

BOOK REVIEWS

Misquoting Jesus: The Story behind Who Changed the Bible and Why, by Bart D. Ehrman. New York: Harper San Francisco, 2005, x + 242 pp., \$24.95.

There has been a long-standing discussion in the world of textual criticism concerning the degree to which scribes intentionally altered passages of the NT to conform more closely to their own theological preferences. Ever since the well-known statement from Westcott and Hort that “there are no signs of deliberate falsification of the text for dogmatic purposes” (*Introduction to the New Testament in the Original Greek* [New York: Harper & Brothers, 1882] 282), there has been a steady chorus of scholars intending to show the opposite to be the case. The idea of theologically motivated scribal changes can be traced back to Kirsopp Lake and J. Rendel Harris and more recently to scholars like Eldon J. Epp and his well-known book, *The Theological Tendency of Codex Cantabrigiensis in Acts* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1966). Bart D. Ehrman joins this chorus in his recent book, *Misquoting Jesus*, and argues that scribes in the early church were not merely disinterested copyists who mechanically transmitted the text in front of them, but, in one sense, continued “writing” the NT text by changing it to adapt to the theological and social challenges of the day. Of course, Ehrman has written on this topic numerous times before—most notably in his more technical book, *The Orthodox Corruption of Scripture* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993)—and it has become the most dominant theme of his academic career. Ehrman laments the fact that textual variants are often overlooked and discarded like scraps on the cutting room floor and argues that they should instead be viewed as a “window” into the history of early Christianity and the struggles and challenges it faced.

In contrast to many of Ehrman’s prior works, *Misquoting Jesus* is written for a more popular audience and begins not with a survey of academic works on the subject but with somewhat of a personal “testimony” from Ehrman himself, cataloging his transition (or transformation) from naïve evangelical at Moody and Wheaton to enlightened scholar at Princeton Seminary. He describes how it was his early studies in textual criticism, and his subsequent awareness of scribal “mistakes,” that first alerted him to the fact that his view of inerrancy might be flawed. Having finally admitted that the Bible has errors and mistakes, Ehrman said that the “floodgates opened,” and he began to change his view of the Bible radically, concluding that the Bible was “a human book from beginning to end” (p. 11). Ehrman’s personal testimony in the introduction, although interesting, strikes the reader as rather out of place for a piece of scholarship coming from the secular academy—after all, are not evangelicals prohibited from appealing to their personal experience in their scholarly works? Ironically, as Ehrman distances himself from his evangelical past, he actually engages in a sort of reverse-evangelism with the reader, hoping to convince any readers who are “literalists” (p. 14), “fundamentalist” types (p. 6), and “one-sided” (p. 13) that they should reconsider their view of Scripture and adopt his own. Ehrman’s appeal to his personal journey, if nothing else, gets his agenda for this book squarely on the table: to use the field of textual criticism as a means to challenge the evangelical doctrine of Scripture.

Although *Misquoting Jesus* is divided into seven different chapters, Ehrman’s actual argument can be best conceived of in three parts. Let us address these three parts, one

at a time. First, Ehrman begins his critique of the NT by arguing that the scribes of early Christianity—the first three centuries to be exact—were not in a position to make reliable copies, since they were not professional copyists but simply literate believers (some even illiterate!) who were willing to give it a try. Moreover, argues Ehrman, scribal activity in general was “maddeningly slow and inaccurate [and] that the copies produced this way could end up being quite different from the originals” (p. 46). Two responses are in order here. (1) If the overall transmission of manuscripts in the ancient world is as Ehrman describes, then one wonders how all of ancient history is not thrown into obscurity and uncertainty. Indeed, if manuscript production was such a “hit and miss” affair, we have no grounds to think that any account of ancient events should be received with any confidence—not to mention the very ancient testimonies that Ehrman appeals to in order to show that scribal activity was uncertain (testimonies which themselves are preserved in manuscripts!). Of course, Ehrman does not question the authenticity of these testimonies, because it is clear that he only desires to call into question the value of *Christian* manuscripts. (2) In order to argue selectively against Christian manuscripts, Ehrman must show that Christian copying was worse than most, which he has tried to do by arguing that Christian scribes were non-professional (even at times illiterate) and therefore prone to mistakes. At this point, Ehrman leans heavily on the study of one of his own Ph.D. students, Kim Haines-Eitzen, *Guardians of Letters* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000). However, Haines-Eitzen has been critiqued for drawing a false dichotomy between formal scriptoria and haphazard/non-professional copying, as if these were the only two choices on the table. Even if there were not formal scriptoria in the second century (and we are not sure), there are substantial indicators that an organized, structured, and reliable process of transmission was in place amongst early Christians. For example, scholars have long recognized that the virtual unanimity throughout all of early Christendom in its use of the codex (as opposed to the roll) reveals a striking degree of structural unity. Moreover, scribal features such as the *nomina sacra*, which are also found in virtually all early Christian manuscripts (even second-century copies), show “a degree of organization, of conscious planning, and uniformity of practice among the Christian communities which we have hitherto had little reason to suspect, and which throws a new light on the early history of the church” (T. C. Skeat, “Early Christian Book-Production,” in *The History of the Bible* [ed. G. W. H. Lampe; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1969] 73). Recent books, such as David Trobisch’s *The First Edition of the New Testament* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), have also continued to discuss these features and the remarkable degree of uniformity within early Christian scribal activity. Incredibly, such textual evidence is simply ignored by Ehrman (and downplayed by Haines-Eitzen) in order to bolster the claim that Christian scribal activity was unreliable.

Ehrman’s second overall argument (spread through a number of chapters) is that the manuscripts themselves are so choked full of scribal mistakes and inconsistencies that they cannot be trusted. The reader senses Ehrman’s excitement about being able to cite such large numbers of textual variants, and it seems that he is expecting that his readers will be stunned by these figures (“some say there are 200,000 variants known, some say 300,000, some say 400,000 or more!”, p. 89). He even appeals to John Mill’s 1707 edition of the Greek NT (more particularly, its critical apparatus) in which Mill catalogued thirty thousand textual differences with the various manuscripts in his possession. Ehrman proceeds to emphasize further the “problem” of textual variations by providing a brief history of textual criticism in chapter 4, highlighting how various scholars struggled over the years to find a way to recover the original text of the NT. Again, several comments are in order. (1) Ehrman’s use of numbers here is a bit misleading because he never makes it clear to the reader that the vast, vast majority of these textual differences are typical, run-of-the-mill, scribal variations that do not affect the integrity of the text in the least (misspellings, word order changes, omitted words,

etc.). Indeed, once a person realizes that such changes are a *normal* part of the transmission of any historical document, then they cease to be relevant for the discussion of the NT's reliability (lest all antiquity slip into obscurity). Such variants should be *expected* in historical documents, not put forth as scandalous. Yet this is precisely the point Ehrman refuses to make clear to the reader. (2) Ehrman's numerical barrage also does not take into account the vast number of manuscripts we possess. Obviously, if we only possessed say, five manuscripts of the NT, then we would have very few textual variants to account for. Yet, we have over 5000 Greek manuscripts alone (not to mention the various versions), more than any other document of antiquity. Thus, a pure numerical count of variants is misleading: *of course* they will increase, because the number of manuscripts is vastly increased. In many ways, therefore, Christianity is a victim of its own success. While the vast number of manuscripts should be positive historical evidence and indicative of the NT's authenticity, Ehrman, somehow, turns the tables to make it evidence for its tendentious character—a remarkable feat, to be sure. Unfortunately, the person left in the dark here is the average reader. On p. 87 Ehrman even acknowledges this point (originally made by Bentley years ago) but never offers a response to it. (3) In addition to these considerations, Ehrman also does not mention that the vast majority of these textual variants are easily spotted and easily corrected. Indeed, the entire science of textual criticism (of which Ehrman is an obvious proponent) is committed to this very task. However, Ehrman almost gives the impression that 400,000 variants exist, and we have no idea what was original and what was not, throwing the entire NT into utter obscurity. That is simply misleading. In this regard, Ehrman wants to be able to have his text-critical cake and eat it, too. On the one hand, he needs to argue that text-critical methodologies are reliable and can show you what was original and what was not, otherwise he would not be able to demonstrate that changes have been made for theological reasons (as he argues in chap. 6). Yet, on the other hand, he wants the "original" text of the NT to remain inaccessible and obscure, forcing him to argue that text-critical methodologies cannot really produce any certain conclusions. Which one is it? This entire method of argumentation is not designed to bring clarity to the issue, but to muddle it, so that the confused reader will succumb to the doubts that have been raised and concede the NT cannot be trusted. (4) Ehrman's appeal to Mill's study also proves to be somewhat misleading. The "thirty-thousand" variants that Mill discovered include comparisons not just amongst Greek manuscripts he possessed, but also comparisons with citations from the Church fathers and copies of the NT in other languages. However, it is well known that comparing Greek manuscripts with manuscripts in other languages, and citations from the Church fathers, is not the same as comparing Greek manuscripts with one another. Translation from one language to another brings in all sorts of variations (just observe the differences in our English translations of the NT), and the Church fathers are known for loose citations of the NT, for citations from memory, and for paraphrasing and conflating citations. Thus, again, the numbers are not all they appear to be. In the end, if one were to take into account just these considerations I have mentioned here—the nature of these variations, the vast number of NT manuscripts, the ability to decipher the original reading—then the ominous "problem" of textual variations put forth by Ehrman would quickly shrink down to its actual size. Then, with rhetoric aside, the remaining text-critical issues could be looked at fairly. When that is done, it is clear that textual variations, although an issue that needs to be addressed, by no means threaten the overall integrity of the NT text.

The third argument put forth by Ehrman—and the pinnacle of his thesis—is that scribes not only changed the text accidentally but changed the text intentionally for theological purposes. In short, this section (primarily contained in chap. 6) is simply an abbreviated summary of his *Orthodox Corruption of Scripture*, as he goes through the various theological changes: anti-adoptionistic, anti-docetic, and anti-separationist alterations to the text. Although I am not convinced of all of Ehrman's text-critical

rationale here, there are good reasons to think that there were scribal changes within the textual tradition that reflected theological concerns—a point that has been noted by scholars for generations. However, the problem is not whether Ehrman is technically correct about this point but whether he draws the right conclusions from it. One suspects that Ehrman's purpose in bringing up this fact is to continue to stir up doubt within the reader concerning whether the transmission process of the NT can really be trusted. Apparently, if it can be shown that some scribes were not always neutral, unbiased, non-emotional automatons, who mechanically transmitted text from one page to another (although I am not sure who really had this conception of scribes in the first place), then we are obligated to abandon any notion that the NT text was transmitted intact. However, there are several considerations that need attention here. (1) Once again, the numerical significance of these alterations is left unclear. Intentional theological changes make up very, very few of the textual variations in the NT and therefore, on a relative scale, have little significance for determining the overall state of the text. The vast majority of scribes, in fact, did *not* intentionally change the text whenever they felt like it. Here is where Ehrman's numerical claims in the prior chapters work against him. If indeed, the number of textual variants is as high as he claims (400,000?), then theologically motivated changes make up such a slight portion of this amount that one wonders why they are being discussed in the first place. Not surprisingly, such a discussion of numbers is notably absent from this chapter, because they seem to work against Ehrman's point, rather than for it. (2) In addition, the *theological* significance of these changes also seems overplayed by Ehrman. For example, are we really to believe that the integrity of the NT hinges on whether the text of Luke 2:33 says "his father and mother" or "Joseph and his mother"? Was not Joseph the legal father of Jesus? Is not the virgin birth elsewhere attested, even in the same Gospel (Luke 1:35)? Moreover, it is not even certain this is a theologically motivated change—could the scribe not merely have swapped two synonymous terms? How does Ehrman know the *motive* of the scribe with any certainty? Such a variant as Luke 2:33 may be interesting in its own right, but it surely has little to do with whether the message of the NT has been accurately handed down to us. (3) Even if one were to concede all of Ehrman's individual arguments concerning these various textual variants, one wonders what such a study actually accomplishes. Certainly it does not substantively change the critical Greek text that we use in modern scholarship (or the churches), because Ehrman argues that each of these variants were not original. Thus, even if certain scribes changed the text with such a motive in mind, we have enough manuscripts at our disposal, so that we can spot these changes when they occur and identify them as additions. Perhaps, then, Ehrman could argue that identifying such variants help us understand the nature of theological debates between Christians within early Christianity. However, do these variants actually tell us *new* information about these debates that we did not already know from the detailed patristic sources at our disposal? And if the point is merely to demonstrate that some scribes intentionally changed the text for theological purposes, then has that not already been accomplished in the prior work of Lake, Harris, or Epp? So, one wonders why Ehrman is so intent on bringing up this issue again and again. Perhaps it has less to do with its relevance for the integrity of the NT and more to do with its emotional appeal to the reader. After all, it is easy to see why the average reader, who does not have all the facts, would be bothered by the idea that scribes altered the text intentionally for dogmatic reasons. On the surface, this argument is quite effective at stirring up doubts. Whether it is effective at challenging the actual reliability of the NT, however, is another matter.

In the conclusion of *Misquoting Jesus*, Ehrman makes a final observation that is worth noting here. He observes that we ought not to be too judgmental of the scribes who changed the NT because, after all, everyone who reads the NT "changes" it by interpreting it within his own way of thinking. Thus, there is no "right" understanding

of the text that is normative; meaning resides with the reader because “to read a text is, necessarily, to change a text” (p. 217). Here is where, I think, we get to the heart of *Misquoting Jesus*. The NT, according to Ehrman, lacks authority because of all the scribes that have changed it; but that is OK because it simply reminds us that we should not seek authority in a text anyway. Authority and interpretation reside with the reader. Readers can attach their own meaning to the world in which they live. Of course, if this were true, then one wonders why Ehrman wrote this book in the first place. If meaning truly resides with the reader, then why bother communicating through the written words of his own book? I imagine Ehrman would be rather displeased if readers took his words to mean anything they desired. No, Ehrman’s own book shows that he assumes some agreed-upon reality with his reader where words mean things and texts can be understood—including his own. For Ehrman to argue that texts have no inherent meaning, while writing his own, makes one thing evident: the only text Ehrman wants to remain unclear is the NT itself.

In summary, *Misquoting Jesus* is an interesting look at the field of textual criticism through the eyes of a former evangelical who is convinced you cannot have textual variants and also an authoritative Bible at the same time. And that seems to be the crux of the issue for Ehrman. It is not so much, I think, the quantity of variants that is at issue (although that is part of it), but rather the existence of any variant at all. Ehrman declares in the conclusion: “If [God] really wanted people to have his actual words, surely he would have miraculously preserved those words, just as he miraculously inspired them in the first place” (p. 211). In other words, if God really inspired the NT *there would be no scribal variations at all*. It is this shocking admission by Ehrman that reveals the core problem with *Misquoting Jesus*. Ehrman is working with his own self-appointed definition of inspiration which sets up an arbitrary (and irrational) standard that could never be met. Does inspiration really require that once the books of the Bible were written that God would miraculously guarantee that no one would ever write it down incorrectly? Are we to believe that inspiration demands that no adult, no child, no scribe, no scholar, not anyone, would *ever* write down a passage of Scripture where a word was left out—for the entire course of human history? Or is God prohibited by Ehrman from giving revelation until Gutenberg and the printing press? (Yet there are errors there, too.) Would Ehrman have been more pleased if the NT were delivered from heaven on golden tablets and not through normal historical processes? I imagine he would then object to the fact that the NT does not bear the “marks of history.” It seems clear that Ehrman has investigated the NT documents with an *a priori* conviction that inspiration requires zero scribal variations—a standard that could never be met in the real historical world of the first century. Ironically, as much as Ehrman claims to be about real history, his private view of inspiration, by definition, prevents there from ever being a NT from God that would have anything to do with real history. Not surprisingly, therefore, Ehrman’s book “concludes” that the NT could not be inspired. One wonders whether any other conclusion was even possible.

Michael J. Kruger
Reformed Theological Seminary, Charlotte, NC

Chieftains of the Highland Clans: A History of Israel in the 12th and 11th Centuries B.C.
by Robert D. Miller, II. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005, 186 pp., \$28.00.

Chieftains of the Highland Clans deals with Iron Age I, the period of early Israel’s emergence in Canaan. In an effort to unravel the puzzle of early Israelite origins, Miller made an independent survey of all Iron I sites in the Israelite highlands and in his book

interprets that data through the lens of anthropological models. Miller's goal is to produce a social history of ancient Israel.

In the first chapter, Miller simply seeks to establish an initial definition of the term "Israel" as "a sociocultural polity and not as a geographic region" (p. 1). Miller argues that "the overall homogeneity of the highlands suggests that the highlands do constitute a self-contained ethnicity on stylistic grounds" (pp. 1–2). The nature of the Iron I settlement patterns and the Merneptah Stele both directly support this contention, but "in another sense, it makes no difference what the Iron I highlanders called themselves: they were the direct antecedents of Iron II Israel and, thus, 'Proto-Israel'" (p. 2). The "direct continuity from the Iron I highlands to Iron II Israel and Judah in pottery, settlements, architecture, burial customs, and metals" establish the identity of the highlanders as "Israelites," and does away with any rationale for retaining the prefix "Proto-" (p. 2). Chapter 2 defines what Miller is attempting to do in writing about Israel's history (pp. 3–5), and chapter 3 defines the "complex chiefdom model" (pp. 6–14), an anthropological model upon which the author builds his reconstruction of Iron I Israel. Chapter 4 reviews archaeological correlates to the complex chiefdom model, including settlement patterns, land usage, mortuary practices, architectural styles, and wealth distribution (pp. 15–21). Difficulties inherent to the study are also set forth (pp. 22–28).

Chapter 5 occupies a full sixty-one pages and makes up the body of the book. In this chapter, Miller utilizes the data from a portion of his doctoral dissertation, which was published as *A Gazetteer of Iron I Sites in the North-Central Highlands of Palestine* (AASOR 56, 2002). The gazetteer is an exhaustive listing of all known Iron I sites in the highlands north of Jerusalem, and "should be considered a companion volume to the present study and consulted for more detailed archaeological information" (p. 29). Using this data, Miller seeks to reconstruct various zones of settlement in the highlands and how these zones related to one another, as well as to outsiders.

Chapters 6–9 review ancient Near Eastern sources, the social history of the highland settlement, and issues of textual origins and correspondence with archaeological and anthropological reconstructions. Chapter 10 serves as a conclusion, in which Miller makes some suggestive remarks noting the limits of what he has sought to accomplish: "An anthropological model like the complex chiefdom model is . . . ill-equipped to write a cultural history, since ideology is relegated to merely one aspect among many elements of the system" (p. 126).

A key to all the Iron I sites in the figures is included as an appendix, followed by a forty-five page bibliography that unfortunately overlooks several works cited in the text. A helpful index concludes the volume.

Chieftains of the Highland Clans includes a remarkable range of archaeological and anthropological data. For undergraduates as well as seminary students, Miller's article, "Identifying Earliest Israel" (*BASOR* 333 [2004] 55–68), may be more accessible. For graduate students and others doing more in-depth study of Israelite origins, however, the book is a must-read. To the period of Israelite sedentarization, formerly considered a "Dark Age," it brings much illumination.

Ralph K. Hawkins
Bethel College, Mishawaka, IN

Encountering the Divine: Theophany in Biblical Narrative. By George Savran. JSOTSup 420. London and New York: T & T Clark, 2005, viii + 280 pp., \$135.00.

The title of this monograph defines both its focus (divine encounter) and scope (biblical narrative). In its broadest sense, the term "theophany" refers to a divine appearance

that may occur in the form of a dream or vision. This study has a unique focus upon actual contact and interaction between the human and the divine. What began as the author's fascination with the idea of divine encounter led to an examination of biblical narratives and eventually to the recognition and identification of an overall pattern associated with such encounters. These narratives merit special attention because they reveal something about the participants, the possibility for interaction between the two distinct spheres (human and divine), as well as the effects one sphere has upon the other.

To develop his thesis, Savran employs Robert Alter's concept of type-scene. By doing so, he is able to overcome deficiencies inherent within earlier form-critical studies where an earlier prototypical text served as the basis for diachronic analysis of other texts within the same genre. Though theophany narratives exhibit call narrative elements, the theophany theme so transforms them that the term "call narrative" cannot sufficiently describe them. Instead, the call narrative itself is better seen as a subset within the broader context of the narrative theophany. It is here, then, that Savran promotes the type-scene as a more effective tool for exposing the interrelationships between these stories as he applies it to a variety of texts. For example, in chapter 2, "Preparing for the Theophany," he investigates "set patterns of behavior" that precede divine-human encounters (p. 31). One element of this pattern involves the separation of the protagonist from human company prior to the theophany, even though the person is not aware it is about to happen. This often takes the form of flight (e.g. Jacob, Genesis 28). The other element, occurring less often, involves the protagonist's willful approach, seeking physical and/or ritual contact with YHWH (e.g. Moses, Exodus 33–34). Yet still others occur as a hybrid of the two.

Chapter 3, "The Visual Representation of the Divine," looks at various ways theophanic texts depict YHWH and delineate the distance between YHWH and humans, including the degree of flexibility, as well as ways this gap is bridged. Some texts emphasize a gradual revelation and recognition of the divine, while others present a sudden appearance. Still others present combinations or variations of these. In all cases, visual aspect and content of revelation hold pride of place over the process of revelation.

Chapter 4, "Human Responses to Theophany," analyzes the range of human responses to the divine encounter—from positive acknowledgment of the power of the divine to various expressions of hesitation and anxiety. Particular emphasis is placed upon the importance of the interactive elements of the theophany, including YHWH's response to the initial human response. But it is chapter 5, "Transformation and Externalization," that stands out as marking an important peak in the analysis, because it explains how the protagonist is transformed by the experience. At times, the protagonist comments on his experience, as do both Ezekiel (3:15) and Daniel (chap. 7). But in reality, the most productive results come from identifying ways by which the protagonist rejoins the community he has momentarily left and how it then shapes his new role in the community. Subsequently, chapter 6, "On the Lethal Nature of the Divine Presence," focuses on the imminent danger to the human participant. However, it is chapter 7, "Sinai Revisited: Theophany and Intertextuality," that develops the heart of the book's thesis by performing intertextual analyses on theophany narratives. For example, Elijah's theophany experience at Horeb (1 Kings 19) alludes to Moses' earlier theophany experience at Sinai (Exodus 33) which in turn serves as a basis for comparison regarding similarities and differences.

The final chapter, "From Theophany Narrative to Divine Journey," investigates post-exilic narrative theophanies and suggests a significant shift has occurred. The ease associated with pre-exilic divine-human communication is now absent, having been replaced with a less personal aspect of the divine. Personal piety now displaces group revelation as seen, for example, in the book of Job. There, the audience is privy to many scenes within the divine counsel but Job does not participate in any of these,

and neither do any of the other characters except Satan (p. 232). Like a countermeasure, the idea of Torah emerges to bridge this ever-widening distance between divine-human contact. For the rabbis, Psalm 119 now becomes a proof-text for elevating Torah to a new status where it is the essential means for communicating God's will. The psalmist's statement, "Open my eyes that I may look upon the wonders of your Torah" (Ps 119:18) is now taken to mean "a search for interpretation by inspired means." The primary significance of this theophanic shift for Savran is the idea that Psalm 119 has supplanted the private nature of theophany in such a way that its personal piety now democratizes the "inspired relationship" (pp. 234–36).

The final chapter also takes up the theophanies of Daniel and *1 Enoch* as marking the last stage of the theophany type-scene. Compared to other theophany narratives, within Daniel's theophanic experience it is the absence of externalization that stands out as most significant. There is "no return of the prophet to transmit the message, or to assume a societal role related to the revelation" (p. 241).

In conclusion, Savran's analysis of theophanic narratives represents carefully reasoned and well-articulated scholarship that advances our understanding of divine-human relationships within the Hebrew Bible. No study of theophany narratives is complete without taking this significant work into account. However, if this book were not part of the JSOTSup series, its title (*Theophany in Biblical Narrative*) could be misleading because it suggests a broader compass of Scripture than is covered. From a Christian perspective, it would seem beneficial to include the narrative theophanies of the NT in such a study, especially the call narratives of Saul of Tarsus (Acts 9:3–9), Ananias (Acts 9:10–16), all disciples (Matt 28:17–20), and John (Rev 1:10–18). Though this is a minor criticism, the application of type-scene to these narrative theophanies against the background of their OT predecessors would make for an interesting study.

Steven C. Horine
Calvary Baptist Theological Seminary, Lansdale, PA

Identifying Biblical Persons in Northwest Semitic Inscriptions of 1200–539 B.C.E. By Lawrence J. Mykytiuk. Academia Biblica Number 12. Atlanta: SBL, 2004, xx + 327 pp., \$42.95 paper.

This work is a revision (with some updating) of the author's 1998 Ph.D. dissertation at the University of Wisconsin-Madison, done under the supervision of Keith N. Schoville. The volume begins with a lengthy and detailed chapter that reviews past work on the subject of the identification of personal names with people and the means by which certain identifications can be made. As illustrations, two well-known incorrect identifications are discussed: the seal of Jotham and its presumed connection with the king and son of the eighth-century BC Judahite king Uzziah; and the three jar handles stamped with "to Eliakim the steward of Yokan," who was identified with Jehoiachin, one of the last kings of Judah before the Babylonian destruction of 587/586 BC. Mykytiuk deals with the major issues of interpretation that led to the incorrect identification. However, the ultimate reason both of these cases absolutely proved to be in error lay outside the immediate field of Northwest Semitic inscriptions, either in terms of paleography or of prosopography. Mykytiuk observes how Albright argued that the lack of a royal title on the Jotham seal was because Jotham was so well known, and how the same scholar argued that the term for "steward" (*na'ar*) must refer to a steward of a king. In both cases these were secondary arguments used by a scholar to bolster what were essentially archaeological issues. In the first example, the discovery of the Jotham seal at Tell el-Kheleifeh on the northern tip of the Gulf of Aqaba should at least give one

pause that this may not be Judean at all, but may be more reasonably related to a nation such as Edom, whose center and influence were much closer. Even more problematic was the identification of the Eliakim seal impressions, of which one was found in the same stratum as *lmlk* jar handles at Beth Shemesh. The identification of these *lmlk* jar handles with the last years of the Judean kingdom was eventually overturned by the indisputable fact of archaeological ceramics and stratigraphy, but the resistance to this was not without what some would describe as vested interests. In the end, however, the problem of the identifications of both of these examples lies more with the material culture and less with the questions surrounding titles or the lack thereof.

Mykytiuk attempts to establish criteria for identifying the degree of certainty that an inscriptional name can carry when associated with a biblical name. He begins with Avigad's old set of three criteria (in addition to matching names): either (1) a matching title (or epithet) or (2) a matching genealogy of three generations; and (3) a chronological synchronism. Mykytiuk's own criteria are generally stated on page 38:

1) Are the inscriptional data *reliable*? 2) Do the *settings* of the inscriptional person and the biblical person match? (Recall "Jotham's" seal.) And 3) Does the combination of *specific identifying marks* of the individual eliminate, or at least render negligible, the chance of confusing two different persons? (Recall "Jotham's" seal and "Jehoiachin" in the seal impression.) *All three of these questions must be answered satisfactorily before an ID can be considered valid.*

Mykytiuk then develops his argument by adding more reflections and qualifications. He creates a system of classifying different name identification proposals according to their degree of certainty. He then examines several seals and bullae (seal impressions preserved on clay) in order to illustrate this classification scheme. While his striving for objectivity is admirable, the great diversity of possible data that must be taken into account remains unwieldy in these examples and others throughout the book. Already in his second example, the bullae of Baruch son of Neriah, Mykytiuk finds his own system of evaluation less than fully adequate: "It would be legitimate to create a grade 4 for IDs such as this, but, working within the grades as set forth above, this is a grade 3 ID which is virtually certain" (p. 72). As one reads through the book, one has the sense that it is difficult to believe such a set of gradings will be found very useful without many more adjustments and qualifications.

Nevertheless, one learns a great deal about the subject of ancient personal names by reading this work. This is true in at least three ways. First, Mykytiuk lists important criteria for the process of identifying persons named on inscriptions with those in the Bible. He covers them and discusses them in practical analyses of many inscriptions. One of the most important principles he introduces is that of singularity. This occurs when the evidence indicates there is only one person who could bear the name mentioned on more than one source, whether on two or more inscriptions or on an inscription and in the Bible. Awareness of this level of relationship provides for the most certain identifications one is likely ever to make with historical figures of biblical times.

A second important contribution is the distinction Mykytiuk consistently makes between provenanced and unprovenanced inscriptions. Except in cases of certainty regarding provenance or authenticity (e.g. seals published in the nineteenth century before there was a developed science of West Semitic paleography), he brackets this out of his grading scheme, which renders it less usable in practice. Even so, his consistent separation of his material into these two groups and his evaluation of each group apart from the other allows for greater respectability in the conclusions he draws regarding how many inscriptional names can likely or certainly be identified with biblical persons.

Finally, Mykytiuk's own detailed study of many of these inscriptions and those names that may be related to biblical characters provides a valuable resource for all future

study of the inscriptions and their interpretation. Mykytiuk is to be commended for contributing an important guide along the road to a better understanding of the relationship between epigraphy and the Hebrew Bible.

Richard S. Hess
Denver Seminary, Denver, CO

Jerusalem's Rise to Sovereignty: Zion and Gerizim in Competition. By Ingrid Hjelm. JSOTSup 404. London: T & T Clark, 2004, xii + 372 pp., \$170.

The Samaritans have found a voice in *Jerusalem's Rise to Sovereignty*, a revised version of Ingrid Hjelm's doctoral thesis written at the University of Copenhagen in 2002. It is a continuation of her work, *The Samaritans and Early Judaism: A Literary Analysis* (Sheffield, 2000). In this volume, Hjelm argues that the biblical narratives in Samuel-Kings that tell of the rise of David as Israel's king and Jerusalem as Israel's capital are not, in fact, representative of the true historical situation. Instead, Jerusalem and Gerizim (among other sites) were competing capitals and cult centers during the monarchy, exile, and much of the post-exilic period. By prioritizing Samaritan sources and arguing from archaeology and cultural phenomena, Hjelm rejects the view that Israel ever achieved the idealistic unity presented in the reigns of David and Solomon. Tribal tensions and multiple cultic sites, rather, were the norm for Israel from the tenth to the second centuries BC. Accordingly, Hjelm sees the Samuel-Kings narratives as representing a created ideology written in and based on the actual historical conflicts between North and South in third to second centuries BC Israel.

Hjelm's work will interest most students of the OT. This is because she validates her thesis by calling upon almost all facets of OT studies in her argumentation, including source and redactional criticism, linguistics, archaeology, ancient Near Eastern history, and even biblical theology. It is also important to note that her method of argumentation is not always straightforward. Instead of a point-by-point linear approach, Hjelm points out "coincidences" and raises questions in many places that bolster her case. Her hope is that the many coincidences she points out and the doubts she raises will cause her reader to agree with her argument in the end.

The book has seven chapters. In chapter 1, Hjelm states her thesis and raises the questions that she will deal with in the following chapters. In chapters 2 and 3, Hjelm begins to gather her "coincidences" of Zion ideology to form her argument. She begins with the Hezekiah and Josiah narratives. She argues that the Hezekiah narrative is meant to show the election of Jerusalem as God's chosen city because of its inviolability against Assyrian attack. She contends that the Zion ideology is apparent through the shared linguistic occurrences between the Hezekiah narratives and idealistic Zion language in the prophets and Psalms. She also argues that the evaluation of the reigns of kings in the North (almost always negative) and South (many positive evaluations) betray a southern and Jerusalem-biased ideology. She also makes general statements about the narratives themselves; she notes that the Samuel-Kings narratives are meant to be ideological works and are not meant to be what we would consider "history" (p. 37).

In chapters 4 and 5, Hjelm addresses the question of Samaritan and Jewish traditions, especially how the two groups differ in the way that they handle the law, the monarchy, and the prophets. She questions the long-standing assumption that Samaritans developed their Pentateuch from the Jews and implies that the opposite, in fact, may be the case. She demonstrates how the Samaritan tradition gives higher authority

to the law above that of the monarchy and the prophets. She sees the Jewish tradition, however, prioritizing the monarchy and prophets over the law so that the Davidic monarchy (by the authority of the prophets) is accomplishing what she calls "something new" that goes beyond and has greater authority than the law (pp. 248–49). In this way, David (South) and Moses (North) are in competition.

In chapters 6 and 7, Hjelm attempts to demonstrate that the cultural and historical setting of the third to second century Israel is a more appropriate home for the narratives of Samuel-Kings. She cites historical events from Hellenistic extra-biblical sources and remarks on their striking similarities with biblical narratives. She claims that this "coincidence" means that "only one, if any, of such parallel traditions is likely to reflect historical reality" (pp. 287–88). Hjelm, of course, favors the Hellenistic traditions. Chapter 7 of the book contains her conclusions.

I find several important contributions in this book. First of all, Hjelm does raise many important questions about the relationship between the Northern and Southern Kingdoms in the tenth to second centuries BC. She also provides a voice for the Samaritan tradition, a tradition often neglected in OT studies. In addition, Hjelm does a masterful job of making literary connections between different parts of the OT. Finally, I think this book is an important landmark to note for conservative scholars; it may be showing us where some biblical historians are heading with their scholarship in the future for both content and methodology. Hjelm's blending of literary, source, redaction, and historical criticism along with linguistics and ANE history could provide a methodological model for future research. The content of this work seems to be driving the authorship of biblical narrative later still than previous works and closer to the period of the Dead Sea community.

I do not, however, agree with Hjelm's thesis and have several questions to offer. The first and most serious problem is with dating and linguistics. It is difficult to believe that Samuel-Kings is a product of the third to second centuries BC when the language of those books represents what Semitic linguists call Classical Biblical Hebrew, a dialect of Hebrew from several hundred years before the Hasmonean period and clearly earlier than the rest of the biblical post-exilic material. Second, I do not share Hjelm's view of biblical narrative as an ideological history. While many would agree with Hjelm that biblical narratives are motivated by more than simply keeping a record of the events, could it not be argued that the motivation is theological and not based on political and tribal disputes? Could David and Moses not work together and could there not be a progressive revelation of how God wants his people to worship him?

Second, methodologically, I am not convinced that the many "coincidences" that Hjelm identifies ultimately add up to her coherent thesis. Many of these coincidences have been explained or can be explained in various ways by traditional views. For example, the northern kings may be remembered as evil because of "southern bias," as Hjelm suggests. It could be, however, that the northern kings are all considered evil because of the "theological bias" of the Scriptures as the texts attempt to honor and glorify their God. In other words, perhaps these kings really were the evil, idol-worshipping, self-serving leaders portrayed in Samuel-Kings.

In conclusion, *Jerusalem's Rise to Sovereignty* is an important and valuable book that can be enjoyed by almost any student of OT. Although evangelical scholars will not likely agree with Hjelm's conclusions, they will benefit greatly from her broad holistic approach and will stay informed of where certain strands of critical scholarship of OT narrative are moving for the future.

Daniel Leavins
The Catholic University of America, Washington, DC

Tradition Kept: The Literature of the Samaritans. By Robert T. Anderson and Terry Giles. Peabody: Hendrickson, 2005, xiv + 432 pp., \$34.95.

The book *Tradition Kept* is both a follow-up and a foundation to Anderson and Giles's earlier work, *The Keepers: An Introduction to the History and Culture of the Samaritans* (Hendrickson, 2002). *The Keepers* provides an historical overview of the Samaritans that gives a context for the literature contained in *Tradition Kept*. However, one need not have read the earlier book to benefit from their newer work. *Tradition Kept* covers the literature of the Samaritans and is comprehensive but not exhaustive, since major works are merely sampled.

As might be expected, the first work covered is the Samaritan Pentateuch (SP). The authors observe that it is "the sacred text of the Samaritans. It is the basic source of Samaritanism. . . . [it] gives the Samaritan community its identity and begins the Samaritan story" (p. xii). As such, it is perhaps telling that apparently the SP developed late in the Hasmonaean period (late second to early first century BC), becoming fixed in the second century AD, although the oldest extant manuscript seems to date from the eleventh or twelfth century. The one thing most biblical scholars might be aware of concerning this work is that it reflects a different textual tradition than the Massoretic Text (MT) and its differences address (and support) the Samaritans' religious distinctions from Judaism. According to the authors, when the SP became known in seventeenth-century Europe, certain affinities to the LXX embroiled it in the Catholic-Protestant debates since Catholics preferred the LXX and Protestants the MT. As they trace the textual development, the authors note that "the SP reads, in fact, closer to the MT than to the LXX" (p. 8). They argue the SP is another textual tradition arising during the same period as the MT, the LXX, and 4Q Exod from the Dead Sea Scrolls (DSS). In the process, they imply that each of the four branches is of equal value and none can claim a priority (p. 5). One reason for this is commonalities between the SP and the DSS suggesting that the Samaritans did not create all of the readings alternate to the MT (p. 42). At the same time, however, they assert that the "Samaritan scribe felt free to follow either MT Deuteronomy or MT Exodus when need demanded" (p. 40). This seems to suggest a priority to the MT.

Interestingly, given its importance ("the importance of the SP as a living and vibrant part of the Samaritan community cannot be overstated," p. 3), the writers devote relatively little space to the SP (approximately 10% of the overall book). Even then, most of their discussion of the SP focuses on its overall characteristics and how it differs from the MT. When they actually discuss the text, they give but brief samples demonstrating significant textual differences.

Following the survey of the SP, the bulk of the book covers other lesser-known items of Samaritan literature. Again, these works are not given in whole. However, major sections are cited, giving the reader a good feel for the overall picture. These are supplemented with evaluations of the works as a whole. The first of these is the Samaritan Joshua (SJ). Like the OT book Joshua, it picks up the story of early Israel after the death of Moses. Unlike the OT Joshua, SJ continues on to the time of the Romans, finishing with the career of one of the most noted Samaritan leaders, Baba Rabba (third century AD). As written, the final product is dated to the thirteenth century AD, although parts of it seem to be dated earlier. The book is rounded out with *Kitab al-Tarikh* (or the *Annals of Abu'l Fath*), additional Samaritan Chronicles, and then several minor works that cover Samaritan theology and worship (such as *Tibat Marqe*), finishing with miscellaneous texts such as amulets and inscriptions.

The authors state that their goal is to provide "a window into the Samaritan self-understanding" (p. xiii), and they seem to do a good job of that. The translations are very

readable. Their observations are generally pertinent and helpful, providing valuable insight into a sect and ethnic group mentioned in both Testaments.

On the other hand, a couple of statements make the reader pause. For example, the writers assert, "The SP has provided significant evidential support to the Documentary Hypothesis for the construction of the Pentateuch" (pp. 46–47). It seems a stretch to argue that the fact the SP represents a variant textual tradition dating to the second century BC gives "significant evidential support" to the idea that the Pentateuch was pieced together from four or more sources several centuries earlier. This is especially true when, as the authors point out, a number of those variations were theologically driven (e.g. worship was to be at Gerizim and Ebal and not Jerusalem, or anthropomorphisms were removed) and thus apparently deliberate (p. 31), or they represented grammatical "updates" on the MT (p. 21). In fact, the evidence Anderson and Giles present seems to argue just the opposite, although this is a point that clearly needs more study.

Beyond this, it is fascinating to read how the Samaritans viewed themselves and tried to defend their perspective on worship. Beyond the Pentateuch they did not admit as Scripture any Hebrew books. They wrote other works that give a different view of the history of Israel from the time after the conquest. It seems apparent the Samaritans revised the textual evidence to support their position. For example, Joshua is called a "king" who built a fortress at Samaria and a "synagogue" on Mount Gerizim (p. 101). Likewise, he put to death a Haman, "king of the Persians" (p. 102). Samuel is called "the magician and the infidel" (p. 128). In SJ the entire monarchical period is skipped over, including the Assyrian conquest of the Northern Kingdom (p. 129). Elijah is claimed to have drowned in the Jordan (p. 162). And the OT prophets (e.g. Isaiah, Hosea, and Micah) were viewed as "pretenders" (p. 229).

It also becomes evident how little we know about the political and religious tensions present in Palestine during the centuries between Ezra and Nehemiah and the NT period. The *Kitab al-Tarikh* makes a big point about how Ezra and Nehemiah changed the script. It views the copying of the OT into the Aramaic script as "tamper[ing] with the Holy Law" (p. 169). It is also evident that there is a significant Islamic influence in the later Samaritan works. For example, SJ states that Moses invested Joshua with the "Califate over his people" (p. 67), and Aaron's son Eleazar is called an *imam* (p. 69).

Overall, the book provides a good overview of the Samaritan corpus of literature. As such, the *Tradition Kept* is an important reference work, especially for intertestamental and NT studies.

Michael A. Harbin
Taylor University, Upland, IN

Old Testament Ethics for the People of God. By Christopher J. H. Wright. Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 2004, 520 pp., \$30.00.

This volume is a major revision of Christopher Wright's 1983 important publication, *An Eye for an Eye: The Place of Old Testament Ethics Today* (IVP; in the UK, *Living as the People of God: The Relevance of Old Testament Ethics*). This volume contains the original preface, as well as a new one for this edition.

At the time of the appearance of *An Eye for an Eye* there had been a long-time dearth of significant research in the field of OT ethics. The situation has changed considerably, however, in the last couple of decades. The last few years especially have witnessed the

appearance of a number of thoughtful works, such as Gordon Wenham's *Story as Torah* (T & T Clark, 2000), Cyril Rodd's *Glimpses of a Strange Land* (T & T Clark, 2001), Robin Perry's *Old Testament Story and Christian Ethics* (Paternoster, 2004), and the volume edited by William Brown, *Character and Scripture* (Eerdmans, 2002). Other works are on the horizon, such as M. Daniel Carroll R. and Jacqueline Lapsley (eds.), *Character Ethics and Biblical Interpretation: Appropriating the Old Testament for Moral Life* (Westminster John Knox, 2006). Each of these deals with the multiple complex issues related to OT ethics in a sophisticated fashion, often utilizing other disciplines to illumine (or sometimes to question) the biblical text and probe it for insights for life.

Old Testament Ethics for the People of God enhances *An Eye for an Eye* in several ways. Some discussions are expanded and updated, more footnotes are included, and each chapter closes with a helpful bibliography for further reading. Wright has attached an entirely new section (Part 3, chaps. 12–14) that is heavily based on another publication, *Walking in the Ways of the Lord* (IVP, 1995). He also includes an appendix that engages the perennially difficult problem of the conquest narratives and the command to eliminate the Canaanites. This work concludes with an extensive bibliography, which amalgamates the earlier bibliographies, and with indices of Scripture references, authors, and subjects.

Wright understands that there are important distinctions to be made in the formulation of OT ethics. On the one hand, the actual behavior and beliefs of the general populace of ancient Israel should not be confused with what the biblical writers and other like-minded Israelites presented as the way of the Lord. On the other hand, that material must be properly situated within the fuller theological and ethical perspective of the canon. Each of these three areas requires attention. The first reveals the moral habits of Israelite society; the second is grounded in the person, word, and deeds of Israel's God and points to the proper motivations and purposes of Israel's moral life; the third is the ultimate basis for working out how to appropriate the OT for modern life.

To accomplish this last task Wright proposes a paradigm approach. He builds his study on a three-pronged matrix of God (the theological angle), Israel (the social angle), and the land (the economic angle). The laws and organization of the society that was biblical Israel, he argues, were designed to reflect enduring divine moral principles within that specific historical context. This chosen community was to be a model—a paradigm—for the surrounding nations of how God's demands for living might be incarnated in society and economic and political structures. Israel's election, in other words, was to an ethical agenda for the world. Passages such as Gen 12:1–3, Exod 19:4–6, and Deut 4:5–8 are keys for establishing this conviction. But that paradigm is not confined to the distant past; its implications continue to speak across the centuries. This scheme, accordingly, is developed with further overlapping triangles. At its broadest application (God-humanity-the earth), Wright's foundational triangle is extrapolated to offer lessons to all societies. At the same time, ancient Israel stands in a typological relationship to the Church (God-the Church-*koinonia*), and the OT's moral directives are to be fleshed out within Christian communities around the world. Finally, the model points to an eschatological future, when redemption will be complete and those ideals fully realized (God-redeemed humanity-the new creation).

Wright's method focuses particularly on the social dimensions of the OT material. Wright does devote one chapter (chap. 11) to the individual, but he rightly emphasizes that personal ethics are inseparable from and must be defined *vis-à-vis* the communal. He also emphasizes that his book is not concerned with resolving the ethical problems of the OT; instead, his concern is to develop a comprehensive framework for processing *how* to appreciate and take on its moral vision. In *Old Testament Ethics for the People of God* Wright accomplishes this goal in commendable fashion. He points the way beyond haphazard searches for ethical principles to deal with modern quandaries or

the common tendency to reduce OT ethics to questions about the Law. Wright also deals extensively with topics of vital importance that sometimes are not handled adequately by evangelicals, such as ecology and the poor.

A work of this size and scope always contains details with which one will disagree, lacunae that seem overlooked, and interpretations that surprise. I list the following as examples. For instance, even though the survey of recent scholarship is quite current (chapter 13), the review of historical approaches (chapter 12) is a bit out of date; theonomy is not nearly as prominent now as it was in the 1980s, and dispensationalism has developed in innovative ways since that time. Second, Oliver O'Donovan's work, *The Desire of the Nations* (Cambridge University Press, 1996), is cited with approval in several places, but Wright appears to miss that in that book O'Donovan champions a more Constantinian perspective on the relationship between Church and state—a position that does not square well with Wright's own views. One wonders, too, how a premillennial view of the OT promises might fit into Wright's scheme, which is essentially amillennial. I do not see this as necessarily problematic, but Wright nowhere entertains the option—though perhaps this is not unexpected in light of his British background. His argument in favor of a kingship mandate instead of a stewardship view of the created order should be a healthy (and welcome) challenge to many, while his functional view of the Fall might catch others unawares (pp. 121–31). OT research now is not so confident of the existence of a Canaanite fertility cult, but Wright mentions it on occasion to contrast it with Israelite religion. Finally, I would also have liked to see a more in-depth engagement with views that question the ideology of the biblical text. Wright is aware of these and does cite such authors (dealing mostly with Rodd's work), but he does not respond substantively to feminist approaches that are extremely relevant to discussions on the authority of the OT. He does close the appendix on the Conquest narratives with the promise for a future book on such matters. This is good news, and one looks forward to that constructive publication from such a seasoned hand in the field.

I highly recommend *Old Testament Ethics for the People of God*, and I, for one, will use it as a textbook for my seminary class on OT social ethics. The book is not difficult to read, is quite full in scope, and irenic in tone. We are in debt to Wright for a job well done.

M. Daniel Carroll R.
Denver Seminary, Denver, CO

Reconstructing Old Testament Theology: After the Collapse of History. By Leo G. Perdue. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2005, xvi + 399 pp., \$20.00 paper.

In this work, Perdue intends to build on a conversation he started in his earlier volume, *The Collapse of History* (1994), as his subtitle suggests. Perdue's methodology is to review and glean from several different contemporary approaches to OT (or biblical) theology. At first glance, Perdue's chosen approaches seem eclectic or perhaps even marginal. However, Perdue attempts to show how each of the diverse methods contributes in its own right and how together these perspectives provide a formidable alternative to older historical approaches to biblical studies.

Perdue surveys the developing relationship between *Religionsgeschichte* and biblical theology with special attention to developments from the last third of the twentieth century. In what may be his most constructive section, Perdue wades through various models for the place of the history of religion in biblical theology. He concludes that the

history of religion will not be illuminating to contemporary faith unless the biblical theologian takes the data gleaned from the past and couples it with current contexts for a dialogue that may produce “a Word that is decisive for faith and life” (p. 74).

Perdue surveys various liberation theologians who delve into biblical theology and highlights the work of Fernando Segovia. Segovia’s intercultural criticism and the treatment of the biblical text as “other” are paradigmatic for biblical theology in liberation (especially Hispanic) contexts. The result is a reader-response hermeneutic with a dialogue focused on the “otherness” of the original audience of the biblical texts with its contemporary oppressed readers.

Perdue demonstrates that feminist theology’s interest in history can result in a hermeneutics of suspicion, which attempts to identify patriarchal attempts to suppress women’s voices in a text. Moreover, Perdue shows that there is some divergence among feminist, womanist, and *mujerista* theologies. Some feminists have moved away from historical approaches to a literary approach that has special interest in the use of metaphor. Many womanist scholars agree with Renita Weems’s reader-response approach. *Mujerista* theologians take up the issues of their male liberation theologian counterparts. They address further concerns such as social location and solidarity among Hispanic women.

Perdue comments on the growth of Jewish biblical theology and how current scholarship fills the dearth once noted by Jon Levenson. Perdue notes that scholars such as Benjamin Sommer and Michael Fishbane grapple with the perennial questions of the status and relationship of the written and oral Torah that face any endeavor in Jewish biblical theology. Perdue proposes that Fishbane’s methodology might be the best model for furthering Jewish biblical theology. Of special interest to Perdue is Fishbane’s tracing of tradition and the imaginative mythmaking found in inter-biblical exegesis.

Postmodern biblical theologies are evaluated in chapter 7, with Walter Brueggemann serving as one of the main exemplars. Interestingly, Perdue notes that Brueggemann is not fully postmodern, but does affirm meaning as multi-faceted and contextual. For Brueggemann, meaning is assessed through the use of imagination and the acceptance of the open-ended dialectic of OT texts.

The last theologies Perdue surveys are a conglomerate of “contextual” theologies in postcolonial societies such as Senegal and India. In many ways similar to the liberation theology of Segovia, these theologies address the unique contexts of societies reemerging after the waning of capitalist colonialism. These surroundings affect the reading and interpretation of the texts, as theologians strive to overcome elitism and sense the need to forge a culturally relevant theology that pursues equity.

Perdue demonstrates openness to the value of many contemporary approaches to biblical theology, with the notable exception of the “canonical method.” One might fault Perdue for his dismissive view of Brevard Childs and other purveyors of the canonical method. Perdue claims scholars such as Childs who follow Barth’s repudiation of the history of religion for theology have “few devotees in the present world of biblical theology” (p. 60). As a result, Perdue devotes his attention to other approaches that evince some incorporation of history of religion, albeit highly contextualized.

A useful feature of Perdue’s work is his use of Jeremiah as a case study for the various approaches he surveys. His application of diverse methods to the sample text allows the reader a tangible application of the methodology. Choosing Jeremiah as the standard example makes it possible to make further comparisons of how the various approaches would handle a text.

The immense diversity among the biblical theologies Perdue reviews perhaps overshadows a central thesis, though Perdue’s proposal persists. He intends a biblical theology that first gleans from historical work and eventually moves to dialogue between “the ever-changing meaning of texts” and the cultural context of the interpreter/reader.

At a more basic level, Perdue's work serves an in-depth introduction to biblical theologies outside the typical evangelical reading patterns, thereby extending the horizons of biblical theology discussions.

Jason K. Lee
Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, Ft. Worth, TX

Rewriting Moses: The Narrative Eclipse of the Text. By Brian Britt. New York: T & T Clark, 2004, 208 pp., \$49.95 paper, \$130.00 hardcover.

Using a method developed by Walter Benjamin and the Freudian premise that traditions preserve what they repress, Brian Britt attempts to show how post-biblical accounts of Moses in a variety of mediums have subverted or rewritten the biblical portrait of Moses. Benjamin spoke of the "aura" of a text, that is, the text reflects the viewer's gaze, becomes more distant the closer one looks, and gathers involuntary memories around it. With this grid, Britt investigates post-biblical usage of Moses to see how the biblical tradition of Moses is engaged in perennial questions about myth, sacred texts, and the nature of tradition.

In Part I, Britt devotes a chapter each to a discussion of Moses in modern novels, films, biblical scholarship, and art. Thirty-four novels were written about Moses between 1859 and 1998 (chap. 1, "Subverting the Great Man: Violence and Magic in Moses Fiction"). These novels mostly make a heroic figure of Moses and ignore the text. Films have to simplify the complex biblical picture by "doubling" Moses (chap. 2, "Double-Moses: Gender and the Sacred in Moses Films"). Doubling is defined as splitting the ambiguities of Moses' biblical character in two and projecting one part onto another character in the film. For example, the biblical text is ambiguous about whether Moses is Hebrew or Egyptian. In "The Ten Commandments" (1956 version), Moses is a quite masculine Egyptian in the first half but an asexual Hebrew in the second. In "The Prince of Egypt," Rameses and Moses are doubles of each other. Rameses is the bully brother, seeking the father's approval, while Moses is the softer, gentle figure, loving Rameses to the end. Chapter 3 suggests modern scholarship mainly searches for the legend behind the biblical person. Chapter 4 compares the veiling of Moses in Exodus 34 and depictions in art. Veiling suggests concealment, silence, and absence in revelation. Most of the art that deals with this episode shows Moses unveiled or only half-veiled. Britt concludes that the tradition could not handle the idea of concealed prophecy and revelation.

Part II of the book is devoted to a study of biblical texts on Moses. Chapter 5 offers a new interpretation of Moses' "heavy mouth" in Exod 4:10–17. His professed inability to speak enhances his writing role and elevates him above the status of ordinary prophet. Chapter 6 investigates the link between Torah and song in Deuteronomy 31–32 and its implications for the writing of Torah. Chapter 7 is an exegesis of Deuteronomy 32 and 33 to show how they connect written tradition and the death of Moses. The final chapter offers a reflection on the birth and death accounts of Moses and what they suggest to us about writing and memory.

Britt concludes Moses is both a writer and a person written about. Ultimately the lines blur, so that Moses as writer and Moses as a text written become the same. For Britt, Moses resides in the writing. Extra-biblical interpretations of Moses miss this vital point and have focused on Moses either as a hero or as a subject through which to promote ideology and attack culture.

Britt provides an interesting look at how biblical characters can become cultural icons and vehicles for entertainment and polemic that bear little resemblance to the text. His discussion of the Moses of the biblical texts often offers thoughtful suggestions on what the texts really want us to know about Moses. For example, he observes that the Pentateuch is more interested in what Moses wrote than what he did. However, his exegesis is marred by modern theories of sources (chap. 6). Even he cannot escape some of the ways modern scholarship has eclipsed the biblical text.

It is not clear to me who the intended audience of this book is. Part I would appeal to those interested in the arts, the Bible, and cultural synthesis, while Part II would appeal to OT scholars. However, the cost of the book outweighs its value, especially for those on the book-buying budget of the average scholar.

Gary H. Hall
Lincoln Christian Seminary, Lincoln, IL

The Reshaping of Ancient Israelite History in Chronicles. By Isaac Kalimi. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2005, 473 pp., \$48.50.

This book is of particular significance for members of a society whose doctrinal basis is that “[t]he Bible alone, and the Bible in its entirety, is the Word of God written and is therefore inerrant in the autographs.” The Chronicler used as his main source for his history writings that were canonized as prophetic history. Kalimi examines the Chronicler’s sources, instructive for the history of the biblical text, in order to “identify and define the literary and historiographical forms and techniques by which the author of Chronicles . . . shaped the texts that he took from Samuel-Kings” (p. 2). He examines the use of various devices used in recounting the history of the Davidic kingdom and their uniqueness in biblical historiography. The Samuel-Kings accounts were “not simply canonical for the Chronicler, who did not treat them as immutable, sealed books that one could only strive to explain and comprehend in their given form” (p. 7). These books served as material for the Chronicler as a historian, who created a new work from existing historiographical materials.

Kalimi has organized his study so as to treat the historiographical emendations first and the literary ones last, with features closely related to both types considered between them. The final chapter gives consideration to modifications introduced by the Chronicler that generated a disharmony with other texts, both within his own work as well as other biblical books. Kalimi categorizes and systematizes the methods of the Chronicler, providing a comprehensive analysis that is helpful in providing a methodological context for individual examples, as well as a comprehensive sense of the historiographical techniques employed in the composition.

Chronicles is arguably one of the most helpful texts in understanding the methods of an ancient historian, because the largest portions of his sources are preserved for us. Even so, at many points the actual procedure of the Chronicler remains a matter of interpretive debate, since his actual text often cannot be known and his own thinking in relation to what he considered a descriptive history must be inferred. An example is the Chronicler declaring that Hiram gave Solomon twenty cities, which Solomon rebuilt and resettled with Israelite people (2 Chr 8:2). The source of the Chronicler states the opposite (1 Kgs 9:11–13): Solomon gave Hiram cities. Kalimi classifies this as an example of removing internal contradictions in Samuel–Kings (pp. 40–42). Kings declares that God had promised Solomon wealth and honor like no other previous king (1 Kgs 3:13); the Chronicler extends this to be true for all kings after Solomon (2 Chr 1:12). The Chronicler also would have regarded it as wrong for Israelite cities to be handed over

to foreign rule. According to Kalimi, the Chronicler “touched up” (quotation marks Kalimi’s) the narrative in the early historiography to make it say exactly the opposite. However, neither the Kings text nor its interpretation by the Chronicler is self-evident.

The text in Kings is ambiguous on the circumstances of this mercantile activity; the connecting adverb *ו* is asyndetic (1 Kgs 9:11). Solomon had not reneged on his contract; the territorial allotment was a part of other commercial dealings. If the Chronicler had found this to be an internal contradiction, he could have simply omitted this episode. He does omit the fact that Hiram gave Solomon one hundred twenty talents of gold (v. 14), which surely would have admirably suited his purpose. For these reasons there is legitimate question as to how the Chronicler interpreted his text, weighing what for him would have been the historical probability of his source. Throughout, the Chronicler views the relationship between Solomon and Hiram as one of superior and subordinate (2 Chr 2:14). That Solomon should have given territory to Hiram, and that Hiram might have expressed dissatisfaction, would have been improbable to the Chronicler. His statement that Solomon resettled the cities with Israelites is unique in biblical literature. His depiction of such resettlement as part of routine peacetime activity was likely conditioned by his own historical experience. In this respect the Chronicler was not different or less objective than any historian; sources can only be interpreted according to the author’s own experience and perceptions.

Kalimi’s work is particularly helpful in demonstrating the importance of literary methods used by the Chronicler: “Many of the changes that the Chronicler made in the early sources that he used can be explained, not by a particular opinion or outlook that he may have held, but by the literary technique that he decided to apply” (p. 406). These include many examples of chiasmic structures (pp. 215–31), presentation of textual components in an order that is the reverse of another literary context (pp. 232–74), various types of repetition (pp. 275–94), *inclusio* (pp. 295–324), lines of contrast between the deeds or fate of two characters (pp. 325–49), simile (pp. 350–55), key words (pp. 356–61), use of numbers to mark a decisive component (pp. 362–68), and various ways of moving between general and specific (pp. 369–80). Recognizing such techniques has significant implications for evaluation of sources. For instance, the Chronicler lists David’s first four sons as children of Bathsheba, with Solomon being the fourth (1 Chr 3:5–8). Samuel–Kings knows of only two sons of Bathsheba. Kalimi shows that this is a numerical literary pattern of three-four, in which the fourth element is made most significant. It is unlikely the Chronicler knows of a separate tradition of the sons of David, or that the phrase “four by Bath-shua, daughter of Ammiel” was a late interpolation. The Chronicler simply wanted to stress the significance of Solomon, the chosen successor to David.

Kalimi believes his analysis of the historiographical and literary work of the Chronicler “shows that inconsistencies and exceptions in the widespread reworking of earlier sources are not always evidence of additions and editing carried out by later writers” (p. 381). Though this point has been made in reevaluating typical source-critical analysis, Kalimi offers numerous credible examples in his last chapter; he categorizes these as inconsistencies in adapting an earlier text, changes leading to disharmony, and historical mistakes. The last category was often a failure to understand terms. For example, in Kings “ships of Tarshish” are a type of merchant boat that sailed the Mediterranean; the Chronicler makes these “ships sailing to Tarshish” (2 Chr 9:21; 2 Chr 20:36–37).

Historians, literary critics, biblical theologians, and exegetes stand in great debt to Kalimi, not only for help in understanding Chronicles, but also for analysis of all biblical texts.

A. H. Konkell

Providence Theological Seminary, Otterburne, Manitoba

The Book of Proverbs: Chapters 15–31. By Bruce K. Waltke. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005, xxxiii + 589 pp., \$50.00.

The Book of Proverbs: Chapters 15–31 is the second half of Bruce Waltke's NICOT commentary on Proverbs. Like its companion (*The Book of Proverbs: Chapters 1–15*), this volume is first-rate in nearly every respect. (See my review of the first volume in *JETS* 48 [2005] 628–30). Together, the two works form a model for what a solid OT exegetical commentary should provide: a fresh translation with extensive text-critical notes; a discussion of the structure and poetic features of each section; extensive comments on key Hebrew words and relevant Hebrew syntax; discussion of parallels in ANE literature; judicious interaction with relevant modern and older scholarly views; a clear unfolding of the meaning of each verse; and relevant application.

The publisher explains the commentary was originally planned and written as a single volume, but length dictated that it be broken into two. Indeed, the first volume is 728 pages (including front matter) and this volume is 622 pages. The two books really must be read together, since no introduction or bibliography appears in the second volume. (In the first volume, the introduction is 133 pages long and the bibliography an additional 38 pages.)

This division of the work leads to two minor difficulties. First, the title of the second volume indicates coverage of chapters 15–31, but in reality the commentary begins at 15:30, covering only the last 4 verses of chapter 15. Why did the publishers not end the first volume at the end of a chapter, rather than split the chapter into two unequal parts? For example, it would have made far more sense for volume 1 to cover the introduction plus chapters 1–13 (a total of 664 pages, including the front matter) and then volume 2 would cover chapters 14–31 (a total of 685 pages). This suggestion would have prevented the awkward overlapping in the titles of the two volumes (both containing chap. 15). Second, and more importantly, the indices to volume 2 only cover the material in that volume. It would have been far more helpful to include complete indices (subjects, authors, Scripture references, and Hebrew words) to both volumes at the end of volume 2. In this manner, a person wishing to look up a subject such as “speech” would only need to refer to one index to see the references in the entire two-volume set.

As in the first volume, each section of Waltke's commentary begins with a fresh translation and notes on the Hebrew text and significant differences in the versions (especially the LXX). His text-critical discussions are excellent. He emends the Hebrew text only occasionally, and not without significant discussion. For example, he emends a כ (‘‘from, than’’) to a כ (‘‘like’’) in Prov 18:19; emends ‘‘harlot’’ to ‘‘unchaste wife’’ in 23:27; and emends the MT slightly in 25:27b, 28:16, 18, and 23. In a very thorough discussion (the footnote is over a page long) Waltke emends ‘‘formerly’’ to ‘‘thirty’’ in 22:20 (with the 30 sayings then paralleling the 30 chapters of *The Wisdom of Amenemope*). Whether one agrees with Waltke here or not, the discussion is fair and thorough. The same is true for Waltke's convincing emendation in 30:1 of the second occurrence of ‘‘to Ithiel’’ in the MT to ‘‘I am weary, O God,’’ and taking the following word as a verb (‘‘I can prevail’’) rather than a proper noun. Waltke has a half-page footnote on this issue in the translation section, followed by another long footnote in the exegesis section (pp. 455–56, 467–68).

Notes on the translation do not merely deal with variants or proposed emendations. Often they deal with a grammatical point (usually with a reference to Waltke and O'Connor's *Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax*), a poetic device (e.g. recognition of sarcasm in Prov 19:27), or the meaning of a particular word (e.g. his nearly full-page footnote on לְנִצָּחַן in Prov 21:28, where he understands it to mean ‘‘successfully’’ rather than ‘‘forever’’; or his half-page discussion of כֶּסֶף סִיגָה in 26:23, preferring ‘‘silver dross’’ instead of ‘‘glaze’’).

Next, Waltke discusses the structure of each section. In Proverbs, this is no easy task, since the rationale behind the arrangement of each proverb and the relationship of one proverb to the next is not always easy to discern. At points I am not convinced the “catchwords” or *inclusios* Waltke proposes are actually deliberate markers in the text (perhaps at times he is guilty of overlinking), but overall his approach is a welcome change to the common tendency to view each proverb from 10:1–31:9 as a distinct entity unrelated to its context. Often Waltke will bring out key poetic features of each section as well (assonance, consonance, alliteration, paronomasia, chiasm, and more).

The heart of the commentary is Waltke’s careful verse-by-verse exposition of the text. Here Waltke includes numerous references to ANE literature (primarily Egyptian and Babylonian texts), further poetic features, excellent word studies, helpful background information, and detailed interaction with secondary literature on the verse/topic at hand. To give an idea of the level of detail, 2177 footnotes adorn this volume alone! Many of the footnotes are explanatory, not simply citations. Sometimes Waltke provides so much detail on so many levels that the effect is a bit overwhelming, and the transitions are not always smooth. But in general Waltke’s style of writing is excellent, considering the volume of information he conveys in any given paragraph.

Often my students will ask me for the “one” book that will help them understand the background of the OT better. There is, of course, no such book, but commentaries often provide much relevant background information. Such is the case with this commentary. The following are but a few of the Proverbs topics that Waltke ably elucidates: bribes (17:8); bears (17:12); wine and beer (20:10); plowing in Palestine (20:4); the ear/hearing and the eye/seeing (20:12–13); usury in the ANE (22:7); arrows (25:18); dogs (26:11, 17); lions (26:13); doors (26:14); couches (26:14); incense (27:9); mercy (28:13); leaders (28:16); locusts (30:27); and flax (31:13).

It is hard in this brief space to communicate the thoroughness or helpfulness of Waltke’s discussions. A few treatments will be mentioned. Waltke has an excellent, balanced four-page discussion of Prov 22:6 (“dedicate a youth according to his way”), providing various translation and interpretation options. Similarly, he has a full discussion of the superscription on 25:1 (“the proverbs of Solomon which the men of Hezekiah king of Judah copied and collected”), showing that Solomonic authorship of the proverbs is clearly attested in 700 BC. Waltke’s treatment of friendship and privacy in Prov 25:17 and its connection with 25:16 is excellent: “Friendship ripens through discreet sensitivity not to intrude on privacy and to allow space for the other person to be a person in his own right, not through self-enjoyment, impetuosity, or imposition. . . . As the son had to learn by experience the limits of his own tolerance for honey [Prov 25:16], he must also learn by experience his neighbor’s level of tolerance for him” (p. 327). The two apparently contradictory proverbs in 26:4–5 (“Don’t answer a fool according to his folly . . . Answer a fool according to his folly”) are well treated by Waltke: “It is unfitting to meet the fool’s insult with insult,” yet “the wise person must expose the fool’s distortions to serve his own interests at the expense of the community and must not silently accept it and thereby contribute to establishing his topsy-turvy world against the rule of God” (p. 349). And Waltke provides an excellent seven-page discussion of the structure, genre, and meaning of Prov 31:10–31, the valiant wife. He rightly concludes that she “belongs in the historical, not the allegorical, realm” (p. 518).

The book is amazingly free of errors. I found only one typographical error: on p. 217 the first eleven sayings are stated to be from 22:16–23:11, but it should be 22:17. Yet, as in the first volume, Waltke often uses a loose citation style. Instead of citing the original source, he will sometimes cite a secondary one and occasionally none at all. For instance, on p. 16 he quotes from Shakespeare but does not indicate where it is from (*Hamlet*, Act V, scene ii, lines 10–11); he cites the *Mishnah* without a footnote (p. 37); changes a quotation from Bridges slightly (p. 37); quotes “Abraham Lincoln’s witticism” (p. 64)

without footnote (and this saying has been ascribed to Lincoln, Mark Twain, and Ben Franklin, among others!); quotes Tennyson but cites Kidner (p. 72); quotes Shakespeare again without giving the source (cites Aitkin, but the quotation is from *Henry VIII*, Act 3, scene ii, lines 358–63); cites a Latin proverb and references Plaut's commentary, but the proverb is from Plautus, *Truculentus*, 885; quotes Zohary but cites Meinhold (p. 385); quotes the Talmud, but cites an article in *NIDOTTE* (p. 394); puts quotation marks around a citation from McCane, but the quotation is slightly altered (changes "God is shrouded in mystery" to "both are shrouded in mystery," p. 470); and mentions Livy's recounting of Lucretia's diligence, but cites Gottlieb, not the primary source, Livy's *History of Rome*, 1.57 (p. 526). It is hard to understand, in a work so generally careful in detail, how these loose or inaccurate citations escaped the notice of Waltke and his editors.

In summary (with apologies to Prov 31:10), who can find a valiant commentary? Her price is far beyond rubies! Waltke's commentary on Proverbs may not be perfect, but it is very, very close. Serious students of Proverbs should not hesitate to purchase the set (along with, perhaps, Paul Koptak's *Proverbs* in the NIV Application Commentary series, which provides rich application). Waltke has produced a masterpiece, abounding in rich detail and judicious insight.

Todd S. Beall
Capital Bible Seminary, Lanham, MD

The Use of Παῖς in the New Testament. By J. William Johnston. Studies in Biblical Greek 11. New York: Peter Lang, 2004, pp. xvi + 222, \$64.95.

This revised doctoral dissertation from Dallas Theological Seminary adds a further volume to the Studies in Biblical Greek series. The introduction, chapter 1, purports to establish the need for study of *pas* and then offers an extensive history of discussion, noting roughly twenty-six previous treatments (including lexicons, grammars, monographs, articles, and one previous doctoral dissertation). The second chapter is given to method, where Johnston distinguishes between the sense and scope of *pas*. Sense is concerned with what he calls the "syntactical-semantic level" and scope with the "exegetical-contextual level" (p. 33). Chapter 3 classifies all of the uses in the NT, divided broadly into *pas* with substantives and independent uses. The fourth and final chapter treats thirteen selected, significant passages. The volume concludes with two appendices, one with textual variations and the other with a list of all of the *pas* constructions, and a bibliography. The results of this study may well prove helpful to those who are in need of the "right" translation of *pas* in a given instance (especially examples cited in chap. 4), but the method, or rather methods, employed provide very little firm foundation for future work.

Johnston unfortunately begins shakily, when the basis for his study is grounded in the supposed fact that "the need is felt to provide a systematic treatment" of the use of *pas* (p. 1). However, he then claims, "My study is not so much a revolution in the understanding of *pas* as it is a refinement of the (for the most part correct) 'gut instinct' of NT exegetes" (p. 2). It is debatable whether his survey of treatments of *pas* establishes a "felt need" for his study, but I am pretty sure he never resolves the tension between attempting a systematic treatment and simply reinforcing previous exegetical conclusions.

Johnston's method reveals the difficulties he creates for himself. He first begins by accepting the terminology and differentiation of Reicke and Bertram found in *TDNT*

(vol. 5, p. 887): wholative, summative, implicative, and elative, as well as generic and categorical. This “exegetical-contextual” terminology is used throughout his treatment, despite his introduction of other methods and terminology. It seems to me that the use of these terms simply begs the question of what Johnston should be trying to do—provide a systematic treatment of the use of *pas*—by adopting someone else’s terminology that is based on translational understanding in a given context. In his method chapter, Johnston seems to introduce several more competing methodological constructs. One of these is his differentiation between sense and scope, noted above. In some ways this is a differentiation of semantics and pragmatics (it is unclear to me why he does not begin with this terminology), except that he wishes to include syntactical criteria and more in his notion of sense and simply translational categorization in scope. Later Johnston surveys two syntactical schemes (Mayser with four and Reicke and Bertram with two categories) but instead introduces a complex syntactical classification scheme. This scheme has to be seen to be believed, as it includes seven major classes, thirty-four subclasses and differentiation of singular and plural (so sixty-eight syntactical subclasses?). This is not only virtually unusable (and difficult to remember), but unnecessary (and in some instances probably wrong).

Another set of methodological principles is derived from Daniel Wallace’s *Greek Grammar beyond the Basics* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996) 1–11. This is not a review of Wallace’s book, but despite Wallace’s claim that this section is for teachers and professors, it is simply inadequate as a method for doctoral research—besides the fact that there are a number of questionable concepts in it. One of the questionable notions that Johnston adopts is the distinction between the “unaffected or ontological” and “affected or phenomenological” meaning of a construction (p. 44). Disclaimers to the contrary, this gives to semantics a metaphysical substance that it simply does not have and renders the divide between semantics and pragmatics substantial rather than perspectival. Nevertheless, Johnston does unload quite a bit on the sense of the word as he defines it. He has a section on structural and semantic features that are important in determining the sense of *pas* (pp. 43–57). These include structural criteria, lexical criteria (count/mass and abstract nouns—although these categories are not always clear), contextual criteria (including a confusing discussion of referentiality, in which this is seen as a discourse feature regarding a particular individual or class; p. 49), and stylistic and genre criteria. It appears that the category of sense has clearly usurped the notion of scope, and gone even further. Concerning scope, Johnston essentially reiterates Reicke and Bertram by saying that there are “four basic scopes of *pas*” (p. 35), providing essentially glosses on uses. These “scopes” are often what end up being debated throughout the rest of the book when examples are treated.

It is not surprising that, without a clear or firm methodological foundation, the results of Johnston’s study are not crisp and precise. His study of NT uses focuses upon differentiating between articular and anarthrous uses in conjunction with a count or mass noun. In many instances these criteria are enough to offer a suitable explanation of examples. However, here also is where Johnston’s previous statement regarding reinforcing previous exegetical conclusions seems to come into play. He often weighs the various translations and attempts to come up with an explanation that allows the usual translation to be maintained, even if the use according to the criteria mentioned above would indicate another understanding. There are several problems with this procedure. One is the obvious one of not wishing to challenge standard renderings. Another is that there is perhaps too much emphasis being placed on translation as an indication of understanding. A third is that it often means that the structural criteria are overlooked or overridden. There is a fourth issue, and that is that Johnston sometimes introduces other categories for discussion (e.g. generic words into his discussion of abstract nouns) and thereby complicates the issue further.

The final chapter clearly shows that much of what Johnston is doing is less concerned with the use of *pas* than it is with larger exegetical and even theological questions. For example, his treatment of Matt 3:15 turns more on whether *dikaioynē* is a mass or count noun than the sense of *pas*. In this as well as other examples, Johnston spends more time discussing the attendant theological issues than he does the use of *pas*. A good example of this is his treatment of Matt 12:31, where the discussion is of the unpardonable sin. There are no doubt instances where Johnston arrives at genuinely useful insights. For example, his treatment of Rom 3:23–24 argues for the anaphoric use of *pantes* to indicate believers. This certainly helps to avoid this passage being seen to argue for universalism. His treatment of 2 Tim 3:16 offers insight into understanding the entire clause, even though the key to interpretation is the sense of the term “Scripture,” not *pas*. However, in both examples, the grammatical explanation is based less upon rigorous sense criteria of *pas* than upon Johnston’s invoking a number of contextual (or scope) criteria. The problems with such an appeal are made manifest in Johnston’s treatment of 1 Cor 6:18, where he apparently approvingly cites a statement by Kempthorne that accepts the “natural and unqualified sense” of *pan* (p. 155). Johnston concludes his discussion of this verse with reference to the “ordinary semantics of anarthrous count nouns modified by *pas*” (p. 156). The whole point of the monograph, I thought, was to systematize use, so appealing to the “natural” or “ordinary” sense, as if this is self-explanatory, undermines the entire exercise. Perhaps most disappointing is the treatment of 1 Cor 13:7, where Johnston appears to create an entirely unnecessary problem for himself by asserting that the notion of “believing all things” is difficult because believers are told not to believe every spirit (citing 1 John 4:1; p. 157). As a result, Johnston debates whether the use of *pas* here is adverbial, and finally accepts this explanation. An extraneous biblical-theological concern has apparently dictated his grammatical and exegetical conclusion.

Johnston has certainly helped to lay out some of the issues and put forward one possible way of proceeding with discussion of *pas*. I am not convinced that he has adequately defined a linguistically rigorous method to deal with *pas* and its collocates. Along the way he has added to our understanding of a number of passages due to his regular invocation of contextual criteria. We still await, however, a settled discussion of *pas*.

Stanley E. Porter
McMaster Divinity College, Hamilton, ON, Canada

Narrative Criticism of the New Testament: An Introduction. By James L. Resseguie. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2005, 288 pages, \$22.99 paper.

For at least two decades, many biblical scholars and publishers have claimed that their approach to the Bible is literary. Because most of these claims have represented a rechristening rather than a shift in methodology, I have become skeptical of book titles and advertising blurbs that promise a literary approach to the Bible. James Resseguie’s book delivers on its claims to be a literary approach to NT narrative.

A professor of New Testament at Winebrenner Theological Seminary, Resseguie gives a helpful thumbnail autobiography of his career as a practitioner of literary criticism of the NT. The story begins with Resseguie’s attendance at a summer institute on teaching the Bible as literature that flourished at Indiana University in the 1970s and 80s. Resseguie particularly came under the influence of literary critic Kenneth R. R. Gros Louis, co-director of the institute and professor of English at Indiana University. The

prime methodology that Resseguie absorbed from this induction was the close reading of texts as they exist in themselves.

Resseguie correctly identifies this methodology as an approach known in literary circles as New Criticism but that can be less technically called formalist criticism (indicating an attentiveness to literary form). It can also be called traditional literary criticism as distinct from contemporary approaches. There can be no doubt that the close reading of “the text itself” (the watchword of New Criticism) is at the heart of that approach, but Resseguie would have performed a useful service if he had differentiated among types of close reading. A typical scholarly Bible commentary or study Bible is certainly not devoid of close scrutiny of the details of the text. I had always loosely associated my literary approach to the biblical text as similar to the methods of exegesis (and as different from broadly theological approaches), until a student claimed that my approach was “virtually the opposite” of what she was taught in her exegesis classes. This is something that merits clarification.

The terms of discourse that Resseguie lays out in his preface and then pursues in the book are impeccable in being genuinely literary. The main headings are as follows: rhetorical devices such as repetition, motifs, figures of speech, and many others; the role of setting in stories; techniques of characterization; the dynamics of plot. Each of these is elaborated in great detail, with the author dipping into NT texts (chiefly the Gospels) for illustration. The most obvious virtue of Resseguie’s book is the consistency with which the author applies genuinely literary methods of analysis to the NT.

Despite this admirable quality, I believe that Resseguie slights the topic of literary content (as distinct from form). The subject of literature is human experience, as the whole history of traditional literary criticism has asserted (even though the terminology for asserting it has evolved through the centuries). Resseguie’s book comes at the end of a phase of literary commentary by biblical scholars that has been stuck at the stage of structuralist criticism—the preoccupation with structural patterns and parallels in biblical texts. In much of this commentary, I find it hard to see that the texts being discussed are *about* anything at all. Resseguie’s book breaks the bondage to abstract structural patterns by unleashing the full arsenal of things that comprise literature and narrative form. Still, the prime principle of literature is *meaning through form*. Resseguie gives full treatment to the facets of literary form in the NT. I did not receive much help in seeing what meanings and human experiences are embodied in those forms. This is not an indictment of what Resseguie has done well; I simply record my fear that the significant breakthrough represented by this book may still not have moved literary criticism as practiced by biblical scholars beyond the paradigm that regards literary form and technique as self-rewarding to the exclusion of considerations of meaning and human experience.

The book’s subtitle calls the book “an introduction.” This is an accurate designation, inasmuch as the book is a virtual handbook on narrative analysis. Its chief use, in my view, is as a reference book. Viewed as such, an obvious strength of the book is its thoroughness of coverage, both in regard to the full array of literary features that comprise a literary narrative and the survey of published scholarship (though there is a nearly complete exclusion of evangelical literary critics and a slighting of Northrop Frye, even though much of the author’s methodology is traceable back to Frye). If one wants to get up to speed on narrative analysis, Resseguie’s book is unsurpassed. The methodology of narrative analysis is laid out with marvelous completeness.

Yet this very completeness becomes a liability if one is looking for an actual demonstration of the narrative analysis of the NT. By my taste, there is “too much of it all,” with no firm hand discriminating among the sources that are cited and no distilling of what is most helpful in the mass of scholarship that is adduced. The author’s chief gifts are as a researcher, a compiler, and a definer of literary terms and concepts. I found

that the book perpetuates a syndrome that has characterized biblical scholarship, namely, its tendency toward an atomizing approach to both hermeneutics and the biblical text. I myself would gladly have given up half of the massive data that Resseguie has compiled in exchange for a sequential reading of one of the Gospels.

I return to my commendation of what the book does well: it is an exhaustive guide to published scholarship on narrative analysis as a field in itself and as applied to the NT, and a thorough listing and description of the ingredients of narrative form found in the NT. As such, this book breaks new ground in the consistency with which it approaches NT narrative in genuinely literary terms. The book is also a triumph of research and scholarship.

Leland Ryken
Wheaton College, Wheaton, IL

Resurrecting Jesus: The Earliest Christian Tradition and Its Interpreters. By Dale C. Allison. London: T & T Clark, 2005, xi + 404 pp., \$34.95 paper.

This book by Dale C. Allison of Pittsburgh Theological Seminary is a sequel to his earlier volume *Jesus of Nazareth: Millenarian Prophet* (Fortress, 1998). Although entitled *Resurrecting Jesus*, the book is not in fact a monograph on the resurrection of Jesus. The chapters are based on a collection of lectures and essays on the historical Jesus and early Christianity, with the largest chapter being about the resurrection.

In chapter 1, "Secularizing Jesus," Allison takes issue with the now-standard taxonomy of Jesus research running along the lines of first quest, no quest, new quest, and third quest. He points out that there never was a "no quest" period, with many British and Continental scholars active in Jesus research between the world wars. Allison also finds very little distinctive in the so-called third quest that sets it apart from earlier scholarship. It appears to me that Allison is correct to insist that modern Jesus research is highly complex and resists any neat taxonomy imposed upon it, and that there never was a "no-quest" period. However, in certain circles of the early twentieth century there was a mood that regarded historical study of Jesus as either methodologically impossible or theologically illegitimate. Also, the third quest may not contribute anything that is wholly distinctive (i.e. unprecedented), but it may possess qualities that are distinctive in the sense that they are characteristic of it (e.g. rejection of double dissimilarity, emphasis on eschatology, and emphasis on Jewish background). Allison is correct that we should not subject the past to a "chronological snobbery" in reviews of research (p. 14), but the first-second-third quest overview remains a helpful generalization for introducing students to twentieth-century NT study (see further Michael Bird, "Is There Really a 'Third Quest' for the Historical Jesus," *Scottish Bulletin of Evangelical Theology*, forthcoming). The chapter closes with an observation of how contemporary exegetes have a tendency to shy away from "traditional theological, Christological, and eschatological concerns" (p. 22) in favor of sociological and political interpretations. He responds that the early Christians were devoutly religious, even "otherworldly," and "more interested in prayer than in economics, in eschatological rewards than in Roman politics" (p. 23).

In the second chapter, "The Problem of Audience," Allison attempts to show that many of Jesus' rigorous commands were probably not intended for adherence by a wide audience but for his immediate followers (e.g. meager provisions permitted for mission in Matt 10:1–42) or for specific individuals encountered in specific situations (burial of father in Luke 9:57–60). This is a valid point with serious implications for NT ethics. At the same time, the fact that the evangelists sought to apply these teachings of Jesus

to their contemporary audiences suggests that they thought them relevant to the fabric of Christian ethics and praxis.

"The Problem of Gehenna" is addressed in chapter 3, where Allison notes the tension in having Jesus speak of both God's love and the threat of eternal judgment. He is unconvinced that the warnings of judgment derive from additions to Q by its redactors or from the evangelists; the wide attestation of the theme in the Gospels makes it highly probable that Jesus spoke on judgment. The chapter interacts with reflections on hell from the Church fathers to classics of English literature. Allison evidently does not like the idea of hell, but as one who stands in the Christian tradition, he realizes that he is stuck with it. His answer is to regard "Gehenna [as] part of the Bible's mythological interpretation of human destiny" (p. 92). Traditional notions of hell are deconstructed by Jesus' teachings on love (p. 96), but hell is also a postulate of human responsibility and divine justice (pp. 97–99).

In chapter 4, "Apocalyptic, Polemic, Apologetics," Allison outlines the theological case for and against an apocalyptic Jesus. He surmises that an apocalyptic Jesus is effective in quashing old Liberalism, but it comes at a price since this kind of Jesus was mistaken about the imminent consummation of the kingdom. He admits that people can have ideological or personal reasons for preferring an apocalyptic Jesus over a non-apocalyptic one, but he cautions against the view that all portraits of Jesus are merely projections of the self (contrast with William Arnal, *The Symbolic Jesus: Historical Scholarship, Judaism and the Construction of Contemporary Identity* [London: Equinox, 2005]). Allison then describes the intellectual journey that led him to an apocalyptic Jesus and how it impacts his faith.

Allison begins chapter 5, "*Torah, Urzeit, Endzeit*," by noting that the diversity of approaches to the law in early Christianity is mirrored in the Jesus tradition, where Jesus is portrayed as law-observant but also as laying aside commandments on certain occasions. He concludes that with regard to the law Jesus was neither a liberal nor a conservative. Jesus' setting aside of several commandments (e.g. the Sabbath commandment) was indicative of a Jewish rhetoric that could radically reinterpret Scripture in order to make a point. It also grew out of situations where it was recognized that there could be conflicting demands in law observance, and it was finally rooted in the eschatological conviction that the kingdom was at hand and there would be a return to Edenic conditions, which would spell the end of several legal stipulations. Jesus never nullified the commandments as a whole and recognized that his actions were exceptional. Yet when law conflicts with the mission of the kingdom, the law itself must forfeit priority.

In chapter 6, "Resurrecting Jesus," Allison scans over various approaches to the historicity of the resurrection ranging from orthodox belief in a physical resurrection to bodily disintegration plus visions. Allison is also honest enough to confess that he rather likes the idea of a physical resurrection but finds himself more like a "cryptic Deist" by habit (p. 215). At the same time Allison notes that it can often introduce some peculiar consequences such as what happens in the case of anthropophagi (p. 221). He does not think that post-mortem survival of death depends on physical continuity, and that holds as much for Jesus as himself (pp. 225, 344). Allison surveys the various formulas, confessions, and appearance stories in the NT. He compares the appearance stories with the widely documented phenomenon of visions of recently deceased persons to family members during times of grief (including his own such experiences). Allison does not think it possible to explain away the resurrection narratives in terms of "typical appearances of the dead" (p. 285) but holds that they might shed light on the resurrection traditions. Allison meticulously combs through the evidence both pro and con for the empty tomb. On the positive side Allison rejects the idea that cognitive dissonance gave birth to belief in Jesus' resurrection. Dissonance is fostered by distance between prophecy and event, and prior to Jesus' resurrection no such dissonance existed. The death of Jesus

did not confute his eschatological teaching; in fact, it confirmed to his disciples that they were living in the final tribulation. Jesus' death may have required a reinterpretation of the end-time scenario, but it did not undermine Jesus' eschatological architecture. The resurrection did not conform to any pre-existing expectation as it split the great act of vindication into two parts: the resurrection of Jesus and the coming of the Son of Man. It was the resurrection and not the crucifixion that forced the disciples into a radical reassessment of their eschatological expectations; thus the resurrection caused dissonance rather than emerging out of it (pp. 322–24). At the end of the section Allison surmises that, although the early Christians had a propensity to create fictions and there were legends of missing bodies in antiquity, nonetheless, the empty tomb is a "slightly stronger possibility" than the alternative (p. 332). Allison adds an addendum that all the evidence is ambiguous and presuppositions undoubtedly play a large part in the interpretation of the evidence. He confesses that he has no need for an empty tomb since life in the world to come does not depend on the reconstitution of one's flesh and bones. The volume ends with excursuses on the burial story and the value of grief-induced visions for reconstructing Christian origins.

This is a well-written and enterprising volume. The chapter on the resurrection makes for necessary reading. I sense that Allison places too much value on grief-induced visions for understanding the resurrection narratives. Even if such experiences/visions do not finally account for the appearances (as Allison admits), their value as analogies is negated by the fact that we do not hear of every Tobias, David, and Hershel killed on a Roman cross being proclaimed as resurrected by his grief-stricken relatives, as one might expect if "resurrection" was a category useful for describing the post-mortem presence of a loved one in antiquity. I am also unsure that a literal resurrection is quite so dispensable for a Christian view of the hereafter. Discounting embodied post-mortem existence is hardly bothersome if one is a Platonic theist, but not for someone who believes in the God of Israel like Allison professes (p. 343). The resurrection attests to the goodness of creation, the goodness of humanity, and the goodness of God as the God of creation. I think that the "eschatological materialism" that Allison eschews (p. 344) is part and parcel of the mosaic of Christian belief. Finally, this is a book that warrants attention and is a worthy companion to N. T. Wright's *Resurrection of the Son of God* (Fortress, 2003).

Michael F. Bird
Highland Theological College, Dingwall, Scotland

Matthew's Bible: The Old Testament Text of the Evangelist. By Maarten J. J. Menken. BETL 173. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2004, xii + 336 pp., €60.00 paper.

The pleasant green-colored slipcase of this volume should contain a noticeably bright yellow warning label: "Do not read while operating heavy machinery." This warning of reading density is not because the book is poorly written, irrelevant, or confusing—it is none of these things. In fact, there is an uncommonly clear thesis and direction throughout, and the writing style is clear. However, the nature of the thesis being propped requires a very detailed form of argumentation, one that oscillates between texts in the Hebrew Bible, LXX, and the Greek of Matthew and examines minute differences in words and forms. The result, at times, is some very thick reading.

So what thesis occasions such a work? Menken, a NT scholar at the Catholic Theological University of Utrecht (Netherlands), seeks to establish this simple thesis: the OT text behind Matthew's quotations (= "Matthew's Bible") was an already-existing

revised form of the LXX. Rather than being his own translation from the Hebrew or his own *ad hoc* revision of the LXX, Matthew's OT quotes reflect his use of an existing LXX different from our current one.

Menken does an admirable job of maintaining a singular focus on this thesis throughout the sixteen chapters of the book. After a brief introduction, he lays out his argument in two parts. Part 1 examines in turn each of Matthew's famous "fulfillment quotations." Ten of the eleven chapters in the section were previously published almost without change as articles in various journals and books. To some degree this makes one question the value of a book for which well over half has already been published elsewhere. On the other hand, together these chapters do make a sustained argument that is best appreciated in this unified book form rather than in disparate essays. For each of Matthew's fulfillment quotations Menken provides a detailed examination of Matthew's wording, comparing it to the other Gospels, the Hebrew text(s), and the LXX. The prose is clear enough, though this type of argumentation is necessarily tedious at points. In each case he concludes that, although at times the data is mixed, on balance Matthew appears to be drawing from a version of the LXX that is different from our standard critical edition at points, one that reflects a revised translation (into Greek) of the Hebrew Bible. Part 2 of the book is of a somewhat different sort and is much shorter. In these 50 pages, Menken takes the theory he has developed from the fulfillment quotations and seeks to test it by examining the other direct OT quotes in Matthew. Here again he concludes that, while the data is mixed and at times inconclusive, it appears that the thesis of a revised LXX text as "Matthew's Bible" is sustainable. The book finishes with a brief conclusion, followed by a bibliography and extensive indices.

So how shall we evaluate this thesis and the book in general? First it must be noted that Menken's argument is indeed original and sounds a new voice in the ongoing discussion of the form of the OT text in Matthew. This topic has spawned a variety of theories and volumes over the years, many of which have as their starting point Krister Stendahl's landmark book, *The School of St. Matthew* (ASNU 20; Lund: Gleerup, 1954). Those noteworthies who have since weighed in on this difficult topic include Gundry, van Segbroeck, Stanton, Prabhu, Boismard, and others. Menken shows intimate knowledge of these works and posits his own view in this field of study. Another strength of the book is that Menken is a competent NT scholar who shows more than a superficial knowledge of current Septuagintal studies. Few scholars today navigate both fields well, but Menken's citation (and apparent digestion) of a wide variety of secondary sources is commendable. This volume also manifests a refreshing amount of detailed, original language work not seen much today in an age when grammar is somewhat passé. Finally, and very importantly, Menken appears to be a level-headed, fair-reasoning scholar who seems intent on not contorting or massaging the evidence only to make his point.

Yet this same academic virtue leads to one of the major weaknesses in the persuasiveness of the book. As Menken works carefully through each OT quote in Matthew, he shows deftness and fairness in handling the materials. However, in nearly every instance, admitted exceptions occur to his thesis, and quite often the data is mixed and appears inconclusive. Nonetheless, he concludes every chapter with the same suggestion: that Matthew is using a revised LXX text. This may indeed be the case, and the carefulness of the work is inspiring, but I am left wondering whether such a conclusion is sufficiently grounded in light of the inconsistent data. At an even more foundational level, the methodology employed in this study poses a perpetual question mark over the firmness of Menken's conclusion. The type of argument made throughout the work is one that rests on several levels of more or less probable assumptions. When the probabilities of such assumptions are multiplied together, the level of confidence we can have in the final thesis is greatly diminished. Thus, to argue that any particular OT quote in Matthew comes from a continuous, revised LXX text *rather* than being Matthew's own

translation of the Hebrew *or* his own adaptation of the LXX *or* something he found in a sayings source, we must assume we rightly understand several difficult issues such as what is the literary relationship of the Gospels, what constitutes a mark of Matthean redaction, what is a better or worse Greek translation of the Hebrew in the original quote, and any number of textual variants, both in Matthew as well as in the MT and LXX. When following Menken's arguments I often found myself commenting in the margin, "This is a possible deduction but not a necessary one." This criticism is not intended to question Menken's scholarly abilities but to point out that the very nature of such hypothetical arguments about what OT text Matthew used is an uncertain business. A final word of critique: in light of the length of the book and the detail of the arguments within, the final conclusions are rather low-flying and thin. Beyond a restatement of his oft-repeated thesis that Matthew is using a revised LXX text, Menken offers only two paragraphs (pp. 282–83) of overarching conclusions. One conclusion is that there was a variety of LXX texts extant in the first-century of our era. This is certainly true and well recognized today. Second, Menken says that from his study we learn a little about Matthew's sources and that he was a conservative editor. Again, this is a rather modest conclusion. It seems more broad-ranging reflections would be in order here.

Nevertheless, Menken's book is worth consulting when dealing in depth with Matthew's OT quotes. He provides solid and generally reliable exegesis, even if his overall thesis can only reside in the realm of the possible and not inspire a greater degree of confidence.

Jonathan T. Pennington
The Southern Baptist Seminary, Louisville, KY

Lex Talionis in Early Judaism and the Exhortation of Jesus in Matthew 5.38–42. By James F. Davis. JSNTSup 281. London: T & T Clark International, 2005, xv + 192 pp., \$115.00.

There is probably no phrase of the Bible that has been more misused than "an eye for an eye." While it is used mostly to justify personal retribution, one must ask, "Is that really what the text intended?" What then did the NT say about personal revenge? I am always interested in reading works that intend to deal with the use of what is sometimes called "OT Ethics" in the NT. This work does not disappoint. Davis deals with Matt 5:38–42 where Jesus, in the Sermon on the Mount, speaks to several ethical quandaries (the best-known being "an eye for an eye") that have already been spoken to by the Hebrew Bible. The work is a publication of Davis's dissertation, which he completed while a student at Dallas Theological Seminary.

In chapter 1 Davis sets out the expected statement of the problem, need for the study, and method for the study. Here we are reminded that the term *lex talionis* comes from the Latin for the ancient Roman law of the Twelve Tables, which established a law of retaliation in the case of a person who was maimed by another (p. 1). The problem Davis intends to deal with is simply stated in three questions (p. 2). First, how do Jesus' statements in Matthew 5 relate to the OT commands of an "eye for an eye and tooth for a tooth"? Second, how does Jesus' teaching relate to the teaching of NT-era Judaism? Thirdly, what does Jesus require of his disciples and for the Church today?

In chapter 2 Davis begins to set forth the real work of the book. He starts with a very current and up-to-date literature survey, which includes both evangelical (e.g. Carson, Keener, and Piper) and non-evangelical sources. While some may argue that the views are flattened out in this survey (it is, after all, a survey), I felt that, given the space and time requirements that Davis must have been dealing with, he was fair to the sources

as I understand them. In this survey of the sources, two primary views of the OT emerge. The first is the more literal view that God was requiring a literal “tooth for a tooth.” The other view is that there has always been an allowance for, if not the preference for, financial compensation rather than actual maiming. Both views, however, understood the phrase “life for a life” to require capital punishment (p. 35).

In chapter 3, Davis deals with the *lex talionis* in the OT. He examines both the primary as well as the secondary texts. In dealing with secondary texts he expands his work to include texts on such issues as murder, insult, compensation, violence, retaliation, and revenge. Davis realizes that the passages with which he deals in this chapter (esp. Exodus 21) are difficult and apt to cause much controversy. They can speak to such areas as the life of the fetus, capital punishment for accidental death, and capital punishment for a false witness. Finally, Davis argues, one must conclude that Leviticus 24 provides the strongest case that a literal application of the law (i.e. a literal eye for an eye) was intended for the nation of Israel. Thus, in Davis’s view, financial compensation was never originally intended (p. 54).

In chapter 4, Davis deals with early Jewish non-canonical texts. He is wise to narrow his claims and alert the reader to the fact that, while the “author has tried to be as complete as possible, it would be too much to claim that every relevant text is cited” (p. 55). Davis goes on in chapter 4 to deal with what is perhaps the most difficult and long-standing problem for NT scholars studying Second Temple Judaism. This is the problem of how much the later documents (the Mishnah and the Babylonian and Palestinian Talmuds) represent earlier thinking. Davis pays careful attention to the work of Jacob Neusner, who argues that one cannot assume a uniform Judaism or one that is consistent over time. Davis uses his methodology carefully to avoid the sort of criticisms that have been leveled at the work of some others who have been accused by Neusner of being less than careful in their use of this kind of Jewish literature.

Chapter 5 deals with the non-biblical background behind Jesus’ principle of non-resistance and the four specific commands based on the general principle of not resisting the evildoer. There are three general meanings of the word ἀνθίστημι as it is used in Matt 5:39. These are: (1) resistance; (2) retaliation; and (3) violent rebellion or even armed revolt. Davis concludes that in the NT context, specifically in the Matthean context, this word should be seen as not resisting or opposing in the context of a court (p. 133). For example a slap on the cheek is seen as an act of contempt for a person (1 Kgs 22:24), and the offended person could take the offender to court for a monetary settlement. Jesus shows the way as the Messiah who voluntarily gives his cheek to the one who slaps him (p. 134).

Chapter 6 is an exegesis of Matt 5:38–42. Davis begins with an evaluation of the context of the passage in the Sermon on the Mount. He particularly deals with the audience, the purpose of the Sermon, and the context of the “you have heard” sayings. He moves on to exegete the passage with a discussion of each verse as to the text, grammar, and syntax. Last, Davis correlates Matt 5:38–42 with the parallel passages in Luke 6:29–30 and the *Did.* 1:4–5. Davis concludes that Jesus teaches one should not engage in personal retaliation either through the courts or through personal revenge. These commands that Jesus gives are, Davis argues, difficult but not impossible.

Chapter 7 argues that Jesus’ ethic surpassed both the ethics of Judaism and what was required in the OT Law. In other words, Jesus not only builds on the OT Law but supersedes it, so that his teaching is to become a new standard for the believer to follow (pp. 164–65). Davis finally argues that the OT passages sought to create a system that would prevent crimes of personal injury through punishment that would cause fear in the would-be offender. Jesus’ commands on the other hand, while recognizing the OT commands, call for positive actions of love that will help diffuse situations of conflict and show a better way.

While no one will agree with everything in this work, it cannot and should not be ignored. The work is well researched, carefully written, and will make a valuable addition to Sermon on the Mount studies. Anyone who enters into studies of the Law in the NT, the Sermon on the Mount, Jesus' view of the Law, or Jesus' ethic would be foolish not to include this work in the bibliography.

Samuel Lamerson
Knox Seminary, Ft. Lauderdale, FL

Contagious Holiness: Jesus' Meals with Sinners. By Craig L. Blomberg. NSBT. Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 2005, 216 pp., \$20.00 paper.

Craig L. Blomberg has contributed previously to the New Studies in Biblical Theology series with a volume entitled *Neither Poverty nor Riches: A Biblical Theology of Possessions* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1999). The focus of the present volume, *Contagious Holiness*, as the subtitle implies, is not the Lord's Supper/Last Supper but "the other meals Jesus celebrated and the company he kept at them" (p. 31). The book contains five chapters, a bibliography, and three indices: modern authors, Scripture references, and ancient sources.

In chapter 1 Blomberg surveys the contemporary debate over Jesus' meals with sinners. He notes that, while a substantial cross-section of both non-evangelical and evangelical scholars maintain that the historical Jesus engaged in table fellowship with sinners, several recent challenges have been offered to this viewpoint. These suggest either that Jesus' table fellowship with sinners was the creation of the evangelists, based on the influence and pervasiveness of the Greco-Roman symposia, or that the catchphrase, "tax collectors and sinners," implies political rather than moral connotations. It was E. P. Sanders, by contrast, who maintained that the sinners with whom Jesus engaged in table fellowship were flagrant sinners. What made Jesus' table fellowship with them distinctive was his lack of call for them to repent. Amidst the current state of scholarly flux, Blomberg proposes to reexamine the issue on the basis of the criterion of double similarity and dissimilarity (cf. p. 28), which enables interpreters to keep an eye not only on Jesus' similarities and differences with his own historical context relative to various habits of table fellowship but also on the early church's appropriation and modification of Jesus' practices.

In chapter 2, "Forming Friendships but Evading Enemies," Blomberg surveys meals in the OT, seeking to highlight every passage in which a meal plays a particularly significant role. He begins with the Pentateuch, followed by the historical books, the wisdom literature, and the prophets. In a minority of instances, meal contexts point to a measure of inclusiveness in which faithful Jews and sympathetic outsiders may participate, with the exceptions of unrepentant Israelites and full-fledged enemies. In the majority of texts, however, meals helped to draw boundaries. Those who belong are included, while the total outsider is not welcome. In this sense OT meals demonstrate differences from the uninvited guest characteristic of the Greco-Roman symposium as well as Jesus' table fellowship with sinners.

Chapter 3, "Contagious Impurity," is devoted to meals in the intertestamental period in both Jewish and Greco-Roman contexts. Here Blomberg begins with the OT apocrypha. He also examines the OT pseudepigrapha as well as Qumran and the Dead Sea Scrolls. Last of all, he gives attention to Greco-Roman symposia. Blomberg observes that views concerning meals in intertestamental Judaism reflect a greater emphasis on

boundary marking. A principal concern is to maintain purity over against the ever present danger of ritual impurity. As with OT texts surveyed in the previous chapter, Blomberg once again sees distinctive differences between the views of meals reflected in intertestamental Jewish literature and those of Greco-Roman symposia, despite the superficial similarity of reclining at table.

In chapter 4 Blomberg turns to non-Lukan Gospel material in order to examine the question, "Is Jesus the consummate party animal?" Here he examines passages belonging to Mark, Q, or John, both the multiple-attested and distinctive materials (Mark 2:13–17 pars.; 6:30–44 pars.; 8:1–10 pars.; Matt 8:11–12 pars.; 11:19 pars.; 21:31–32; John 2:1–11; 21:1–14). Blomberg concludes his analysis of this Gospel material by noting that Jesus was not a "party animal" in the sense that he merely loved to eat, drink, and the like, for the sheer pleasure of it. Rather, Jesus demonstrates kingdom purposes in his presence at banquets and other special meals. Blomberg nonetheless considers it striking that Jesus is willing to socialize in the intimacy of table fellowship with anyone in the service of discharging his mission.

Blomberg turns to the distinctively Lukan material in chapter 5, which he entitles "Pervasive Purity." Included in his treatment are Luke 7:36–50 (a "sinner in the city"); 10:38–42 (hospitality vs. holiness); 11:37–54 (a meal turned sour); 14:1–24 (a cagey host and a rude guest); 15:1–32 (a scandalous summary); 19:1–10 (Zacchaeus short-changed?); and 24:13–35 (Cleopas and company). Here in Luke's unique material, as in the Gospel tradition previously surveyed, Jesus' table fellowship forms not a central theme of the Gospel but a prominent one nevertheless. The similarities with other Gospel strata, moreover, indicate that Luke is providing a reliable portrait of Jesus' activities. In the closing chapter 6, "The Potential of Contemporary Christian Meals," Blomberg summarizes briefly his findings and offers contemporary applications.

Blomberg's study addresses a subject that does not receive the attention it deserves and treats the biblical texts reverently rather than high-handedly. It helpfully examines the subject of Jesus' meals with sinners against the backdrop of OT and intertestamental texts. One important contribution of this study is the distinction Blomberg sees between Jewish meals and Greek symposia. Another is Blomberg's sketch of potential areas of contemporary application, much of which is well taken.

Given the unwieldy nature of the secondary literature, one can partially sympathize with Blomberg's decision largely to avoid the Lord's Supper/Last Supper (p. 31), except for some general thoughts in the last chapter (pp. 178–79). At the same time, however, given the subtitle of the volume, *Jesus' Meals with Sinners*, the role of Judas at the last supper, at the very least, would have been an interesting and profitable theme to pursue further. Indeed, in the light of Blomberg's study, Judas's act of betrayal appears all the more flagrant, giving new force to words of Ps 41:9, cited by the Johannine Jesus (John 13:18: "He who eats my bread has lifted up his heel against me"). While acknowledging that Judas is a "notorious sinner," Blomberg nonetheless surprisingly bypasses treatment of him on the basis that "it is doubtful if we can make any generalizations for Christian practice based on this one exceptional figure" (p. 31). Yet a study of Judas would have been worth pursuing precisely because he and his act of betrayal are thematically related to the book's subtitle, at least more directly related to it than Jesus' (post-resurrection) meal with Cleopas and his companion (Luke 24:13–35), which does receive treatment (pp. 157–60). This issue aside, however, Blomberg has once again given us much to process in a relevant and engaging study.

James P. Sweeney
Immanuel Church, Chelmsford, MA

Studies in Matthew. By Ulrich Luz. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005, xii + 385 pp., \$30.00 paper.

The work of Ulrich Luz is already well known to students of Matthew's Gospel, though perhaps not yet as widely as it should be. His commentary has now been translated in full (vol. 1 independently by Fortress Press in 1989; vols. 2–3 in Hermeneia), with a fresh translation of the updated first volume in preparation for the Hermeneia series. The scope of the commentary is breathtaking, reaching from philology through the standard critical sieves to brilliantly executed summaries of the history of the influence of Matthew. Luz is no evangelical, but his scholarship is deep, and his determination to understand the tradition influenced by Matthew, the tradition from which we encounter this Gospel, is fruitful. Certainly, mainline biblical scholars must give heed to this work, which is careful and creative in equal measures. More importantly, no one interested in the shift toward theological interpretation (cf. *Dictionary for the Theological Interpretation of the Bible* [Baker, 2005]) should overlook what Luz has done. Among the other fruits of his work can be mentioned his *The Theology of the Gospel of Matthew* (Cambridge University Press, 1995) and *Matthew in History* (Fortress, 1994).

The volume presently under review, *Studies in Matthew*, is a welcome supplement to these other works, representing either earlier attempts to develop his ideas in preparation for the commentary or retrospective summaries of his exegetical work. Only two of the eighteen chapters have appeared previously in English (chaps. 6–7), and two others appear here for the first time (chaps. 17–18, both on hermeneutics). The remaining fourteen chapters have appeared previously in French or German. The dates of the original publications, which Luz has not “modernized” for this volume, run from 1971 to 2003. It is true that, if we leave aside the occasional change of opinion that can be registered (compare, e.g., p. 9 with his *Commentary* 1.88, n. 167), there is nothing that will surprise anyone who has paid attention to the earlier volumes. Still, *Studies* not only conveniently collects and translates these essays but serves to flesh out and give perspective on Luz's key ideas. For those unfamiliar with Luz and looking for something in between the massive *Commentary* and slim *Theology*, this strikes the right balance.

The essays are grouped unevenly under eight headings (numbers of chapters per section indicated): Matthew's Story (2), Matthew and His Tradition (2), Christology (2), Ecclesiology (3), Ethics (1), Miracles (1), Matthew and Israel (1), and Hermeneutics with Matthew in Mind (6). Given space limits and the richness of the essays, I will restrict myself to general comments from which some of the specific contents of these chapters can be inferred.

First, there is naturally some redundancy when these previously published essays are read together, but Luz's globally informed scholarship, his attention to the history of effects, and his own fruitful but disciplined imagination make the entire volume a profitable read.

Second, in general, Luz's *theological* conclusions are deeply indebted to his source-critical and composition-critical views: Matthew, writing after AD 70 and writing from within and for a particular community (*contra* Bauckham, *The Gospels for All Christians* [Eerdmans, 1998]), is not the apostle and had no independent access to the Jesus story outside of Mark and Q. Matthew's composition is decidedly a narrative, meant to be read as a *story*; it is not merely topical. That his revision of Mark's story into a new, “fictional” story must have been conscious and deliberate is therefore, on this reading, patent. From here we may proceed to speculation as to the literary and historical situation and motives that would have informed and guided his composition. Luz does so boldly and creatively, developing and then building on hypotheses as to the transparency of the Gospel for the history of Matthew's own church community. To be sure, disagreeing with Luz's foundational constructs does not lead directly to dismissing his conclu-

sions as vitiated. For instance, his view of chapter 10—that this chapter is a “disciple discourse,” not a “mission discourse,” and that it is basic to understanding Matthew’s “dynamic ecclesiology”—does not require the full infrastructure of his particular theories to commend it; I find it very convincing and fruitful. Yet due precisely to the coherence of Luz’s thinking, reading him requires that we spend particular time over this question of the relationship between theological conclusions and historical constructs. In that sense, this collection of essays is a vital prolegomenon to his commentary.

Third, Luz’s discussion of both the structure and setting of Matthew can be fruitfully placed in conversation with the conclusions of Davies and Allison (ICC). For Davies and Allison, Matthew’s Gospel is an “omnibus of genres” and is “structurally mixed.” Their overall view of Matthew sees the five discourses as basic. Luz’s conclusions are closer to Kingsbury’s (*Matthew as Story* [Fortress, 1986]), subordinating the five major discourses to Matthew’s *story*. This amounts to a transparent retelling of Mark’s story in terms of the story of Matthew’s own community, a Jewish-Christian community at a crossroads. Grounded in Q, having experienced failure in their mission to Israel, they have now chosen to merge with the Great Church and its universal mission (Luz vacillates on whether the mission in Israel continues or not: contrast *Studies* 250; *Commentary* 1.88 with *Studies* 12, 26) and in so doing have come into contact with the Gospel of Mark. Matthew is advocating this shift and is working out the transition in part, though not finally or perfectly. The story he tells, therefore, has a double meaning: it is Jesus’ story (as found in Mark), essential and foundational, and at the same time Jesus’ story retold as *their* story. The differences with Davies and Allison over the setting may be summarized under these questions: (1) whether Matthew’s churches have made a clean break with Judaism (Davies and Allison: not yet, and Matthew is resisting the attempt of the parent religion to exclude Christians; Luz: yes); (2) whether Jamnia bears on Matthew’s work (Davies and Allison: very much so [defining Jamnia as a process]; Luz: not as Davies and Allison believe it does); (3) whether Matthew is writing mainly for Christians or also to his fellow Jews (Davies and Allison: also to fellow Jews; Luz: to Christians).

Fourth, here are a few of my own responses to Luz’s literary and historical conclusions. I find much of his proposal as to the structure of Matthew compelling. Luz’s work is a good illustration of the fact that in Gospel research a theory of *structure* is embedded within several layers of theories about *history* and *theology*. Yet I like his narrative-centered approach in contrast to the more formal and topical approach that divides Matthew into blocks of narrative followed by discourse, although it is to be admitted that this can heighten the tension of the chronological discrepancies with Mark. His theories about the specific history of Matthew’s community are reaching far into the realm of speculation and his resulting understanding may owe too much to the idea of the local character of the individual Gospels. I am certainly uncomfortable with his placing of Jesus in tension with Matthew. More emphatically, I cannot accept the outworking of this tendency in Luz when he places (or *seems* to place) Matthew 23 in *opposition* to Jesus or other parts of Matthew’s Gospel in *opposition* to Paul (note the strong statements in *Matthew in History* 33; *Theology* 148–49; *Commentary* 1.87; *Studies* 217; partially mitigated in: *Studies* 214–18 [esp. 217]; *Theology* 146–53). Lastly, I am uneasy with the suggestion that Matthew appeals to the *risen Christ* in the partially fictitious rewriting of the *Jesus of history’s* narrative. Plainly, the commission of 28:18–20 is the command of the *risen Christ* and, just as plainly, it stands in contrast to 10:5–6. However, when Luz states that 28:18–20 “has been conceived and formulated by Matthew,” he is suggesting that Matthew has authorized his own *fictionalized narrative* of the Galilean ministry (esp. chaps. 8–9) by an appeal to this *laterredactional* cancellation of the exclusivity of 10:5–6 (*Studies* 26, 60; cf. 249–50, 256, 259; likewise, *Theology* 142–45; this point is tempered, but only partially so, by Luz’s claim

that Matthew is working from precedents in the tradition itself, e.g. *Studies* 260–61; *Theology* 145). Still, in all of this we have an instructive illustration of how one thoughtful scholar approaches the hermeneutical complex of Jesus the Word, Matthew the human author, and Matthew the Word of God.

Finally, the most exciting contribution of Luz derives from his hermeneutical reflections. Luz long ago took to heart his reading of Gadamer and others, and he undertook his task as commentator from the perspective of *Wirkungsgeschichte*, which he allows can be translated as “history of influence.” His thinking on this was discussed and illustrated more fully in *Matthew in History* (cf. *Commentary* 1.95–99). The closing section of *Studies*, nearly a third of the volume, is devoted to this topic. The fruits of this approach are amply present in his commentary and in the essays of the present volume. Luz is consistently interested in noting where Matthew’s theology goes in church history and equally in how that newly effected situation has affected subsequent re-readings. Moreover, given the history of rereadings, Luz does not duck the question of what then counts as truth in interpretation. For him, there are two criteria that converge with each other: correspondence with the history of Jesus and love. Whether or not we agree with him in how this works out, his work is of a piece with the turn to theological interpretation that was mentioned at the start of this review. In my own view this is a good and necessary turn, and likely an unstoppable one. However, fuller interaction with Luz on this point would require more space than is permitted, and others will certainly need to engage deeply with Luz over this dimension of his work.

In short, Luz is a brilliant and creative scholar whose work with Matthew’s Gospel will be essential reading for students of Matthew and all interested in the theological interpretation of the Bible. His writing warrants this collection, and Eerdmans is to be thanked for its part.

Jon C. Laansma
Wheaton College, Wheaton, IL

The Gospel Hoax: Morton Smith’s Invention of Secret Mark. By Stephen C. Carlson. Waco: Baylor University Press, 2005. xix + 151 pp., \$19.95 paper.

Ever since the publication of *Secret Mark* in 1973, there has been speculation that this “new” apocryphal Gospel may have been a forgery perpetrated by its discoverer, Morton Smith. The discovery was initially met with a positive reception as scholars anticipated yet another dramatic and sensational addition to the cache of apocryphal material already collected through twentieth-century excavations. However, it was not long before some scholars raised questions. During Smith’s 1958 trip to the Mar Saba monastery outside of Jerusalem, he claims to have found a letter by Clement of Alexandria copied onto the end of a genuine seventeenth-century edition of the epistles of Ignatius. It was this supposed letter of Clement—copied in an eighteenth-century hand—that contained excerpts from the otherwise unknown *Secret Mark*. The problem, however, was that Smith was the only one (and still is) to have ever seen the physical manuscript itself. He only provided photographs to his fellow scholars, and the original manuscript was mysteriously “lost” a few years later. It is not a surprise, therefore, that some scholars have raised serious doubts about *Secret Mark*’s authenticity, while others have vigorously defended it, creating a “stalemate” in the academy ever since.

With this scenario in mind, Stephen Carlson, an attorney by trade, has undertaken a new challenge to the authenticity of *Secret Mark* in his recent volume, *The Gospel Hoax*. Employing forensic and legal skills, Carlson applies modern critical techniques

for spotting literary forgeries to the case of *Secret Mark*. Such a methodological approach has taken the discussion in new and fruitful directions, offering a compelling, if not devastating, case against the authenticity of this apocryphal story. Carlson's case can be broken down into four kinds of arguments:

First, using the limited number of photographs available, Carlson focuses in upon the Mar Saba manuscript itself, particularly the handwriting of the author. He points out that in most literary forgeries the forger imitates the handwriting by "drawing" the letters rather than writing them naturally. This process results in noticeable signs: trembling and shaky lines, pen lifts, ink blobs, letters written slowly and deliberately, and portions often retouched by the forger. Carlson demonstrates that these features are clearly present in the Mar Saba manuscript, suggesting it was not written "naturally" but composed by a forger. In addition, Carlson has collected a number of writing samples from Smith where he has written in Greek. He then painstakingly compares various letters in the manuscript to these known samples of Smith's handwriting, showing that they share fundamental similarities at a number of key points. In light of such detailed evidence, it is difficult to believe *Secret Mark* is part of an authentic letter from Clement of Alexandria.

Second, Carlson addresses the content of the letter, questioning whether it can really be shown to be from Clement of Alexandria himself. Carlson argues that the vocabulary usage of the letter is so similar to the vocabulary in other genuine works of Clement that it suggests a deliberate imitation. Clement's other genuine works have a fairly stable percentage of original vocabulary words (*hapax legomena*)—however, that percentage is even lower in the letter that Smith discovered. Carlson argues that this "hyper-Clementine" style can only be explained by someone intentionally trying to sound like Clement, something that Smith could have done as a scholar very familiar with the works of Clement.

Third, Carlson reminds the reader that forged letters often contain content that is relevant to the time of the forger, but anachronistic when compared to the time in which the letter was purportedly written. He then demonstrates how the content of the supposed letter from Clement fits not with what we would expect from the second or third century but with the modern day—particularly the 1950s and 60s when the letter was discovered:

(a) *Secret Mark* describes this bizarre scene of Jesus raising a young man from the dead who "looking at [Jesus], loved him and began to beseech him that he might be with him . . . and in the evening the youth comes to him wearing a linen cloth over his naked body. And he remained with him that night for Jesus taught him the mystery of the Kingdom of God." The sexual innuendo in this story is obvious to a twentieth-century reader, but would have been missed on a second or third-century reader, argues Carlson, for they would not have recognized a peer-to-peer homoerotic encounter, but only one between men and boys or between men of different social classes (e.g. master and slave). Thus, it is clear that *Secret Mark* is actually relevant to the debates over homosexuality burgeoning in the 1950s and 60s, when the manuscript was "discovered," and would not have connected with an early church audience.

(b) Carlson points out that the purported letter from Clement contains technical details about *Secret Mark* that would not be meaningful to a third-century reader, but quite relevant for modern source critics. For example, when Clement cites the excerpt from *Secret Mark*, he actually tells his reader where in the overall Gospel of Mark the passage occurs. Such a technical detail may be important to modern source critics who want to hypothesize about what the original *Secret Mark* would have looked like, but makes no sense in the context of the letter itself.

Fourth, Carlson argues that Smith intentionally left “clues” throughout the letter from Clement (and in his writings about this letter) pointing to the fact that he was the real author. For example, while noting the letter’s anachronistic reference to salt, Carlson argues that this is a veiled confession due to the fact that “Morton” brand salt was popular when *Secret Mark* was published—thus a link to the name “Morton Smith.” Another intentional “clue,” argues Carlson, is contained in Smith’s own theory that the person who penned the letter was named Μαδιότης. Carlson notes that this word is from the root μαδ- which may be an allusion to μαδῶ, which means “to lose hair” or be bald. Since Morton Smith’s name begins with “M” and he was bald, Carlson argues this is a veiled self-reference.

Overall, Carlson’s book puts forth quite an impressive case against the authenticity of *Secret Mark*. His legal/forensic approach breaks new ground and undoubtedly should end the “stalemate” over this apocryphal Gospel within the academy. That being said, the only substantive weakness in the book was the fourth category of arguments noted above. Although it is always interesting to wonder whether a forger left intentional “clues” to his identity along the way, the arguments put forth by Carlson in this vein seemed a great deal more subjective and esoteric than the other parts of his book. Drawing a connection, for example, between Morton salt and Morton Smith seems to be somewhat speculative and without the possibility of external corroboration. Indeed, Carlson is at his best when he focuses more definitively on the concrete literary arguments (handwriting, anachronistic allusions, etc.) rather than on hypothetical “confessions” embedded within the forged letter.

In the end, *The Gospel Hoax* does more than simply debunk an existing apocryphal Gospel, since it raises larger and more difficult questions about the state of the academy, which could so easily be duped by a forgery of this kind. If the text of *Secret Mark* contains a number of obvious anachronistic references, has handwriting that bears the marks of forgery, and comes from a previously unknown eighteenth-century manuscript that has been mysteriously lost and that no one else has ever seen, then how did it ever gain any support within modern biblical scholarship in the first place? Are these not the same critical scholars who have meticulously examined the canonical Gospels and found them to be lacking in historical credibility? How then could many of them, at the same time, so readily grant credibility to something like *Secret Mark*? Perhaps the lesson to be learned through Carlson’s book has more to do with the modern academy than with Morton Smith. When it comes to evaluating the authenticity of ancient Gospel traditions, it seems that modern critical scholarship all too often tends to find exactly that for which it is looking.

Michael J. Kruger
Reformed Theological Seminary, Charlotte, NC

The Birth of Christianity: The First Twenty Years. Vol. 1: *After Jesus*. By Paul Barnett. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005, x + 230 pp., \$15.00 paper.

This volume surveys the first two decades of Christianity after Jesus. Barnett opens and closes the book by contrasting his views with those of John Dominic Crossan, who labels this period “the lost years of earliest Christianity,” “dark ages,” “empty years,” and “darkened decades” (pp. 1, 211–14; cf. p. 111, n. 2). Barnett, a teaching fellow at Regent College and Moore Theological College and a former lecturer in ancient history, seeks to dispel the shadows by casting the light of his historical expertise. Barnett calls himself a “creedal believer” who is “committed to the academic rigor in which I was

schooled and to the ideal of objectivity and the professional use of texts" (pp. 10–11). "Empathy" and "objectivity" are not "mutually exclusive" (p. 11).

The first four chapters lay the groundwork of the study. Chapter 1 surveys various modern explanations of the advanced Christological "development" expressed in Paul's letters (Crossan, Bousset, Casey, Akenson). Barnett rather concludes that "Jesus presented himself as the Messiah, his disciples recognized him as the Messiah, and the post-Easter believers preached him as the Messiah" (p. 6). "My thesis is that the birth of Christianity and the birth of christology are inseparable, both as to time and essence. Christianity *is* christology" (p. 8). Chapter 2 reiterates the foundations and canons of historical scholarship. Chapter 3 draws the perimeters of the study. These are Jesus' crucifixion (which Barnett dates to AD 33) and Paul's arrival in Corinth (AD 50). Using the chronological signposts in Galatians 1, Barnett concludes that Paul's conversion occurred in AD 34, only one year after Jesus' crucifixion; Barnett readily acknowledges that this is "a minority view" (p. 25, n. 10). Whether or not one adopts the exact strictures of this chronology, the basic ramifications are clear: Paul evidences an "advanced" and early Christology (p. 26). Chapter 4 is a fascinating and imaginative placement of earliest Christian history within the wider history of the eastern Mediterranean context.

In many ways, chapters 5 through 10 are the heart of the volume. Barnett begins by examining Paul's earliest correspondence as a "window" into the period after Jesus (p. 54). Barnett establishes that Paul's mission work presupposed an extensive pattern of pre-formed doctrinal and moral teaching. This teaching had been "received" by Paul and then "proclaimed" and "entrusted" to his followers. Barnett theorizes that Paul received this catechesis in Damascus at his baptism (pp. 48–50, 58, 87, 153). Thus, Barnett downplays a "vertical" (revelatory) reception of Paul's Christology and rather emphasizes a "horizontal" (catechetical) reception (pp. 76–77). What was the ultimate fountainhead of Paul's Christology? Barnett responds, "In our view all fingers point to Peter" (p. 77). "Paul would have derived this 'teaching' at his baptism ultimately from Peter" (p. 153). "In each Pauline text it is possible to detect the influence of 'the teaching of the apostles,' in particular the teaching of Peter" (p. 94). However, Barnett does not seem to interact adequately with Paul's assertions in Gal 1:12–17.

Chapter 7 peers through a second "window," the material found in Acts 1–9. Barnett portrays Paul as *the* arch-leader of the persecution of Judean Christians, which he repeatedly terms "Saul's persecution" and "Paul's 'reign of terror'" (e.g. pp. 66, 80, 95, 98, 100). Barnett refers to "the cessation of persecution" after "Saul's persecutions" (p. 110; but cf. 1 Thess 2:14–16). On the other hand, Barnett emphasizes the pivotal role of Stephen in the formation of early Christianity. "It is impossible to overestimate the importance of Stephen, his teaching, and his death for the birth of Christianity" (p. 75). In a hyperbolic overstatement, Barnett asserts that Stephen-less Christianity "would have continued as a messianic Temple cult founded by an obscure Galilean" (p. 76).

Chapters 11 through 14 examine the Gospel traditions in this same twenty-year period. Barnett argues that the oral transmission of Jesus materials was not a communal "free-for-all" but a "narrowly focused," "controlled didactic," "guided process" (pp. 116, 136–37). Written texts and oral transmission "existed side-by-side for many years" (p. 117). Barnett examines the echoes of Jesus' teachings in 1 Thessalonians, 1 Corinthians, Romans, James, and 1 Peter (pp. 120–35), but the evidence gathered does not necessarily warrant his contention that the epistolary authors utilized *written* collections of Jesus materials (pp. 125–26, 132, 134). Barnett resorts to a double-edged sword: "Who can assert with confidence that such teachings of Jesus were not derived from written collections?" (p. 155).

Chapter 12 tackles "Q," which Barnett employs as a working hypothesis ("the most likely explanation of the relationships among the Synoptic Gospels") that provides

“historical and theological coherence” (p. 140). His guns are set upon those who use “Q” to postulate “a merely ethical/reformist Jesus” stripped of “any messianic, atonement, or resurrection associations” (pp. 138, 139, 142). Barnett reveals the messianic implications and resurrection expectations within the so-called “Q” material but does not establish an explicit theology of atonement. He does demonstrate the arbitrary subjectivity involved in reconstructing compositional layers in the hypothetical “Q.”

The thirteenth and fourteenth chapters argue that both Mark and John are “primary” Gospels, in the sense that they do not depend upon any extant “earlier discrete text” (p. 150). Barnett assumes that Mark incorporates pre-existing “blocks” of Jesus traditions in Greek (p. 156) that Paul also knew and used (p. 157). In regard to John, Barnett argues for its literary independence from the Synoptics and for an early composition (AD 60s). He argues, “Since this Gospel reflects the life and times of the pre-70 era, it is more likely that John wrote during the earlier period and not afterward” (p. 172). Yet the authentic reflection of the pre-70 era only seems to prove that the recollections themselves are true to a historical context; it does not necessarily bear upon the actual date of composition. Barnett’s use of the plural pronouns in John 3:11 in order to place the Gospel’s *Sitz im Leben* in pre-70 missionary endeavors may be grasping at grammatical straws (p. 175).

The book closes with two appendixes, a final response to Crossan, a bibliography, and assorted indexes. The first appendix argues that the author of Acts was a personal companion of Paul, based upon the “we passages.” “Continued skepticism regarding Luke-Acts as a source about Paul and the birth of Christianity is unwarranted” (p. 193). Barnett seeks to expose the false (though common) dichotomy of theology vs. history (pp. 195–96) and to counteract Crossan’s complete neglect of Acts (pp. 211, 213). The second appendix summons evidence for a “southern” destination and early dating of Galatians.

One might mention a few curious inconsistencies and one caution. Barnett refers to *marana tha* (1 Cor 16:22; Rev 22:20) as the “only one remaining echo of Aramaic-speaking Christianity” in the Epistles (p. 119). Yet he also recognizes the similar evidence of *abba* (p. 70). Barnett moves Papias’s evidence back to AD 110–20 on p. 159, but dates Papias to AD 130 on p. 116. Barnett advises, “Conjecture must be identified appropriately, qualified, and limited. It may cast light on an unresolved issue, yet it remains conjecture apart from some means of lateral verification” (p. 180). One should remember this caution as Barnett proposes his own conjectures of varying probabilities. He maintains that Paul did mission work among the Nabateans while in “Arabia,” perhaps reaching as far as the capital, Petra (pp. 62, 87). Hebrews, according to Barnett, was written to residents of Jerusalem who were descendants of the “Hellenists” (pp. 106–9). The governmental authorities in Antioch were the ones who first labeled the Antiochian believers as *Christianoi* (p. 81). Barnett uses Rom 6:3 and 17 to maintain a baptismal context for Rom 1:2–4 (p. 91). He claims that Mark “presumably” assisted Peter in mission work in the land of Israel before being drafted by Barnabas and Paul (pp. 160–61).

Nonetheless, Barnett has helpfully collected various evidences for his primary thesis, the earliness and pervasiveness of an “advanced” Christology, “the faith” that proclaimed Jesus as “Christ,” “Son,” and “Lord.” (p. 183). “The apostles formulated their christology on the basis of their involvement with Jesus and his death and resurrection, now seen through the lens of Spirit-led reflection on OT texts” (p. 87). Like the NT, Barnett’s heart “throbs with the conviction that God’s hour has struck in the coming of the Messiah, who died ‘for’ others and whom God raised alive on the third day” (p. 214).

Paul A. Hartog
Faith Baptist Theological Seminary, Ankeny, IA

The Quest for Paul's Gospel: A Suggested Strategy. By Douglas A. Campbell. JSNTSup 274. London: T & T Clark International, 2005, xi + 290 pp., \$115.00.

Douglas Campbell, assistant professor of New Testament at Duke Divinity School, has been speaking and writing on central matters of Pauline interpretation for some time now (e.g. *The Rhetoric of Righteousness in Romans 3.21–26* [JSNTSup 65; Sheffield Academic Press, 1992]). For this reason it is helpful to have a good portion of this work collected in a single volume. Most of the chapters originated as oral presentations, with elements of four having appeared previously in print (p. 3, n. 5; oddly, only two previous publications are noted in the Acknowledgement, p. vii).

The book opens with a complaint about the lack of a “grand strategic discussion” (p. 2) in Pauline studies, giving promise of a breakthrough. On the whole, however, what unfolds seems to be less a new strategic vision and more a stimulating rendition of the familiar quest for the center of Paul’s gospel (p. 17) or soteriology (p. 33). In particular, Campbell urges that we aim for a “constructive theological explanation,” which results in “recovering [Paul’s] theology for the church” (p. 3). Such interest in a theological and practical orientation is refreshing in a Pauline scholar.

With acknowledged kinship to J. L. Martyn’s apocalyptic interpretation and the trajectory associated with Deissmann and Schweitzer, Campbell argues that Paul’s center is to be found in what he terms “pneumatologically participatory martyrological eschatology” (PPME). One also hears echoes of Sanders’s participatory eschatology. The reader must learn immediately to negotiate Campbell’s love of abbreviations. Alongside PPME, we have JF (more traditional, “Lutheran,” justification by faith), SH (salvation history), and AT (anti-theological), just to name the more prominent. Taken on the whole, the book is a sustained argument for an apocalyptically oriented interpretation of Paul and against the “Lutheran” model. The SH model, although inadequate as a descriptive center, contains valid concerns that Campbell sees as sufficiently covered in the PPME approach. He is sympathetic to the New Perspective on Paul (NP); it is, however, not a “coherent explanatory enterprise” but a diverse coalition. In the end, so Campbell, only the PPME model will achieve victory in the quest for Paul’s gospel; no compromise or truce is allowed.

The book unfolds in three sections. The first (chaps. 1–2) reviews the debate over Paul’s gospel and outlines the three main strategic options: (1) justification by faith (JF); (2) salvation history (SH), e.g. Cullmann and Wright; and (3) his own PPME model. The JF model is nearing the end of its usefulness, and SH will become a subordinate witness to the superior PPME model. Each model is helpfully aligned with particular sections of Romans (JF with Romans 1–4, PPME with Romans 5–8, and SH with Romans 9–11), and he rightly cautions against seeking some “conceptual and linguistic construct” for Paul’s center rather than “Christ *himself*” (p. 32).

Section 2 (chaps. 3–7) seeks to flesh out the PPME model in relation to a number of selected texts and issues: apocalyptic and salvation history (chap. 3), narrative (chap. 4, esp. Romans 5–8), Gal 3:28 (chap. 5), Pauline ethics (chap. 6), and Jewish Law (chap. 7). This is the heart of the book, and there is much here for students of Paul to mull over. Here are just a few examples. Although reference to the binding of Isaac (Genesis 22) is not new for Pauline scholars, Campbell gives heightened stress on this story as foundational to Paul’s narrative of Christ’s descent (a “story of descent by a Father’s own Son through obedience to suffering and death,” p. 86). Galatians 3:28 is “an excellent summary of the Pauline Gospel, articulating the PPME model clearly and compactly” (p. 95; cf. chap. 5). Participatory eschatology is reaffirmed, which carries strong ethical connotations (as against JF’s notorious difficulties in relating justification and sanctification). Chapter 6 examines the modern issue of gay ordination. Although

clearly leaning in the direction of a liberationist sexual ethic, Campbell stops short of prescribing this, calling instead for a process of ecclesial discernment on the issue. Campbell is prepared to speak of Paul's inconsistency in ethical application, so that he is sometimes liberational and thus true to his gospel (as in Gal 3:28) and at other times more "rooted . . . in structures of creation than in the structures of redemption" (p. 113). When a "creation-based theology obstructs true theology" in Paul (e.g. gender codes [1 Cor 11:2–16], "unnatural" homosexual activity [1 Cor 6:9], slavery [Philemon]), the apostle's analysis "lacks theological authority," being "neither christologically derived, nor fundamentally scriptural" (p. 120). Evangelical scholars will likely be troubled by such blunt talk of inconsistency, but questions related to Paul's stance on creation are rather complex.

Section 3 (chaps. 8–11) examines the JF model in detail (chap. 8), followed by a treatment of a number of Pauline topics and texts in order to demonstrate the superiority of the PPME model over the traditional JF model: faith-language in Paul (chap. 9), Gal 3:15–29 (chap. 10), and Rom 1:18–3:20 (chap. 11). Chapter 8 is an example of Campbell's conversance with systematic-theological discussion, utilizing J. B. Torrance (contra Federal Calvinism) to critique the contractual character of the JF model. A lexical examination of *pistis* (chap. 9) concludes that it refers primarily to "fidelity" or "faithfulness" and only secondarily to human "trust" or "belief." As such, *pistis* overlaps considerably with obedience and is the means by which the group or individual participates in Christ. Unlike the difficult relationship between faith and works in the JF model, here they are conjoined in *pistis* itself. Chapter 11 argues that Rom 1:18–3:20 was, in fact, not Paul's expression of his own soteriology, but an *ad hominem* portrayal of his opponents' position, which "he intends to savage" (p. 247). In particular, the retributive view of God present in the section (God repays impartially according to deeds) is not Paul's own view, but one that he rejects. "This section states very little concerning Paul's view of things" (p. 253). (I found this particularly difficult to swallow in light of the axiomatic nature of these convictions for nearly all strata of Judaism, not merely for a few renegades as Campbell suggests; cf. Jouette M. Bassler, *Divine Impartiality* [SBLDS 59; Chico: Scholars Press, 1982]; Kent L. Yinger, *Paul, Judaism, and Judgment According to Deeds* [SNTSMS 105; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999].)

The nature of the volume, a collection of originally disparate presentations, means that it is not easily readable as single flowing argument. There is considerable repetition of material (e.g. same graphic on pp. 25 and 44; *pistis Christou* debate covered in §4.13 and in chaps. 8, 9, and 10), and the book contains a great deal of rhetorical overkill (the PPME model passes muster "with the soteriological equivalent of flying colours" [p. 6]; Gal 3:21–29 "is the JF interpreter's Waterloo" [p. 225]). In fairness, this should probably be attributed to the originally oral nature of the material (where it may have been quite effective). I seriously doubt that either the abbreviation (PPME) or the unwieldy "pneumatologically participatory martyrological eschatology" will ever catch on.

Such critical notes should by no means be taken as my final word. This is a book well worth reading. Campbell's call for greater sensitivity in Pauline interpretation to systematic-theological and practical church concerns is welcome. One may hope this signals a trend toward overcoming the chasm between theologians and exegetes. In addition, the book represents a vigorous challenge to the JF model and interacts knowledgeably with a wide range of current Pauline scholarship. Scholars committed to a more traditional reading of Paul's letters will want to take a careful look at elements of Campbell's critique, while apocalyptic interpretation finds an able advocate. I can easily imagine a number of individual chapters being used for collateral reading in classes on Pauline literature. Chapter 9, for example (a lexical study of "faith"), might

be very stimulating for thinking about translation issues, as well as about the meaning of faith in Paul and its relationship to obedience.

Kent L. Yinger
George Fox Evangelical Seminary, Portland, OR

Arguing with Scripture: The Rhetoric of Quotations in the Letters of Paul. By Christopher D. Stanley. London: T & T Clark International, 2004, 196 pp., \$34.95 paper.

In *Arguing with Scripture: The Rhetoric of Quotations in the Letters of Paul*, Christopher D. Stanley has offered his promised second volume on Paul's quotations. While his first book, *Paul and the Language of Scripture: Citation Technique in the Pauline Epistles and Contemporary Literature* (SNTSMS 74; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), focused on the technical aspects of Paul's technique, his *Vorlage*, and his changes to the OT text, *Arguing with Scripture* poses the more interpretive questions: "(1) how do Paul's quotations serve to advance the developing arguments of his letters? and (2) how well does Paul's strategy of biblical argumentation cohere with what we can surmise about the capabilities and inclinations of his audiences?" (p. 171).

To answer these questions, Stanley draws on contemporary rhetorical and literary studies, historical estimations of ancient literacy, and NT scholarship. The book is divided into two parts, the first methodological, the second illustrative. In part 1, "The Rhetoric of Quotations," Stanley elaborates on his basic approach to the fundamental goal of the book: to understand how Paul's original audiences, in all of their various capacities as hearers/readers, would have understood his quotations of the Jewish Scriptures (= OT). Stanley approaches this problem from the angle of general rhetorical studies, of specific studies of literary quotations, and of the historical reconstruction of Paul's first-century audiences.

In what will likely be the two most interesting chapters in part 1 for students of the NT (chaps. 3–4), Stanley focuses on understanding Paul's audience(s) and on framing a method for approaching his quotations. In chapter 3 Stanley notes that any understanding of Paul's effectiveness necessarily implies a view of Paul's audience(s). Many scholars have held historically unsupportable assumptions about these groups of hearers/readers, and nine of these assumptions here come up for review (some escaping more unscathed than others). Stanley, drawing on recent works on ancient literacy (especially those of William Harris, *Ancient Literacy* [Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1989] and Harry Gamble, *Books and Readers in the Early Church: A History of Early Christian Texts* [New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995]), points to the low levels of literacy in the ancient world, suggesting that this undermines the views of those who assume that Paul's hearers/readers could have examined the Scriptures in their original context for themselves. This, in turn, implies that sometimes his audience(s) did not recognize quotations, when not explicitly marked, and that they were even unable to evaluate Paul's fidelity to the Jewish Scriptures. Such misapprehensions have come about from interpretive approaches that are decidedly "author-centered," seeking to explain how Paul read Scripture instead of how his audience would have heard his letters.

Yet surely some among Paul's audience(s) understood? In fact, Stanley recognizes a diversity of hearers/readers, and his fourth chapter sets out a typology (admittedly somewhat artificial) of three levels of audience competency. First, the "informed audience" is comprised of those who know "the original context of every one of Paul's quotations"

and are “willing to engage in critical dialogue with Paul about his handling of the biblical text” (p. 68). Stanley suggests this would have been a very small percentage of Paul’s hearers/readers. Second, the “competent audience” knows “just enough of the Jewish Scriptures to grasp the point of Paul’s quotations in their current rhetorical context” (p. 68). Finally, the “minimal audience” includes those who have “little specific knowledge about the content of the Jewish Scriptures,” and here Stanley places most Gentile converts.

Stanley proceeds, in part 2, “Case Studies,” to embark on his plan to evaluate the effectiveness of Paul’s rhetoric by examining how the quotations embedded in his discourse might have been heard by each of these hypothetical audiences. In chapters on 1 Corinthians, 2 Corinthians, Galatians, and Romans, Stanley follows a common structure. First, he examines what biblical knowledge Paul presupposes (e.g. the creation story in 1 Corinthians, etc.) and then turns to analyze a handful of passages containing quotations using the threefold typology set forth in part 1. Such readings are admittedly speculative, and their persuasiveness varies. A final chapter in part 2 summarizes the findings of the study. Without commenting on the individual interpretations that comprise the second half of his study, illustrative as they are meant to be, I want to pass on here to some observations and evaluations concerning Stanley’s methodology and its implementation.

First, Stanley’s concern to press the rhetorical analysis of Paul’s letters to the study of quotations should be lauded. Too often rhetorical studies have become quagmired in issues of structure or genre, and the current study offers an advance in this area.

What is more, Stanley’s focus on the audience is an entirely appropriate one and should add to our understanding of the reception, function, and effect of Paul’s letters and other early Christian literature in the early church. At times, however, Stanley has overplayed the disjunction between “author-centered” and “audience-centered” approaches. In reacting against the long dominance of studies of Paul’s use of the OT that center on Paul’s interpretive activity, Stanley goes too far in privileging the audience(s) in the act of interpretation, thus producing a somewhat lop-sided picture of the “meaning” of Paul’s citations.

My single most substantial critique of this work concerns the evaluations of Paul’s rhetorical practice and ability (recall Stanley’s two guiding questions). For a study that ostensibly takes as one of its points of departure the impossibility of access to an author’s intention (itself a disputable point), *Arguing with Scripture* is full of speculative flights into Paul’s motives (i.e. intentions) in quoting Scripture. Far too often, Stanley tells us, with near-Foucaultian suspicion, that this amounts to a power move on Paul’s part: “Paul assumed a stance of social and ideological dominance/power over his intended audience, a dominance for which he claimed divine support” (p. 171; cf. e.g. p. 88: “a carefully crafted attempt to wield power over the minds and wills of the Corinthians,” pp. 92, 95, 105, 122, 170, and all of chap. 9). Apart from being rather unimaginative, this accusation ignores the various rhetorical ways in which an appeal to authority can be construed, much less the other (sometimes more likely) rhetorical moves in which Paul engages (e.g. narrative posturing or world-projecting).

Furthermore, in his case studies (part 2), Stanley often comes to the conclusion that the “informed audience” would have questioned or even rejected Paul’s interpretation of Scripture (e.g. pp. 92–93, 100–101, 103, 112, 123–26, 133, 147–48, 151–53). However, this is done so often and with such ease and unsympathetic readings of Paul’s argument that one is led to question even the places where such disagreement may have been more likely. This is compounded by Stanley’s failure to engage the scholarly literature in these places in greater depth (one example: on Rom 10:19–21, no mention is made of Richard Bell’s *Provoked to Jealousy: The Origin and Purpose of the Jealousy Motif in*

Romans 9–11 [WUNT 2/63; Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 1994], the most significant monograph on Paul's quotation of Deut 32:21).

Other nagging questions remain: Given what Stanley tells us about how quotations function, what are we to make of his own numerous quotations of both Paul and modern scholars? Is it surprising that, given the non-theological starting points in "secular" rhetorical studies and literary criticism, the results of his study are so theologically meager? Is it possible to draw such sweeping conclusions about audience competence and reaction given that we know so little of what early Christian worship services actually entailed?

In short, Stanley's book is engaging and provocative. The questions that he raises are both poignant and important. However, he may be guilty of some of the overstatement of a would-be reformer, and it may be that the questions he raises and method he suggests will endure longer than the answers he supplies. While *Arguing with Scripture* will not displace studies that seek to understand Paul's interpretive activity, it should add another dimension to the investigation of Paul's engagement with Israel's Scriptures.

David Lincicum
Knoxville, TN

Solidarity and Difference: A Contemporary Reading of Paul's Ethics. By David G. Horrell. London: T & T Clark International, 2005, xvi + 339 pp., \$49.95 paper.

David Horrell's work has two major, interrelated aims. The first aim is to provide an exegetically informed reading of Paul's ethics guided by issues and questions raised by contemporary ethical debate, specifically the debate between liberals (represented by Jürgen Habermas) and communitarians (represented by Stanley Hauerwas). The second aim is to investigate how Paul's ethics might inform the aforementioned debate.

Because the contemporary ethical debate forms the context in which Horrell reads Paul, his work is "a study of Paul's ethics as social or political ethics, by which I mean ethics concerned with the formation and maintenance of human community, and with reflection on the ways in which this human sociality should rightly be sustained" (p. 2). Therefore Horrell is less concerned with what he labels "moral quandaries" (e.g. Paul's views on homosexuality, marriage and divorce, or slavery) and more concerned with the formation of the communities in which these issues are to be debated and resolved.

Horrell begins with a survey of the field of Pauline ethics, touching on issues commonly thought central to Paul's ethics: the indicative and imperative in Paul, Paul and the Mosaic Law, Paul's relationship to the teachings of Jesus, and the social context of Paul's ethics. Above all, it is the work of Daniel Boyarin in *A Radical Jew: Paul and the Politics of Identity* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994) that sets the agenda for Horrell's work by presenting him with his fundamental question: "How did Paul—and how might we—conceive of human communities as places of solidarity and difference?" (p. 44).

The second and third chapters of the book set the stage for the analysis that follows. In the second chapter, Horrell examines the contrasting approaches of Jürgen Habermas and Stanley Hauerwas in order to develop the contemporary context in which he will read Paul's ethics. This context provides the questions that Horrell will ask of Paul in chapters 4–8, such as: What are the metanorms of Pauline ethics? How does Paul conceive of the distinctive identity of the Christian community? Is there any appeal in Paul

to a universal rationality? How does Paul handle difference of conviction in the community? In the third chapter, Horrell lays out his methodology for handling Paul's letters with regard to ethics. Drawing on social-scientific approaches, he argues that "Paul's letters are to be seen as reflecting, and contributing to, a narrative myth which constructs a particular symbolic universe, giving meaning and order to the lives of those who inhabit it" (p. 97). Paul's ethics are his thoughts on how this mythology, which is enacted in ritual, should shape the lives of his readers.

The bulk of the book (chaps. 4–8) is devoted to constructing a reading of Paul's ethics. In chapter 4 Horrell argues that "the first and most fundamental moral value, a metanorm, in Pauline ethics is that of corporate solidarity, a form of human solidarity with egalitarian impulses" (p. 99). In chapter 5 Horrell explores Paul's rhetoric of holiness and the ways in which this rhetoric is designed to create a sense of distinction between the believing community and the world. Chapter 6 examines 1 Corinthians 8–10 and Romans 14–15 and argues that the idea of "other-regard" (what Paul often calls "love") constitutes the second fundamental metanorm of Pauline ethics. Chapter 7 builds upon chapter 6 by investigating the ways in which Christ functions for Paul as the paradigm for believers' attitudes and actions. Whereas in chapters 4–7 Horrell focused on Paul's "insider" ethics, in chapter 8 he expands his focus to Paul's thinking regarding relationships with outsiders and the extent to which Paul appeals to "universal" moral standards. Horrell summarizes his reading of Paul's social ethics under seven theses which he presents in chapter 9 along with a summary of possible ramifications of this reading of Pauline ethics on the contemporary ethical debate between liberals and communitarians.

This work is quite commendable in many regards. First, Horrell has identified a gap in scholarship (the need for more synthetic studies of Pauline ethics, taking into account how Pauline ethics might be relevant to today) and has gone about admirably addressing that gap. Second, the exegesis that Horrell engages in is balanced and quite detailed in places for a work of this nature. Third, the argument is clearly laid out. Although there are some holes—his claim that solidarity and other-regard are the two most important and fundamental metanorms of Pauline ethics is more assertion than argument, for he fails to show why his metanorms are more fundamental than those other scholars have proposed—the work is well organized and very lucid. Fourth, I found Horrell's reading of Paul to be thought-provoking, even when I disagreed with him. In addition, his reading opened up to me fresh insights into Paul's letters. This was especially true in chapter 8, where Horrell addresses "outsiders" and Paul's appeal to universal standards. Fifth, Horrell's work continues the important move away from Bultmann's overly individually-oriented reading of Paul toward a more communally-oriented one (though this work may be guilty of overcorrection).

There are, however, serious difficulties with this work. First, reading Paul through the lens of social-scientific perspectives carries with it the danger of reducing Paul's talk about God to talk about humans, their experiences, and their social construction of reality. Horrell is certainly guilty of that. For example, rather than view the indicative as representing that which God has declared to be true of believers, Horrell claims that the indicative should be read as "group norms that need to be constantly affirmed" (p. 94). Likewise, Horrell ignores Paul's language of conformity/transformation (e.g. Rom 8:29; 12:2; Gal 4:19; Phil 3:10, 21) and speaks only of conformity in terms of living up to the moral paradigm presented by Christ.

Second, Horrell's synthesis simply cannot account for all of the relevant data from Paul nor does it accurately handle some of the data that it addresses. Horrell claims that baptism is the community-forming event in Paul's ethics. Yet, the proclamation and acceptance of the gospel is more likely the candidate to be the community-forming event in Paul's thought, especially in light of 1 Cor 1:17—a text Horrell ignores (cf. 1 Thess

2:13–14 where Paul moves seamlessly from the proclamation of the gospel to the Thessalonians being a community). He also fails to convince that solidarity and other-regard are the two fundamental metanorms for Paul. Where does obedience to God, pleasing God, or faith fit? In passages central to Horrell's analysis, such as Romans 14 and Phil 2:6–11, these concepts are clearly present, yet are ignored. Horrell also fails to address the aspects of Paul's thought that apply to individuals as individuals (e.g. Rom 14:22; 1 Cor 3:10–15; 2 Cor 5:10). Granted Horrell's focus is on social ethics, but communities are made up of individuals. In what sense are Paul's ethics concerned with the individual within the group? Even the field of social psychology that Horrell draws on recognizes that issues related to individuals as individuals are relevant to discussions of the group.

For the student, the teacher, the pastor, or the interested lay person, the weaknesses of the work would seem to outweigh its strengths, and I would not recommend it. For the Pauline scholar or the ethicist, the strengths would seem to outweigh the weaknesses, and the book would be well worth spending the time necessary to reap the benefits of Horrell's work.

James G. Samra
Calvary Church, Grand Rapids, MI

Romans. By Leander Keck. ANTC. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 2005, 400 pp., \$22.00 paper.

Leander Keck has proven to be one of the best Pauline scholars in the last two decades. His approach to Paul is one of a skilled exegete and a learned theologian. The great divide between biblical studies and theology has been broken down more than once in Keck's writings, and this commentary is no different. Keck gives a power presentation of Paul's *magnum opus*. However, do we need another commentary on Romans?

The Abingdon New Testament Commentary series is known for being short and accessible. Thus this commentary is much shorter than most other commentaries on Romans. This, of course, has its advantages and disadvantages. One major advantage is that it reads more smoothly than most commentaries of greater length, which tend to be more choppy and disjointed. Keck, however, gives a very lucid account of Paul's argument in Romans, tracing it step by step and honing in on the main themes and motifs. The disadvantage of this approach is that there are many questions left unanswered, or at least not solved with an exhaustive argument. In light of this, Keck's new commentary is a good supplement to some of the more critical commentaries that give greater attention to the minutiae of grammar, syntax, and word studies.

The text of the commentary does not display footnotes but rather includes bibliographical notes in brackets within the text. This approach can be cumbersome at times, though Keck is careful not to overload his citations. Citations of the Greek text are transliterated, so that those who do not know Greek can pronounce the word (although I am not sure what the benefit of this is). The book is straightforward; it looks like a novel, and at times reads as smoothly as a novel.

The introduction to the commentary gives a wonderful discussion on discourse and canon with regard to the book of Romans. "We do not read the letter as its first recipients did," says Keck, "for it comes to us already interpreted by its placement." Keck goes on to say, "Recognizing this does not invalidate historical exegesis, but expands its horizon by reminding us if the early church had not canonized this letter we would not be reading it at all. The New Testament Romans is the only Romans that exists" (p. 20). This sets

the tone of the commentary, which tends to be more literary than historical-critical. Nevertheless, he does go on to give a brief overview of the probable background of the letter (pp. 29–32) and yet recognizes that the exegetical priority belongs to the text itself. “No reconstruction of earliest Christianity in Rome accounts adequately for much of the theological argument of the whole letter because it ignores the likelihood that the content of Paul’s argument has its own logic and so was not directly his response to what he thought was going on in Rome” (p. 30). As an exegete, then, Keck is committed to the text, and this focus is clear throughout the commentary.

So where do we place Keck on the grid of approaches to Paul? From this commentary, I would say that his approach is “quasi-apocalyptic.” I would not place him fully in the same camp as, say, J. Louis Martyn (*Galatians* [AB; New York: Doubleday, 1997]) or Douglas A. Campbell (*Quest for Paul’s Gospel* [JSNTSup 274; London: T & T Clark International, 2005]), but he would be closer to them than other traditional or new perspective Pauline scholars. Some of Keck’s interpretive conclusions are, however, very traditional. For instance, his treatment of Rom 1:18–3:20 is not much different from what you would find in Douglas Moo’s or Thomas Schreiner’s commentaries. He believes that 1:18–32 is directed toward Gentiles (e.g. p. 74); that 2:1–16 is directed to the moral man; and of course 2:17–29 is directed toward the Jew (pp. 82). He says that Paul was against homosexual acts because they were contrary to nature (pp. 68–69); that “works of the Law” refers to “deeds of the Law” in general (pp. 99–100); and that justification is a forensic declaration (he uses the term “rectification” as does Louis Martyn). So much of what is in this commentary will not sound very novel (Keck does take *pistis Christou* to be a subjective genitive, “faith of Christ,” but this can hardly be called “novel” any more).

Yet his presentation is powerful and theologically rich. His section on 1:16–17 has an “apocalyptic” or even Barthian ring to it. “The gospel is God’s power because the message itself has the capacity to effect salvation” (p. 51). God’s righteousness is being revealed *ek pisteōs*, by Christ’s faithfulness, *eis pistin*, that is, it effects or elicits faith from the believer. “For faith,” says Keck, “clearly refers to the purpose of revelation, namely, the intended result of hearing the gospel, igniting Christian faith” (p. 54). This section is programmatic for the entire argument in Romans 1–8. God’s righteousness, his saving power manifested in the gospel, is the solution to the dark condition of the old age. It breaks into the cosmos rectifying both man and creation in order to set the world right.

Throughout the commentary, Keck demonstrates a wide knowledge of both primary and secondary sources. Even though his commentary is rather brief in comparison, he does not shrink back from interaction with all sorts of Second Temple Jewish and Greco-Roman texts. I was impressed by Keck’s familiarity with a vast volume of primary texts, and this goes for secondary sources as well. He demonstrates a thorough acquaintance with commentaries both old and new, and even with recent monographs that a veteran like Keck could have neglected (in particular, Ross Wagner’s recent work often pops up in his discussion). So although his commentary is brief and at times frustratingly concise, it is a fine contribution to the vast world of Romans commentaries.

So do we need another commentary on Romans? Perhaps not. Yet after reading this one, I would say that we *do* need more books by Leander Keck, and what could be more fruitful and stimulating than his seasoned thoughts on Paul’s greatest theological treatment?

Preston Sprinkle
University of Nottingham, Nottingham, England

Hebrews. Edited by Erik M. Heen and Philip D. W. Krey. ACCS. Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 2005, xxvi + 292 pp., \$40.00.

The special nature of this “commentary” on Hebrews requires some explanation at the outset. Thomas Oden, ACCS general editor, envisions the biblical commentaries in the series as analogous to the compilation of Jewish rabbinic comments in the Talmud, a sort of “Christian Talmud.” Such an ordered compendium of interpretive comments on the Scriptures by the Fathers revives a primitive Christian form and practice. In keeping with the ACCS mission and ancient form, the editors of *Hebrews* (ACCS)—Heen and Krey—selected, reworked, introduced, and arranged interpretive extracts on the text of Hebrews from the first eight centuries of Church fathers. After giving the biblical pericope itself (RSV), they present their own brief overview of the major lines of patristic interpretation on that passage. Selected comments from the Fathers then follow with a bold topical heading introducing each one, with author and work also clearly identified. Readers who struggle to remember the names, dates, and general historical data for the numerous and sometimes relatively unknown Fathers quoted will find helpful additional historical sections as back matter in the commentary: brief biographical sketches for every Father, a timeline of the Fathers inclusive of geographic locations, and a bibliography on the works in their original languages.

As to the content itself, Heen and Krey most notably made a strategic decision to anchor their catenae-like commentary in Chrysostom’s homilies on Hebrews (ca. 403–4). Chrysostom’s work, while not the earliest, stands out above all other early Christian interpretation of Hebrews as the best-preserved and most comprehensive work on that epistle. His finely-honed homilies drew on the best rhetorical traditions of his day (intriguingly fitting to Hebrews’ own well-known refined literary style) and were the pinnacle of early Christian biblical exposition. In both the Greek East and the Latin West Chrysostom’s work heavily influenced all Christian exegesis of Hebrews to and even beyond the Reformation. So, fittingly, Heen and Krey regularly reference his comments, using him as a sort of exegetical plumb line to attain “continuity of voice” throughout this volume, a largely successful stratagem.

In the array of other Church fathers that are quoted, an imbalance in favor of the Eastern Church fathers occurs, though this apparent weakness is largely unavoidable due to the earlier acceptance of Hebrews there and the delayed openness to Hebrews in the West. This, however, still does not unduly detract from a real strength of this volume on Hebrews, namely the truly ecumenical feel the reader experiences when exposed to colorful contributions from all quarters of early Christian exegesis. From the adventurous allegorical comments of the Alexandrian Origen, on whose words one can almost smell Plato, to the more circumspect and careful comments of Antiochenes such as Theodoret and Chrysostom himself, exposure to this ecumenical “cloud of witnesses” gives a sense of community conversation around the exegetical common ground.

This commentary has a particular strength in focusing on what most typified early patristic literature—biblical citation, paraphrase, and exposition. However indebted we are to modern patristic studies focused on matters of metaphysics, socio-cultural backgrounds, creeds, councils, and doctrinal development, the reality remains that serious interaction with Scripture stands as the great common denominator throughout all the Fathers. Biblical researchers today, therefore, are indebted to ACCS editors such as Heen and Krey, whose far-reaching efforts have made the biblical insights of the Fathers, often onerous to obtain, vastly more accessible. One particular aspect of this improved accessibility appears in the practice of intertextuality, a necessity when—as with Origen’s missing homilies on Hebrews—an interpreter’s comments on Hebrews are only available buried in other works where they pull in Hebrews.

The comments of the Fathers themselves reveal a different world of exegesis from the contemporary critical approaches that dominate modern biblical commentaries. Without gainsaying the insights of modern methods, it is refreshing to see Heen and Krey select extracts that show the Fathers' more integrated approach to exegesis. Their comments include theology, moral exhortation, spirituality, and liturgical instructions, which is markedly different from the overspecialized style of commentaries so common today. The comments of the Fathers on Hebrews include deeply practical and demanding applications of the text to real life issues. While the commentary may be more of a supplement to modern biblical commentaries, recognizing how the Fathers' comments are contextualized in the life of the church offers a corrective voice to Bible interpreters today to value seriously a more integrated approach.

Clearly Hebrews significantly impacted the Fathers across a wide spectrum of theological, Christological, and ecclesiological issues of their day. Their comments range from the use of Heb 1:3 in anti-Arian polemics, to church conflicts over rigorist interpretations (Novatians) of Hebrews' notorious warning passages, to reflections on the nature of Jesus' humanity and divinity, and to the key feature of Hebrews' high priestly Christology. To give a specific example, Heen and Krey extensively cite Epiphanius of Salamis (fourth century) from his *Panarion* on the distinctive Melchizedek teachings in Hebrews. Intriguingly, his comments occur in the context of his refutation of the spurious doctrines of the so-called Melchizedians. Epiphanius offers restrained and sound observations on Melchizedek teachings in Hebrews, basic insights still echoed by modern Christian interpreters.

In closing, one unavoidable weakness most readers of *Hebrews* (ACCS) will likely experience is the fact that the Church fathers are difficult to read. Despite the editors' efforts to present the patristic writings in the best English translational style possible (an effort duly noted and appreciated) and though one has to wrestle only with extracts from the Fathers in *Hebrews* (ACCS) rather than full texts, their comments often still remain opaque rather than directly intelligible. This, however, is not an insuperable difficulty to the determined reader and does not detract from this "Christian Talmud" commentary's great strengths of ecumenicity, accessibility, and a more integrated exegetical approach. *Hebrews* (ACCS) occupies a unique exegetical place within the growing contemporary literature on this singular NT epistle, a valuable addition to the library collections of new generations of Christian teachers.

John L. Terveen
Multnomah Biblical Seminary, Portland, OR

The Works of Philo: Greek Text with Morphology. Edited by Peder Borgen, Kåre Fuglseth, and Roald Skarsten. Logos Bible Software Series X. Bellingham: Logos Library Systems, 2005. CD-ROM. \$119.95.

NT scholars and students of Second Temple Judaism have long known the importance of Philo. Hebrews and John are often compared with the language and concepts of Philo, and numerous other NT works use vocabulary or concepts that Philo also uses. The only reason that there are not more references to Philo in scholarly works is that in the past we often could not find the data without reading through his voluminous works in Greek ourselves. Thus we have often relied upon the information extracted by others, which means that we missed data. It is clear that we have needed a searchable form of Philo.

Logos Bible Software already had available *The Works of Philo: Complete and Unabridged* (trans. C. D. Yonge; Hendrickson, 1993). However, while that is certainly useful

for (among other things) looking up and inserting quotations from Philo, it is a translation of Philo. Therefore, searching it did not reveal if a certain Greek word appeared in Philo with multiple meanings or if he used a certain grammatical construction. That deficit is remedied in the work under review, the result of the Philo Concordance Project, which was initiated by Peder Borgen and Roald Skarsten in the late 1960s at the University of Bergen and continues with ongoing checking and revising of the database. I have owned an earlier (paper) product of that project, *The Philo Index* (Trondheim: Unitrel, 1997) since the late 1990s.

The work under review is a welcome step forward from that printed *Index* because: (1) it was published by Logos Library Systems in the Libronix format and so is computer-readable; and (2) it contains morphological tags, which means that one can search for morphology as well as for Greek terms and lemmas. For instance, once I figured out how to use the Logos Greek font, I could pick up the 35 instances of διπλός in seconds and do what I cannot do with the paper text, jump to each instance and read it in its full context. If one wanted an English translation, one could have the English version, *The Works of Philo, Complete and Unabridged*, open in another window. One can also link the two, and they will synchronize. What is more, if you have any other book in Libronix format that has hot links to Philo, a click on that link will bring you to the proper place in this Greek text so that you can read the example in context.

The power of this tool is enhanced in that one can search for morphological tags (using the Libronix advanced search window). For instance, let us say that I wanted all occurrences of διπλός that were accusative plural feminine. I could search for the lemma and this tag (JAPF); four instances appear. Yet here we have a problem, for Libronix searches by section or sentence (since there are no "Bible verses" in Philo), and so in one of these four instances another word in the same section is the JAPF targeted by the search, and my chosen lemma occurs in that section as an accusative plural neuter. Still, I did narrow the field to four possible instances, even if one was a false positive. One could, of course, have a series of required grammatical tags and/or lemmas to be found within the section/sentence, and that would further limit the possible hits.

Obviously this is a wonderful tool, but it is not a perfect one. If I were doing a biblical search, Libronix has a search engine that can do grammatical searches combined with a lemma. That tool will not work on Philo, since the sophisticated engine only works on canonical books. As an increasing number of morphological non-biblical works become available, one would hope that Libronix would develop a similarly sophisticated search engine to search them. The way that one does a search now is to specify a tag *and* another tag or a lemma *and* whatever else one wants to be in the sentence/section. What one cannot do is specify the order in which they occur or, as indicated above, whether the tag or lemma go together. This is a limitation that means that one will be doing more analysis by hand than would be the case if another search program were available. A further limitation is that the tags and lemmas are not hidden as they are in biblical texts. In reading an electronic biblical text, one does not realize that the tags and lemmas are there, but the program does have them and uses that data when questioned about a word or when searching the text. Since Philo is not a biblical text, the coding remains visible, so that, as in printed editions of tagged biblical texts, one has three lines per line of text, the first containing the text, the second the tagging under each word of text, and then the third the lemma under the tagging. If what one wants to do is simply read the text, the other information "between the lines" is distracting.

This is not a perfect tool. Eventually, we will certainly have a better search engine and a viewer in which the tags and lemmas are masked, except when we want that information. Furthermore, the Philo Concordance Project is ongoing, and the text is being corrected and updated (free upgrades will be available periodically for download). Still, what we now have is a giant leap forward. Before this text was published, there may

have been an excuse for not checking out a word or construction in Philo. Now there is none. This is an affordable tool that scholars of the NT or first-century Judaism ignore at their peril.

Peter H. Davids
St. Stephen's University, St. Stephen, NB, Canada

No Longer Jews: The Search for Gnostic Origins. By Carl B. Smith II. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2004, xvii + 317 pp., \$29.95.

Literature on ancient gnosticism continues to be published with what an acquaintance once called “kaleidoscopic rapidity.” One of the newer, substantial studies is that of Carl B. Smith II, associate professor of history and religion at Palm Beach Atlantic University. This book is a revised form of his Ph.D. dissertation under the noted scholar Edwin Yamauchi. In addition to Smith's book, at least three other major books have appeared in the last five years on the general issues of the origins and character of gnosticism: *Die Gnosis* by C. Marksches (München: Beck, 2001); *ET Gnosis* [London: T & T Clark, 2003]; *Die Gnosis* by K.-W. Tröger (Freiburg: Herder, 2001) and *What Is Gnosticism?* by K. L. King (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2003).

The subtitle of this book makes Smith's major goal clear: he seeks to answer the long-term elusive question about gnosticism—when and how did it originate? If this could be answered definitively, so much of the discussion about the nature of ancient gnosticism and its relationships with Judaism, Greco-Roman religion and philosophy, and the early church would be cleared up.

Before Smith gets to the development of his own proposal, he gives, in the first two chapters, an excellent survey of the state of gnostic scholarship at the time of his writing. This would be an important introduction to gnosticism for any teacher or student. The one drawback to this fine survey of scholarship is Smith's virtual neglect of any close study of the panoply of texts from the Nag Hammadi collection (Smith does discuss helpfully internal polemics in Nag Hammadi texts later in his study [pp. 195–213]). Their contributions to the issues of gnostic origins certainly need to be taken into account (e.g. see now *The Secret Revelation of John* by K. L. King [Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2006]).

In chapters 3 through 5 of the book, Smith develops his new, distinctive theory on gnostic origins. He proposes that gnosticism arose in a social context of “alienated Judaism” influenced by Greco-Roman and early Christian ideas in the aftermath of the Jewish revolt against Emperor Trajan in AD 115–17. It is this historical location that is most distinctive about Smith's proposal; the other elements, individually and together, have appeared in other scholars' reconstructions of the origins of gnosticism. Issues related to “alienated Judaism” have frequently been discussed over the years (e.g. R. M. Grant, A. Segal, B. A. Pearson, D. M. Scholer). Whether gnosticism had its origins before the rise of the Christian movement or after/within the Christian movement is a long-term debate. With Smith, a student of Yamauchi, the apple has fallen near the tree. At one point (p. 245) Smith credits me with the correct understanding of the Jewish intellectual context but argues for a significantly different historical location of the origin of gnosticism. Smith's “devaluation” of the traditions about Simon Magus, which are probably too severe, are virtually necessary to his case that gnosticism did not originate before AD 115–17.

Smith's hypothesis is innovative but remains somewhat speculative. It is simply too difficult, especially given the general paucity of information about the AD 115–17 Jewish

revolt, to make a probable case that this is the historical locus of the intellectual ferment that produced gnosticism. It is a possible suggestion, but possibilities do not become historical probabilities simply by assertion, even when accompanied by close, careful arguments. And, Smith does give a closely argued, carefully crafted case for his point of view; it is a pleasure to read it. So, Smith's theory is now on the table and will take its place as one possible solution to an admittedly very difficult problem.

What probably is the deeper issue is whether gnosticism—and here the problem of definition is crucial and maybe determinative—originated apart from and prior to the Christian movement or as part of/within the Christian movement. Clearly, gnosticism became a Christian option in the second century AD in the quests to solve the theological problems of God, evil, and the place or role of the Christ Redeemer. Smith makes a slightly anachronistic assumption of the clear difference between “orthodoxy” and “heresy” for this period in the second century. What became known as traditional orthodox Christianity and as “heretical” gnosticism were both seeking profound answers to fundamental theological problems of God, the universe, human life, and human destiny. This is not to denigrate the “orthodox” solutions; Smith, myself, and many of the readers of this review will agree that those solutions were biblically sound and most adequate.

Smith's book concludes with a fine bibliography and thorough indices (pp. 253–317). All in all, Smith has produced a fine study. It is thoughtful, creative, fair, well argued, and provocative. It is a good addition to the scholarly debate on the origins and character of the gnostic phenomenon in antiquity.

David M. Scholer
Fuller Theological Seminary, Pasadena, CA

Rabbinic Literature: An Essential Guide. By Jacob Neusner. Nashville: Abingdon, 2005, 164 pp., \$16.00 paper.

Neusner's book is a valuable introductory guide for novices entering the world of rabbinic literature. The first chapter briefly defines rabbinic literature and its significance both for general interest and most importantly for Christian studies. Chapters 2 through 4 form the majority of the text and survey the various rabbinic works of antiquity (up through ca. 600). The main goal of these three chapters is to describe the overarching message of the compilers of each work in its final form. The final two chapters briefly seek to demonstrate the relationships between rabbinic literature and Hebrew Scripture, on the one hand, and Christian Scripture, on the other. The appendix consists of a chart listing each of the divisions and tractates of the Mishnah and indicating which ones are treated in the Tosefta and in the Palestinian and Babylonian Talmuds.

Chapter 2 introduces the reader to the concept of the oral tradition (oral Torah) by surveying two works, one of the tractates of the Talmud, *Abot*, “The Fathers,” and a later reworking of the same, known as *Abot d'Rabbi Nathan*, “The Fathers according to Rabbi Nathan.” Chapter 3 treats halakhic (legal) works. Beginning with the Mishnah, Neusner gives a valuable overview of each of the six orders, showing how each contributes to the main message of the Mishnah and how each of the 62 tractates relates to that order (pp. 23–30). Next, he treats in turn the Tosefta and the two Talmuds. Finally, he turns to the verse-by-verse commentaries: to Exodus, *Mekhilta attributed to Rabbi Ishmael*, to Leviticus, *Sifra*, and the two *Sifres*, to Numbers and Deuteronomy. Chapter 4 treats aggadic (theological) works, organized around Scripture. Here he treats the commentaries: first, *Genesis Rabbah* and *Leviticus Rabbah*, organized around Scripture; then

Pesiqta deRab Kahana, organized around the lectionary cycle of the festivals; and, finally, *Lamentations Rabbah*, *Song of Songs Rabbah*, *Ruth Rabbah* and *Esther Rabbah I*.

Rabbinic works are clearly composite, but it must be agreed that the compilers of each composition had a purpose in arrangement. As Neusner notes, the purpose is not expressed explicitly but must be gleaned from reading the finished product itself. Neusner is careful to distinguish the intent of the original sayings and the intent of the final compilers (p. 159, n. 3; cf. p. 75). In chapters 2–4, Neusner delineates the similarities and differences of each work's message and structure and compares them to one another. For *Lamentations Rabbah* (pp. 97–102) and *Ruth Rabbah* (pp. 109–14) he offers a précis of the entire work. Along the way, he provides a few key examples to illustrate.

Chapter 5, "Rabbinic Literature and the Hebrew Scriptures," is quite amazing. In a mere fifteen pages Neusner constructs a coherent theology of Aggadah and Halakhah in all of rabbinic literature. He does this by identifying three theological points of all of the Aggadah. Under each point he lists a total of nine categories formulated in Halakhah, listing under each the tractates dealing with that point. The Halakhah is then summarized as three motifs (pp. 134–35).

Chapter 6, "Rabbinic Literature and the Christian Scriptures," is less ambitious. Though Neusner does not attempt to summarize all of Christian theology through ca. 600, he follows his diachronic approach by treating the writings of the NT and the early Christians as a whole. Then he illustrates how this approach can be used to compare Judaism and Christianity with aggadic and halakhic examples. The aggadic example compares the parable of the king who gave a marriage feast (Matt 22:1–14) to a similar parable attributed to Yohanan ben Zakkai (*b. Shab.* 153a; pp. 137–44). One may easily disagree with Neusner's analysis of Jesus' parable, but the approach is interesting for comparing the two systems.

Some might fault Neusner for not interacting with other literature. His sparse endnotes mostly offer a small bibliography of standard works on the subjects, including translations, but there is no discussion of the views of others. Further, most of the bibliographic entries are books by Neusner himself. This is somewhat to be expected, since a large part of his career has been devoted to publishing translations of rabbinic works, several of which have had no complete translation in any modern language. More thorough bibliographies and scholarly interaction, however, would have made the book less accessible to a reader new to the confusing world of rabbinic literature. The few other works that are mentioned do provide thorough bibliographies for students desiring to do more investigation.

At times Neusner is difficult to follow. One place this shows up is in his frequent classifications, which often do not seem parallel. For example, he categorizes Halakhah as legal material, as is commonly understood, by the meaning of the term. However, he classifies Aggadah (which means "narrative," or "lore," in his words) by his understanding of its nature, "theological" (cf. titles to chaps. 3 and 4 and pp. 19, 74). Beginners would benefit by closer parallelism or explanations of such deviations.

A more significant matter gets to the heart of Neusner's book, namely, his diachronic approach. Neusner advocates ignoring temporal differences between the works to portray a unified theology of rabbinic Judaism. Most scholars tend to focus on the differences within Judaism, which precludes even seeking to find a cohesive theology. Neusner's attempt is quite ambitious and interesting. Does Neusner oversimplify? Certainly the veracity of Neusner's constructions needs to be thoroughly tested, but that must be left to experts using his larger books introducing various rabbinic works rather than this brief guide.

Neusner's contribution is valuable, because it provides a big picture of the individual works of rabbinic literature and of the theology of rabbinic Judaism as a whole. Certainly this work is appropriate for graduate or undergraduate students who have no prior

knowledge of rabbinic literature in the original language. A beginner should read the relevant parts of Neusner's book to begin to grasp the larger context of the literature. Rabbinic scholars will find plenty to chew on in Neusner's various analyses.

Lee M. Fields

Roanoke Bible College, Elizabeth City, NC

Broken Words: Reflections on the Craft of Preaching. By Paul Scott Wilson. Nashville: Abingdon, 2004, 168 pp., \$18.00 paper. *Difficult Texts: A Preaching Commentary.* By Catherine Gunsalus González. Nashville: Abingdon, 2005, 118 pp., \$16.00 paper.

These two books address the biblical and theological content of the sermon from different vantage points. Paul Scott Wilson is Professor of Homiletics at Emmanuel College of the University of Toronto. His title *Broken Words* points to the dynamic of divine grace and human action that stands as foundation of this book. Preached words break open the bread of life, but they are also broken themselves, spoken by redeemed sinners, imperfect yet empowered by the Spirit. Wilson himself is honest enough to present a few that did not work as an encouragement to learn through one's mistakes.

A companion to Wilson's earlier *The Four Pages of the Sermon*, the opening chapter of *Broken Words* explains the four pages approach as concerned not so much with the form of the sermon (as in narrative, expository, topical approaches) as its theological content. The basic tension between trouble and grace generates electricity; words that trouble put the burden on humanity to act, words that proclaim grace place the burden upon God to save. An element of judgment appears in Wilson's understanding: "Trouble has to do with human sin and God's condemnation. Grace has to do with supplying what we lack" (p. 3). Both are necessary if a sermon is to faithfully represent the biblical witness.

The trouble-grace dynamic offers a "theological grammar" that gives focus to the sermon and a "theological structure to enable the gospel to be heard" (p. 3). The four-page structure guides the preacher in writing about: (1) trouble in the biblical world; (2) trouble in our world; (3) grace in the biblical world; and (4) grace in our world. The four components need not be presented in that order, as some of the sermons included here show, but each should receive equal voice if the message of redemption is to be both experienced and understood.

A general theory can guide practice, but real coaching takes place here as common preaching challenges are handled with wise counsel and a model sermon. Wilson answers the kind of questions that might have been raised in his preaching class: How does one preach grace if the text seems to have none? How can I use imagination to bring the text to life and remain faithful to it? What can the preacher do to magnify the work of God in a biblical text? Other reflection/sermon pairings address preaching ethics and social justice, finding one's reflection in the text, keeping the focus on God and locating the presence of God in ordinary events. A final chapter on eschatology, "preaching's often neglected dimension" (p. 152), reminds us that people do need to hear that "God wins" (p. 162), especially those listeners who know they are desperate.

Catherine Gunsalus González, Professor Emerita of Church History at Columbia Theological Seminary, in her book *Difficult Texts*, offers help with preaching Scripture's difficult texts. She acknowledges that some of the difficulty of hearing Scripture's message is attributable to sin, but adds that often the message itself is hard to understand and apply in a particular time and place. To prove the point, she presents a few examples in which different social settings and cultural perspectives can make for hard

listening. So Jesus' words on hating father and mother (Luke 12:51–53) might sound compatible with the culture of American individualism, but they would be hard for people in Asian cultures where first-generation Christians risk rejection by the families they are supposed to honor. Or, whereas many Americans interpret "Love your enemies" as a call to be kind to people they do not like, people with deep-seated ethnic conflicts like those of the former Yugoslavia or Palestinians and Israelis who lay claim to the same land make loving enemies a form of treason to one's own people.

González then proposes a method that begins by asking why a text might be difficult in a given time and place before she treats some texts many Americans find hard to hear. To start, preachers might list all the questions and objections listeners might raise, examining cultural assumptions as to why a text seems not right or not relevant. Other texts from both testaments can be consulted to draw a larger picture of the issue. The preacher can then study the difficult text in depth and finally make some conclusions for interpreting the passage now. González applies her fourfold method to the words on having enough in Prov 30:7–9, asking "Can the consumer ever be satisfied?" (p. 13) and Jesus' words about service in Matt 20:17–28, asking "Shouldn't we try to get ahead?" (p. 67).

The combination of insightful summary of contemporary sensitivities with careful use of biblical scholarship makes this an admirable model of sermon preparation for all texts, not just those that appear difficult. Like Wilson's four pages approach, González's approach brings biblical and contemporary worlds together in conversation that respects each without diminishing biblical authority. What I found especially helpful is the way the two approaches give both preacher and congregation encouragement to voice their questions together. Attention to that interaction offers the promise that preaching can bring a life-giving word that is both relevant and faithful.

Paul E. Koptak

North Park Theological Seminary, Chicago, IL

Servants of the Servant: A Biblical Theology of Leadership. By Don N. Howell, Jr. Eugene: Wipf & Stock, 2003, 314 pp., \$24.00.

This book sets out to delineate a full-orbed biblical theology of Christian leadership and is aimed at both an academic as well as a lay audience. While recognizing the Bible is not a textbook on leadership, the author nevertheless believes it indeed contains a "theology of leadership" that can be discerned from the precepts, principles, and examples of Holy Scripture (p. 1). As the title of the work indicates, the concept of servanthood is presented here as central to the biblical understanding of a leader.

In his introduction, the author defines leadership as "taking the initiative to influence people to grow in holiness and to passionately promote the extension of God's kingdom in the world" (p. 3). Whether a person leads in a beneficial or detrimental way depends upon whether or not the character, motive, and agenda of the leader are in accord with biblical truth. According to the author, this holds true of leadership in any setting, quite apart from questions of leadership style, the type of organization (church vs. parachurch ministry), or a person's specific role in a given organization. Hence the theology of leadership presented in the volume is applicable to a wide variety of people and organizational settings.

The study is organized as follows: Part 1 explores the language of servanthood in the Bible, first in the OT and then in the NT. Part 2 contains eleven chapters, each of which provides a "leadership profile" of several OT figures (Joseph, Moses, Joshua, Deborah,

Gideon, Samson, Samuel, David, Solomon, Daniel, and Nehemiah). After an analysis of the biblical material that pertains to these characters, each chapter provides a summary of the chief leadership qualities of the person in question. Part 3 examines the leadership profile of Jesus, focusing in particular on three “kingdom motifs” that governed how he prepared and equipped his disciples for leadership in the post-resurrection church, which the author summarizes under the rubrics of “harvest through sacrifice,” “righteousness through freedom,” and “greatness through servanthood.” Part 4 follows with five NT leadership profiles (Peter, John, Barnabas, Timothy, and Titus). Part 5 devotes two chapters to the apostle Paul, whose foundational leadership in the early church is plain both in his epistles and in Acts. Part 6, which concludes the work, sets forth the broad profile of the biblical servant leader. Rather than providing merely a compilation of the various profiles contained in the preceding chapters, Howell attempts to relate the biblical material to the three key issues he set forth in the book’s introduction, namely, a leader’s character, motive, and agenda.

While the author’s commitment to the authority of Scripture is clearly stated at the outset and is evident throughout the work, his actual use of Scripture was something of a disappointment. By this I am not referring to the fact that I disagreed with his interpretations of particular passages on occasion, which is only to be expected. Rather, I found myself increasingly dissatisfied with the almost exclusive weight the author places on the various “leadership profiles” of biblical characters for establishing his theology of leadership. Though he mentions the need to look at the “precepts, principles, and examples” of leadership in the Bible (p. 1), in reality he gives practically all of the attention to the examples and has relatively little interaction with the Bible’s more directly didactic material relevant to the subject (e.g. he gives little consideration to leadership themes in non-narrative portions of the OT). He explicitly states he is attempting to use the historical narrative of Scripture to establish normative principles of leadership (p. 2). While this is no doubt possible in some instances, it is not so in many others, and when applied across the board it quickly falls into a moralistic reading of Scripture that invites eisegesis rather than exegesis. The attempt to paint a “leadership profile” of Joseph (pp. 22–26) is a case in point: the author views Joseph as the “leadership figure” of the narrative, with his elder brothers portrayed as “discredited leaders” (p. 23), and he develops his profile accordingly. I think the author’s hermeneutic leads him astray here because, to the contrary, I believe that it can be argued from a narrative analysis of Genesis 37–50 that Judah, not Joseph, is the real “leader” in the narrative (see, e.g., Gen 49:8), and the larger redemptive-historical movement of the biblical narrative certainly bears this out. This points not only to the need for a much more thorough literary and exegetical analysis in order to make assertions about the character, motives, and agenda of various biblical personages, but more importantly to the need for more careful hermeneutical reflection on the use of Scripture and theological method. The author would have been better advised to focus his attention on analyzing key texts that speak *directly* to the subject of leadership (as he does in chapter 23 in his helpful discussion of Paul’s qualifications for church officers in the Pastoral Epistles) before proceeding to this sort of narrative approach.

Such criticism notwithstanding, Howell is to be commended for his serious attempt at scholarly reflection on a theology of leadership. This is not “fluff,” and he clearly desires to let Scripture act as the decisive guide on the matter rather than adapting the theories of the latest leadership guru. The book’s focus on the theme of servanthood is thought provoking and serves as a helpful reminder to anyone called to a role of leadership.

Max Rogland
Trinity Presbyterian Church, Rochester, MN