

BOOK REVIEWS

The Book Called Isaiah: Deutero-Isaiah's Role in Composition and Redaction. By H. G. M. Williamson. Oxford: Clarendon, 1994, 244 pp. + appendix + bibliography + indices, \$55.00. *Rhetoric and Redaction in Trito-Isaiah: The Structure, Growth, and Authorship of Isaiah 56–66.* By P. A. Smith. Leiden: Brill, 1995, xi + 207 + bibliography + indices.

Among the many recent attempts at identifying and explaining the unity of the prophecy of Isaiah enter two thought-provoking entries. H. G. M. Williamson offers his readers a detailed explanation of the relationship between the so-called First and Second Isaiahs, while P. A. Smith addresses questions regarding the rhetorical and redactional development of so-called Third Isaiah.

Williamson advances three proposals concerning the role of Deutero-Isaiah (DI): (1) DI was especially influenced by the literary deposit of Isaiah of Jerusalem; (2) he regarded himself as the herald of salvation, able to reopen the sealed work of Isaiah of Jerusalem; (3) he included a version of the earlier prophecies with his own and edited them in such a way as to bind the two parts of the work together (p. 240).

Williamson exercises considerable caution in establishing his criteria for identifying a case of direct influence, readily acknowledging that similarity does not always entail influence. Thus, he recognizes the importance of citing only clear-cut cases. His basic criterion for determining influence is guided by the process of elimination: "Unless another book, passage, or tradition circle could be found that also embraced all the data to be considered, the most economical hypothesis would be to ascribe all possible example of influence to First Isaiah" (p. 29). He further observes that "influence" should not be restricted simply to 'imitation.' Readers "must be alert to the possibility that the later writer may be in fact *reversing* quite as much as *endorsing* what was said or written by his predecessor, for that is just as much 'influence' as is continuation" (p. 28; italics mine).

Some examples of this clear-cut influence include the use of Isaiah 6 in chaps. 40–55, found in expressions such as "high and lifted up," "the Holy One of Israel," and "blind" and "deaf." Other examples include "potter and clay" and "signs to the nations," where Williamson notices a distinct change in tone—i.e. there is "development by means of reversal." Williamson concludes that "the cumulative effect of all this material seems irrefutably to point to the direct literary influence of this chapter on the Isaianic tradition as a whole and on Deutero-Isaiah in particular" (p. 55).

Williamson's second proposal focuses on DI's conception of himself and his ministry. He contends that the inclusion of themes, vocabulary, etc., from First Isaiah, coupled with DI's portrayal of his ministry as a herald of salvation, is a clear indication that from the outset he deliberately included the earlier work in his own (pp. 94–115). This is based upon his analysis of the "sealed book" passages (8:1–4; 8:16–18; 30:8). "As the period of divine judgement by means of exile wore on, it may be proposed that Deutero-Isaiah came to appreciate that now was the time of which Isaiah had written when the sealed document was to be opened and a new message of salvation, to which the earlier prophet had alluded, was to be proclaimed. . . . This is most clearly

articulated in 50:4–9” (p. 107). The implications of this conclusion are significant for Williamson’s thesis. If DI has indeed opened up the long-sealed book, then his work is an integral continuation of First Isaiah, and consequently it was never meant to be understood apart from its connection with the earlier material.

Williamson’s third and final proposal is an assessment of DI’s reworking/redaction of First Isaiah. Here, and rightly so, Williamson is even more cautious than before: “We have entered the realm of plausible hypothesis” (p. 116). His rationale is straightforward: “If . . . we have managed to establish that a particular author (in this case, Deutero-Isaiah) incorporated an earlier work into his own, rather like a source, then it becomes reasonable to allow that to influence our judgement to some extent in regarding possible examples of his handling of that ‘source’ as in fact probable” (p. 117).

Williamson then traces DI’s handling of his source through the three major sections of Isaiah 1–39: chaps. 2–12, 13–27, and 28–39. Here he not only traces DI’s methodology (he “intervened primarily at the start and finish of sections”), but he also searches for the bridge between the two books. Interestingly, Williamson does not find in chaps. 36–39 the same link with chap. 40 that other scholars do, or, more precisely, he has “found no evidence for supposing that they were written explicitly for their present position in the book” (here arguing *contra* Christopher Seitz in *Zion’s Final Destiny*). Thus, while he views the chapters as a bridge, “this must have been some time after the work of Deutero-Isaiah” (p. 209). Rather, utilizing the work of W. Beuken, Williamson argues at length that chap. 33 is “the point of original connection between the literary deposit of Isaiah of Jerusalem and the material which Deutero-Isaiah added to it in chapter 40 and following” (p. 230).

Each of Williamson’s proposals merits careful reflection by those concerned with the unity of Isaiah. His judicious care in marshaling evidence and his hesitancy to proclaim his conclusions as the last word on the nature of Isaiah’s unity is to be commended. The evangelical reader of this work will benefit from the many thoughtful observations on the verbal and thematic similarities between chaps. 1–39 and 40–55 (hopefully, forever dismissing the notion of their mutual exclusivity). However, those who contend that Isaianic authorship best explains the unity of the book will not ultimately find Williamson’s arguments compelling, as his second and third proposals are much more difficult to sustain than his first. The literary connections between chaps. 1–39 and 40–55 do not necessarily establish Williamson’s conclusion that a separate writer viewed himself as one who opens the sealed book, adopts it for his writing, and then emends the original in order to place it in a new historical context. (One also wonders if Williamson’s is as simple an explanation as he hopes.)

P. A. Smith’s work takes a somewhat different approach from Williamson’s. Smith employs a rhetorical approach patterned after the seminal work of James Muilenburg (i.e. with a special emphasis on stylistics, although Smith is not averse to utilizing other literary approaches) to analyze Isaiah 56–66. He argues that a close reading of the text will make it possible to identify within Isaiah 56–66 a few large, well-crafted poems. In so doing, he makes a powerful case for the overall unity of the section.

Smith’s careful textual analysis is done to determine, as much as possible, the growth and authorship of Isaiah 56–66. He concludes that there are two primary authors of these chapters: Trito-Isaiah (TI), the author of the message of salvation in 60:1–63:6, and his successor, TI2, who was responsible for the remaining poems of chaps. 56–66.

According to Smith, TI was a prophet, or prophetic author, who not only reaffirmed the words of his master (DI) but also reinterpreted and went beyond them in an attempt to meet the needs of his audience (p. 48). Similarly, TI2 updated the message of TI to make adjustments for the sinful behavior of Israel in the postexilic community.

This conclusion about the authorship of these chapters enables Smith to make some preliminary yet specific statements regarding their historical background, especially the much-noted tensions within the postexilic community. He rejects as simplistic the notion that there was a clean break between two easily definable groups, e.g. clergy/laity, exiles/nonexiles, priests/visionaries (p. 194). Instead, he suggests that tensions within the community grew out of differing reactions to the supposedly failed promises of Isaiah 40–55. One response, influenced by the prophet Haggai, emphasized “the building of the temple as a necessary preparation for the divine intervention” (p. 195). On the other hand, there was a group “(supported by T12) who saw the building programme as of no particular significance given the injustice and resolution of the contemporary situation revolving around preparation for the believed imminent intervention of God by means of religious faithfulness and social practice, the criteria set out in the opening unit of chs. 56–66, 56:1–8” (ibid.). Both of these groups had their roots in the preexilic period, which, according to Smith, explains why they reappear so quickly after the exile.

The value of the work lies in Smith’s close reading of the text and his careful application of appropriate literary principles. His analysis of the poems within these chapters provides many helpful observations for the student of Isaiah. Whether readers of this *Journal* will be convinced of his audience analysis is another question. As with most such efforts, it is questionable if the text can sustain such detailed conclusions.

Discussions of Isaiah’s unity, diachronic development and final form remain unsettled, with no universally accepted conclusion in sight. Despite the caveats mentioned above, both Williamson’s and Smith’s careful analyses of the text have furthered this most fascinating debate.

Neil O. Skjoldal
Trinity International University, Miami, FL

Possessed by God: A New Testament Theology of Sanctification and Holiness. By David Peterson. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995, 191 pp., \$18.00 paper.

This study is the first in a series of monographs, *New Studies in Biblical Theology*, intending to examine some essential topics in Biblical theology. D. A. Carson, the series editor, outlines three areas, one or more of which each writer will address in the individual contributions:

1. the nature and status of biblical theology, including its relations with other disciplines (e.g. historical theology, exegesis, systematic theology, historical criticism, narrative theology);
2. the articulation and exposition of the structure of thought of a particular biblical writer or corpus; and
3. the delineation of a biblical theme across all or part of the biblical corpora (p. 7).

David Peterson’s painstaking analysis of the Biblical data on the nature of sanctification touches on nearly all of these categories and leaves the reader with a deeper awareness of the multitude of Biblical data contributing to a determinative accent in the meaning of sanctification.

Peterson argues that insufficient attention has been given to definitive sanctification, the onetime event of being incorporated into Christ through faith by the Holy Spirit, in many influential theories on sanctification (p. 14). His concern is threefold in my view. First, he simply desires to be true to the voice dominant in Scripture on the matter. Second, there are a number of views, particularly in systematic theological

formulation, that differ on the nature of sanctification (pp. 12–13). Third, Peterson unequivocally advocates a solid foundation for both the understanding of, and the motivation for, living the Christian life. He points out, for example, that the call for holiness “can so easily degenerate into a moralistic and perfectionist program for believers to pursue” (p. 137).

The first section (chaps. 1–3) explores the meaning of God’s call and empowerment of those in Christ to live as those who are possessed by him and indwelt by the Holy Spirit. In chap. 1, “The Biblical Starting-Point,” Peterson shows how an informed view of holiness is rooted firmly in the OT portrayal of God as holy and as calling his people into a relationship with him that grounds them in holiness. There is further the responsibility inherent in the relationship to manifest holiness in every dimension of their existence, individually and corporately (pp. 17, 24).

The restatement of his thesis at the beginning of chap. 2, “Sanctified in Christ,” effectively holds the reader’s attention to the flow of Peterson’s argument on the nature of sanctification: “In the New Testament, however, it primarily refers to God’s way of taking possession of us in Christ, setting us apart to belong to him and to fulfill his purpose for us” (p. 27). He argues here that in the majority of instances where the verb “to sanctify” and the noun “sanctification” are used, the saving work of God in Christ actualized in the lives of believers through the Holy Spirit rises to prominence. Chapter 3, “Sanctified by Word and Spirit,” includes extended treatments of passages such as Eph 5:25–27 (pp. 52–54); Acts 20 (pp. 56–58); Acts 26 (pp. 55–56); Romans 12–15 (pp. 58–60); 2 Thess 2:13–15 (pp. 60–62); 1 Thessalonians 4–5 (pp. 65–67). These sections include references and commentary on other Biblical passages, but together they contribute to a deeper appreciation of the definitive nature of sanctification as that which is built on the word of God and the power of the Spirit.

Chapter 4, “Pursuing Holiness,” builds on what has been presented before on sanctification while wrestling with the question: “How can we pursue something that is God’s gift to us?” (p. 71). Peterson discusses much from the letter to the Hebrews and other NT passages showing that God is concerned about the members of the community of faith manifesting their sanctification in Christ (p. 75). “No Christian should doubt the need to give practical everyday expression to the holiness that is our status and calling in Christ” (p. 91). Peterson trenchantly observes that with the intensity of many who desire “progress” in holiness, the danger exists for a shift of attention from the grace of God to human effort (pp. 91–92).

An extended discussion on Romans 6–8 dominates the content of chap. 5, “Living Between the Cross and Resurrection.” Peterson argues that moral renewal stems from the believer’s union with Christ in his death and resurrection. He further explicates the tension between the “now” and the “not yet” of Biblical sanctification. The Christian is called to live in the present as those who belong in the age to come. The flesh is still a powerful influence in one’s life, though it may be offset through submission to the work of the Spirit. Through such submission and the appropriation of power, the believer lives awaiting God’s consummative work at the resurrection (p. 114). In chap. 6, “Transformation, Renewal and Growth,” Peterson presents Biblical data with explanation advancing the point that the NT uses the language of renewal, transformation, and growth to explain what God is doing in the lives of believers (p. 136). Two helpful appendices complete his study of sanctification.

This review is woefully inadequate in reflecting the breadth and depth of Biblical analysis contained in this book. Peterson must be commended for this aspect alone. He does, however, make some unique and timely observations. The Church always exists in a sociocultural setting and can be affected, positively or negatively, by this setting. In a time when sexual promiscuity runs rampant in our society and does have

an effect on the Church, Peterson wisely emphasizes the relationship between holiness and sexuality. Believers belong to the Lord and cannot indulge themselves in the abuse of their bodies (pp. 82–84). Needed in our day as well is the reminder of the corporate nature of sanctification. Incorporating favorably the suggestion of Peter O'Brien on Col 3:11, he confirms that there is the creation of a new humanity in Christ. There is a removal of the centrality of "racial, religious, cultural and social barriers" among believers (pp. 131–132). Polarization is also a growing reality in this country and in various parts of the world. The Church, simply by living in the reality of our union with Christ and with each other, can be a powerful model of reconciliation.

Peterson's impressive work would have been strengthened by greater sensitivity to two general points. In criticizing some systematicians like Anthony Hoekema, he needs to explain the relationship between Biblical and systematic theology. The systematician should indeed build his/her ahistorical categories in theology on Biblical sensitivities. The nature of systematic theology, however, calls for a response to other elements as well, such as philosophical and ethical concerns in the discussion of a particular theological category. The systematician should reflect Biblical emphases as Hoekema, for example, does in his treatment of sanctification (see *Saved by Grace*, pp. 202–203). A critique of sanctification in the realm of systematic formation must be informed by some understanding of this Biblical-systematic relationship to argue the case for a needed emphasis on definitive sanctification.

Second, a fleshing out of how his emphasis on definitive sanctification should affect the Wesleyan or Reformed traditions would have been helpful. Peterson revealed well some inadequacies in their explanation of the meaning of sanctification. The question remains, however, how they should reconstitute their views. How should this reminder from Scripture affect the form and content of their enunciation of sanctification?

These concerns in no way detract from the contribution that Peterson's work makes to this foundational Biblical-theological topic. The Biblical analysis alone is impressive and helpful and calls for serious reflection for those who hold to Biblical authority.

Bruce L. Fields
Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, Deerfield, IL

Zephaniah: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary. By Adele Berlin. AB 25A. New York: Doubleday, 1994, 165 pp., \$29.00.

The little book of Zephaniah has not received the attention it deserves, and Adele Berlin's volume is a welcome addition to the literature on it. The commentary contains a couple of helpful maps, a useful bibliography, and indices for Scripture references, subjects and authors. The author also gives her own translation of Zephaniah. The question of the date is based on the data in the superscription: "the days of Josiah son of Amon, king of Judah." Whether the religious picture in Zephaniah refers to the pre- or post-Josianic situation is left open. But Berlin makes clear "that the time of Josiah is not necessarily the time that the book was written, but it is *the time in which the book is set*" (p. 38; italics hers).

Since Zephaniah is mentioned only in the superscription and nowhere else, Berlin concludes there is "no way to confirm whether he indeed existed and spoke the words attributed to him" (p. 31). But she concludes that his "existence is credible, though, because other prophets like him were active before, during, and after this period, and

because the personal name 'Zephaniah' is an authentic name, found in the Bible . . . and on a seal impression from Lachish" (p. 31).

Matters of a more technical nature are treated briefly but are judicious. The textual observations are especially to the point. The author's sensitivity to literary matters (see her *The Dynamics of Biblical Parallelism*) enable her to make some pointed observations in this area. The author's personal translation of the text is crisp and stylish.

Larry L. Walker
Jonesborough, TN

Hearing the New Testament: Strategies for Interpretation. Edited by Joel B. Green. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995, xvi + 444 pp., \$25.00 paper.

This volume contains 20 essays by 19 scholars from America and Great Britain. The plural in the subtitle ("Strategies") seems intentional. The editor writes: "No one interpretive method can claim to provide one authentic understanding of any given NT text" (p. 9). Accordingly, the essays address traditional historical-critical questions, literary approaches, issues of hermeneutics and theological interpretation. It is extremely useful for teachers and students, with most chapters applying interpretive methods to one or more of five Biblical passages and offering suggestions for further reading. Green's volume is in some respects similar to the collection of essays edited by I. H. Marshall (*New Testament Interpretation*, 1977) but offers numerous advantages of being more comprehensive, concise, accessible to beginning students and naturally more up to date. In NT introduction courses, *Hearing the New Testament* could serve as an excellent secondary text in addition to a standard work on NT literature.

The following comments address the content and certain specific points of individual chapters. Although Anthony C. Thiselton is sometimes quick to criticize non-traditional scholars without relating their lasting contributions, "New Testament Interpretation in Historical Perspective" is a good starting place for students who have not yet read Kümmel or Baird. In tracing how scholarship has come to represent such a plurality of approaches, Thiselton both places NT scholars "within their own historical context" (p. 11) and offers a number of distinctive and promising interpretations. Addressing the role of the individual interpreter are Edgar V. McKnight's survey of intellectual history ("Presuppositions in New Testament Study") and Kevin J. Vanhoozer's discussion of "The Reader in New Testament Interpretation."

In "Traditio-Historical Criticism and the Study of Jesus," Bruce Chilton offers a rather complex picture of gospel traditions and applies this to eucharistic texts. The analysis is at times quite speculative (identifying contrasting traditions with Jesus, Peter, James and Paul), but students will benefit from seeing an historical critic in action instead of just reading a summary of current positions. James L. Bailey addresses the other main aspect of form criticism in his helpful discussion, "Genre Analysis." Stephen C. Barton presents a balanced summary of the contributions and limitations of "Historical Criticism and Social-Scientific Perspectives in New Testament Study."

Richard Bauckham and Loveday C. A. Alexander respectively offer inviting introductions to "Extra-Canonical Jewish Texts" and "Greco-Roman Literature and Culture" for NT study. Both chapters would be strengthened by discussing certain primary texts for younger students to begin reading instead of just listing them in the bibliographies. Foundational to all NT studies is textual criticism, and Bart D. Ehrman offers a useful introduction. Concerning which manuscripts contain the "longer ending" of Mark (16:9-20), "some of our manuscripts" (p. 130) and "many manuscripts"

(p. 140) should read “nearly all manuscripts” in both places. Max Turner’s discussion of lexical semantics (“Modern Linguistics and the New Testament”) explores χάρισμα and κεφαλή in Paul to show why one must not rely solely on *TDNT* or other works “dominated by . . . prescientific ‘linguistics’” (p. 147).

Students will also profit from the excellent discussions of narrative and rhetorical criticism by Mark Allan Powell and C. Clifton Black respectively. Unfortunately, Green’s own “Discourse Analysis and New Testament Interpretation” is rather uninformative (e.g. Luke’s audience knew Greek and the LXX, p. 185). In another chapter the editor and Richard B. Hayes discuss numerous relevant “literary and theological problems surrounding the use of the OT in the NT” (p. 229).

One can question whether the naïve overgeneralizations about what is distinctive in (supposedly monolithic) African, Asian and Latin American applications of the Bible (“Global Perspectives on New Testament Interpretation”) belong in this volume. This chapter also ignores the fact that a contextualization of the gospel message is possible only after an historical analysis of what the NT meant within its own milieu. Three other chapters address theological aspects of interpretation (“Feminist Hermeneutics” by Sandra M. Schneiders, “Reading the New Testament in Canonical Context” by Robert W. Wall, and “The New Testament, Theology, and Ethics” by Stephen E. Fowl). Missing in this otherwise rather comprehensive volume is a discussion of history-of-religions analyses.

As the editor himself notes (p. 9), it would be impossible for any individual to pursue all the methods or hold all the views *Hearing the New Testament* contains. The essays together teach the necessity of thinking critically about using a variety of approaches to the Biblical text. For this we are indebted to Green and his contributors.

James A. Kelhoffer
The University of Chicago, Chicago, IL

Exegetical Writings: A Selection. By Anton Fridrichsen. Translated and edited by C. C. Caragounis and T. Fornberg. WUNT 76. Tübingen: Mohr, 1994, xiii + 314 pp., n.p.

Anton Fridrichsen (1888–1953), whom the editors describe as “undoubtedly the greatest Scandinavian New Testament scholar of this century,” was professor of NT at the University of Uppsala from 1928 to 1953. Due, however, to the fact that the bulk of his writings were in Norwegian (his native language) and Swedish, he is not as well known as he deserves to be, and it is this fact that provided the incentive to produce the present volume. To judge from these essays, Fridrichsen was indeed a remarkable scholar. He studied on the continent with Ernst von Dubschütz and Paul Wendland and took his doctorate from the University of Strasbourg, submitting a dissertation in 1925 that would find its way into English translation only in 1972 (*The Problem of Miracle in Primitive Christianity*), almost twenty years after his death.

Fridrichsen was thus at his scholarly prime at a time when the field of NT studies was in great ferment, with radical scholarship often coming to conclusions that were destructive of the Christian faith. Fridrichsen, however, was himself a devout Christian and had often contemplated taking a pastorate in Norway. It is indeed this uniting of a deep evangelical faith with an uncompromising commitment to the solid scholarship entailed by the scientific investigation of the texts that make Fridrichsen so interesting—especially to persons searching for just such a combination.

The present collection of Fridrichsen’s writings contains some 28 essays, half of which are in English and half in German. Many of the latter are very brief, however, and less than one third of the actual text is in German. The editors have wisely chosen

to preface the collection with a biographical essay entitled "Anton Fridrichsen as Academic Teacher in the Service of the Church," by Erik Beijer, who had been his pupil. Following this informative piece is Fridrichsen's programmatic essay (1936, in the first issue of *SEÅ*): "Realistic Interpretation of the Bible: A Scientific Demand and a Practical Desideratum," which Beijer characterizes as highly influential in the Church of Sweden. The essays that follow are divided into four groups: (1) "The Synoptic Gospels," including articles on "The Parables in Recent Research" (1929), "The Conflict of Jesus with the Unclean Spirits" (1931), and especially the very interesting "Who Did Jesus Claim to Be? The Historical Foundation of Faith in Christ According to Present Biblical Research," which was originally published as a booklet in 1931. (2) "The Fourth Gospel," with important articles on "Jesus' Farewell Discourse in the Fourth Gospel: An Introduction to the Johannine Question" (1938) and "The Shepherd Chapter: Jn 10" (1943). (3) "Paul," with interesting articles on "Die Apologie des Paulus: Gal. 1" (1922) and especially "The Apostle and His Message" (1947). (4) "Varia," containing the informative "The New Testament and Hellas" (1930) and especially "The Unity of the New Testament" (1938).

It is impossible to do justice to these articles in the small space allotted for a book review. What strikes me immediately about them, however, is their relevance for the contemporary scene. Indeed, in Fridrichsen I hear, a generation earlier, the likes of a Martin Hengel (at whose initiative the present book began), a Peter Stuhlmacher or a C. K. Barrett. That is, we have here scholarship of the highest caliber, in the service of the faith rather than against it. There are of course many points with which one might choose to disagree with Fridrichsen, but what is to be gleaned above all from these essays is an attitude, a direction, described by Fridrichsen as an "empathy" with the Biblical text, an approach "from the inside." And almost as if he were responding directly to the Jesus Seminar, Fridrichsen writes: "The attitude of liberal exegesis to the religion of the New Testament comes to light clearly and characteristically on a particular, central point, namely, *the picture of Jesus*. Precisely here it becomes apparent that the pretended objectivity is a disguised subjectivity. . . . Modern rationalism . . . sets up its own picture in the sanctuary and declares it to be the historical Jesus" (p. 25; italics his). Fridrichsen not only criticizes, however; he also sets forth a positive and convincing portrait in answer to the question "Who Did Jesus Claim to Be?" where he shows that the Christology of the Church goes back to Jesus' own consciousness and the experience of the disciples as they followed him. Finally, Fridrichsen finds the unity of the NT in its eschatological perspective (he focuses consistently on its realized dimensions) and its concentration on Jesus, themes he traces through the "eschatological realities" of reconciliation, Church and love.

In short, then, here are essays filled with insight and wisdom—essays that sound often as though they had been written yesterday, and therefore essays that remain exceptionally useful. We owe Caragounis and Fornberg a debt of gratitude for their labors in producing this volume and for helping us to rediscover a truly exceptional scholar.

Donald A. Hagner
Fuller Theological Seminary, Pasadena, CA

Die apostolische Herkunft der Evangelien. By Hans-Joachim Schulz. 2d ed. QD 145. Freiburg: Herder, 1995, 411 pp., n.p.

Has the apostolicity of the gospels been unmasked as fiction by historical-critical exegesis? Have recent interpreters been successful in recasting apostolicity in terms

of *Urkirchlichkeit*? And what are the implications for canonicity and inspiration of a rejection of the gospels' apostolic authorship? The present author challenges the notion, postulated by the form criticism pioneered by Schmidt, Dibelius and Bultmann, that the gospels are the product of anonymous community members from a time in which reminiscences of the "historical Jesus" had already begun to fade and the Pauline *kérygma* had largely been submerged under Hellenistic syncretism. This separation between the gospels' content and apostolic teaching, Schulz contends, could not even be overcome by redaction criticism's subsequent emphasis on the theological contribution of the gospel's final editor.

According to Schulz, historical criticism, owing to its rationalistic presuppositions, is not truly historical. He urges a return to a "biblical-liturgical hermeneutic." From his critique of form and redaction criticism he envisages the emergence of a true tradition and genre criticism of the gospels, based, not on literary models that are historically unrealistic, but on the actual kerygmatic, catechetical and liturgical processes in the canonical life of the early Church. Specifically, Schulz finds that ancient attribution places the origin of the gospels in relation to the apostolic proclamation and the Church's expansion through the apostolic mission. This stands in contrast to the tenets of form criticism, which considers the gospels to be late collections of small heterogeneous units of which only the oldest are of apostolic origin.

As Schulz argues, the constancy of traditions of small integrated units presupposes an early process of large-scale integration and hence an early formation of the gospels. He suggests the following dates of composition for the four gospels: the early 60s AD for Mark (Peter's departure from Jerusalem in AD 42 caused John Mark to record the liturgical and kerygmatic legacy of the first Jerusalem stage of Peter's ministry); AD 66–70 for Matthew; after AD 61–62 for Luke; and between 62 (John's move to Ephesus) and 66 (shortly after Peter's martyrdom) for John (with the gospel's final publication in AD 99, shortly after John's death). These conclusions are densely argued, and brief summaries cannot do justice to the author's cogency and grasp of the original sources.

The author is equally conversant with ancient Biblical and patristic sources and recent Roman Catholic, Eastern Orthodox and Protestant scholarship. It is unfortunate that this work will almost certainly never be translated into English and thus fail to exert the influence its strength of argument would deserve. While many will part company with some of Schulz' more idiosyncratic "biblical-liturgical" reconstructions, such as his contention that the Johannine discourses represent a meditation of Passover Haggadah and an interpretation of the exodus events in the light of Christ, the true Passover, Schulz' work represents a serious challenge to historical criticism's marginalization of the gospels' apostolic content and origin. It is hoped that English-speaking works on the subject will take up some of Schulz' legitimate findings and incorporate them into a responsible reassessment of the apostolic authorship of the four canonical gospels.

Andreas J. Köstenberger

Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary, Wake Forest, NC

Hebrew Gospel of Matthew. By George Howard. 2d ed. Macon: Mercer University, 1995, xiv + 239 pp., \$24.95.

Howard's primary task is to take the Hebrew manuscript of Matthew that appeared in the body of a 14th-century polemical treatise entitled *Even Bohan* ("The Touchstone") by Jewish scholar Shem-Tob ben-Isaac ben-Shaprut and to demonstrate

that this manuscript predates the 14th century. The second edition corrects a number of errors in, and addresses the questions raised by, the first edition of 1987.

From a number of sources in the early Church, the early Church fathers gave testimony to the existence of the gospel of Matthew written in Hebrew, or supposedly Aramaic, and then translated later into Greek. Papias (ca. AD 60–130) first stated that a Hebrew text existed but later fathers—Irenaeus, Origen, Eusebius, Epiphanius and Jerome—also cited a Hebrew text. However, Howard points out that the allusions and citations by these men have very little or no connection with the Church's preserved text of Matthew and Shem-Tob's Hebrew text of Matthew.

The Hebrew text of Matthew in Shem-Tob's possession is a Christian text in Hebrew, preserved by Jewish scholars, and it was used for a polemical purpose of pointing out its errors and in general the mistakes and wrong assumptions by Christendom regarding Jesus as Messiah.

In part 1 of the book, Howard presents the Hebrew text of Matthew of Shem-Tob with a critical apparatus, noting manuscript variations on the left pages while on the opposite side is the English translation. In part 2, Howard indicates that an earlier text of Matthew in Hebrew/Aramaic was known to and cited by the Church fathers mentioned above but the assessment is that "they are unclear about the relationship of" what they used regarding "our canonical Matthew." The rest of part 2 is a detailed demonstration that Shem-Tob's text of Matthew is unlike the Greek text of his day or the Latin Vulgate, and therefore the text predates the 14th century. The manuscript does reflect less "disparity between Judaism and Christianity than the canonical texts," but Howard points out that Shem-Tob's purpose was to strengthen Jewish people to not consider Jesus as the Messiah.

The book is valuable for those interested in considering what a possible ancient version of Matthew in Hebrew could be and for missiologists and missionaries who would want to note the polemics used by Jewish writers vis-à-vis the claims that Jesus is indeed the Jewish Messiah.

Louis Goldberg

Jews for Jesus and Northeastern Bible College, New York, NY

Jesus the Jewish Theologian. By Brad Young. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1995, xvi + 308 pp., n.p.

Young's book is a welcome addition that explores the roots of Jesus, setting the record straight that to understand the life and ministry of Jesus properly we must see him in the midst of Jewish history, culture and thought. His book joins a number of other volumes by Christians and Israeli Jews who seek to rectify the de-Judaizing trend in Christendom and bring Jesus back to his Jewish roots. Having studied under some of modern Israel's Jewish professors intensely interested in Jesus and the NT, Young is able to reflect upon sources from the *Sifrim Hitzonim* ("Outside Books"), Qumran literature, the Mishna and early Gemara, considering carefully what religious teachers of that day said, all of which have a bearing on Jesus' teaching.

Young divides his book in accordance with Jesus' life and ministry: Part 1 explores Jesus' life events, his birth, baptism and temptation; part 2 deals with the Messiah's kingdom theology; part 3 examines Jesus' parables, notably Jewish grace in the parables, the father and the two lost sons, faith as *chutzpa*; part 4 views the Jewish Messiah and the politics of Rome; part 5 looks at the future Messiah, asking if Jesus is human or divine; and the epilogue notes how many theologians of Christendom

have departed from Jesus' roots. Young makes a plea to consider what various ancient Jewish religious leaders have said on the very topics Jesus talked about, and that his teaching reflects his background.

A few examples from Young are helpful: When Jesus was baptized, the voice of the Father was heard from heaven and the Holy Spirit descended upon him like a dove. Such accounts are also replicated in Jewish backgrounds: A famous teacher, Rabbi Jose, was once praying and he heard the divine voice, cooing like a dove (*Ber.* 3a). But in addition, rabbinic and Qumran sources also stated that the Holy Spirit, or Shekinah, would rest on the Messiah. Therefore, at the baptism, Jesus can be viewed as both human and divine. Another lesson is that of the father and his two sons, one of whom is the prodigal. In the analysis of the father's character and action, Jesus drew on lessons taught by the Pharisees concerning the love of God, whereby he receives with great compassion anyone who truly repents. In the lesson of faith as *chutzpa*, Jesus presented two parables of the importunate friend and the unjust judge as illustrations of what constitutes real faith. But Young draws upon a number of sources, from Rabbis Eleazar, Akiba and Samuel the Short, and others who also prayed with boldness, or *chutzpa*, and God heard and answered their prayers.

One difficulty that surfaces in the book is that while looking for Jewish parallels to Jesus' ministry, the tendency can be to overlook facets he taught that mark him as unique, for which no parallel exists in Jewish sources. In Peter's great confession about who Messiah is (Matt 16:16), Peter is commended for his statement that Jesus is the Messiah of God. But Young ventures no comment that this disciple also declared that Jesus is the Son of God, a belief for which no parallel exists in Jewish thought. In discussing whether Jesus is human or divine, Young places great emphasis on him as the Son of Man, who is also an elevated person, someone supernatural, but nowhere does Young state he is also divine.

Teachers, pastors, seminarians and people in the pews can profit greatly from Young's contribution, which has a good index, bibliography and is well documented, but care also needs to be taken with those special unique lessons of Jesus.

Louis Goldberg

Jews for Jesus and Northeastern Bible College, New York, NY

The Modern Search for the Real Jesus: An Introductory Survey of the Historical Roots of Gospels Criticism. By Robert B. Strimple. Phillipsburg: Presbyterian and Reformed, 1995, 161 pp., \$10.99 paper.

With much of NT scholarship in the midst of renewed interest in the historical person of Jesus, it is not surprising to see another book with a title such as Strimple's. Strimple clearly states his purpose in the preface (p. vii): "to provide a concise, introductory survey of the most significant scholars and movements that have shaped the critical study of the Gospels in modern times." It certainly is understandable why Strimple might look at all of gospels criticism today through the lens of historical Jesus studies (cf. p. 19). What is uncomfortable, however, is that Strimple seems to equate all of gospels criticism with the quest of the historical Jesus when, in fact, gospels criticism is a broader field.

A glance at the table of contents shows that the volume really is a survey of gospels studies as the preface announces. The book is divided into three parts. Part 1 covers "the old quest" with chapters on rationalistic criticism (Reimarus and Paulus), Hegelian reconstructions (Strauss, Bauer and Baur) and Ritschlian liberalism (Weisse,

Holtzmann, Ritschl and Harnack). Part 2 covers the end of the quest with a chapter on the history-of-religions school (Wrede and Bousset) and a chapter on thoroughgoing eschatology (Baldensperger, Weiss and Schweitzer). Part 3 covers “the new quest” with chapters on Martin Kähler, Rudolf Bultmann (form criticism and existentialist theology) and post-Bultmannians (Jaspers, Buri, Ogden, Käsemann, Ebeling and Fuchs, and redaction criticism with Bornkamm, Conzelmann, Marxsen and Stonehouse).

Yet the book stops short in its survey, both with regard to the specific area of historical Jesus studies and with regard to gospels criticism in general. While the Jesus Seminar (arguably a leftover enterprise from the “new” or second quest) is mentioned in both Strimple’s introduction and conclusion, ironically no mention is made of the most modern search that many are calling the “third quest for the historical Jesus,” the roots of which some trace back several decades. As for critical methodologies in gospel studies, Strimple does treat the big three: source, form and redaction criticism. But he only briefly mentions such approaches as liberation, black and feminist theologies (in one sentence on p. 152) and the methodologies of sociological, genre, canonical and reader-oriented approaches (pp. 152–154). Altogether absent are composition criticism and narrative criticism.

Despite these shortcomings, the book provides some helpful insights. Strimple’s differentiation between the labels “liberal” and “radical” is appreciable: While both camps preclude the supernatural from the realm of history, liberal theology sees Jesus as the creative force in Christianity and radical theology sees the Church as the creative force, and yet radical exegesis is more sound (e.g. Bultmann; cf. pp. 24, 61–62). Better still is Strimple’s treatment of form criticism (pp. 104–118), where he points out its extremes and yet sees value in a much more conservative application of some of its tenets (see esp. p. 116).

Having set out to summarize and simplify the history of gospels criticism for evangelical seminary and college students, Strimple meets his goals to a limited extent. While it needs to be supplemented with material concerning gospels studies over the last three decades, as a quick survey of important persons and movements in the history of NT studies from Reimarus to Stonehouse the book is highly valuable.

Douglas S. Huffman
Northwestern College, St. Paul, MN

The Jesus Quest: The Third Search for the Jew of Nazareth. By Ben Witherington III. Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1995, 304 pp., \$19.99.

In the last several years the literature of the “third quest” for the historical Jesus has been accumulating rapidly to address a growing scholarly interest and satisfy a curious public. This situation has created an acute need for some kind of survey and critique that sifts through the abundant literature and attempts to make sense of the variety and complexity of current scholarship on Jesus. *The Jesus Quest* provides just this kind of contribution.

In the seven central chapters of the book Witherington presents and evaluates the different ways that various third-questers have portrayed Jesus: “Jesus the talking head” (the Jesus Seminar); “Jesus the itinerant Cynic philosopher” (John Dominic Crossan, Burton Mack, F. Gerald Downing); “Jesus, man of the Spirit” (Marcus Borg,

Geza Vermes, Graham H. Twelftree); "Jesus the eschatological prophet" (E. P. Sanders, Maurice Casey); "Jesus the prophet of social change" (Gerd Theissen, Richard A. Horsley, R. David Kaylor); "Jesus the sage: the wisdom of God" (Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza, Ben Witherington); and "Jesus: marginal Jew or Jewish messiah?" (John P. Meier, Peter Stuhlmacher, James D. G. Dunn, Marinus de Jonge, Markus Bockmuehl, N. T. Wright).

The work also offers a brief preface summarizing the first two quests of the historical Jesus and an opening chapter on Jesus and his social setting (looking at Palestine under Roman rule, the religious milieu of Jesus and the Pharisees, and social, economic and religious life in Galilee—all in the interest of creating a believable social setting for Jesus the Jew from Galilee). The work concludes with a succinct summary of findings, some conclusions and a few prognostications about the future of Jesus research, together with an epilogue on Raymond E. Brown's recent work, *The Death of the Messiah*. Witherington's book is enhanced by extensive endnotes, a substantial bibliography and various indices.

Witherington puts his finger on the common strands that bind together the works of the third quest and distinguish it from the previous two quests. (1) The third quest utilizes all of the available historical and critical tools in the search for a common object, though the tools are evaluated and used in various ways and with varying results. (2) "It is probable that the attempt to place Jesus more firmly in his social and economic setting and to focus on the social aspects of his life, ministry and teaching will be seen as a distinguishing feature of the Third Quest" (p. 247). (3) The desire to say something fresh and innovative characterizes almost all of the relevant works, sometimes showing a preference for what is new more than what is probable.

I am impressed by the breadth and depth of Witherington's familiarity with the writings of the third quest and with the extent of his interaction with several of the works presented. Witherington quite openly challenges various writers at certain points (e.g. Crossan on inconsistent application of the criterion of multiple attestation or on Jesus as a politically correct advocate of radical egalitarianism, Borg for so emphasizing Jesus' compassion that it is categorically impossible for him to have demanded moral purity, and Schüssler Fiorenza for allowing antipatriarchal ideology to dictate methodology and historical and exegetical conclusions). Nevertheless, such critiques are routinely balanced by comments on scholars' constructive contributions. On the whole it seems to be an even-handed and balanced presentation.

As Witherington tells the story of the third quest, John Meier comes to the surface as a certain kind of hero. His yet unfinished three-volume work, *A Marginal Jew*, "is likely to be recognized as one of the most significant contributions, if not the most significant and helpful, to the Third Quest for the historical Jesus" (p. 212). Nevertheless, praise even of Meier is mingled with challenge (e.g. Meier may be too quick to attribute certain of the Jesus traditions to the early Church).

Witherington's treatment of the Jesus Seminar adds to the mounting and now virtually devastating, broad-based scholarly opposition to certain key methods and arguments characteristic of that group. (See also e.g. the forthright critique of the methods and self-representation of the Jesus Seminar by Richard Hays in *First Things* 43 [1994] 43–48; Luke T. Johnson brings a very bold challenge to the Jesus Seminar in *The Real Jesus* [HarperCollins, 1996], but note N. T. Wright's caution regarding Johnson's closeness to a Bultmannian skepticism regarding history [*Time*, April 8, 1996, p. 58].) Schweitzer's dismissal of much 19th-century historical-Jesus research as little more than finding one's own reflection at the bottom of the well of history is apt, and Witherington applies this now familiar criticism to the Jesus Seminar (p. 57).

The Jesus Quest could be improved by expanding the preface beyond its meager four pages (there Witherington tells the story of the evolving search for the historical Jesus over the last 200 years) and by offering more links of the various features of the third quest to the historical context of ideas and thinkers that constitute the deep scholarly soil beneath them. Further, one might wish for more integration of the discussion of Jesus' social world into the long presentation of recent major works on Jesus.

Perhaps other minor objections could be raised, but what would be the point? *The Jesus Quest* is an outstanding book, one that is highly suitable for textbook use at the undergraduate or graduate level. Further, because it is very well written and not overly technical or academic in style, this book is sure to have a broad appeal. *The Jesus Quest* is worthy of a hearty recommendation.

Peter K. Nelson

Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, Deerfield, IL

The Scandal of the Gospels: Jesus, Story, and Offense. By David McCracken. New York: Oxford University, 1994, xii + 204 pp., \$29.95.

The strength of this book is its general framework, articulated repeatedly and clearly. That framework is the element of offense that permeates the gospels and indeed vast parts of the Bible—a motif that the author most often links with the Greek word *skandalon* but that in the Hebrew occurs as images of traps, snares, stumbling blocks and obstructions that cause a fall. The effect of reading the book is to have one's consciousness raised about the element of offensiveness in the Biblical text, especially the gospels.

Other motifs gather around the main one. One is the quality of encounter that we find in the gospels, as characters within the gospel episodes are either offended by Jesus and his claims or refuse to be offended, thereby evincing their faith. Another is the element of reversal in the gospels—seen, for example, in the way in which Jesus refuses to fit worldly standards of respectability, or by the way in which Jesus' parables repeatedly challenge conventional ways of thinking. Yet another feature of the gospels that receives scrutiny is the repeated blindness of such characters as the Pharisees and the disciples, which the author treats as variations on the theme of the scandal represented by Jesus' actions and even more his words. In themselves, these are not new revelations. But the book often treats these familiar approaches in the new light afforded by the specific lens of scandal, and it has the added force of providing systematic coverage of that selected point of vision.

The Scandal of the Gospels fits into the mainstream of nonevangelical literary criticism of the Bible. It prefers the problematic and obscure to clarity of interpretation. It claims to offer a counterreading to traditional readings. It takes many opportunities to escape from the Biblical text to theoretical frameworks (especially those provided by Kierkegaard and Bakhtin), in the process rendering the book more specialized than the topic itself requires. It champions the narrative element in the Bible, claiming that this narrative element resists being reduced to a specific meaning.

The book succeeds in putting a focus on the scandalous element in the gospels. This very clarity of focus runs the risk of being one-sided in the sense that whenever McCracken is faced with alternative interpretations, he opts for the reading that supports an element of offensiveness. In the story of the Samaritan woman at the well, for example, the author believes that Jesus' asking the woman for a drink and telling

her to fetch her husband are calculated strategies of offense, though other interpretations are as plausible. Still, the book does an admirable job of presenting the case for a side of the gospels that is often suppressed.

The rock on which the book's argument founders is the author's repeated claim that traditional interpretations of the gospels "domesticate" the element of scandal, thereby distorting the Biblical text. This is partly true, and the book deserves praise for uncovering the potentially offensive nature of the gospels to people who come to them with the wrong presuppositions. Yet the pattern that the author clearly documents is that within the gospels themselves, refusal to be scandalized by Jesus and his claims is a sign of faith. On this logic, interpreters of the gospels who themselves possess faith in Jesus and his words naturally look at the text differently from those who do not believe. The famous beatitudes, for example, are offensive to people who accept a worldly success ethic, but not to those who have renounced such an ethic. To a first-century Greek, the statement in the middle of the Christ hymn that begins the fourth gospel that "the Word became flesh and dwelt among us" was shocking, but to long-time Christian believers there is scarcely anything more familiar, scarcely anything in the realm of thought that seems more right. While this does not invalidate what the author uncovers about the potential offensiveness of Jesus' statements, it calls into question his easy dismissal of "domesticated" interpretations of the gospels. Within the logic of his own argument, this is something with which the author should have wrestled, and also with the distinction between an utterance that is heard for the first time and one that has become familiar through repeated contact.

Leland Ryken
Wheaton College, Wheaton, IL

What Really Happened to Jesus. A Historical Approach to the Resurrection. By Gerd Lüdemann. Translated by John Bowden. Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1995, 147 pp., \$12.99 paper. *Gospel Truth? New Light on Jesus and the Gospels.* By Graham Stanton. Valley Forge: Trinity Press International, 1995, 215 pp., \$21.95.

Lüdemann's monograph is an abbreviated version of his *The Resurrection of Jesus: History, Experience, Theology* (1994). The present study endeavors to make accessible to a popular audience the results of scholarly research on the burial, resurrection and appearances of Jesus. Lüdemann defines his work as a "purely historical investigation into the historical context of the testimonies of the resurrection" (p. 6). He questions the historical objectivity of the gospel authors and contends that "everything that they say must therefore at first be treated with skepticism" (p. 9).

Lüdemann's skeptical presuppositions compel him to conclude, for example, that the Matthean and Lukan accounts of the empty tomb are Christianized embellishments of a Markan original, which itself is legendary rather than historical. He considers the resurrection narratives to be an attempt to explain the inexplicable; they have nothing to do with an actual historical event. Mary Magdalene, Peter and Paul had resurrection experiences, but they did not encounter the resurrected Jesus. Their experiences are interpreted psychologically and explained as visions. Lüdemann concludes his study with the controversial statement that "*the tomb of Jesus was not empty, but full, and his body did not disappear, but rotted away*" (p. 135; italics his).

This monograph asserts much but proves little. Moreover, it contains several errors of fact, the most obvious of which occurs during a discussion about "the exoneration of Pilate in the Lukan passion narrative, where he washes his hands in innocence"

(p. 40). Pilate, of course, washes his hands in innocence in the gospel of Matthew, not the gospel of Luke. While Lüdemann has provided a service in that he brings together all the relevant texts pertaining to the resurrection, his work is of limited value because it begins from an overly skeptical view of the historical veracity of the gospel witnesses to the resurrection as they now stand.

With cogent, judicious and circumspect arguments, the monograph by Graham Stanton brings a nonspecialist audience up to date on current issues surrounding the quest for the historical Jesus and the problem of Christian origins. Chapters 1–8 cover such topics as the dating of P⁶⁴, an ancient manuscript consisting of three small papyrus fragments from the gospel of Matthew; the question of whether 7Q5, a small Greek fragment discovered at Qumran, is, as Jose O’Callaghan maintains, a fragment from the gospel of Mark; the significance of the Q source for gospel research; and the value of noncanonical gospels such as Peter, Thomas, Egerton and “Secret Mark” for providing historical information about the life, death and resurrection of Jesus.

Chapters 9–16 focus on what can be known about Jesus from recent archeological discoveries as well as from traditions outside of the NT such as Josephus and Tacitus. These chapters also examine such issues as Jesus’ relationship to John the Baptist, Jesus’ self-understanding of his mission and ministry, and the reasons for Jesus’ crucifixion. Stanton concludes the book with a discussion of the term “gospel truth,” which he defines as “the truth of the Gospel message about Jesus Christ which the evangelists sought to proclaim” (p. 191).

Overall, Stanton’s monograph is both informative and helpful. He succeeds in introducing his readers to recent discoveries that provide new light on Jesus and the gospels. He also sets forth a very specific understanding for the term “gospel truth,” one that emphasizes the four evangelists’ theological convictions about Jesus, rather than the “absolute reliability of every single word of the Gospels” (p. 191). This distinction is very helpful. I am curious, though, why he waited until the last chapter to develop fully this understanding of “gospel truth,” since this term is a key element in the reader’s understanding of his various arguments throughout the book. The reader would have been better served had Stanton’s understanding, in its fullest expression, been given earlier in the book. This criticism, however, should not detract from the book’s value.

Jim Oxford
Baylor University, Waco, TX

The Faith of Jesus Christ in Early Christian Traditions. By Ian G. Wallis. SNTSMS 84. Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1995, 288 pp., \$59.95.

The author’s context for this study is explicitly theological: the frequent tendency to think that granting Jesus a real and full divinity must entail denying to him a faith such as humans must rely upon in their relationship with God. Wallis seeks ultimately to encourage contemporary Christological thinking that is able to affirm a full humanity in Jesus that included a faith in God his Father. The immediate task of this book, however, is to demonstrate that in the NT and early Christian tradition there is evidence of an emphasis on Jesus’ own faith, explicitly in two key ways: as inspiring example for Christians, and as salvific medium, a feature of Jesus’ redemptive work. That is, Wallis seeks to show that in the earliest Christian centuries Christ was seen as “important not only for what he revealed of God, but also for what he revealed of

human response to God" (p. 6). Toward this end, Wallis focuses upon texts in which the *pisteuō* word group is present.

In chap. 1, after setting the context for his study, Wallis surveys the meaning of faith/trust in early Christian times, as illustrated in OT texts and in post-Biblical Jewish material. Thereafter, he looks at the meanings of the *pisteuō* word group in early Christian times.

Chapter 2 is an examination of "Jesus' Faith in the Synoptic Gospels." This involves attention to references to faith in the miracles stories, the sayings tradition and a few other "corroborative" references. The main points derived are that both implicitly and explicitly Jesus' own faith figures in the gospel material and that the authors seem to see no tension between referring to Jesus as having faith on the one hand and calling for faith in him on the other hand. Indeed, this latter point is clearly major for Wallis, for he comes back to it whenever the evidence permits in the discussion of other texts as well. In the gospels, Jesus' faith functions mainly as example or paradigm for Jesus' followers (and for the intended readers of the accounts).

In chap. 3, Wallis turns to the Pauline epistles and is at once involved in the current debate over a number of Pauline passages where the phrase *pistis Iēsou* appears. Pointing to recent philological studies that argue for a dearth of instances of the objective genitive sense of constructions with *pistis* in the LXX and other relevant Greek literature, Wallis proceeds to examine examples of the contentious phrase in the relatively undisputed letters of Paul. Granting that grammar alone cannot settle the issue, he engages in a detailed discussion of seven key passages in their epistolary contexts (Rom 1:17; 3:22, 26; Gal 2:16, 20; 3:22; Phil 3:9). Wallis argues that in all cases there are grounds for taking Paul as referring to Jesus' own faith.

Chapter 4 deals with passages in the so-called "deutero-Pauline" letters and the pastorals, and Wallis finds clear references to Jesus' faith here as well. In chap. 5, Wallis discusses Hebrews ("the most explicit references to Jesus' faith in the New Testament," p. 145) and Revelation, where again Wallis sees ample references to Jesus' own faith/faithfulness.

Chapter 6 is devoted to several very early extracanonical Christian texts in which Wallis finds continued reference to Jesus' faith. But Wallis argues that this tradition wanes under the impact of Christological controversies of the fourth century, especially the Arian controversy, and he finds Athanasius heavily responsible for this waning as he sought to emphasize Jesus' full divinity over against the Arians.

This is a stimulating and well-written study and well repays the reader interested in any of the texts in question or in the development of early Christian Christology. There is, I think, little question that Jesus' own faith/faithfulness toward God was much more emphasized in the first two or three centuries than thereafter. And it is likely that a misguided concern to "protect" Jesus' divinity by denying or minimizing his human features is partly to blame for the subsequent decline of emphasis on Jesus' own faith.

But I do not think that Wallis succeeds in his attempt to make all his chosen texts refer to Jesus' own faith instead of the faith of Christians. The subjective-genitive interpretation of *pistis Iēsou* cannot be dismissed out of hand and presents itself with greater likelihood in some of the Pauline passages. But Wallis sometimes exaggerates the success of his argumentation. Also, he relies too much on theological arguments that reflect implicitly later controversies, e.g. his statements that emphasis on believers' faith would have shifted focus away from the centrality of Christ or God (p. 116 n. 215). This is simply a *non sequitur* and an anachronism from Protestant-Catholic polemics. In the context of Galatians 2–3, for example, the contrast is between Gentiles relating to God through Torah-obedience or through faith in the sufficiency of

Christ. Here it is this contrast, and not Wallis' somewhat Calvinistic worry, that controls Paul's discussion.

L. W. Hurtado
New College, University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh, Scotland

The Interpretation of Mark. Edited by William R. Telford. 2d ed. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1995, xiv + 342 pp., \$25.95 paper.

This book is the most comprehensive and up-to-date introduction available today to the study of Mark's gospel. Telford begins the book with an essay in which he surveys important developments and issues in the interpretation of Mark, highlighting the scholarship of the last half of the 20th century. Both the introductory chapter and the extensive bibliography at the end have been updated since the first edition of this work in 1985. In the initial chapter, Telford examines the history of interpretation of Mark's gospel, the major issues that remain unresolved in the scholarly debate, and the significant themes emphasized by Mark in his gospel. On the whole, Telford keeps his evaluation of different scholarly positions to a minimum, but he does show that the trend in scholarship is away from the older view that Mark's gospel is a simple, unsophisticated and untheological report on the life of Jesus.

Next in the book comes a series of previously published articles, which serve as examples of recent scholarship on the gospel of Mark. Telford selected these essays, including several that are new to the second edition, for a number of reasons. Some are written by pillars of recent research on Mark, such as Eduard Schweizer, Norman Perrin and Ernest Best; some illustrate newer methodologies, such as structuralism, narrative criticism and reader-response criticism; and some have proven to be seminal works that continue to influence the discussion of significant issues in the interpretation of Mark.

Two of the more influential articles in this collection both touch on Mark's unusually harsh presentation of the disciples. In "The Heresy that Necessitated Mark's Gospel," Theodore J. Weeden argues that Mark used the disciples to represent the false teaching of his theological opponents. Like Mark's opponents, the disciples hold to a false Christology, which emphasizes the miraculous activity of Jesus as a divine man and neglects the suffering and death of Jesus. By thoroughly discrediting the disciples in the gospel, Mark also discredited his opponents and sought to settle the theological dispute that was raging in his own community. "The Disciples in Mark: The Function of a Narrative Role," by Robert C. Tannehill, continues to be influential both for its conclusions concerning the disciples in Mark and for its use of a more literary approach to the gospels. As Tannehill points out, the presentation of the disciples is not entirely negative. Mark started his story with a positive view of the disciples, and only later in the narrative did he show the inadequacy of the disciples' response to Jesus. Mark did not aim to discredit the disciples or anyone else. Rather he wanted to encourage his readers to identify with the disciples initially and then to reflect on their own response to Jesus in light of the failure of the disciples. In comparing these two approaches to the disciples, most students of Mark's gospel would probably agree with Tannehill that Mark's purpose is pastoral rather than polemical.

In summary, the literature on the gospel of Mark has become so extensive that a road map of the research is very helpful, and this volume edited by Telford provides such a map.

Joel F. Williams
Columbia International University, Columbia, SC

Luke. By Darrell L. Bock. 2 volumes. Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1994, 1996, xx + 2148 pp., \$75.00.

What could any writer possibly do to justify yet another megacommentary on Luke, after the increasingly prodigious outputs of Marshall, Fitzmyer and Nolland? One could begin by devising a user-friendly format. First, divide the treatment of each pericope into seven parts: (1) an overview of the passage, including its fit in Luke's narrative flow; (2) a discussion of sources and historicity, complete with running interaction with the Jesus Seminar (even more than they deserve); (3) a discussion of form and structure; (4) the author's translation; (5) a detailed verse-by-verse commentary divided by clearly labeled subtitles according to the passage's outline; (6) a summary of the passage's meaning and key themes; and (7) additional notes, particularly dealing with textual criticism.

Then add gray background to separate off various sections from each other, use large, clear typeface, and change the fonts in different sections. Create running headers that show exactly where in Luke's outline one is at any given time. Limit documentation to parenthetical author-date notes within the text and reserve footnotes for content items. Revise the writing style repeatedly until the English is crisp, clear and succinct. Indent and enumerate all the options for the main exegetical cruxes in each passage and judiciously assess their strengths and weaknesses, never engaging in polemics. Scatter around the commentary 12 helpful excursuses on such topics as Quirinius' census, the genealogies in Matthew and Luke, interpreting parables, and Luke's "Great Omission." Conclude with 56 pages of bibliography and 126 pages of indices of subjects, authors, and ancient sources. Finally, adopt a thoroughgoing conservative perspective on the text that falls well within North American definitions of inerrancy. Accept many of the traditional harmonizations of the so-called contradictions among the gospels, while recognizing that the literary conventions of the day allowed the evangelists to arrange their material thematically and incorporate the "gist" of people's speech as an accurate summary of their words.

Astonishingly, Darrell Bock has done all this. The 2170-page commentary should leave little doubt as to Bock's worthiness to be the first-ever research professor (of New Testament) in the history of Dallas Seminary. A comparatively modest 48-page introduction begins the volume. Bock defends traditional views: Luke is Paul's traveling companion and probably a doctor, writing to primarily Gentile Christians in the early to mid-60s, to edify and encourage them in light of the increasing separation of Christianity from Judaism. Bock cautiously accepts Mark, Q and L as Luke's primary sources. But he is convinced the solution to the synoptic problem is more complex. Almost every time Luke has seemingly paralleled material in a different context than Mark or Matthew, Bock invokes the likelihood of special sources. In his treatment of historicity, he consistently adopts the correct stance on the burden of proof: Instead of feeling compelled to argue from a position of skepticism via the criteria of authenticity, he notes the objections scholars have raised and answers them one by one. He finds the outline of Luke to be largely chronological and geographical, with the major sections consisting of 1:1-2:52, 3:1-4:13, 4:14-9:50, 9:51-19:44 and 19:45-24:53. A concise summary of Luke's theology completes the commentary's introduction.

A tiny sample of Bock's exegetical highlights may be offered. A regal, Davidic Messiah plays a more prominent role in Luke's Christology than is often acknowledged, particularly in chaps. 1-2 and in Luke's use of the OT. Bock's dispensationalism is very moderate: The kingdom was inaugurated with Jesus' advent, but political redemption is what was delayed. In 2:7, Jesus was laid in a "feed-trough" because there was no room for him in the "guest room." Christ as Lord (e.g. 2:11) acknowledges "the

absolute sovereignty and divine relationship that Jesus possesses" (p. 218). In his debates with the Jewish leaders, Jesus advocates "a restricted hierarchical ethic" (p. 525). The sermon on the plain deletes much of Matthew's account because Luke has no interest in Jewish, legal matters. The Lukan beatitudes and woes nicely balance a socio-economic with a spiritual dimension. Bock recognizes the need for a controlled allegorical interpretation in numerous parables and the fact that many make more than one point. Jesus' miracles contain parabolic significance as pointers to who Jesus is. That some will not taste death until they see the kingdom of God (9:27) may refer to the transfiguration plus Jesus' resurrection and the subsequent events that inaugurated God's kingdom.

Luke's central section is a thematically arranged collection of teaching from Jesus' final phase of ministry—not a straight-line journey from Galilee to Jerusalem. The parable of the good Samaritan points to the priority of racial reconciliation. The friend at midnight is bold, not importunate (11:8). The mustard seed and leaven are both positive metaphors of the kingdom's surprising growth. The turning point of this central section comes in 13:31–14:35, in which the country as a whole rejects Jesus' Messiahship. Yet Luke holds out the hope of a future for national Israel in 13:35; 21:24, 28; 22:28–30. A generous and compassionate use of riches is a recurring theme in these middle chapters, but God favors the outcast more than the merely poor. The unjust steward removes either the interest or his commission from his master's bills (16:1–8). Luke 17:21 should be translated as the kingdom of God is "among" you or "in your presence."

Jesus' triumphal entry leads to an aborted temple cleansing, not merely an announcement of judgment. Luke's eschatological discourse (21:5–38) focuses more on the first century than do Matthew's or Mark's versions (see esp. vv. 20–24), but "this generation" in which "you see these things happening" (vv. 31–32) still means that the major signs of Christ's return will take place in one end-time generation. Luke's distinctive emphases in his passion narrative highlight Jesus as the innocent sufferer. The longer text of 22:19–20 should be accepted. 22:43 and 23:34 are also textually secure. Jesus is tried before the Sanhedrin both during the night and into the early morning hours. He is convicted of blasphemy because of his reference to sitting at God's right hand (22:69). The synoptics are right in placing the crucifixion on the day after the Passover meal, and John can be read so as not to contradict this. The resurrection highlights Christ's fulfillment of Scripture, a key Lukan theme. A robust defense of the historicity of both passion and resurrection narratives permeates the commentary's climactic chapters, though interestingly Bock eschews traditional harmonizations of the resurrection accounts in favor of a "literary" solution involving thematic arrangement and less precise detail (p. 1888).

On an overwhelming number of issues, I find myself in total agreement with Bock. Still, I have an occasional doubt. It is refreshing to see a gospel scholar take seriously the possibility that Jesus said similar things in different settings, but when passages as closely parallel in wording as, say, Luke 12:22–32 and Matt 6:25–34 are assigned to separate sources because they appear with slight variation and in diverse contexts, one suspects special pleading. Occasionally, difficult cruxes are made more confusing by a proliferation of options, not all of which are obviously that distinct (e.g. I simply got lost in the 12 possibilities for the rendering of Luke 18:7 [pp. 1452–1454]). And the view attributed to me concerning 16:17 is identical with the next-listed view of R. Banks (whom I endorse), except where I am misrepresented. The interpretation of "the parable of the brats" (!) in Luke 7:31–35 surely has things backwards: The children calling out to their playmates are John and Jesus (see J. Jeremias), not the Jewish people (p. 681). I do not see how an inerrantist can argue that the reference to Zechariah in

11:51 "must be to the martyr of 2 Chronicles" (p. 1124), since Matthew, in quoting the identical expression of Jesus (even if in a different context), makes this Zechariah explicitly the son of Berechiah (cf. Zech 1:1), not Jehoiada (cf. Matt 23:35 with 2 Chron 24:20–22). Nor does it seem plausible that either of the two categories of people punished in 12:47–48 are Christians (p. 1186).

Is it possible to protest of omissions in a work of this magnitude? There are a few that surprise, given the wealth of secondary literature surveyed. No mention appears of the probability that the demons' acknowledgment of Jesus' identity is part of their failed attempt to "ward him off" (G. Twelftree). Little interaction takes place with the "new look" on first-century Pharisaism, popularized by E. P. Sanders. The whole story of Mary and Martha (10:38–42) passes by without any discussion of the implications for the current debate on gender roles. B. Malina's twist on the potential irony of the Samaritan leper's giving thanks (17:15–16) is missed. The view of several prominent evangelical scholars on the eschatological discourse that sees all the signs fulfilled by AD 70, so that the things that must occur in "this generation" do not include the *parousia* and have all happened, at least provisionally, appears nowhere at all. Nor does the format of the commentary create space for a regular summing up of Luke's distinctive redactional emphases in each passage (as e.g. in R. Stein's recent *New American Commentary* volume) or for systematic application (though there are wonderful nuggets scattered throughout).

But all these are mere quibbles. The pastor, teacher or scholar who is prepared to pay the hefty price of this work should agree with the book-jacket endorsement on vol. 2: "If you could own only one commentary on the Gospel of Luke, it looks as if Darrell Bock has written it" (D. Litfin). And for those who cannot afford to buy it, or who want a more succinct synthesis coupled with application, Bock has also written the volumes on Luke in the IVP *New Testament Commentary* and the NIV *Application Commentary* series. If he is as prodigious and helpful on Acts (and the list of projected contributors promises a work in this same Baker series), he might just overtake his mentor, I. H. Marshall, as the preeminent evangelical Lukan scholar of our day.

Craig L. Blomberg
Denver Seminary, Denver, CO

The Signs Source in the Fourth Gospel: Historical Survey and Critical Evaluation of the Semeia Hypothesis. By Gilbert Van Belle. BETL 116. Leuven: Leuven University, 1994, xiv + 503 pp., n.p.

In this expanded and updated version of Van Belle's *De Semeia-bron in het vierde evangelie* (1975), the author, a student of F. Neirynck, provides a painstaking historical survey and critical evaluation of the Semeia Hypothesis (SH). As is well known, this hypothesis argues that the fourth evangelist drew on (1) literary "signs (σημεία)" and "passion sources" for the narrative portions of his gospel and (2) a "discourse source" for Jesus' extended utterances, based on the observation that the discourses in John's gospel appear to be distinct from the accounts of Jesus' miracles (termed "signs" in John). Formulated for the first time in form of a full-fledged theory by R. Bultmann, and revised and expanded by R. Fortna, this hypothesis has found many followers but never achieved the status of a generally accepted paradigm in Johannine studies.

Van Belle traces the origin of the SH To Bultmann and antecedents (chap. 1), surveys reactions to Bultmann's commentary (chap. 2), follows the spread of the

hypothesis (chap. 3), including further developments of the theory by Fortna and Nicol (chap. 4), takes inventory of the criticism of the SH in recent research (chap. 5), and concludes by summarizing and evaluating the SH (chap. 6). Two appendices on the Johannine σημεῖα and Johannine style characteristics are also included. The author notes that the case for a σημεῖα source has been made on the basis of five major arguments, two of which are source-critical and one each stylistic, form-critical and ideological. These are as follows: (1) The numbering of the first two signs in 2:11 and 4:54 were considered to constitute an *aporia* (“seam”) in light of the references to other signs in 2:23, 3:2 and 4:45, a phenomenon best explained by a preexisting “signs source”; (2) the gap between the last recorded sign in John 11 and the concluding reference to signs in 20:30–31 (as if signs had been narrated from beginning to end) was likewise taken to reflect a literary *Vorlage*; (3) proponents of the SH claimed to have detected stylistic differences between Johannine narrative and discourse material, such as the preponderance of Semitisms in narrative portions; (4) form-critically, some noted similar patterns in the Johannine miracle stories; and (5) the references in the fourth gospel connoting a positive correlation between signs and faith (2:11; 4:53; 6:14; 20:30–31) and those indicating a negative stance (2:23; 4:48; 6:26; cf. 10:38; 14:11) were taken to point to a signs source (positive evaluation of signs) underlying the later redaction by the fourth evangelist (negative view); many found in the signs source a lower θεῖος ἀνὴρ (“divine man”) Christology in contrast to a higher Christology in the Johannine redaction. Regarding the contents of such a σημεῖα source, Bultmann postulated its contents as follows: 2:1–12; 4:46–54; 5:1–18; 6:1–21; 9:1–41; 11:1–44 + 12:37–38 and 20:30–31. Some, like Schnackenburg, also include 21:1–14. Others propose a short signs source made up of only 2:1–12 and 4:46–54 (to which some add 21:1–14), while yet others, like Fortna, extend the source to include also chaps. 18–20, thus forming a “gospel of signs,” which combines Bultmann’s “signs” and “passion sources” into one.

In the ultimate analysis, Van Belle finds none of the above stated arguments for a signs source underlying the fourth gospel determinative, for several reasons. (1) ἀρχή in 2:11 may refer to the primary, paradigmatic sign in John, not merely the first, and 4:54 may merely relate the second miracle in Cana to the first sign performed there by Jesus. (2) 20:30–31a need not be seen as the conclusion of a source but may rather be regarded as a provisional conclusion followed by an epilogue (chap. 21), comparable to 1 John 5:13. (3) Style criticism is rendered notoriously subjective in light of the fourth gospel’s stylistic and linguistic unity. (4) The rigid form-critical *a priori* distinction between narrative and discourse units illegitimately tends to presuppose the conclusion of corresponding sources, which could not have been delineated merely on style-critical grounds. (5) Why would the evangelist use an entire source (i.e. the σημεῖα source) only to subject it to radical criticism? Moreover, Jesus’ miracles in John’s gospel cannot be isolated from the center of Johannine Christology, i.e. the presentation of ultimate revelation of the Father in the incarnation of the Son. Van Belle also notes the vast disagreement among proponents of a σημεῖα source regarding the contents of such a document and the complete lack of consensus regarding the source’s date, place of origin or life setting. For these reasons the author is “inclined to refuse the semeia hypothesis as a valid working hypothesis in the study of the Fourth Gospel” (p. 376). Following his mentor Neiryneck, Van Belle rather leans in the direction of Johannine dependence on the synoptics.

Owing to the largely descriptive nature of this work and the author’s comprehensive presentation of scholarship on the subject, this monograph constitutes an invaluable guide for all who are interested in Johannine studies. Its major contribution is that it can no longer be argued that anyone rejecting the SH is outside the main-

stream of Johannine scholarship. Bultmann's stranglehold on the study of the fourth gospel may finally be broken and the way prepared for greater variety in methodology. Most important, Van Belle vindicates the fourth gospel as a "seamless garment," which makes an emphasis on the final text of John's gospel not only appropriate but also the most plausible approach to John in light of the available evidence.

Andreas J. Köstenberger
Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary, Wake Forest, NC

Neglected Endings: The Significance of the Pauline Letter Closings. By Jeffrey A. D. Weima. JSNTSup101. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1994, 270 pp., n.p.

In this dissertation, written under the supervision of Richard Longenecker, Weima argues the straightforward thesis that the closings of Paul's letters serve to signal his central theological concerns in writing. The work begins with an excellent tracing of the history of research, close description of the closing conventions of Hellenistic letters, and equally precise formal analysis of Semitic letters. His background work is thorough and competent, modeling all that a dissertation ought to be. The same may be said for his treatment of the "conventions" of the Pauline closings: grace benedictions, peace benedictions, greetings, doxologies and hortatory sections. Along the way he makes various sound judgments and useful observations.

Yet in the end I think his thesis is only partially persuasive. He clearly shows that the usual view of the letter closings must be qualified. They do not simply serve to maintain personal contact between Paul and his congregations, but they transmit his theological concerns. As Weima points out, that is particularly evident in the closing to Galatians (6:11-18), where Paul contrasts himself and his gospel with the message of his adversaries. Elsewhere, however, it is harder to sustain his thesis, as Weima himself recognizes. Indeed, examination of the letter closings in my judgment leads away from his conclusion. Galatians, with its focus upon the "other gospel" of Paul's adversaries, is unique among Paul's letters in excluding secondary concerns from the closing, just as it lacks the normal prayer of thanksgiving. Elsewhere the Pauline letter closings partially reflect the primary theological themes of the body but also broaden to include other pastoral concerns. Weima strains the evidence when he argues (on the basis of the "holy kiss" greeting in 5:26) that a major concern of 1 Thessalonians is the problem of dissension within the church. Paul's exhortation in 4:11-12 is general and presupposes no immediate difficulty, and other material that suggests such a concern appears only late in the letter. One of Paul's concerns in 1 Corinthians is opposition to him within the congregation (e.g. 1 Cor 4:1-12; 9:1-7), which Weima suggests is reflected in the closing expression of joy, greetings and greeting directive (16:13-24). Yet the bulk of 1 Corinthians is given to other matters. Paul does not extensively confront the Corinthian defection in the letter, perhaps in part because it did not yet involve the whole of the congregation. The brewing conflict may well inform all that Paul says, but unlike 2 Corinthians it does not serve as the explicit topic of the body of the letter. Likewise, I find it hard to think that tensions within the Corinthian congregation serve as a primary concern in 2 Corinthians. There the substance of the letter is given to the relationship between the apostle and the church.

Weima's study incidentally highlights one of the most interesting and potentially fruitful areas for future work. Precisely where does the body of a letter of Paul end and the closing begin? Given the variation in the order of the closing units in Paul's

letters, one has to allow for a certain fluidity and even repetition on Paul's part, perhaps even some overlapping or dovetailing of the body and closing. The relation between Funk's "apostolic parousia" (Paul's self-reference marking the end of the body) and the closing exhortations deserves further investigation. Weima gives little attention to this matter, and some of his closing markers may be called into question. Why should Rom 15:33 and not the exhortation at 15:30 (or perhaps 15:14, or even 12:1) mark the closing of the letter? In Philippians, why should we regard 4:8 and not 3:1 as introducing the closing? Or in 1 Thessalonians why 5:23 and not 5:12? It is here that a combination of epistolary and rhetorical analysis, toward which Weima gently pushes, might yield new insights.

Mark A. Seifrid

Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, KY

Paul and the Language of Scripture: Citation Technique in the Pauline Epistles and Contemporary Literature. By Christopher D. Stanley. SNTSMS 74. Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1992, xii + 396 pp., \$59.95.

In this revision of his 1990 Duke University doctoral dissertation, Christopher Stanley tackles a notoriously difficult problem: how Paul uses the OT in his letters. What Stanley brings to this task that distinguishes his work is an appreciation of not only the Jewish background to Paul's usage but the possible Greco-Roman background to Paul's citation technique.

Stanley's book is divided into nine chapters in three parts. In part 1, Stanley discusses the issues involved in the subject, defining various solutions that have been proposed for categorizing Paul's use of the OT and weighing various alternative methods that have been suggested for identifying citations and establishing the texts to be discussed, including proposing his own method.

In part 2, Stanley first applies his method to identifying the citations and establishing the texts that he is going to treat in the rest of his monograph. Chapters 4 and 5 offer detailed analysis of each passage that Stanley has isolated in chap. 3, including matters of grammar and discussion of possible changes to the versions. These two chapters form the bulk of the book. In chap. 6, Stanley offers 12 conclusions on the basis of his foregoing discussion that outline how it is that Paul incorporates these quotations into his letters.

In part 3, Stanley offers extended discussions of citation technique first in Greco-Roman literature and then in early Judaism. In the first he examines the use of Homer in such authors as Strabo, Pseudo-Longinus, Heraclitus and Plutarch, and in the second he examines use of tradition in the Qumran documents, Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha and Philo. He then offers his conclusions. In brief, Stanley concludes that Paul regards Scripture as authoritative, his diffusion of quotations throughout the Pauline letter corpus is not unusual among contemporary writers, his technique for indication of a quotation is most similar to that of Philo, he predominantly uses the Septuagint, he probably drew on a personal collection of quotations of the OT gathered from recognizable sources, and he, like other authors, adjusts his texts in a variety of ways for a variety of reasons.

In many ways, this is a book to be commended highly. First, the attention to methodology, both in terms of surveying past work and in defining his own method, is noteworthy. Stanley's discussion can be profitably referred to for useful categorizations of

others who have examined this question. Useful bibliography is provided throughout. Second, the discussions of individual quotations of the OT found in chaps. 4 and 5 should provide useful resources for those studying these passages in the future. Third, the extended discussions of citation technique in Jewish and Greco-Roman authors add a dimension not found in most other treatments of the topic.

Nevertheless, despite these several significant strengths there are issues that require further examination. First, Stanley is overly restrictive in his definition of what constitutes a citation. He confines it to those places in which an OT passage is formulaically introduced. Therefore, although we may have a fair view of how Paul uses this particular kind of quotation, there are a number of places where he uses the OT that are not discussed. Would the results be the same? Further study is needed before this can be determined. Second, on the basis of the evidence that Stanley himself presents, I would conclude differently regarding the technique that Paul uses. It may well be better to categorize Philo as a Greco-Roman writer rather than a Jewish writer, for a number of reasons. This would, by Stanley's own categories, place Paul more firmly within the ambit of Greco-Roman citation technique. When other features of Greco-Roman citation technique are considered in relation to Jewish, it seems to me that Paul more comfortably fits within that category. The fact that Stanley plays off Greco-Roman and Jewish citation technique reflects an unfortunate dichotomization that to my mind does not accurately reflect either Paul's technique or the realities of the Greco-Roman world of which Judaism was a part.

Stanley E. Porter

Roehampton Institute London, London, England

Paul, Moses, and the History of Israel: The Letter/Spirit Contrast and the Argument from Scripture in 2 Corinthians 3. By Scott J. Hafemann. WUNT 81. Tübingen: Mohr, 1995, xii + 497 pp., DM 228.

This work represents the completion of Hafemann's study on 2 Corinthians 2–3, and fortunately his book is also available in an affordable paperback version from Hendrickson Publishers. The first work is contained in his 1986 dissertation, *Suffering and the Spirit*, which was also published by Mohr in the WUNT series (an abridged and edited version of this book entitled *Suffering and Ministry in the Spirit* is available from Eerdmans, 1990). Hafemann tackles one of the most controverted texts in the Pauline corpus (2 Corinthians 3), and his study and conclusions are bound to be of interest since one's understanding of 2 Corinthians 3 impinges on central issues in Pauline theology, such as Paul's understanding of the Mosaic law and the hermeneutical implications of his use of the OT. Indeed, from now on all scholars who address these issues must reckon with Hafemann, for his work represents the most thorough interpretation both of 2 Corinthians 3 and the OT background to that text, and he directly challenges the scholarly consensus on this text.

The work commences with an introduction in which the history of research on the letter and spirit in Paul and the "new perspective" on Paul's theology of the law are sketched in. Part 1 of the book examines the sufficiency and call of Moses and the sufficiency and call of Paul. Moses' call is examined in the OT and a wide range of Jewish literature (including the Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, Qumran, Philo, Josephus and rabbinic literature), and it is argued that in the OT his call functions as the "prototype"

and “precedent” for the call of the OT prophets. Even though Moses (and the prophets) are insufficient in themselves to accomplish God’s purposes, they are made sufficient by God’s grace for their calling. Hafemann does not argue that the same portrait of Moses exists in all of Jewish literature. For instance, Philo emphasizes Moses’ intrinsic superiority, and Josephus downplays his insufficiency. The common theme found throughout the literature is that Moses’ authority was presupposed, and it functioned to support the theological agenda of the various writers. Any attempt to form a “synthetic picture” of Moses is wisely avoided by Hafemann. Instead, the history of interpretation provides the interpretive background for Paul’s own use of the tradition.

Paul’s calling, it is argued, is patterned after the call of Moses and the prophets. He too is made sufficient by God’s grace despite his insufficiency. The idea that Paul is actually a second Moses is rejected. Instead, Paul alludes to the call of Moses and the prophets to establish his legitimacy and authority. Paul, like Moses, was made sufficient by God’s grace despite his insufficiency. It is not the case, however, that absolute continuity exists between Moses and Paul. Hafemann provides a careful analysis of the new covenant text in Jer 31:31–34 and interprets Paul’s understanding of the new covenant and letter/Spirit in light of the Jeremiah text and Ezek 36:25–26. He convincingly argues that the letter/Spirit contrast must be interpreted in terms of salvation history. The term “letter” does not signify any criticism of the content of the law, nor does it refer to legalism. Hafemann rightly demonstrates that the new-covenant texts in Jeremiah 31 and Ezekiel 36 teach that the law will be kept when the Spirit is given. Thus, the letter/Spirit contrast should be interpreted functionally and in terms of salvation history. The “letter” refers to the law without the Spirit. Israel transgressed the law because it lacked the power of the Spirit to put it into practice. The presence of the Spirit, therefore, does not involve doing away with the law. Those who have the Spirit keep the law, just as Jeremiah and Ezekiel prophesied. Moses’ problem, then, was not that he transmitted the law to Israel. The problem was that the law was given apart from the transforming work of the Spirit to a hardened and resistant people. By contrast, Paul’s ministry is superior because through the preaching of the cross the Spirit is given with the result that the law is obeyed. Hafemann’s exegesis is penetrating and convincing on this issue. It is hard for me to see how any other interpretation could overturn his.

Part 2 of the book explores the letter/Spirit contrast in light of the second giving of the law in Exodus 32–34. A thorough study of Exodus 32–34 in both the Masoretic Text and the Septuagint ensues. Hafemann rightly insists that we must read this text as a coherent narrative since this is the form in which Paul knew the text. Both the Masoretic Text version and the Septuagint are substantially the same with some minor differences. The exegesis of this entire section is masterfully done, and many exegetical insights await the reader. The most important conclusion from this section, which flows from Hafemann’s exegesis of all three chapters, is the reason why Moses wore a veil. He contends that Moses did not wear the veil “to make up some deficiency in the glory or in himself, nor as an expression of his humility and modesty, nor to keep the glory of God from being wasted, nor even to keep it from being profaned” (p. 224). The veil was given to Moses as an expression of God’s mercy and judgment. It revealed his mercy because the glory of God was still available to the people, though in a veiled form. The covenant with Israel that was broken by the golden calf incident had been restored. God’s judgment is also involved because a direct revelation of God’s glory would have destroyed Israel in her stiff-necked state. Once again, Hafemann’s analysis is persuasive and grounded in a contextual analysis of Exodus 32–34. One objection might be that the glory of God in the tabernacle in Exodus 40 shows that the glory is now restored to Israel, but Hafemann rightly remarks (p. 224) that the glory

hidden behind the curtain in the tabernacle is analogous to the glory being both hidden and revealed in Moses' experience in the tent of meeting.

The last two chapters are sustained interpretations of 2 Cor 3:7–11 and 3:12–18 respectively. Hafemann attempts to demonstrate that the argument of these verses functions as a support for Paul's sufficiency as an apostle. In vv. 7–11 Paul, says Hafemann, does not argue that the Mosaic covenant possesses less glory than the new. The surprising element here is the conjunction of the glory of the Mosaic covenant with death. How can something that is glorious produce death? Hafemann rightly insists that Paul cannot merely assume that the Mosaic covenant led to death since for most Jews the law was the pathway to life. The reference to the letters engraved on stones indicates a reference to the second giving of the law in Exodus 32–34 and highlights the glory of the law. When v. 7 says Israel could not look at the glory of God that was shining on Moses' face, this does not mean that Israel could not gaze upon God's glory at all. The infinitive *atenisai* signifies that Israel could not look at his glory "*directly and continuously*" (p. 282; italics his) without being destroyed by God's judgment. Thus, v. 7 functions as evidence for the thesis propounded in v. 6 that the letter kills. In v. 7 Paul summons the narrative of the golden calf to illustrate the point that the law apart from the Spirit kills. Since God did not grant Israel his Spirit, the ministry of Moses became one of death for them. The problem, then, cannot be located in the content of the law. It is the law without the gift of the Spirit that produces death, and since Israel lacked the Spirit she could not keep the law.

One of the most intractable issues in the interpretation of 2 Corinthians centers on Paul's interpretation of the veiling of Moses. Most interpreters argue that Paul departs from the meaning of Exodus 34 and proceeds from Christian presuppositions. Paul, according to most scholars, contends that the glory on Moses' face faded or came to an end, even though the most natural reading of Exodus 34 and the unanimous view in Jewish tradition is that the glory on his face lasted forever. Hafemann charts a different course and engages in a thorough study of the key verb *katargeō*. The view that the verb means "abolish, nullify, or bring to an end" is ably defended. Not only does the verb signify that something has been brought to an end, but the consequences or effects of that which is nullified or abolished are also involved. Hafemann conclusively demonstrates that the idea that the verb means "fade away" cannot be sustained. His understanding of the verb *katargeō* leads him to the following interpretation of v. 7. The veil on Moses' face brought to an end the consequences or effects that would have occurred if the glory of God were not covered. The effect for Israel would have been judgment and destruction were it not for the veil of Moses. Hafemann's understanding of *katargeō* is crucial for his book, and if one were to dispute his interpretation this would probably be the place to begin. Nonetheless, I found his analysis of the term to be persuasive, and those who dispute his findings will need to provide not only an alternate definition of *katargeō* but also a plausible explanation for the use of the term in the context of 2 Corinthians 3.

According to Hafemann, then, Paul interprets Exodus 34 in accord with its original context. He maintains that the point of the comparison between the glory of the two covenants is not quantitative. The difference expressed between the two covenants in vv. 9–10 is eschatological, in that the old covenant primarily demonstrated God's glory in judgment, while in the new covenant his glory is manifested by his saving righteousness through the gift of the Spirit.

The most interesting issue in vv. 12–18 is whether Paul "plays with" or distorts the OT narrative regarding the veiling of Moses (Exod 34:29–35). Scholars generally agree that Paul veers away from the historical meaning of the Exodus text. But Hafemann boldly (and in my opinion, convincingly) argues that Paul interpreted Exodus

34 in accord with its historical meaning. Moses wore the veil so that stiff-necked Israel would not experience the consequences of God's judgment, which would have been his "death-dealing judgment" (p. 358). Hafemann maintains that in v. 13 *telos* bears the meaning "outcome" or "consequence." And once again *katargeō* signifies the bringing to the end of the effects of God's judgment. That is, Israel was spared by the wearing of the veil from encountering the glory of God in an unmediated form that would have spelled Israel's certain judgment given her hardened condition. When Paul speaks of the veil over Israel at the reading of the law, the point is not that Israel cannot understand the law but that she is morally hardened so that she will not and cannot submit to the law. Only the Spirit, which is mediated in Paul's ministry, can remove that hardness. Israel in rejecting Christ continues the pattern of her history that commenced with the golden calf incident. Those who turn to the Lord, whom Hafemann identifies as Yahweh, will have the veil removed.

The identification of the Lord and the Spirit in v. 17 has long been debated. Hafemann understands the Lord here to be Yahweh, but insists that no ontological identification of the Lord and the Spirit is intended. Rather, Paul's point is that Moses' experience with Yahweh is analogous to the experience of the Spirit that was mediated through Paul's ministry. The freedom proclaimed in v. 17, Hafemann contends, is the freedom to fulfill the law in accord with Jer 31:31–34 and Ezek 36:26–27. Verse 18, then, refers to the gradual transformation of believers through the power of the Spirit that occurs as they behold the glory of the Lord. Unlike Moses Paul did not have to veil God's glory because his glory does not destroy those who have the Spirit but transforms them. Paul saw the eschatological promises of the OT and the second-exodus promises of Isaiah as being fulfilled in his ministry. Through the Spirit the people of God keep his law and avoid the judgment that came under the old covenant. Paul was bold as an apostle because he understood that his ministry was radically different from Moses' in that the Spirit was mediated through his ministry.

If Hafemann is correct, and I think he is, then the consequences of his study for NT scholarship are weighty. The content of the OT law is not criticized in 2 Corinthians 3, nor is there a critique of legalism here. In fact, Paul maintains that the law is kept by those who have the Spirit. Hafemann suggests that the opponents were Judaizers who trumpeted Moses' ministry as superior to Paul's. But Paul strikes back by highlighting the superiority of his ministry to Moses', for through his suffering the Spirit was mediated, and the gift of the Spirit was precisely what was lacking in Moses' ministry. The major difference between the ministry of Moses and Paul, therefore, relates to salvation history. The Spirit was not bequeathed through Moses' ministry, while the gift of the Spirit was at the very center of Paul's ministry. This study also calls into question the creativity of Paul's hermeneutic. Many scholars appeal to 2 Corinthians 3 to justify the thesis that Paul does not read the OT in accord with its historical meaning. In fact, 2 Corinthians 3 is often the pivotal text for those who defend an ahistorical hermeneutic in Paul. And they go on to argue that Paul's playful use of the OT text is a paradigm for our hermeneutical work. But Hafemann enters the lions' den by arguing for a careful contextual reading by Paul of the OT based on its original canonical meaning in 2 Corinthians 3. He calls into question, then, the idea that Paul used the OT text in a playful and creative way contrary to its original intention. The pattern of Paul, Hafemann suggests, is to read the OT in its original context, and thus if modern-day interpreters accept Paul as their paradigm they must do the same.

Thomas R. Schreiner
Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, KY

The Epistle to the Galatians. Black's New Testament Commentary. By James D. G. Dunn. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1993, xxiv + 375 pp., n.p. *Galatians*. IVP New Testament Commentary. By G. Walter Hansen. Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1994, 212 pp., n.p. *Galatians*. New American Commentary. By Timothy George. Broadman & Holman, 1994, 463 pp., \$27.99.

Paul's magnificent letter to the Galatians is well served in these three fine commentaries. The bold message of the book requires a matching boldness in the commentator if its message is to accomplish the intended impact. Each of the present commentators is up to the task and will not disappoint the reader.

From the start, these commentaries differ for two main, but relatively incidental, reasons: the nature and intent of the series of which they are a part and the allotted length. None of the commentaries could be described as particularly technical; all could be described as scholarly. While in each case the commentator obviously works from the Greek text, none requires Greek of the reader. Dunn's commentary is based on his own translation, while Hansen and George are in series that use the NIV. Dunn's commentary, the most standard or typical of the three, focuses on the flow of the argument but is also filled with exegesis of the high caliber that we associate with his name. The IVP series of which Hansen's is a part "seeks to move from the text to its contemporary relevance and application" (p. 9). Hansen fulfills this task admirably while at the same time providing careful exegesis of the text, all within the confines of a relatively short book. The most distinctive of the three commentaries, however, is that of George, who writes not from the perspective of a NT specialist but rather from that of a Reformation theologian. George, who has the luxury of the most space, writes expansively and frequently refers to or cites theologians from various eras of Church history.

So far as introductory questions are concerned, there is only a minor difference among the three. On the much-disputed South or North Galatia issue, all three identify the addressees as Christians in South Galatia. On the related matters of the date of the epistle, however, while George accepts an early date for the letter—that is, prior to the Jerusalem council (Gal 2:1–10=Acts 11:27–30)—Dunn and Hansen, perhaps in dependence on Dunn, opt for the unusual combination of the South Galatia hypothesis and a date in the mid-50s (Gal 2:1–10=the Jerusalem council of Acts 15:1–20).

When we turn to the understanding of the theological argument of the letter, however, we encounter a great divide between George and Dunn, with Hansen serving somewhat as a mediating influence (but finally siding with George against Dunn). This we can have expected from the beginning when it was noted that George is a Reformation theologian. George takes what may be called the traditional or familiar view of Galatians, while Dunn presents an interpretation of Galatians that in many ways must be dubbed as nothing less than revolutionary. As is well known, Dunn has become an advocate of the so-called new perspective on Paul derived from the work of E. P. Sanders. A key element of this perspective is that the traditional reading of Paul on the questions of justification and the law has been unduly influenced by the viewpoint of the Reformers. From Dunn's point of view, George's theological admiration for the Reformers is a sure recipe for misunderstanding Paul.

We may illustrate this problem by looking at how Dunn and George exegete certain key passages. Particularly important is the meaning of "works of the law" in 2:16. Dunn denies that this phrase refers to righteous deeds done to establish one's relation to God or to gain God's favor. He argues instead that it refers to the insistence upon boundary markers, in particular circumcision and the food laws, that separated Jews from Gentiles. That is, Paul resists here only the notion that Gentiles must conform

to the law as a set of Jewish distinctives in order to obtain salvation. The results of this interpretation, Dunn points out, is that “works of the law” and “faith in Jesus Christ” are “not necessarily being posed here as mutually exclusive antitheses” (p. 137). Paul is thus not talking here about two alternate ways of salvation, i.e. grace versus law, but only about Jewish exclusivism that denied the rightful place of Gentiles in the family of God by faith. George counters with the insistence that “works of the law” refers to the totality of the Mosaic legislation and thus points to the impossibility of the human position before God and hence also to the necessity of salvation by grace. On 2:16 Hansen agrees with Dunn’s interpretation, but he does not press this interpretation elsewhere in the letter as Dunn does.

Dunn pursues his hypothesis consistently in passages where the law is in view (such as 3:10–14, 18; 3:21, 24–25; 4:5, 21; 5:1, 13, 18), continuing to insist that the question is not salvation by works versus salvation by faith but the restriction of covenant grace to Israel versus the inclusion of the Gentiles apart from circumcision, the food laws and Sabbath observances. The contrasting children of Sarah and Hagar in 4:21–31, moreover, portray for Dunn not the old and new covenants but two aspects of the Abrahamic covenant: the law covenant and the promise covenant. In keeping with his perspective, Dunn understands 6:16 to refer to two groups: the Church, “those who walk by this rule,” and the Jews, “the Israel of God.” In short, Galatians has no polemic against the law as such, or against Jews who would live by the law, but only with those who want to impose the law upon Gentiles.

By contrast, George understands the key issue of Galatians to be the more general question of the law and the possibility of righteousness for any human being, Jew or Gentile. He quotes Luther on 3:17–18, pitting faith against “the righteousness of the flesh, the law, works and merits” (p. 250). In his exposition of other passages, George emphasizes that the coming of Christ sets humanity free from bondage to the law, and he takes the Hagar and Sarah analogy to refer to the old and new covenants, referring to 2 Cor 3:7–16. As for Gal 6:16, George argues that “the Israel of God” is not simply an exegetical reference to the Church but that it has in view Jews who are among the elect remnant who are yet to believe in Christ.

While Hansen on 3:21 seems clearly to side with Dunn, on passages such as 3:24–25; 4:5; 5:1, 13, 18 he is closer to the traditional view as found in George, applying the passages to humanity universally and not just to Judaizing Jews or Jewish Christians. Although he does not explicitly identify the two covenants of 4:21–31 as old and new, he regards the Galatian Christians as the children of Sarah. So too, Hansen identifies “the Israel of God” in 6:16 as not only the Galatian Christians but also “all those who follow the gospel” (p. 201).

A final point that demands mention is the treatment of 3:28. On the implications of the statement “there is no longer male and female,” Hansen and Dunn take a prophetic stance, seeing significance in the words for the equal social status of women in the Church and its ministry. George, on the other hand, devotes an excursus to the subject “Was Paul a Feminist?” in which he rejects any such implication and sadly reduces the statement to the innocuous assertion that women too can enjoy salvation.

Here, then, are three superb exegetical commentaries, each with its own particular strength: Timothy George with its rich, edifying theological texture; James D. G. Dunn with its independent but vigorous and tough-minded analysis; and G. Walter Hansen with its concise exegesis and the wisdom and maturity of its applications. There is much to profit from in each of these fine commentaries.

Donald A. Hagner
Fuller Theological Seminary, Pasadena, CA

The Theology of Paul's Letter to the Galatians. By J. D. G. Dunn. Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1993, xviii + 161 pp., paper n.p. *The Theology of the Shorter Pauline Letters.* By K. P. Donfried and I. H. Marshall. Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1993, xii + 208 pp., paper n.p.

Both volumes are part of Cambridge University Press' ambitious New Testament Theology series, which is edited by Dunn. However, as with many such creative ventures, the contributions are of uneven quality and vastly dissimilar writing styles.

In the case of these two works, it is completely reasonable for the theological contours of Galatians and Philippians to be treated independently. However, it is not nearly so clear why Colossians and Philemon would be fully detached, given their considerable background linkage. Nor will many evangelicals be convinced by Donfried's reason for a separate handling of the theology of 1 and 2 Thessalonians (see below).

Though I do not endorse every point of Dunn's treatment of Galatians, it is the stronger of the two works under review. His material is not only highly readable but also thorough and yet surprisingly succinct. This slender treatment pulls together the essential features of his encyclopedic understanding quite admirably.

Donfried dates 1 Thessalonians between AD 41 and 44, choosing speculatively to place the letter in the long period of silence in Paul's earlier ministry instead of following the chronology laid out in Acts. He also sees it as reflective of a more harmonious "early Paul" while Galatians and Romans supposedly reflect a polemical "late Paul." His discussion of the theology of 1 Thessalonians, as organized around the concept of election, is worthy of thoughtful consideration but is hardly the last word.

For dubious reasons, like "an unusual dependence on and imitation of 1 Thessalonians" (p. 85), Donfried believes that 2 Thessalonians is "Pauline" but not written by Paul. His best guess is Timothy. Donfried does stick somewhat closer to the commonly understood theme of eschatology for 2 Thessalonians. Yet how ironic it is that his discussion of the theology of 2 Thessalonians (not written by Paul, according to Donfried) sounds so much more "Pauline" than his treatment of 1 Thessalonians.

Marshall believes that Philippians is a unified letter, though not based on some of the more sophisticated recent arguments from literary structure, notably a grand inversion (e.g. C. Talbert, D. A. Black, Luter and Lee). He also holds that Paul probably wrote Phil 2:5-11, the "Christ Hymn." His candidate for an overall theme is "unity," also championed recently by Black, though "partnership in the gospel" (which requires unity) seems closer to Paul's emphasis.

Marshall discerns that the foundational reason Philemon is in the NT canon is because of the slavery issue. His brief discussion, while thought-provoking, is somewhat one-sided.

In spite of the above-stated concerns, all three authors offer some helpful insights from which evangelicals can profit. Thus, both volumes can be given qualified recommendations for evangelical scholars and pastors (though not much for lay students) in their study of the Pauline literature.

A. Boyd Luter

Golden Gate Baptist Theological Seminary, Southern California Campus, Brea, CA

Paul's Letter to the Philippians in Light of Disunity in the Church. By Davorin Peterlin. Leiden: Brill, 1995, 272 pp., \$88.75.

Peterlin's work, a revision of his 1992 doctoral dissertation under I. Howard Marshall, attempts to establish the occasion and overall aim of Philippians. After an

introduction to other views, Peterlin asserts his own: Paul writes to address disunity in the church. The church is divided over its allegiance to Paul and its support of his mission.

The work has two parts. The first is a study of disunity. Peterlin examines Phil 1:1–11, 1:12–26, 1:27–2:18, 3:1–21 and 4:2–3. From these passages he concludes that the common presentation of the Philippian congregation as a mature, harmonious and supportive group is wrong. They are instead wracked by strife and party spirit.

The second section examines the Philippians' financial capabilities and their support of Paul. Peterlin examines the social composition of the church, the mission of Epaphroditus (2:25–30) and Paul's attitude toward the gift (4:10–20).

The clarity of Peterlin's presentation is one of his strengths. It is always clear where his argument is going. He demonstrates that the rosy picture of Philippians as a mature, harmonious congregation is somewhat overemphasized. Two other strengths include a helpful section on the social composition of the Philippian church, which is fresh and insightful, and a section on the subject of women as deacons, which draws on inscriptional evidence and on secondary works little used by other commentators.

There are three major weaknesses of Peterlin's work. (1) The quality of his logic and argumentation varies. At points he is lucid, displaying tight logic. At other times he is careless and jumps to conclusions based on preconceptions. For example, he evaluates Paul's comments in 4:10–20, saying it contains "genuine gratitude" and "manifest appreciation" (p. 207). But we are never told what criteria Peterlin uses in order to make these value judgments. On what basis does he evaluate Paul's "gratitude"? Twentieth-century standards? First-century standards? Similarly, he assumes 4:10–20 contains the language of finance, relying heavily on the works of others. He concludes that a fair proportion of the Philippian Christians were involved in financial transactions typical of commerce and business. On another item, Peterlin establishes that the congregation was divided over support for Paul. The church actually contained an anti-Pauline lobby. He then reaches the conclusion that Euodia and Syntyche themselves disagreed on whether to support Paul. This conclusion seems questionable.

(2) His methodology is faulty. His entire argument relies heavily on mirror-reading. For example, stated simply, Peterlin asserts that 1:12–26 does more than just report dissension over Paul at the place of his imprisonment. Rather, Paul includes that report because there is a similar dissension over Paul in Philippi. Similarly, Peterlin looks for a reason why Paul praises Epaphroditus in 2:25–30 and concludes it must be because there is tension between Epaphroditus and the church. (On mirror-reading see Barclay, "Mirror-Reading a Polemical Letter: Galatians as a Test Case," *JSNT* 31 [1987] 73–93.)

(3) Peterlin's work displays a gross lack of familiarity with the social backgrounds regarding the giving and acceptance of gifts in the Greco-Roman world. In that context, acceptance of a gift establishes an ongoing social relationship and places the receiver under obligation to repay the giver. (See Mott, "The Power of Giving and Receiving: Reciprocity in Hellenistic Benevolence," *Current Issues in Biblical and Patristic Interpretation* [ed. G. F. Hawthorne; Eerdmans, 1975] 60–72.) These social backgrounds would have strongly influenced the way Paul felt he must respond to the Philippians' gift of financial aid in 4:10–20. Peterlin acknowledges this crucial background but chooses to ignore it. I believe his understanding of Philippians is grossly flawed as a result.

Owing to its cost and spotty quality I would recommend that only those who wish to engage in scholarly work on Philippians consult Peterlin's work. And they should borrow it from a library.

G. W. Peterman
Osceola Evangelical Free Church, Osceola, IA

Personal Speech-Ethics in the Epistle of James. By William R. Baker. WUNT 68. Tübingen: Mohr, 1995, xvi + 364 pp., n.p. paper.

This volume in the rapidly expanding WUNT series is a revision of the author's dissertation, written under Robin Barbour at the University of Aberdeen. Baker tackles a key motif in the epistle of James. James' polemic about the tongue in 3:1-12 is well known, but in a manner typical of his style he mentions the issue of human speech at many points in the letter. Baker analyzes each reference, grouping them into five categories, which supply the chapter titles for the monograph: The rudiments of speech-ethics (particularly the power of words), the evil of the tongue, speech in interhuman relationships, speech in human-divine relationships, and the relationship of speech to truth. In each chapter, Baker first surveys background information relevant to the issue of the chapter. He casts his net widely, looking not only at the OT and Jewish literature (Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha, Qumran, Philo, the rabbis) but also at ancient Near Eastern wisdom literature, the Greco-Roman world, and the NT. Baker then exegetes the relevant passages in James, concluding with an analysis.

Baker draws four main conclusions at the end of his study. First, personal speech-ethics is a key concern in James. Second, James' teaching about speech reflects widespread concerns about speech-ethics in the ancient world. A third related conclusion is that most of what James says about the tongue has parallels in various other ancient writings. Unfortunately, these parallels are so general and found in so many different kinds of literature that it is impossible to say which of the backgrounds is most influential on James. Baker's fourth general conclusion is that James does contribute some distinctive emphases in his teaching about speech. Most of these have to do with the new Christian context in which James writes. This also shows that James is not, as some scholars have thought, a Jewish tractate with a thin Christian veneer.

Several strengths distinguish this monograph on speech-ethics in James. First is the sheer comprehensiveness of the study. The tongue, as we noted above, is an important topic in James, and it is helpful to have a survey of all the relevant texts. A second strength is the survey of background materials. Baker leaves few stones uncovered, providing a full and very helpful topical analysis of the relevant literature. Baker's sober and balanced exegesis is another high point. He avoids the common dissertation habit of excessive novelty. And finally, Baker succeeds in validating for this particular topic what scholars since Dibelius have generally argued for James: that, following the parenetic style and in keeping with his practical, pastoral concerns, James is generally content to transmit traditional ethical teaching to his readers.

Unfortunately, the value of the monograph is seriously marred by an equal number of weaknesses. The author claims in the preface, dated 1994, that the monograph is a revision of his doctoral dissertation. I have not seen the dissertation and cannot comment on the nature or extent of the revision. But I was very surprised to find that the bibliography contains no piece of literature dated later than 1985. Baker thus fails to interact with some of the significant work on James that has appeared in the last decade. One thinks here especially of the commentary by R. P. Martin (Word, 1988) and several important studies of James' social world. A second weakness is the flip side of one of the strengths mentioned above. The exegesis, while sober, is generally quite superficial. The opinions of commentators are noted, Baker indicating with whom he agrees. Few new ideas are found. Third, while the survey of background material is impressive in scope, this material is rarely brought to bear on the exegesis of James. The two sections in each chapter stand generally unrelated to one another. One would have expected to see these data figuring prominently in the discussion of texts in James, but such is not the case. Finally, the author betrays throughout his exegesis an ignorance of recent studies in the Greek tenses. Certain traditional assumptions about the function of the tenses (e.g. that a negated present imperative always implies that the

action prohibited is in progress) are followed without any awareness that these are now widely challenged (cf. e.g. pp. 123, 280).

If one is looking for a survey of material on speech-ethics in the ancient world and in the letter of James, Baker's monograph is the place to go. But it will not satisfy the scholar looking for a contribution to the field or the exegete looking for fresh and insightful ideas about the text.

Douglas J. Moo
Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, Deerfield, IL

On the Genre and Message of Revelation: Star Visions and Sky Journeys. By Bruce J. Malina. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1995, 317 pp., \$24.95.

The inside dust jacket of this study states that Malina offers "a completely new lens for viewing the book of Revelation." What is this lens?

A well-known axiom of hermeneutics is that an interpreter must begin by reconstructing the original context of a writing so as to hear the work as the first audience did. To do this, he or she must adopt that audience's perspective. Malina contends that Revelation is puzzling because we do not understand the worldview of John's audience. Its mental map of reality embraced not only social and political structures but also an entire cosmology. The point at issue for Revelation is cosmology, for in contrast to western, "scientific" man, who sees himself in an impersonal, material universe, Palestinian man lived in an entirely different place. For him, the night sky was unobscured and its vivid, luminous objects were personal beings (pp. 6-7, 14). Reality was a seamless whole. "There was no separation between the cosmos and society, no gulf between celestial events and human history, no distinction between supernatural and natural" (p. 22). Judeans believed that what happened in the sky had direct consequences for their daily lives.

In Palestinian society, many astrological writings existed that purported to explain how events like eclipses and comets affected various local areas. Based on the similarity Revelation bears to these writings, Malina avers that it is a subset of them and that John is an "astral prophet"—albeit a Christian one (pp. 12, 29). His visions are sky trips, a common feature of such literature, and he interprets his journeys "in terms of Israel's story of human beginnings in Genesis and the new human beginnings with Jesus Messiah" (p. 52). His burden is not to foretell the distant future but to answer the question his fellow Christians had: "Where is Jesus, and what is he doing now?" (p. 264).

Working from these twin perspectives (Palestinian cosmology and the visions as past/present), Malina describes Revelation's overall progress and identifies many of its numerous details. For instance, the four living creatures of chap. 4 are the four seasonal constellations (pp. 97 ff.), and chaps. 12-16 are about the pre-flood conditions (pp. 153-199). But Revelation is also about the "forthcoming" that arises out of the past and present. Based on what has already happened in the cosmos (and thus on earth), it is inevitable that the new Jerusalem should descend.

Malina's proposal needs to be thoroughly tested by those who are interested in placing Revelation within its apocalyptic milieu. There are many times the text appears artificially forced to fit his thesis. He does not give a clear answer to the question of whether John actually believed in astrology (which would put him at variance with the prohibition of Deut 18:9-14), or whether he was simply using astrological symbols to convey his message. In addition, Malina's conclusion that Revelation is an

historical apocalypse puts him outside the mainstream of evangelical interpretation. At the same time, he offers much to stimulate and provoke thought. For all his seemingly radical departures, his theological conclusions have an orthodox cast. On his reading, the seer of Patmos declares that Jesus is the cosmic Christ, the one who is "truly all-powerful over every actual and potential source of power in the universe" (p. 263). The book contains a bibliography and indices of modern authors and Biblical and ancient sources.

Marcia A. Munger
Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, Deerfield, IL

The Book of Revelation: An Annotated Bibliography. By Robert L. Muse. Garland Reference Library of the Humanities 1387. New York: Garland, 1996, xxxvi + 352 pp., \$58.00.

Robert Muse has done Biblical scholarship an invaluable service in providing a full and readable annotated bibliography on the book of Revelation. He reviews significant monographs, commentaries and articles published in English, French and German, and he lists most unpublished dissertations in English, from roughly 1940–1990. The major commentaries from the first half of this century (Lohmeyer, Schmidt, Ramsay, Charles, Bousset, Allo, Loisy, Beckwith, Swete) are also included, and reference is made, though with little or no annotation, to some works in Italian, Spanish, Dutch and Greek.

The book is divided into six chapters: an 11-page introduction, in which Muse surveys the contents of Revelation on a broad, section-by-section basis and discusses exegetical issues and research trends relating those sections, followed by annotated bibliographies of historical-critical research on Revelation, compositional studies, exegetical/expositional studies, theological/thematic studies, and the Revelation in the life of the Church. Indices of authors and of Scripture and ancient texts are also included.

Though the layout is generally useful, the book is marred by an incomplete cross-referencing system. The reader is infrequently alerted that a work found in one section of Revelation equally pertains to another section, and one is never pointed in a later section to a work already listed in an earlier section. So, for example, research on the Christology of Revelation requires consultation of both section C of chap. 5 (Jesus Christ) and section H of the same chapter (Other themes [(18) The Lamb]), though no cross reference specifies as much. Furthermore, Ulrich Müller's *Messias und Menschensohn* might be missed entirely since it is only listed in chap. 3 (I)—Source and Revision Hypotheses—and not cross-listed in 5C. Examples of this sort are numerous.

This is not to say, however, that *Revelation* will not reward the researcher richly. For anyone working in Revelation, the book is a must. The annotations are usually very helpful, and the bibliography is a remarkably thorough (though Jon Paulien's Andrews University dissertation, published in 1988 as *Decoding Revelation's Trumpets*, is notably absent). The user not already familiar with the field must beware, however, that *Revelation's* abundant treasure can only be mined with more than casual effort.

Alan Hultberg
Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, Deerfield, IL

The Death of Jesus in Early Christianity. By John T. Carroll and Joel B. Green. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1995, xviii + 318 pp., \$24.95.

This volume offers to nonspecialists the fruit of many years of involvement in the SBL's Passion Narrative and Tradition in Early Christianity Group. Its thirteen chapters are divided into parts treating (1) the NT gospels, (2) other early Christian literature, and (3) historical and theological issues.

The first part opens with a chapter in which the authors emphasize that many scholars no longer maintain a "narrow focus" on analyzing individual pieces of tradition for their historical value. Carroll and Green also mention important studies of each gospel's passion narrative and note how discussions of recent decades have integrated a deeper appreciation for the role of the passion narratives within the larger presentation of each evangelist. The remaining chapters of part 1 discuss how each of the evangelists portrays Jesus' death. They consider the structure of the gospels as wholes and elucidate how elements before the passion narratives relate to the days leading up to the crucifixion. These discussions are not only refreshing and effective but also provide good introductions to the distinctive points of each evangelist's narrative.

Two minor criticisms do not take away from the quality of part 1. More discussions of the structure of each individual passion narrative and a comparison of parallel passages (as Raymond Brown offers in *The Death of the Messiah*, 1994) would have added to the analyses offered here. It is also odd that the authors do not explore, as Paul Danove did with Mark (*The End of Mark's Story*, 1993), how depictions of the passion also complement postresurrection narratives and vice versa.

Part 2 highlights the various depictions of the crucifixion in Paul, Hebrews, 1 Peter, Revelation and certain extracanonical gospels. A narrative analysis pieces together the "story" reflected in Paul's occasional letters and highlights the importance of the *theologica crucis* to the apostle. There is an excellent chapter on extracanonical passion narratives by R. E. Van Voorst who supports a growing but contested consensus that these second- and third-century writings reflect ideas of their own period and do not contain independent first-century traditions. Against scholars like Crossan and Koester, he doubts that the *Gospel of Peter* reflects source material earlier than the canonical gospels. One only wishes Van Voorst had also discussed epistolary writings like *1 Clement* and the letters of Ignatius. Unexplained in part 2 is the absence of a discussion of the Johannine epistles (i.e. 1 John 1:7; 3:16; 4:10).

The third and most engaging part of this book addresses the reason for the crucifixion, asks the question of who bears responsibility for the death of Jesus, discusses Jesus' death in light of the OT and impresses the meanings of discipleship and of the atonement. In chap. 9 Carroll and Green challenge the jaundiced view that Jesus was not executed as one who threatened imperial rule since in their view a number of NT texts do portray him as a subversive revolutionary. They argue that Jesus' actions in the temple, claims about his messianic identity and disregard for dietary norms and Sabbath regulations would be perceived as blasphemous by many Jews and politically subversive by leaders from Rome. To answer the question of who was responsible for the death of Jesus (chap. 10), the authors survey anti-Jewish polemics of second-through fifth-century Christians and then look at Paul and the NT gospels. They propose that "certain power brokers, both Jewish *and Roman*," regarded Jesus as a threat and decided to put him to death, and conclude that sweeping indictments by Christians who blame all Jews (ancient and modern) for Jesus' death represent faulty and immoral interpretations of history (pp. 202–204; italics mine).

The explanation given in chap. 9 for the "why" behind Jesus' accusation, arrest and death by crucifixion has merit because it rests upon a careful reading of the gospels within the social, political and religious context of early first-century Palestine. Given

the lack of uniformity with which Rome dealt with its provincials (Fergus Millar, *The Roman Empire and its Neighbors*, 1981, esp. pp. 52–80; Peter Garnsey and Richard Saller, *The Roman Empire Economy, Society and Culture*, 1987) and the overwhelming indications that Jesus was crucified as a criminal (i.e. Mark 14:58; 15:2 ff.), it is difficult for others to substantiate by way of historical analogy a radically different explanation for the death of Jesus. On the other hand, the assessment of the role of the Roman elite among those who wanted to kill Jesus does not follow from the historical reconstruction provided in “Why Crucifixion?” (chap. 9) but rather seems to stem from the survey of anti-Judaism in early Christianity (chap. 10). The discussion of the identity and motivation of these non-Jewish “power brokers” is vague and unpersuasive.

Joel Marcus adds to this volume with material from his book *The Way of the Lord* (1992) in the chapter entitled “The Old Testament and the Death of Jesus: The Role of Scripture in the Gospel Passion Narratives.” Another welcome contribution is Donald Senior’s essay on how the passion narratives “were designed in part to invite reflection on the meaning of discipleship” in the areas of vigilance and prayer, personal witness and critiquing abuses of power (p. 234). In a final chapter Carroll and Green address NT, classical and modern views of the atonement and explore avenues of communicating this concept to contemporary audiences. The book also includes a select bibliography and indices of modern authors and ancient persons.

The impressive range of material found in this reasonably priced volume is significant and would work well in introductory and undergraduate courses. Those familiar with Green’s dissertation (*The Death of Jesus*, 1988) will note that the question of a pre-Markan passion narrative is, appropriately, not discussed in this volume. This very readable book is a model example of how scholars can present the results of recent scholarship for a wider reader audience.

James A. Kelhoffer

The University of Chicago, Chicago, IL

Gnostic Truth and Christian Heresy: A Study in the History of Gnosticism. By Alastair H. B. Logan. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1996, xxiv + 373 pp., \$29.95.

Logan offers a study of gnostic texts commonly referred to as “Sethian” to reverse the current consensus on gnosticism’s origin and development. Against scholars like G. W. MacRae, B. A. Pearson, PHEME Perkins, Kurt Randolph, J. M. Robinson, H.-M. Schenke and Gedaliahu Stroumsa, he argues that “Sethian Gnosticism” is “basically a Christian phenomenon” and represents a discrete system of thinking that can and should be understood apart from Judaism. Many scholars have concluded that the Sethian texts have pre-Christian roots in Judaism since they build on traditions of Seth in Genesis (cf. 4:25–26).

Logan’s approach relies heavily upon and seeks to revise one section of Simone Pétrement’s controversial book, *Le Dieu séparé* (1984; ET: *A Separate God: The Christian Origins of Gnosticism*, 1990). Among other things, Pétrement argues that the testimonies of Irenaeus and the *Apocryphon of James* point not to an early, seminal form of gnosticism but rather to the later, more developed Valentinians. Accordingly, Logan has no use for distinctions like pre- and post-Christian or proto- and “full-blown” gnosticism. Building on the premise that Irenaeus and the *Apocryphon* point to later forms of gnosticism (Pétrement) and extending the study of ritual in gnostic circles (J.-M. Servin, *Le dossier baptismal Séthien*, 1986), Logan identifies “a central core of ideas” in the Sethian texts “based on and concretely expressed in the rite of initiations as a projection of Gnostic experience.”

The author begins with the argument that the gnostics constructed “their own myth of origins in reaction to contemporary Jewish persecution, a myth which in its several variants was influenced by Johannine and Valentinian ideas and then underwent a ‘Sethian’ reinterpretation, largely in response to ‘orthodox’ Christian criticism” (p. xx). The second chapter studies the character of this myth, traces its series of redactions and analyzes its relationship “to a whole series of Gnostic texts and systems from the late first to the late third century CE” (p. xxi). The remaining six chapters support the above points through a detailed analysis of theogony, cosmogony, anthropogony, anthropology, soteriology and eschatology in the primary sources. An appendix discusses “the etymologies of Barbelo, the illuminators and Adamas.” The author includes a bibliography and indices of names and ancient sources but no summary or conclusion.

The following comments address the author’s arguments concerning gnostic origins and development. With regard to the former, Logan tries to answer one question (gnostic origins) with another (whether gnosticism of a later date can be traced directly to Judaism). He seems to think that because the Sethian myth reflects views distinct from Judaism, gnosticism could have only arisen in reaction to Christianity. Identifying a distinct mode of thought at one point in gnostic history (and, according to Logan, this is late), however, says nothing to the question of the possible borrowing of Jewish ideas in an earlier, less developed period. The various Christian influences are, of course, important, but here too caution is in order. Making comparisons can be a more complicated task than the author seems willing to admit.

Logan’s explanation of how gnostic thought developed over time also rests on two dubious points. (1) A weak argument (pp. 1–13) supports the thesis that Irenaeus offered a rather complete and unbiased account of gnostic sects and the “Christian Gnostic myth of Father, Mother and Son” as known to him around AD 180. (2) Against Pétrement’s claim that Irenaeus knew the *Apocryphon*, Logan argues that the type of gnosticism described in *Adv. haer.* 1.29 “underwent progressive development including ‘Sethianization’, until it emerged in the latest form of the *Apocryphon*, the long recension” (p. xx). This rather complex theory of development in four stages (cf. the elaborate diagram, p. 55) from the group(s) described by the hostile Irenaeus to the more detailed *Apocryphon of James* lacks substantial confirmation in the primary sources.

As a study of a certain myth and its relation to ritual, *Gnostic Truth and Christian Heresy* will interest some specialists and probably be acquired by larger theological libraries. Logan’s other theses should be read with care and compared with the studies of the scholars mentioned above. In light of the fact that Michael Allen Williams has recently argued that no ancient self-definition supports the modernist construct “gnosticism” (*Rethinking “Gnosticism”: An Argument for Dismantling a Dubious Category*, 1996), debates over classifying and interpreting these sources will undoubtedly continue for some time.

James A. Kelhoffer

The University of Chicago, Chicago, IL

The Canonical Approach: A Critical Reconstruction of the Hermeneutics of Brevard S. Childs. By Paul R. Noble. Biblical Interpretation 16. Leiden: Brill, 1995, 381 pp., \$112.00.

This is “a critical reconstruction of the hermeneutics” of Childs, as the subtitle tells us—i.e. Noble is not simply attempting to summarize the principal contributions

of Childs and evaluate them but is reconstructing the underlying hermeneutic that shapes Childs' work and then evaluating it and in some ways reconstituting it. There have been earlier attempts at evaluative criticism of Childs (works by James Barr, John Barton and Mark Brett, as well as many briefer contributions), but this is by far the most comprehensive and penetrating.

Barr faults Childs for side-stepping the power and implications of the historical-critical method and charges that he is in danger of losing historical truth; Barton assesses Childs from a largely literary point of view, examining what it means to read the entire text as a whole when the entire text is the canon; and Brett, deploying in part categories developed in the field of cultural anthropology, consistently attempts to shove Childs toward the pluralistic framework that lies at the heart of his own agenda. By contrast, Noble makes a valiant effort to understand and expound Childs on Childs' terms before offering some suggestions as to how he thinks Childs' program might be improved.

After an introductory chapter that lightly surveys earlier treatments of Childs, Noble devotes two long chapters to an analysis of Childs' canonical method as it has developed over the last thirty years. This period covers the work from Childs' seminal article, "Interpretation in Faith: The Theological Responsibility of an Old Testament Commentary" (*Int* 18 [1964] 432–449), through his introductions, commentaries and numerous articles, down to his *Biblical Theology of the Old and New Testaments: Theological Reflection on the Christian Bible* (1992). These two chapters argue that several "methodological tensions" mark Childs' work from the beginning, in particular tensions between faith and reason, between the descriptive task and the normative/constructive task, between the original context of a text and the canonical context. These tensions, Noble argues, continue in the crowning volume (*Biblical Theology*) and mean that this work therefore falls somewhat short of Childs' own goals.

For instance, Childs repeatedly tells us that the OT bears witness to Christ. Yet on many occasions it is difficult to see precisely what it is that authorizes this claim. Childs often draws attention to God's suffering-redemptive involvement with humanity, or (to take a concrete text that Childs treats) more precisely to Yahweh's suffering-redemptive involvement with Israel (Isa 63:9). But Noble points out, it is one thing to grasp this divine involvement with human beings and another thing "to claim that Yahweh's suffering-redemptive involvement with humanity took the specific form of him becoming incarnate in Jesus" (p. 75), and yet another to claim that the former is an adumbration of the latter or in some sense a prior and prophetic witness to it. The canonical presupposition doubtless helps, but in itself that might warrant the second step but not (by itself) the third. So how is the conclusion that Isa 63:9 is a prior witness to Christ and his sufferings anything more than a Christianizing gloss?

In the next three chapters, Noble examines these "methodological tensions," probing and exploring, making suggestions: "Reference, Fact, and Interpretation" (chap. 4), "Historical Methodology" (chap. 5) and "Traditions and the Final Form" (chap. 6). These reflections go beyond what Childs has said in print. There is too little space to convey the plethora of points Noble offers, but a couple of examples will not go amiss. Noble constantly returns to Childs' persistent "decoupling" of a text's theological value from its historical veracity. If one must choose between semantic understanding of what a text means and genetic understanding (the latter explains the text by appealing to its [reconstructed] history), Childs prefers the former.

This does not mean that Childs rejects mainstream critical opinions. Far from it: He not only adopts them but feels he must delineate the theological value that emerges from such positions. Thus Childs emphasizes Moses' canonical (as opposed to historical) authorship of the law and its relation to the authority of the law. The attribution

of the law to Moses was not (in the modern sense) an historical judgment at all, nor was the law authoritative because Moses wrote it (for after all in Childs' view Moses did not do so). Rather, the attribution to Moses was one of the ways at the community's disposal to affirm the authority of the law that was already accepted as authoritative within the community.

But Noble points out that there are considerable problems with this attempt to separate theology from the ostensible history. First, if Moses were in fact the author of the law, this would in fact justify, in the context of Sinai and God's self-disclosure on the mountain, the law's claim to be authoritative. Some of the laws, after all, can scarcely be thought to be intrinsically authoritative. Thus the question of Mosaic authorship is historically relevant to the theological questions. More importantly, when Childs defends the theological relevance of the (late) Deuteronomistic history to the history of the divided kingdom, he is saying in effect that although the Deuteronomist's evaluations of Israel's kings are doubtless historically anachronistic and retrospective, they are nonetheless legitimate within canonical norms (in much the same way that assessment of the Nazis must be in some measure retrospective and not dependent solely on the documents produced by the Nazis themselves). But if God had not prohibited intermarriage with foreigners before Solomon's many marriages, why should he have been condemned for entering into them—which is certainly what the Deuteronomist presents as having happened? After presenting a number of such problems, Noble concludes: "Once Mosaic historical authorship is rejected it has to be asked how Israel's law did in fact develop; . . . our assessment of the canonical theologies is dependent upon the historical answers we find to this question. . . . [I]f the bulk of this legal material had its origins in the last years of the monarchy then much of the Deuteronomistic theology would surely be no more than a radical misinterpretation of Israel's history. In the case of Mosaic authorship, then, theology and historical referentiality cannot be decoupled—one cannot regard the law, for theological purposes, as having been given by Moses while also admitting that in fact it was not" (p. 88).

The next three chapters expand the hermeneutical discussion to treatments of authorial intention, reader-response hermeneutics and various other aspects of philosophical hermeneutics (including Schleiermacher's "convergent circle" and Gadamer's antiobjectivism). Noble argues, against Gadamer, for objective meaning and also for a Hirschian distinction between meaning and significance and, further, that for Childs' program to be methodologically sound it must be tied to objectivist hermeneutics. This discussion covers a lot of now familiar ground and is not particularly perceptive. Noble's primary criticism of any strong and consistent form of antiobjectivist hermeneutic is the old argument that it is necessarily self-defeating, for the thesis itself must fall under the same axe. Far more subtle and telling critiques are available.

The tenth chapter is a brief discussion of the illumination of the Spirit. Childs says that Calvin's treatment of the subject is so magisterial that further discussion by him is not necessary: He merely (and usually cryptically) adopts some elements of Calvin's view. Noble therefore expounds Calvin's view and wonders if Childs is really willing to pay the theological price of adopting Calvin's views of the matter, since those views are tightly tied to other doctrines to which Childs seems unwilling to commit himself.

In the eleventh chapter, Noble evaluates Childs' "canonical exegesis" and finds it wanting. It is frequently unclear, from Childs' discussion, whether the Christological interpretations of OT passages that he advances are properly regarded as the true and proper witness of the OT to the Christ of the NT (as he claims) or are anachronistically imposing on OT texts meanings that are essentially alien to such texts. Noble himself suggests that some of the problems could be resolved by greater resort to

typological exegesis. The final chapter finds Noble reconstructing Childs' program so as to preserve the best of it, while integrating more typological exegesis and more of the implications of belief in a divine author working behind and through the human authors.

The work is well written and, considering the difficulty of the subject, admirably clear and easy to follow. In substance, Noble is more critical of Childs than his courteous tone and evident sympathy might suggest. My occasional hesitations—e.g. the treatment of reader-response theory is remarkably thin; the treatment of typology, though surely along the right lines, is too brief and too narrow to support the weight that Noble wants to rest on it—cannot detract from the importance and good sense of this work.

D. A. Carson

Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, Deerfield, IL

The Politics of Biblical Theology: A Postmodern Reading. By David Penchansky. Studies in American Biblical Hermeneutics 10. Macon: Mercer University, 1995, ix + 109 pp., \$18.00 paper.

Despite a rather broad title, the scope of this little book is quite narrow. It is a description of the fall of the American Biblical-theology movement. This, however, is no ordinary, humdrum retelling of an old tale. Penchansky is a postmodernist. He is suspicious of all human motives and interpretations. Accordingly, he proposes to describe the political motives behind the downfall of the movement. It is an exposé on a "power play, an effort to drive out the ruling priests of the academic world" motivated by "absolute hatred of and disappointment in the promise of the Biblical theology Movement" (pp. 4–5).

It is difficult to conduct meaningful discourse with those who deny the possibility of meaningful discourse. Nevertheless, if we pretend for the moment that we can make sense with our words, there are two lines of inquiry through which we can interact with Penchansky's thesis. First, we can address the method Penchansky uses to approach his topic. Second, we can address the degree to which he has demonstrated an accurate understanding of the particulars of the subject.

Penchansky is clear about his commitments. He utilizes four postmodern interpretive "keys" to explore the Biblical-theology movement. First, he revels in contradiction. According to the author "contradictions inhere at the very heart of all things" (p. 12). Second, he accepts no methodological or linguistic center in interpretation. That is, nothing is verifiable or falsifiable. Third, "all readings are political" (p. 13), either consciously or unconsciously. Fourth, all attempts to organize ideas or phenomena in bipolar structures (e.g. substance and essence, sign and signified, text and reader) are unacceptable. One cannot properly call this a "method" as such. Rather, it is a set of values that the author believes exist at the heart of all that is human and that he tries to reveal in the writings of the Biblical-theology movement and its opponents.

The obvious absurdity of such a position, which has been pointed out many times, is this: If we claim that everyone unavoidably approaches and writes texts from preconceived and (more importantly) all-pervasive ideological positions, we also claim that one's ideology is static. By definition, it denies the malleability of the reader and asserts, exclusively, the malleability of the text. The ideologies of the text and the reader cannot converge. In this sense (to use a postmodern buzz word) texts have no "power" to affect and mold the thoughts and loyalties of the reader.

Penchansky's descriptions of the history of the Biblical-theology movement, its characteristic methods, and the opposition to it by James Barr, Brevard Childs and Langdon Gilkey largely agree with the standard treatments. Penchansky's unique contribution to this history is his claim that the opponents of the Biblical-theology movement and the leading members of the movement itself unconsciously share certain core values. According to Penchansky, Barr, Childs and Gilkey accused the Biblical-theology movement of being "biased, religio-, and ethnocentric," while, at the same time, being all of those things themselves. More specifically, Barr and company substituted their own "positivist ideology" for the "romantic ideology" of the Biblical-theology movement. Unfortunately, both ideologies, he claims, suffered from the same political and chauvinistic weaknesses.

Penchansky is correct that the Biblical-theology movement is highly indebted to romanticism for its notion of history (*Heilsgeschichte*), linguistic theory and value of the primitive (hence the emphasis on archeology and comparative sociocultural studies). What he means by "positivist" is less clear. If he means nothing more than that Barr, in particular, affirms the objectivity of knowledge and emphasizes the methods of the sciences, he would be correct. If, however, he means that Barr affirms the notions of progress, infinity of nature and history, and so forth, that characterize the various subbranches of positivism, he is categorically wrong. Properly, positivism is itself (along with absolute idealism) within the sphere of philosophical movements generally called "romanticist." Barr shows no affinity to positivism in this sense and traces his own roots to Scottish common-sense philosophy ("Common Sense and Biblical Language," *Bib* 49 [1968] 377–387). Furthermore, it is hard to comprehend how any one label, "positivist" or any other, can encompass the widely divergent positions of Barr, Childs and Gilkey.

Regarding the common ideological links between the Biblical-theology movement and its critics, Penchansky identifies them as (1) a tendency to identify themselves in opposition to outsiders, and (2) an attempt to impose order on religion. This "commonality" is nothing more than the recognition that both parties have different conceptions of Biblical theology. All that this means, ultimately, is that neither of the two movements indulges in contradiction like the postmodernists do.

The value of Penchansky's volume is his recognition that all Biblical-theological methods are ideological. Biblical-theological methods, even purely "descriptive" ones, apply methods and values to the Biblical text. The weakness of his method is its failure to recognize the ability of texts to affect readers. This, in fact, should be the goal of Biblical theology: the conformation of our methods and conceptions to those that are indigenous to the world of the text. Only by means of such a text-imminent method can Biblical theology properly be called "descriptive."

William A. Tooman
Madison, WI

An Introduction to Biblical Hermeneutics: The Search for Meaning. By Walter C. Kaiser and Moisés Silva. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1994, 298 pp., \$24.99.

This jointly-authored book by two authors well known to this *Journal* constitutes another in a growing list of volumes dedicated to the topic of hermeneutics. It is divided into four parts with 15 chapters and a glossary.

Part 1 concerns the search for meaning. The first chapter, by Silva on the necessity of hermeneutics, does not actually critically address the major issues in hermeneutics

but offers an assuaging treatment about how easy interpretation really is, as one moves from the Greek text to personal application. In the light of this chapter, it is perhaps surprising that the rest of the book is even needed. Nevertheless, further chapters there are. Kaiser attempts to define the meaning of meaning and comes up with some truly astounding ideas. Whereas Silva in the previous chapter has endorsed the grammatico-historical method of exegesis, here Kaiser argues for the syntactical-theological method (what they are and how they differ remain unclear to me). After transmogrifying the concepts of reference and sense, he apparently opts for meaning as intention, a concept left unnecessarily vague (on p. 40 I think "Divine Intervention" should read "Divine Intention," perhaps a revealing slip). In a chapter on the use of language, Silva establishes the importance of the Biblical languages in the course of affirming that English translations are adequate (for what?). He does, however, dispel romanticizing notions of language, etymologizing and illegitimate totality transfer but pulls up short of actually establishing the importance of serious grammatical study. Unfortunately, this seems to be an opportunity missed.

In part 2, on understanding the text, Kaiser begins with a chapter on narrative, in which he draws a surprising contrast between prose and narrative as literary genres, which does nothing to inspire confidence in the rest of his exposition of narrative technique. Leaving aside the unfortunate invocation of chiasm, I find it difficult to accept Kaiser's attempt to invoke historical referentiality as a part of narrative meaning. Kaiser's treatment of poetry and wisdom literature is a whirlwind tour of various literary devices. Silva tackles the problem of the gospels and the parables. Although he does a commendable job in treating the issue of history and theology, he finds it unnecessary to define the parable, except to say that most readers will have a "satisfactory working definition of the term as referring to the well-known stories told by Jesus" (p. 110 n. 1). In his chapter on the reading of the letters, Silva discusses reading the letters theologically, as wholes and as historical documents. He admits that historical reconstruction requires reading between the lines, but he takes courage in hand and endorses it, if done wisely. Silva here usefully pays attention to the importance of epistolary structure, although much more could be said at this point. In a chapter on prophecy, Kaiser repeats his well-known views, in which the prophets displayed awareness of what they were saying and their words are fulfilled in a complex single sense. It seems to me that this entire perspective is based more on Kaiser's own presuppositions than it is on the evidence of the Biblical text.

In part 3, on meaning and application, Kaiser writes all three chapters. He offers a useful, succinct definition of the clarity of the Scriptures, one that many could benefit from reading. However, his chapter on the cultural use of the Bible appears to be confused over whether culture is a third horizon or a part of one of the other horizons. He concludes with a chapter on the theological use of the Bible. Although many important issues are raised here, few are treated in sufficient detail.

In part 4, on further challenges in the search for meaning, in the first chapter Kaiser offers a short history of interpretation. Like most such chapters, it must deal in generalities. Oddly enough, it begins with rabbinic exegesis before discussing the use of the OT in the NT, virtually neglecting earlier Jewish interpretation. Silva offers a better treatment of the 20th century. He then delivers an apologetic for Calvinistic hermeneutics, one that is interesting but perhaps not entirely appropriate to this book—at least at this point. It might have been better if these chapters had been included at the beginning of the book so that especially students would have had a clearer sense of the tradition of interpretation that had preceded them. Kaiser concludes the volume.

As one can see from the comments above, I cannot praise this book. Without repeating my statements above, my overall impression is that it is far too simplistic in

approach, even contradictory in places. On the one hand, there is an attempt to lay out the complexities of Biblical interpretation while, on the other hand, it minimizes the technical competence necessary and attempting to reduce the techniques down to a few simple statements and definitions, almost platitudes. The result is what seems to me an undeveloped effort to introduce a highly complex and important subject from which students could greatly benefit.

Stanley E. Porter
Roehampton Institute London, London, England

Discovering the Bible in the Non-Biblical World. By Kwok Pui-lan. Maryknoll: Orbis, 1995, 136 pp., n.p.

One of the more urgent sets of issues confronting the global Church today concerns the question of gospel and culture. Responsible theology in the decades ahead cannot afford to ignore the complex and highly controversial debates over contextualization and religious pluralism. Furthermore, given the global nature of the Church, serious discussion of these issues must include Biblical scholars and theologians from Africa, Latin America and Asia as well as western scholars.

It was thus with considerable interest that I picked up this recent volume written by a leading feminist Chinese theologian who currently teaches at the Episcopal Divinity School in Cambridge, Massachusetts. The book is divided into seven chapters, with a prologue and epilogue that are taken from a Bible study and sermon preached by the author. Kwok's concern is for a fresh perspective on the Bible that will enable it to be more relevant and acceptable to Asians in general and to Chinese women in particular. The focus of the work is not so much upon the content of the Bible itself as it is upon certain methodological issues concerning our views on the nature of Scripture and its interpretation. What we are given are the reflections of a leading Asian feminist theologian who has drunk deeply from the wells of postmodernist radical hermeneutics and religious pluralism.

Chapter 1 sets the stage for the rest of the book by calling into question the traditional perspectives on Biblical authority and canonicity. Taking her cue from Foucault, Kwok asserts: "Biblical interpretation is never simply a religious matter, for the processes of formation, canonization, and transmission of the Bible have always been imbued with issues of authority and power" (p. 9). The formation of the Biblical canon is dismissed as a political power ploy; insistence upon the unique authority of Scripture as the Word of God is rejected as spiritual colonialism.

Chapter 2 insists that the Bible be understood within the pluralistic context of Asia, with its many sacred texts and traditions. "Since the Bible exists as one of many scriptures, it is important to develop a multifaith hermeneutics in Asia" (p. 23); "Asian Christians must debunk western claims that the Bible is the sole revelation of God because such claims reinforce the ethnocentrism and cultural hegemony of the West" (p. 30). Subsequent chapters introduce Kwok's alternative proposal, the "dialogical model of interpretation"; look at the role of oral transmission in Asian culture and its potential for Biblical interpretation; consider the significance of women in the Biblical narrative and some implications of this for today; and suggest how Biblical interpretation can be enriched by drawing upon the sacred scriptures and traditions of other Asian religions.

Kwok makes some helpful and interesting points, and many of the issues she raises concerning the foreignness of the Bible to Asian cultures, questions of justice,

and the abuses of the past are legitimate. Certainly there is a real need for serious and responsible examination of the Biblical data with the concerns of Asia in mind. However, for at least the following three reasons this book is not likely to contribute much to the engagement of Scripture with Asian cultures.

First, given the author's pluralistic commitments, it is not at all clear why she thinks we should be concerned with what the Bible has to say to Asian cultures. Is the Bible any more authoritative than the sacred scriptures of any other tradition? It seems not. Scripture appears to be simply one among many resources for enriching our perspectives. But this view will be unacceptable to the vast majority of Christians—certainly Asian Christians—who regard the Bible as the unique and authoritative Word of God.

Second, although the book is largely concerned with theological method the discussion is rife with questionable and controversial philosophical and hermeneutical assumptions. Those already persuaded by Derrida, Foucault, *et al.* will find much of this familiar territory; those who reject such perspectives will certainly find nothing here to cause them to change their minds.

Third, the tone throughout is unnecessarily caustic and polarizing. Classical orthodoxy is repeatedly equated with white male western imperialism ("Eurocentric hegemony and colonization of the mind") and summarily rejected on that basis. Certainly the west has been guilty of political, military, economic and even religious imperialism with respect to nonwestern cultures. But the abuses of the past cannot be remedied by a naive and simplistic reaction that equates all claims to orthodoxy and the unique authority of Scripture with male chauvinism and Eurocentric colonialism.

In sum, those looking for a fresh but responsible treatment of issues concerning the interpretation of the Bible in nonwestern cultural contexts will not find much help here. Despite the title, Kwok seems to be much more interested in advancing a particular feminist and pluralist agenda than in discovering what Scripture itself might have to say to Asian cultures today.

Harold Netland

Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, Deerfield, IL

Women in the Church: A Fresh Analysis of 1 Timothy 2:9–15. Edited by Andreas J. Köstenberger, Thomas R. Schreiner and H. Scott Baldwin. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1995, 334 pp., \$21.99.

The best defense of the complementarian position to date, this book is well-argued and advances the debate. Nearly every author's contribution is helpful to the case.

For instance, in my opinion, the bulk of evidence supports S. M. Baugh's central contention in the first essay ("A Foreign World: Ephesus in the First Century"): Ephesus was not a bastion of first-century feminism. He rightly notes Roman influence in Pauline Ephesus and that "Ephesus was not a unique society in its era." His appeals to women in official positions and to inscriptions, which focus on the upper class, may prove more problematic. Though some fairly well-to-do members were in Paul's churches, genuinely aristocratic members were not representative. These comments do not, however, detract from his central thesis.

While David Gordon ("A Certain Kind of Letter: The Genre of 1 Timothy") correctly notes that many of Paul's instructions in the pastorals reflect universal principles, we should note that many also reflect local issues (e.g. Titus 1:5, 12–14). Nevertheless,

he correctly pinpoints the heart of the hermeneutical issue and also establishes an interpretive premise on which all evangelical interpreters should agree: Paul's letters are occasional documents, but in them Paul brings to bear transcultural principles on specific situations.

Scott Baldwin's analysis of $\alpha\upsilon\theta\epsilon\nu\tau\acute{\epsilon}\omega$ ("A Difficult Word: $\alpha\upsilon\theta\epsilon\nu\tau\acute{\epsilon}\omega$ in 1 Timothy 2:12") is careful, well-reasoned and good scholarship. I think Baldwin is probably correct in his reading "have authority" for the pre-Christian uses of $\alpha\upsilon\theta\epsilon\nu\tau\acute{\epsilon}\omega$, which are those that count most. There are, however, only two of them, and only a handful of others not written by authors cognizant of the language and contemporary interpretation of 1 Timothy. This may be scant evidence to sustain a major thesis, but some evidence is better than no evidence, and in my view Baldwin has shifted the burden of proof for the term's meaning back into the egalitarian court. Egalitarians will undoubtedly respond by questioning his arrangement and interpretation of his data; the most significant objection will be to his omitting the cognate noun from consideration.

Andreas Köstenberger ("A Complex Sentence Structure in 1 Timothy 2:12") argues from the grammatical structure that "teach" and "exercise authority" must be either both positive or both negative. This principle is not clear in all the instances he cites, but the pattern seems to hold in general, and this is what matters most. He is probably correct that "have authority" should be read as coordinate with "teach" rather than as subordinate ("teach in a domineering way"). This reading would challenge the more moderate complementarian view that allows women to teach men provided they are under male authority (i.e. provided they are not a senior pastor or bishop). In response, some moderate complementarians may ultimately join egalitarians in appealing to a specific situation to explain why Paul prohibits teaching as well as holding authority.

Thomas Schreiner ("An Interpretation of 1 Timothy 2:9–15; A Dialogue with Scholarship") provides a fair survey of views, though no two exegetes will necessarily agree on all the details. He acknowledges the danger of false teaching in Ephesus but believes that if this were the reason for the prohibition the text should state it explicitly. (But are not assumptions of situation shared by the writer and original readers often left unstated? Cf. e.g. for an obvious case 1 Cor 15:29.) Daniel Doriani's essay ("History of the Interpretation of 1 Timothy 2") is fascinating and will be useful to all readers interested in the subject regardless of their commitments.

Egalitarians will, however, react to what they will perceive as some unfair caricatures of their position. They will bristle at the repeated assertion (especially in essays by Robert Yarbrough and Harold O. J. Brown) that egalitarians reflect the secular culture (an assertion rarely sustained by attention to what egalitarians say of themselves). In "The Hermeneutics of 1 Timothy 2:9–15," Yarbrough (who to his credit shows great passion for Scripture and justice matters) notes that scholarly defenses of the "progressive" evangelical scholars appear more frequently today. (Egalitarians might respond that the "historic" view does as well.) One writer can be interpreted as classifying evangelical egalitarians with "epistemological relativists" because "feminism" can be classified as liberation theology.

Moderate egalitarians would respond that repression of women, like radical feminism, reflects the world's values and that we should avoid painting fellow evangelicals unjustly with the brush of either extreme. Most evangelicals will affirm, sometimes at great personal cost, that the 1960s released unprecedented social damage. Yet guilt-by-association is a specious form of reasoning: That social upheaval also paved the way for desegregation and the conversion of some of us who were alienated from traditional churches. Further, egalitarians would doubt that the very asking of a contemporary question constitutes capitulation to the contemporary worldview. If so, the Bible itself would be full of capitulations.

Finally, the claim that “‘progressive’ readings . . . were virtually unheard of . . . prior to the women’s movement of the 1960s” (p. 170) is simply untrue. Pentecostals and holiness traditions may not have published much in academic journals, but they hosted many women pastors and evangelists from the early 1900s—more so then than today. Certainly social trends made it easier for their view to gain more of a hearing today, but the traditional view also has a social context. Appeals to an interpretation dominant in much of Church history, conditioned as it was by presuppositions of Greek thinkers (including Aristotelian and Galen’s understanding about women’s different nature), also shared with medieval Arab writers, reflect historical conditioning no less. Doriani concurs that medieval Christian writers still sometimes wondered if women had souls. Those of us who deny women’s ontological inferiority (though not gender differences) must allow that a frequent “historic” interpretation (especially when studied with “exceptions”) may be mistaken. Those who doubt some Church traditions, e.g. concerning polity, sacraments, Judaism or allegorical hermeneutics, do not have a problem saying so on such other issues; and in some cases God even used culture to chasten his Church. How much of Church history understood Paul’s writings as occasional documents with specific historical contexts—even though that is what they explicitly claim to be?

More annoying are remarks in “The New Testament Against Itself: 1 Timothy 2:9–15 and the ‘Breakthrough’ of Galatians 3:28.” This essay is by Brown, a rightly respected scholar who has worked hard for the kingdom and from whom one would not have expected *ad hominem* assaults. Yet though he allows for exceptions, he generally associates egalitarians with those who reject special creation and virtually accuses many evangelical egalitarians of pretending to believe the Bible’s full authority just to gain a hearing, though they have already “vitiating” it. He writes as if egalitarians do not allow gender distinctions, though most evangelical egalitarians have always recognized these.

At some points *Women in the Church* sounds less moderate than some other complementarians. Schreiner thinks women are less likely to emphasize and draw lines over doctrine, being less devoted to “rational analysis and objectivity” (pp. 145, 153). Yet if this proved true only a percentage of the time (I know many exceptions; cf. also some scientific studies cited in Mary Stewart Van Leeuwen’s *Gender and Grace*), would the prohibition prove likewise true only a percentage of the time? In Doriani’s positive “Thomist” position, men and women by nature have “equal gifts but different interests.” So what happens when their interests do not prove different?

But the book is mostly irenic. Schreiner speaks of the need to “bend over backwards” (p. 105) to encourage women in ministry that complementarians do hope and pray that God blesses their ministry, and acknowledges that many fine exegetes are egalitarian. In his own exegesis he cites freely exegetes from either camp. Yarbrough cites the “need for détente”—there should be no more mudslinging (p. 194). He acknowledges “a wide range of mediating positions between hard-core male dominance views and full-blown biblical feminist positions—even among those who claim the highest possible understanding of scriptural authority” (p. 194).

Complementarians and egalitarians will also find much common ground in this book. Baugh recognizes that Paul was progressive for his day. Although Yarbrough denies the egalitarian cultural reading for 1 Timothy 2, he allows it for some other early Christian practices (e.g. the kiss and head coverings). Although the authors deny women’s pastoral call, they affirm women’s ministry in most respects. Yarbrough also affirms “exceptions” in Scripture where women lead in exceptional situations; Doriani recognizes that historically women could teach (just not teach doctrine with authority). On many exegetical issues, Schreiner and many egalitarians are not far apart.

With such common ground established, where must differing interpreters explore next? First, the most obvious examples aside, how to differentiate universal from particular prohibitions demands more careful work from all scholars. Discerning the exact universal principles in Paul's specific applications of those principles requires considerable care. Head coverings, wine for the stomach's sake, getting Paul's cloak from Troas, are easier than some other examples; thus evangelical scholars of all persuasions should charitably cooperate on this task to further clarify God's Word for his people. Second, understanding Paul's case in 1 Tim 2:13–14 will require more detailed analysis of Paul's use of Scripture elsewhere.

Because of its clarity on the issues and its careful scholarship, this book warrants a respectful reading from all sides on the current debate, including from those who (like myself) will not share all its conclusions.

Craig S. Keener
Eastern Baptist Seminary, Philadelphia, PA

Women in the Church: A Biblical Theology of Women in Ministry. By Stanley J. Grenz with Denise Muir Kjesbo. Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1995, 284 pp., n.p.

"[H]istorical, biblical and theological considerations converge not only to allow but indeed to insist that women serve as full partners with men in all dimensions of the church's life and ministry" (p. 16). This thesis is developed in seven chapters: (1) Women in the Church (contemporary American denominations), (2) Women in Church History, (3) Women in the Faith Community (OT, gospels, Acts), (4) Women in the Writings of Paul, (5) Women in Creation, (6) Women in the Church and the Priesthood and (7) Women in the Ordained Ministry. The stakes are raised high when it is asserted that the question of women in ministry "is central to the gospel" (p. 142) and that nonegalitarians who "categorically deny women the opportunity to obey the Spirit" are "acting unjustly toward women" and "standing in opposition to the work of the sovereign Holy Spirit" (p. 16). In the following review we will trace and critique the argument at significant points and conclude with some general comments regarding the work's overall approach and thesis.

In the first two chapters, D. Kjesbo seeks to substantiate the thesis that Church history evidences a pattern moving from "charismatic ministry" (with full female participation) to institutionalization (with the marginalization of women). Though this pattern may be characteristic of various stages of Church history, however, the question remains whether it also applies to the period of the early Church. At this point Kjesbo provides virtually no evidence but merely assumes an egalitarian reading of the NT. At the end of her survey she concludes that history indeed bears out the egalitarian view. Here it should be remembered that history itself cannot "prove" any position, be it egalitarian or otherwise. Another notable point in Kjesbo's portion of the book is the casting of the issue of women in ministry as an all-or-nothing proposition: To oppose women's ordination is to deny them any ministry whatsoever. Also, Kjesbo believes to have established women's God-given right to exercise their callings free from any restrictions by showing that women historically were engaged in learning, teaching and leadership roles. Her treatment here would need a more disciplined focus: How does the evidence she adduces show that women functioned in roles of ultimate responsibility over the Church before God?

The major portion of the book contains S. Grenz' survey of the Biblical and theological data. He uses a phenomenological approach that interprets the Scriptural data with a view toward their significance for the issue of women in ministry. His treatment of the OT therefore does not start, as might be considered appropriate, with Genesis 1–3, but with ancient Hebrew society. Acknowledging merely in passing the lack of women priests in OT Israel, Grenz points to the leadership of Miriam, Deborah's role as a judge, and Huldah's prophetic office as examples of authoritative functions fulfilled by women in OT history. From this data the rather ambiguous conclusion is drawn that "Scripture offers no evidence that the Israelites ever rejected a woman's leadership simply on the basis of gender" (p. 67). But what about the fact that all OT priests were male? Does this not qualify as evidence?

The author's survey of the NT data likewise fails to persuade at significant points. Espousing a strongly realized eschatology, with Gal 3:28, "Paul's Charter of Equality," as his theological center, Grenz maintains that "[o]ur position in Christ carries us beyond creation . . . by lifting creation to God's redemptive intent" (p. 105). But arguably redemption reaffirms God's creative purposes rather than supplanting them, as if the Creator's original design needed improvement or alteration. Grenz considers Jesus' appointment of twelve male apostles to be merely a function of salvation-historical realities that are superseded by concerns of the kingdom. As in the case of the lack of women priests in the OT, Grenz fails to consider the significance of the lack of women among Jesus' apostolic circle. Priscilla represents a "clear indication of authoritative teaching by a woman in the church" (p. 83) and the NT "nowhere directly prohibits the appointment of women to [the] office [of elder]" (p. 90). Yet the former assertion does not adequately acknowledge that Priscilla did not function in a permanent authoritative teaching role in a local congregation, while the latter contention presupposes an egalitarian reading of 1 Tim 2:12. Concerning this passage, Grenz contends that the expression $\alpha\theta\epsilon\nu\tau\epsilon\iota\nu$ constitutes an "unusual term that generally carried negative connotations" and addresses a situation in which "unlearned women are usurping authority" (pp. 133–134). In light of recent syntactical studies of 1 Tim 2:12, however, not to speak of lexical and background research, this interpretation has now been rendered virtually untenable. The point of 1 Tim 2:13–14, according to Grenz, is "that rather than fulfilling God's intention to complete the creation of humanity by delivering the male from his solitude, the female actually became the agent of the opposite result. She led him into the bondage that brought a more profound loneliness—alienation from God, each other and creation" (p. 169; cf. p. 138). Unfortunately, this novel interpretation of 1 Tim 2:13–14 is not related to v. 12: Is Paul not permitting a woman to teach or have authority over men because she failed to deliver man from his solitude? This hardly seems to make sense. Yet despite these incongruities, Grenz is able to draw from his Biblical survey "one significant conclusion: in view of the practice of the early church, the burden of proof now rests on those who would bar women from full participation with men in all dimensions of the gospel ministry" (pp. 140–141).

In the theological section of the book, Grenz expresses his conviction at the outset that "a biblical understanding of creation, the community of Christ and the ordained offices all lead to the conclusion that women ought to be full participants with men in all dimensions of church life and ministry" (p. 143). In perhaps the most questionable theological portion, Grenz, relying on the German scholar W. Pannenberg, argues for "a more nuanced, somewhat [?] symmetrical model" of the Trinity than the traditional subordinationist view. According to Grenz, the persons of the Trinity are mutually dependent, so that the "Father is dependent on the Son," not merely for his Fatherhood but even "for his deity" (p. 154). Apart from the fact whether this model

is true to nature (Is the relationship between father and son really best described as a relationship of “mutual dependence”?), it is doubtful whether a reader not already armed with an egalitarian agenda would derive this understanding from an inductive study of Scripture’s portrayal of Jesus’ relationship with God the Father (cf. e.g. the gospel of John). Grenz’ treatment of God’s image in man and woman and the ordination of women is marred by a serious misrepresentation of opposing views. It is misleading and inaccurate to claim that “complementarians . . . conclude that in the final analysis men more completely reflect the divine image than do women” (p. 169). R. Tucker’s attribution of such a view to J. Hurley in *Women in the Maze* is insufficient evidence for such a generalization. Regarding ordination, Grenz charges complementarians with violating the ecclesiological principle of the priesthood of all believers. But it is questionable whether his claim that “this ecclesiology leads to an egalitarian view of the ordained office” (p. 186) reflects an accurate understanding of this Biblical-Reformation doctrine.

Despite the above-noted lapses, Grenz and Kjesbo must be credited with a serious effort at establishing a Biblical theology of women in ministry that will form an important point of reference for future such ventures. Generally, the authors’ language does not always come across as irenic as the back cover claims: According to Grenz, complementarians “skirt implications,” seek “to salvage the complementarian interpretation” by “impos[ing] an artificial dichotomy,” etc. Repeatedly one also finds the insinuation that the complementarian position is fueled by a male quest for power (e.g. pp. 49, 218), which, in *ad hominem* fashion, imputes improper motives to those with whom the authors disagree. Regarding the general approach of this work, it should be noted that, although the authors attempt to give their work an inductive flavor, the procedure is actually deductive. In fact, the book may best be described as an effort to provide an apologetic for the egalitarian position. Both Grenz and Kjesbo rely heavily on secondary literature. This is particularly limiting in the historical section; in the exegetical portion, one frequently finds a rapid survey of others’ views without a clear attempt to argue for and substantiate Grenz’ own view. His discussions of the meaning of κεφαλή and of 1 Timothy 2 in particular fail to wrestle with the pertinent issues. Hermeneutically, it is troubling that the authors tend to “read off” normative theology from narrative portions, as if the mere mention of a phenomenon automatically constituted its general applicability. Also, the fact that the roles of men and women in marriage and the Christian home are excluded from consideration artificially severs the Scriptural tie between God’s design for the home and the church (cf. e.g. Eph 5:21–33; 1 Tim 3:4, 15). On a definitional level, the authors do not adequately frame the issue: Is it the ministry of women, the ministry of women in leadership, the ministry of women in positions of assuming ultimate responsibility for the Church (and hence local congregations) before God, “male vs. shared leadership” (p. 16), or something else? Grenz’ style of argumentation likewise tends toward ambiguity. Repeatedly, what starts out on the level of bare possibility is by the end of Grenz’ discussion presented as a firm exegetical conclusion, on the basis of which major conclusions are drawn. An example of Grenz’ procedure of merely asserting his view while proceeding as if his position had been established on the basis of evidence is his acknowledgment of male-female differences on p. 160 followed by the claim: “However, these differences do not bar women from leadership positions in the church, as complementarians claim. On the contrary, differences between the sexes compel us to encourage women and men to serve together at all levels of church life.” But why? The frequent repetition of this assertion does not render it true or even more plausible. Grenz does not seriously consider the possibility that a complementarian model might facilitate an adequate representation of the divine image and of individuals’ spiritual gifts.

In the end, Grenz has not demonstrated that any women functioned, in the Pauline churches or anywhere in the NT, in a role that connoted the bearing of ultimate responsibility for God's Church. Where are the women pastors and elders? Paul's reference to particular women as his "coworkers" may indicate a genuine partnership in the gospel ministry, with significant contributions made by women, without indicating that women functioned in positions of ultimate responsibility. The incidence of female "patrons" of house churches in the NT era, likewise, must not be construed as proof that women bore ultimate spiritual responsibility for the Church before God, since there is no indication in Scripture that patrons, be they male or female, functioned necessarily, or even usually, as pastors of house churches. Overall, the authors' effort to impose an egalitarian grid of gender roles on the entire sweep of Biblical history and teaching must therefore be judged a failure. When eschatology, ecclesiology and even theology proper need to be recast to fit the egalitarian paradigm, one may legitimately wonder whether the implementation of such an agenda for the Church is worth the price such reform would require.

Andreas J. Köstenberger
Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary, Wake Forest, NC