

in recognizing that Scripture often employs modes of expression that are sometimes puzzling and cannot be clarified by adherence to a simple historical or literal interpretation. As such, interpreters must move beyond the literal sense to “theological interpretation,” admitting that “the message of Scripture is not always equivalent to the intention of its human writer” (135).

However, it is also true to say that patristic exegetes often resorted to interpretive methods that would not win many adherents today. Returning to the example cited above, the early church, when confronted with puzzling modes of expression in biblical texts, saw such “riddles and enigmas” as opportunities to seek “deeper meanings” through allegorical elucidation. While some of the later Fathers did recognize the “marvelous sublimity” of the Bible (79), many failed to fully appreciate the general artistry or specific literary strategies employed by the authors. This approach was not unique to the early church. G. points out that in Greco-Roman literary circles, allegorical interpretations of mythological or legendary compositions were common. Even Homer’s epics were allegorized to uncover deeper, metaphysical connotations.

In conclusion, one could agree with G. that surveying the Fathers’ views of biblical inspiration and the “entailments” thereof highlights the timeless value of a “rich and complex reading of Scripture,” which in turn “underscores the element of subjectivity involved in interpretation” (147). The Fathers’ unique insights and collective wisdom demonstrate that, while every generation of the church reads Scripture as an authoritative revelation from God, such readings are governed by the culture of the day. As a window onto the vibrancy and diversity of biblical interpretation in the early church, this book will benefit the scholar and casual reader alike.

Ian J. Elmer
Australian Catholic University, Brisbane

History, Ideology, and Bible Interpretation in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Collected Studies. By Devorah Dimant. *Forschungen zum Alten Testament* 90. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014. Pp. xv + 609. \$288.

Dimant has been an important figure in Dead Sea Scrolls studies since the mid-1970s, when she completed her doctoral work at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem with a dissertation on fallen angels in the Scrolls and related literature.

This volume contains 27 articles divided into four different categories: The Qumran Library (nine articles); The History of the Qumran Community (one article); Themes in the Qumran Literature (five articles); and Texts from Qumran (twelve articles). The titles of these categories and of individual articles attest to the breadth of D.’s competencies. Examples of the latter include “The Qumran Manuscripts: Contents and Significance”; “The Vocabulary of the Qumran Sectarian Texts”; “Sectarian and Nonsectarian Texts from Qumran: The Pertinence and Use of a Taxonomy”; “Between Sectarian and Nonsectarian: The Case of the Apocryphon of Joshua”; “Between

Qumran Sectarian and Qumran Nonsectarian Texts: The Case of Belial and Mastema”; and “Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha at Qumran.”

None of these articles is completely new; except for D.’s introductory essay, all have been written and published over the last 35 years or so. Many of the articles are updated and revised, however, and four are translated from Hebrew originals. In “Not Exile in the Desert but Exile in Spirit: The Peshet of Isaiah 40:3 in the Rule of the Community and the History of the Scrolls Community,” D. argues that the syntactical structure of the peshet of Isaiah 40:3 indicates that the desert referenced there cannot be understood as referring to a real desert. This “real” interpretation of the desert reference played a part in the evidence marshalled in earlier scholarship for the identification of the Scroll community. D. maintains that “the peshet on Isaiah 40:3 relates the whole verse—the withdrawal to the wilderness and the preparing of the way—to the study of Torah” (461). D. goes on to identify various uses of the term “desert” in a metaphorical sense in other sectarian texts of the Dead Sea Scrolls. She remarks, at the end of the article, that the

old answers given to the fundamental questions of the community’s origin and development—such as the identity of the Teacher of Righteousness, when and where he was active, and what we know about his life and place in the history of the Yahad—must be studied afresh in light of the new texts and new insights gained through the study of the scrolls in the last decades. (464)

D.’s assessment here of avenues for future research is just one of many instances in this volume; such cues alone make the volume worthwhile.

A respected, careful, experienced scholar has furnished a valuable map of the terrain of Dead Sea Scrolls studies, filled with directions for fruitful research. Two more examples of this scholarly generosity are worth noting. In the section entitled “The Origins and History of the Qumran Community,” D. comments that one “of the most intriguing features of the Qumran library that has yet to be investigated thoroughly is the presence of similar features in several distinct literary forms” (238). (It is in this article that D. marshals evidence against the Groningen hypothesis that at an early stage the Qumran community broke away from the Essene movement.) In “Not the Testament of Judah but the Words of Benjamin: The Character of 4Q538,” a translation of a Hebrew version first published in 2010, D. observes that another “trajectory deserving systematic investigation is the research into the vestiges of lost Jewish works that are embedded in early Christian literature and papyri. Today, with the numerous hitherto-unknown compositions found among the Qumran manuscripts, a fresh sifting of this corpus is needed for this purpose” (454).

D.’s introductory essay, “The Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls—Past and Present,” written for this volume, indicates that one of her current projects focuses on the history of research in the Dead Sea Scrolls. She concludes:

The foregoing survey traces, I hope, the decisive transformation that has taken place in the study of the community that owned the Dead Sea Scrolls from that of a small, reclusive group at the fringes of Second Temple Judaism, to that of a major and central community that was

heir to an ancient religious tradition. One of the major tasks of forthcoming Qumran research is to approach the scrolls from this new perspective and situate the Qumran community where it originally belonged, namely, at the center of Second Temple Judaism. (24)

The articles following the introductory essay masterfully direct scholars in this task.

Deirdre Dempsey
Marquette University, Milwaukee

Paul for Today's Church: A Commentary on First Corinthians. By Stanley B. Marrow.
Foreword by Thomas Stegman, S.J. New York: Paulist, 2013. Pp. ix + 213. \$22.95.

The wit throughout this contemporary pastoral commentary on First Corinthians is a rare quality for its genre. Since Marrow almost intended his volume as a “pastoral last will,” he allows himself some bold side comments that hit right on target. Many readers will smile even if they mildly disagree with a particular remark. M., a Jesuit born in Iraq and long-time New Testament professor at Weston Jesuit School of Theology (d. 2012), had a real gift for brilliant punch lines. Examples can be adduced from almost every page. It must be added, however, that sometimes M.’s desire to denounce vigorously the small (or large) sins of contemporary American churches comes across as a little bitter. It is the price to pay for the boldness and personal character of the work. That said, the theological and spiritual balance is so strong that his comments will nourish a Bible study group or any reader seeking solid food (30). M.’s commentary is accessible, clear, and takes stands on issues.

On a formal level, the commentary proceeds verse by verse, and each comment is rather brief, making for easy reading. Technical exegetical remarks are rare, and the decision to proceed this way does not give much space to the rhetorical organization of the letter (main arguments, theses, and parts), or to the Greek nuances of the text. This lack of engagement with scientific scholarship will not satisfy the Bible scholar, but M. knows it and does not write with that intent. Nevertheless scholars will appreciate the outspokenness and clear choices of the exegete. Two readings could have been developed a bit more: some modern commentators view the two assertions in 6:13 (“food is meant for the stomach and the stomach for the food, and God will destroy both one and the other” [NRSV]) and 7:18 (“every other sin which a man commits is outside the body” [RSV]) as slogans of the Corinthians, and not Paul’s actual thought. Likewise, the comment on 14:33b–35 could have mentioned its possible status as interpolation.

The commentary is moderately canonical—M. does not hesitate to quote other pertinent verses from the whole Bible. It is also deeply theological; M. does not hesitate to offer insights about the Trinity, grace, flesh, faith, general resurrection, and more—quoting abundantly and aptly from Augustine. But he never loses sight of the text. It says something very original in today’s literature on the Bible that names like Henri de Lubac (32) and John Henry Newman (186) pop up, as do less probable writers like