

in liturgy, and to such unfortunate modern liturgical terminology as calling the eucharistic minister 'the President', whilst the same principle is put to effective work in discussions of musical history and style. Both this book in particular and the trilogy as a whole are an extraordinary *tour de force* and by the time this review will have appeared, St Andrews will have hosted a major conference on Brown's contribution to the field of theology, aesthetics and culture, which is indicative of its impact and significance.

It is very clearly written throughout, although Brown does not always make concessions to those who do not share his cultural fluency and, more generally, the book is clearly addressed not to religion's cultured despisers but to its very cultured and theologically well-informed friends. A difficulty is that, precisely because Brown commendably brings the argument back to particular examples, he makes himself vulnerable to those who do not share his aesthetic judgements. This reviewer, for example, finds the agnosticism of such modern church composers as Parry, Vaughan Williams and Howells only too evident in the music itself. However, Brown does note in conclusion that there are possibilities of negative responses that, for tactical reasons, he has not dwelt on. Finally, unlike many recent works of British theology, this is a work that can, simply, be read and read by those sufficiently prepared with pleasure. It serves both church and academy well, and keeps a constant eye (and ear) on the wider society beyond.

George Pattison

Christ Church, Oxford University, Oxford OX1 1DP, UK

george.pattison@theology.ox.ac.uk

doi:10.1017/S0036930610000955

Patricia Walters, *The Assumed Authorial Unity of Luke and Acts: A Reassessment of the Evidence*, SNTSMS 145 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), pp. 238. \$99.00.

This book, a PhD dissertation originating at Loyola University in Chicago (2005), attempts, on the basis of classical Greek prose conventions, to challenge the putative authorial unity of Luke and Acts. The author, Patricia Walters, currently Assistant Professor and Coordinator of the Religious Studies program at Rockford College (Illinois, USA), is aware that the prefaces of Luke (1:1–4) and Acts (1:1–5), the consistent testimony of writers from the second to fourth century, and the similarities between Luke and Acts in vocabulary, style, themes and theology generate an exceedingly strong case for the single authorship of Luke–Acts. Walters makes no attempt to refute this traditional evidence, but focuses instead on 'genre-neutral text' in Luke and

Acts, which should ‘reveal the same or similar prose compositional features’ if single authorship is indeed true (p. 190). She finds such material in the ‘seams and summaries’ of Luke-Acts, i.e. in transitional material and editorial conclusions where authorial style is theoretically free from source influences, or theological, historical and thematic interests. The following seams and summaries are identified: Luke 1:1–4; 1:80; 2:40, 52; 3:1–3, 18; 4:14–15, 31–2, 40–1, 44; 5:15–16, 17; 16:17–19; 7:11; 8:1–3, 4a; 9:51; 10:38a; 13:22; 14:25a; 17:11; 18:35a; 19:28, 47–8; 21:37–8; and Acts 1:1–5, 14; 2:41, 42–7; 4:4, 32–5; 5:12–16; 6:1a, 7; 7:58b; 8:1b–c, 25; 9:31; 11:21, 24b; 12:24, 25; 16:5; 19:20. This material provides a linguistic database that is examined in light of prose compositional criteria evidenced in Aristotle, Pseudo-Demetrius, Dionysius of Halicarnassus and Pseudo-Longinus. Walters concludes, on the basis of euphony (i.e. hiatus – vowel clashes between or within words that cause a pause in speech; and dissonance – harshness of sound due to awkward consonantal combinations), rhythm (long and short syllables), and two aspects of sentence structure (syntax and end of clauses, and clause and sequence segues), ‘that the differences between Luke and Acts are not explainable by the normal variations expected in the prose compositional style of a unitary author’ (p. 189).

This well-organised and closely argued monograph exhibits Walters’ proficiency in Luke-Acts studies, literary criticism, ancient Greek prose styles and statistical analyses. Both she and the publisher are to be congratulated for producing a volume that, despite the density of detail, is enviably free of typographical errors. Avoiding sweeping assertions, Walters patiently insists that her stylometric evidence leaves the assumed unitary authorship of Luke and Acts open to question. My facility in mathematics and statistical analysis is insufficient to judge Walters’ quantitative methodology. I would raise two questions, however, that leave doubts in my mind about her methodology and conclusions. First, the different sources that doubtless lie behind Luke and Acts are not sufficiently factored into the author’s argument. Many of the seams and summaries identified by Walters exhibit high Hebraic content and are scarcely ‘genre-neutral’ (see my *Hebrew Gospel and the Development of the Synoptic Tradition*, Eerdmans, 2009, pp. 292–332). Her select linguistic database is thus not as valid as she assumes. Second, the specialised linguistic criteria by which she judges the database (hiatus, dissonance, rhythm, etc.) are relevant only if the author(s) of Luke and Acts was/were attentive to such features. I am doubtful of this. The several styles evident in Luke alone (classical prologue, alternating clusters and dearth of Hebraisms, alternating similarities to Mark and Double Tradition) seem to imperil the assumption that the author(s) of Luke and Acts was/were tutored and tethered to such compositional constraints.

This is not to suggest that the assumed unitary authorship of Luke and Acts is unassailable, but I cannot see that Walters' methodology and conclusions have seriously challenged the traditional assumption.

James R. Edwards

Whitworth University, Spokane, WA 99251, USA

jedwards@whitworth.edu

doi:10.1017/S0036930610000967

Anthony C. Thiselton, *Hermeneutics: An Introduction* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2009), pp. 409. \$30.00.

Anthony Thiselton is a New Testament scholar rightly celebrated for his influential publications on biblical hermeneutics. *Hermeneutics: An Introduction* is not a major new work, but it is a significant contribution which supplements Thiselton's substantial corpus.

The first quarter of *Hermeneutics* provides a good review of major currents in biblical hermeneutics (though not in philosophical hermeneutics). Thiselton's use of many concrete biblical examples to illustrate modern hermeneutical debate and practice should prove especially useful for the beginner. The last quarter of *Hermeneutics* will also be very useful in introductory courses, and may be the most important contribution of this volume, for Thiselton provides concise reports on a multitude of influential works in liberation theology, postcolonial theory, feminism, womanism, reader-response and reception theory, all of which owe a decisive debt to major developments in twentieth-century hermeneutics. Aside from attenuated and mostly negative summaries of Foucault, Derrida and Rorty, Thiselton's analyses are pithy and fair.

In the third quarter of the book, only the chapter on mid-twentieth-century approaches (Barth, the New Hermeneutic, Structuralism, Post-Structuralism and Barr's Semantics) is suitable for introductory use. The chapters on Schleiermacher, Dilthey, Bultmann, Gadamer and Ricoeur are both too advanced to be useful for the beginning student and insufficiently developed fully to engage scholars. They are best read as supplements to Thiselton's earlier work, and in that sense they are indeed a new and valuable resource (Thiselton himself repeatedly refers readers to his previous publications).

I would argue that the second quarter of the book, which addresses hermeneutics from the third to the eighteenth centuries, suffers from a complicated problem. As Gadamer realised with signal clarity, after Heidegger it becomes apparent that Schleiermachean hermeneutics begins with authors, texts and interpreters as uninterrogated givens. Heidegger