temporary readers. For example, she considers Ecclesiastes 1 to be a call for the reader to "effect change" by caring for the Earth (p. 35). She also challenges readers not to dwell on uncertainty, but to rest confidently after work and dispense their gain to this and future generations (p. 83). Concluding chapters 6–7, Turner calls for a curbing of consumption (p. 99). Summarizing chapters 8–9, she argues for justice for refugees and animals (p. 105). She concludes her commentary most forcefully by stating that if readers do not give Earth prominence over economy, all work done to care for the Earth may be for naught (p. 121). Turner's "Hearing Qoheleth's Earth" serves as a significant contribution to the fields of Ecclesiastes studies and ecological hermeneutics.

There are two issues with which I must quibble. First, while Turner surveys many meanings of Hebrew terms with extraordinary conciseness, this reviewer is often left wanting for explanation of her choices—Why this sense and not another (e.g. "breath" on pp. 25–27)? Second, though I might concede that deliberate ambiguity exists, the so-called ambiguity in Ecclesiastes seems to be the fault of interpreters rather than the aim of the author. In such case, Qoheleth is not implicitly calling for the reader to exercise executive force. Rather, the reader is explicitly taking that authority for oneself, potentially unrelated to the intentions of the author. In other words, it is likely a reader's ignorance of language, history, and literature—not the so-called deliberate ambiguity—that causes the text to be so elusive. This is not to say polysemy and word plays are not present throughout Ecclesiastes; any reader with steady attention on the Hebrew of Ecclesiastes knows the book is full of complex and rich language.

In sum, this disagreement over deliberate ambiguity is more a matter of hermeneutics than analysis of a specific word or phrase. Turner's perspective has helped me think more carefully about my own hermeneutical approach, especially when interpreting Ecclesiastes.

Critiques notwithstanding, Turner is to be commended for this innovative, concise, and thought-provoking commentary. I, the son and grandson of farmers, read Ecclesiastes "with new eyes" thanks to Turner's commentary. She achieves her *raison d'écrire*.

Ethan C. Jones
Scarborough College, Fort Worth, TX

Micah. By Stephen G. Dempster. Two Horizons Old Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2017, viii + 284 pp., $30.00 paper.

With this commentary, Stephen Dempster skillfully expounds the prophecy of Micah, whom he identifies as "the first person in history to pronounce destruction on the sacred temple of Jerusalem and to announce judgment on the Holy City" (p. 238). Dempster serves as professor of religious studies at Crandall University in Moncton, New Brunswick. In 2003, he released *Dominion and Dynasty: A Theology of the Hebrew Bible* (NSBT 15; Apollos).

Following the preface, the contents of the book unfold in the following manner: "Introduction to the Book of Micah" (56 pp.), "Commentary" (136 pp.), "Theological Themes of Micah" (43 pp.), "Micah's Contribution to Biblical Theology" (3 pp.), "Micah's Relevance to Present-Day Theological Issues" (20 pp.), and the back matter (bibliography and indexes). The section-by-section commentary is organized in light of Dempster's threefold outline of the book of Micah. Subheads in the commentary section address topics such as "Structure," "Literary Features," "Key Words and Expressions," "Interpretation—Micah's Word Then," and "Interpretation—Micah's Word Now."

As the norm, Dempster follows the MT, although sometimes he prefers a LXX reading, such as at 3:3, 6:13, and 6:16 (p. 49 n. 143). Commendably, Dempster cautions against unnecessary emendations of the Hebrew text: "What constitutes bad Hebrew may be a construct in the mind of the interpreter rather than in that of a native speaker" (p. 50). Following the lead of Andersen and Freedman, he suggests that even grammatical abnormalities do not necessarily indicate textual corruptions; rather, they might reflect the emotional state of the writer (p. 50).

Throughout the commentary, Dempster compares the book of Micah to a superbly-performed symphony—a symphony with three main movements that gradually accelerates the tempo as it advances toward a final crescendo (pp. 34, 162). In his analysis, Dempster distinguishes between the book of Micah in its current form, and the oracles of Micah as originally spoken by the prophet (pp. 16–18). For him, "the present form of Micah is that of self-contained speech units that were gradually shaped according to specific design" (p. 48). He suggests excerpts such as 7:8–20 reflect later editorial activity (p. 187).

The author criticizes the discipline of historical criticism and its Enlightenment presuppositions for undermining the historicity of the prophecy: "The acids of historical criticism burned away … parts of the book from the historical Micah" (pp. 27–28). Historical critics have downplayed or ignored theological outcomes, he observes: "Theology without exegesis is speculation and exegesis without theology is antiquarian" (p. 37).

With great facility, the commentator elucidates the poetic components of the book of Micah. For instance, he discusses the literary feature known as intensification, in which a subsequent line of poetry intensifies the meaning of the prior line (pp. 40–41, 154–55). Moreover, Micah as a book remains "rife with wordplays and various poetic techniques" (p. 181). The numerous toponyms in 1:10–16 work together to create "wordplay 'overkill'" (p. 41; cf. pp. 42, 65–67). Discussions of puns enrich the commentary throughout (e.g., pp. 133–34, 174).

Hermeneutical principles affect the interpretation of prophecy. One such principle employed by Dempster is that a prophecy does not need to be fulfilled according to its details; the generals can override the particulars. For example, 1:6 predicts that Samaria will become a heap of ruins. According to Dempster, "That Samaria was only partially destroyed in the destruction of 722 BCE and was rebuilt does not necessarily invalidate the prophecy, for that is to be woodenly literalistic" (p. 71). In the accompanying footnote, Dempster rejects Walter Kaiser's hermeneutical principle that a prophecy must be fulfilled exactly as stated (n. 42).

Dempster characteristically relates the prophetic fulfillments of Micah to the eighth century BC, most notably to Assyria's invasion of the Northern Kingdom in 722 BC or the Southern Kingdom in 701 BC (e.g., pp. 108, 135–36, 173, 176, 187). The commentator acknowledges, however, that sometimes he was unable to find specific historical synchronisms that support eighth-century fulfillments. "Conjecture" played a role in determining the historical milieu of a prophecy (p. 38). He assures readers that "the precise details are not as important" when seeking a historical setting (p. 38). Concerning 1:2–16, Dempster admits that "virtually all historical references dealing with the particulars of warfare have been blurred in this text" (p. 75).

Furthermore, in 5:5–6 and 7:12, Dempster proposes that the nation of Assyria symbolizes evil forces, thus implying that the word "Assyria," in these literary contexts, lacks any distinction from other nations in terms of geography, ethnicity, or destiny (pp. 140, 183). Within the same literary contexts, however, he suggests that the nation of Israel ought to be understood as a literal nation (pp. 137–38). This brings up the issue of consistency in interpretation: Should we interpret one nation as symbolic (Assyria) but another nation as literal (Israel) within the same context?

The commentator takes 3:12 as a conditional prophecy. It reads, "Zion will be plowed as a field, Jerusalem will become a heap of ruins, and the mountain of the temple will become high places of a forest." For Dempster, this prediction anticipated the Assyrian crisis of 701 BC, even though the prediction was never fulfilled (and never will be fulfilled). "Judgment was averted because of repentance" (p. 117; cf. p. 114).

With great zeal, Dempster challenges contemporary church leaders to stand against sin and serve God wholeheartedly. He asks, "Where are the Micahs who are full of the Holy Spirit and who will call sin for what it is wherever it is, and who do not care for the approval of people, nor for their money because they serve a higher master?" (p. 121).

The volume is well written, scholarly yet accessible, and it contains mature reflections upon the prophecy of Micah. For these reasons, the commentary deserves a wide reading, even among interpreters who do not share all of the author's hermeneutical convictions concerning prophetic fulfillment.

Mark A. Hassler
Virginia Beach Theological Seminary, Virginia Beach, VA

Mark Through Old Testament Eyes: A Background and Application Commentary. By Andrew T. Le Peau. Grand Rapids: Kregel, 2017, 352 pp., $28.99 paper.

Coming from a concern that the OT "for many Christians (today) has … become a closed book" (p. 25), *Mark Through Old Testament Eyes* is the first in a series of NT commentaries (also edited by Le Peau) that aims at unpacking the NT text with special attention to the impact of the OT on its writers (p. 17). To achieve this goal, Le Peau employs two main types of comments. The majority are presented in