Liberty Baptist Theological Seminary and Graduate School at DigitalCommons@Liberty University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Publications and Presentations by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@Liberty University. For more information, please contact [scholarlycommunication@liberty.edu](mailto:scholarlycommunication@liberty.edu).

ences between the OG and the MT are due to a conscious theological purpose (*Tendenz*) on the part of the translator, or are due simply to the mechanical difficulties of rendering a text from one language into another, or a combination of these factors. The prevailing opinion seems to have been that the OG reflects a theological *Tendenz* on the part of the translator, who imported into the translation various interpretations from his own time.

Jeansonne has challenged this view in a work that is a revision of a PhD dissertation. Her thesis is that "the OG translator of Daniel 7-12 attempted to translate accurately the *Vorlage* available of the day" (p. 132), and that he "did not hold that translation was the proper forum for the theological interpretation of the readings of the sacred text" (p. 133). Two judicious aspects of her methodology stand out at once. First, she attempts to reconstruct critically the original OG of Daniel, distinguishing between the original OG and its later form as attested by Origen. Second, she avoids the tendency of some scholars to assume that the *Vorlage* of the OG was more or less the same as the MT, a tendency that creates a somewhat artificial basis of comparison. However, Jeansonne limits her study to chapters 7-12 of Daniel, choosing not to deal with chapters 1-6 because of their somewhat distinctive nature. Whether such a bipartite approach to the Book of Daniel is best is debatable; one wonders how well her conclusions would stand up for the OG of the Book of Daniel as a whole.

Jeansonne's study deals extensively (pp. 32-69) with a selected sample passage (Dan. 8:1-10), which is carefully analyzed word by word, followed by other selected test cases to illustrate translation technique in the OG of Daniel. It is here that one wishes for more than what such a methodology can provide. Whether the selections chosen are fully representative of the whole of the OG of Daniel 7-12, not to mention the whole Book of Daniel, is not clear. Perhaps space did not allow for a more exhaustive approach, but without it one cannot be sure about the conclusions reached. There follows a discussion of "mechanical variants and errors in the Old Greek" (pp. 70-82), where Jeansonne concludes that the possibility of mechanical error in the OG is to be preferred over that of theological *Tendenz*. She then discusses "post-translational changes in the developed Greek text" (pp. 83-102), where she shows that in places the OG translator accurately translated the text, but his translation was subsequently altered by copyists. Next she takes up OG variants that can be traced to the translator himself and that would have provided opportunities for embellishment if he had been so inclined (pp. 103-30). She concludes that such was not the case.

Jeansonne's work makes an important contribution to textual research on the Book of Daniel. The Catholic Biblical Association is to be applauded for making such a technical work available at such a modest price.

Richard A. Taylor

---

***Hosea: An Introduction and Commentary.*** By David Allen Hubbard. The Tyndale Old Testament Commentaries. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1989. 245pp. \$14.95; paper, \$8.95.

The introduction to a Bible commentary is as important as the commentary itself. Hubbard devotes 30 pages to helpful background material. Given the importance of the difficult historical background of the Jeroboam II era, one might have expected more discussion than one page on it. However, at the appropriate points in the commentary, he deals with the issues (e.g., 5:8-13). His historical summary chart is helpful.

Hubbard's discussion of the themes of Hosea provides good direction in understanding the message of the book. He shows how the Book of Hosea presents the various areas over which the Lord is sovereign.

Hubbard could have been more definitive in discussing the priority of the Book of Deuteronomy to that of Hosea. He also quotes, seemingly favorably, Crenshaw's position that there is no evidence that prostitution lay at the center of Canaanite religion. It would seem strange that a fact of the cult inveighed against so severely by Hosea would be considered indigentous to Israel, especially in light of the effort by many to treat Israel's religion as integrally a part of Canaanite worship.

The discussion of the fulfillment of the prophecies in Hosea is stimulating. Hubbard traces the fulfillment through four stages and allows for some form of literal fulfillment of the prophetic promises, though he does not seem to commit himself to a millennial fulfillment.

Hubbard's presentation of chapters 1-3 of Hosea is well done. He sees both the immediate (Hosea and Gomer) and the remote (Israel as a people) in chapter 2, which this reviewer views throughout as the application of the metaphor of Hosea's marriage to the nation.

All in all, this is a stimulating, challenging, and helpful commentary.

Homer Heater, Jr.

**James: Running Uphill into the Wind.** By Don Anderson. Neptune, NJ: Loizeaux Brothers, 1990. 303 pp. Paper, \$9.95.

This book is a practical exposition of the Book of James. It is designed to help the reader "run the race that is the Christian life" (p. 13). As such, it is more of an exposition of the text than an exegetical commentary. As evident in all his writings, the author is skilled at relating the biblical text to life. Each chapter includes "Points to Ponder," which makes the edition particularly helpful for any Bible study group. The book is also filled with examples and illustrations, making it very useful for pastors and teachers.

Douglas M. Cecil

**Second Peter and Jude.** By D. Edmond Hiebert. Greenville, SC: Unusual Publications, 1989. 324 pp. Paper, \$12.95.

This commentary, like Hiebert's other works, is solid Bible exposition. In discussing the problems of the authorship and canonicity of 2 Peter, Hiebert defends the conservative position. In his exegesis Hiebert has the knack of being complete without wordiness, and succinct without missing the primary issues. He takes 2 Peter 1:19 to mean believers have a prophetic Word that is even more reliable than the witness of the apostles. He believes 1:20-21 refers to the origination of prophecy, not the interpretation of it. To Hiebert, 2 Peter 2:1 describes apostates who have rejected the gospel message. The angels who sinned (2 Pet. 2:4) are those who cohabited with the daughters of men, according to Genesis 6 (cf. Jude 6). They now are detained in Tartarus awaiting final judgment. He believes the reading, "Balaam, the son of Beor," in 2 Peter 2:15 should be, "Balaam, the son of Bosor." The people described in 2 Peter 2:20-22 are apostates who knew the truth and turned from it.

In his treatment of Jude, Hiebert states and defends his view that Jude followed Peter and was acquainted with 2 Peter. Hiebert denies the inspiration of the writing Enoch (Jude 14) but accepts the truthfulness of the statement quoted from it.