JETS 60/2 (2017): 377–434

BOOK REVIEWS

Inductive Bible Study: Observation, Interpretation, and Application through the Lenses of History, Literature, and Theology. By Richard Alan Fuhr Jr. and Andreas J. Köstenberger. Nashville: B&H Academic, 2016, xii + 371 pp., $34.99.

The inductive Bible study book by Richard Fuhr and Andreas Köstenberger is a practical and useful tool that claims to have flowed out of Köstenberger and Richard Patterson's earlier work, *Invitation to Biblical Interpretation: Exploring the Hermeneutical Triad of History, Literature, and Theology*. It appears to lay the foundation for Köstenberger and Patterson's earlier work by combining their hermeneutical triad of history, literature, and theology with the inductive Bible study method. To be sure, there is no shortage of hermeneutical or Bible study books on the market. Those geared to the beginner include Gordon D. Fee and Douglas Stuart, *How to Read the Bible for All Its Worth*, and David R. Bauer and Robert A. Traina, *Inductive Bible Study*. For the more advanced student there is: William W. Klein, Craig L. Blomberg, and Robert L. Hubbard Jr., *Introduction to Biblical Interpretation*, and Grant R. Osborne, *The Hermeneutical Spiral: A Comprehensive Introduction to Biblical Interpretation*. But there is still room for this clear, practical, and easy-to-follow introduction to the study of the Bible.

The authors of this beginning textbook provide a nice balance, with a younger scholar, Dr. Fuhr (Liberty University), whose expertise is in the OT, and a more mature scholar, Dr. Köstenberger (Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary), whose specialty is the NT. The structure of this book is exactly what readers would expect of an inductive study book: Observation, Interpretation, and Application. Chapter 2 basically lays out the steps for their inductive Bible study method, which is then further explained throughout the rest of the book. The strongest section is the discussion of the final area of Bible study: application. The authors provide sensible and practical guidelines on how to properly make the biblical text relevant to its modern readers.

The introduction provides a helpful description and explanation of the various gaps between the modern reader and the biblical text, namely the Time Gap, the Geographical Gap, and the Cultural Gap, and even gives some contemporary examples to help the reader understand these. But it is missing some biblical examples to help today's student see why all the work required for in-depth study makes an important difference in the interpretation of the text. For example, Köstenberger explains that when he first studied the Gospel of John, he carefully mapped out the movements of Jesus and his followers throughout the land of Israel (p. 9), but he does not further explain how this changed his thinking. Many students would be better motivated to do the extra work suggested by this book if there were a clearer discussion, with examples, of how the principles presented will change their understanding of Scripture and its application to life. This is especially important given that this book is more of an introduction to this area, probably

aimed at Bible college or Christian university students that sometimes need to be convinced of the importance of this area. Once past the introduction, however, the authors do much better at providing biblical illustrations to highlight the principles. Good examples of this include the explanation of how to apply 1 Corinthians 8:1b to the contemporary reader (pp. 318–322), the discussion of the textual issue in Amos 4:4 (p. 52), and exploring just how tall Goliath was (p. 64).

One issue that surfaces in the footnotes is the tendency for the authors to draw mainly from authors writing with Broadman and Holman Publishers. While this publisher has many fine books in print, the problem here is a question of bringing more balance in perspective by including a wider range of resources. On a lesser note, there are a few instances in which an illustration or example could easily have been provided to illustrate the point being made. For instance, when describing the textual variant in Hosea 7:14 (p. 65), the authors simply state that "both Hebrew verbs look very much alike." It would be more helpful to either include the Hebrew verbs themselves for visual comparison, or to at least explain that the issue hinges on the difference between the two letters *daleth* and *resh,* i.e. the slightly extended stroke (or "tittle") on the letter *daleth*. Similarly, when talking about chapter and verse divisions (p. 152), examples such as Isaiah 4:1 or 9:1 (ET) would be helpful. There are a few places where I would want them to clarify their language, such as on page 15 where they state, "Others expect that God will act today in exactly the same way as he has done in the past." In general, this is true. God's character does not change and so we read the Bible to see how God works with people. Thus, I am wondering what nuances they are trying to get across here and maybe just an example would help clarify things.

However, these points are relatively minor when we compare them to the positives the book has to offer. There is a significant emphasis on the original languages taking precedence over any Bible translation (e.g., p. 12). There is a clear explanation about the biblical text having a "single meaning of the text" (or what the authors refer to as a "one-meaning principle," pp. 27–29). They highlight the progressive nature of the divine revelation of the biblical texts and why that makes a difference in interpreting the text (e.g., pp. 32–33). The "sample interpretive questions" (pp. 87–99) provide good examples of the types of questions the reader should ask to draw meaning from any given text. The guidelines presented for beginning Bible study students throughout the book are not only clear, but are useful tools to mine the treasures of the biblical texts.

While the field of inductive Bible study has many good books from which to choose, I would definitely recommend this book for any beginning Bible student, especially for its section on application of the biblical texts. The concepts are easily accessible, well laid out, and provide a good framework for the student to know where to start in order to delve more deeply into the study of Scripture.

Paul D. Wegner
Gateway Seminary, Ontario, CA

Crossing Cultures in Scripture: Biblical Principles for Mission Practice. By Marvin J. Newell. Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2016, 302 pp., $20.00 paper.

My first reaction upon delving into *Crossing Cultures in Scripture* was to think (aloud!): "Marvin, you just might be onto something here!" In his preface, the author affirms that he has "yet to discover an entire text devoted to what may be called a biblical theology of culture" (p. 13). Indeed, there may not have been one, and this is a step in the right direction. Marvin J. Newell serves as senior vice president of Missio Nexus (a network of evangelical mission agencies, churches, and training centers in North America), spent 21 years in cross-cultural service in east and southeast Asia, and holds a doctorate in missiology. He is distinctly qualified to attempt to develop a biblical theology of culture.

As I considered the author's claim, several works came to mind, but none of them could rightly be considered to be a "biblical theology of culture," nor do they necessarily claim to present biblical principles for mission practice. Tillich's *Theology of Culture* is a philosophical and liberal theological approach to culture. Niebuhr's classic, *Christ in Culture,* is a neo-orthodox theological approach, and Schilder's book of the same name represents, to borrow from Van Til, a "Calvinistic concept of culture." Luzbetak's *The Church and Culture* presents a (somewhat) Catholic approach to missiological anthropology. Kraft's *Christianity in Culture* and Miller's *Discipling Nations* come a bit closer to a biblical theology of culture, but are not intended as such. The first three books are theological in nature and steeped in the trappings of their Western heritage. The latter three are missiological in nature, taking cross-cultural issues into serious consideration, but the starting point of two of them (Luzbetak and Kraft) is the social sciences, while the latter—though thoroughly biblical—is not an examination of the stories of the Bible for the purpose of preparing missionaries.

In other words, Newell seems, indeed, to have found a niche. In reality, the book falls short of being a biblical theology of culture and should not be judged as such. (Neither should readers expect a book on contextual theology or intercultural hermeneutics, though there are traces throughout.) Rather, it reads somewhat more like a biblical theology of missions and lives up to its subtitle in presenting biblical principles for mission practice, primarily by looking at the Bible both as our "first and final authority," and as "a guide to our experiences in crosscultural engagements," which are found throughout Scripture and "are so numerous that the Bible itself is a textbook on cultural understanding" (p. 13). Without showing disrespect for the social sciences, Newell focuses on "Scripture through the lens of cultural understanding" (p. 13), asserting that the Bible is a portrayer of cultures, a sculptor of cultures and an appraiser of cultures. In light of these three realities, he divides the book into three parts: (1) Foundational Cultural Considerations; (2) Crossing Cultures in the OT; and (3) Crossing Cultures in the NT.

In a span of about 300 pages divided into 36 chapters—organized canonically rather than topically—Newell introduces the reader to "culture," then explores many of the numerous cultural engagements encountered from Genesis to Revelation. While the journey is sweeping and non-exhaustive, it nonetheless manages to

examine about twenty-five narratives—ranging from the obvious (e.g. Abraham, Jonah, Jesus, and Paul) to the unexpected (e.g. "Luke's one last word")—and a handful of additional non-narrative chapters (e.g. "The Lord's Prayer for Missionaries" and "Eternity: Doxological Diversity"). The chapters average around six to eight pages each, and most of them are structured around the Bible passage, "Setting," "Crosscultural Insights," and "Crossing Takeaway." Occasionally, a chapter (or portion thereof) will feel a bit like a typical Sunday School lesson, but by and large Newell does an admirable job of gleaning insights into crosscultural missions topics such as shame and honor, crosscultural ignorance, multicultural leadership, conversion, power-distance relationships, ethnocentrism, contextualization and much more—and drawing out applications for mission practice. This is done in part through a nice illustrative mix of some of his personal missions experiences blended with contemporary examples (such as that of Nima, from the world of human trafficking) or historical and biographical ones (e.g. Hudson Taylor).

There are several components of *Crossing Cultures in Scripture* that I found very helpful from a pedagogical perspective, including four appendices (the first one, a "Sermon Series Guide," will prove especially helpful to pastors and Bible teachers), a fairly comprehensive bibliography, a name index, a Scripture index, 11 figures, 11 tables, and a topical guide. In lieu of the last of these, I much would have preferred a more comprehensive subject index. With respect to the figures and tables, there were several missed opportunities (such as with the five "blessing passages" in chapter 4).

There are several aspects of the book that dampened my enthusiasm just a bit. First, some of the chapters are inconsistent in their size and content. They range from two to eleven pages long, and while most of them explore Bible stories, some of them stray into other territory that does not fit the overall flow of the book, particularly in part 3 (NT). I would suggest, for example, that chapter 23 ("The Lord's Prayer for Missionaries") be included as an appendix and the very short chapter 33 ("1 Cor. 13: A Guide to Crosscultural Awareness") be included in a box or sidebar, or as an excursus or appendix. Second, despite Newell's early strong affirmation of the authority of Scripture, he does not often go deep in explaining it, contrary to what I expected when I read that he was attempting a biblical theology of culture. The book is not theological in nature. It lacks the depth and sophistication to be such. It would have been better to keep the reader's expectations to "biblical principles for mission practice" rather than a biblical theology of any sort. Finally, it felt to me that Newell's primary frame of reference was an "old school" conventional model of missions rather than a 21st-century frame, with a focus more on baby boomers—or possibly Gen X—rather than Millennials and iGen (or whatever nomenclature one prefers for the younger generational cohorts).

That having been said, at some point in my reading, I found myself thinking (out loud again!), "Way to go, Marv!" I recommend *Crossing Cultures in Scripture* without reservation. Newell has succeeded in helping us "to both decode the Bible stories from the biblical cultures and to encode the Bible stories for different cultures today, so that God's message remains relevant and universal" (Patrick Fung, "Foreward," p. 11). He finishes on a high note ("Eternity: Doxological Diversity").

Some will want to preach from this book. Others will want to use it as a text for Sunday School. I am looking forward to including it in my Biblical Theology of Missions course, as it fills a gap. I can even imagine an entire course—for a university or mission agency, perhaps—being built around *Crossing Cultures in Scripture*. It is novel. It fills a niche. It challenges, teaches, and equips.

João Mordomo
Columbia International University, Columbia, SC.

Interpreting Apocalyptic Literature. By Richard A. Taylor. Handbooks for OT Exegesis. Grand Rapids: Kregel, 2016, 208 pp., $21.99 paper.

One might say the essence of exegesis and interpretation is asking the right questions of a text. If so, then a proper understanding of genre is an indispensable guide to the right questions in any given type of text. Attention to the differences between literary genres prevents us from misreading and overreading texts and encourages reading a work as its author intended. The very helpful Handbooks for OT Exegesis series, edited by David M. Howard Jr., intends to provide a resource for students, pastors, and informed laypeople that will teach the basic skills for interpreting and proclaiming the various genres of the OT (p. 13). Thus far there are five volumes in the series, covering the historical books (Chisholm, 2006), Psalms (Futato, 2007), Pentateuch (Vogt, 2009), the prophetic books (Smith, 2014), and now the volume under review, *Interpreting Apocalyptic Literature*, by Richard A. Taylor. Taylor is senior professor of OT studies at Dallas Theological Seminary. He has previously written a commentary on Haggai (New American Commentary).

As the series title suggests, this is a handbook that summarizes the key features of the apocalyptic genre, provides up-to-date bibliography, illustrates concepts with ample examples, and gives practical guidance for preaching and teaching. Readers should expect to gain help with the book of Daniel in particular, as well as small portions of OT prophetic books and later extra-biblical Jewish apocalyptic works. The book is comprised of six chapters, an appendix, and a short glossary.

Chapter 1 ("What is Apocalyptic Literature?") provides an overview of the genre. Taylor defines "apocalypse" using the description from the Apocalypse Group of the SBL Genres Project (see John J. Collins, *Apocalypse: The Morphology of a Genre* [1991], 13–14) which comes from "a careful examination of all examples of apocalyptic literature that fall under its purview" (p. 33). Therefore, Taylor does not distinguish between the genre of Daniel and the genre of later extrabiblical Jewish apocalyptic works (see more on that below). He describes the literary and social characteristics of apocalyptic language, which include visions, an emphasis on angelic intermediaries, symbolic language, use of pseudonymity, use of *ex eventu* prophecy, and speculation about cosmic bodies (p. 35).

Chapter 2 ("Major Themes in Apocalyptic Literature") surveys representative apocalyptic texts both canonical (Daniel, Isaiah 24–27, Ezekiel 1, parts of Joel) and extrabiblical (Book of Enoch, Fourth Ezra, Apocalypse of Abraham), and again describes the characteristic features of apocalyptic works.

In chapter 3 ("Preparing for Interpretation of Apocalyptic Literature"), Taylor focuses on interpretation of the book of Daniel. This chapter contains five parts: comprehending figurative language, learning from reception history, textual criticism, working with original languages, and benefitting from previous studies. Each section concludes with a helpful annotated bibliography.

Chapter 4 ("Interpreting Apocalyptic Literature") begins with a short discussion on the perspicuity of Scripture and a recommendation of grammatical-historical exegesis. Taylor discusses the process of interpretation, the importance of a text's macrostructure, and potential interpretive pitfalls. He wisely cautions readers to avoid extremes, noting that some readers ignore apocalyptic texts because of their difficulty, while others express a misplaced certainty about the meaning of details.

The preparation in chapters 1–4 lead to "Proclaiming Apocalyptic Literature" in chapter 5. Using Daniel 7 as an example text, Taylor describes and illustrates seven steps: (1) Getting Familiar; (2) Resolving the Main Difficulties; (3) Clarifying the Structure (including writing an exegetical outline); (4) Summarizing the Main Point (i.e. a single sentence); (5) Framing the Presentation (including a homiletical outline); (6) Listening to Other Interpreters (e.g. commentaries); and (7) Bridging to Application.

The sixth and final chapter works through two example texts from the OT using the seven steps from chapter 5. Taylor chooses Dan 8:1–27 for the first text, an example of what he calls "full-blown apocalypticism" (p. 153). The second text is Joel 2:28–32 which he calls an "incipient apocalypticism" (p. 153). The appendix is a more technical discussion concerning the possible roots and development of apocalyptic literature. Taylor surveys many different possible sources including Canaanite mythology, Akkadian prophecy, wisdom, and OT prophecy. He concludes that apocalyptic literature is in continuity with prophetic literature, from which it derives many of its theological emphases and much of its literary style (p. 197).

This handbook is a very good introductory (or basic reference) guide on the apocalyptic genre. It would serve well as a supplementary textbook in an exegesis course or a course on Daniel. Pastors beginning a series on Daniel will find it helpful for a refresher of the major features of the genre that affect interpretation. I recommend this series to my students in exegesis and OT text courses every semester and will include this volume as well.

There is a significant shortcoming: Taylor does not discuss the possibility that canonical and extrabiblical apocalyptic literature should be differentiated in terms of genre. When he introduces the key features of the genre he focuses on extrabiblical works (following mainstream critical biblical scholarship), but when he discusses exegetical method he focuses on Daniel and OT prophetic books. This leaves the impression that all of the characteristics of later Jewish apocalyptic works, even those such as pseudonymity and *ex eventu* prophecy, are shared by the biblical books as well. The lack of at least a discussion about these matters is a surprising omission. No matter what Taylor's personal views are, it would be useful for him

to acknowledge the various perspectives held by evangelicals and to help the reader consider possible implications of those perspectives.

Notwithstanding this overall ambiguity, *Interpreting Apocalyptic Literature* is another successful volume in this series of exegetical handbooks.

Eric J. Tully
Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, Deerfield, IL

Fishers of Fish and Fishers of Men: Fishing Imagery in the Hebrew Bible and the Ancient Near East. By Tyler R. Yoder. Explorations in Ancient Near Eastern Civilizations 4. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2016, 222 pp., $54.50.

Tyler Yoder's work offers a penetrating analysis of the origin, development, and use of fishing metaphors employed by the authors of the OT. *Fishers of Fish and Fishers of Men* begins with a brief review of more notable theories of metaphor from the last century. His review sets the stage for the book's approach and its noteworthy attention to textual analysis. Yoder, however, does little to integrate the initial discussion of theory into the ensuing chapters; yet, he consistently develops his main point of contextual awareness throughout his study.

Additionally, the first chapter summarizes the evidence for the fishing of fish from the ANE. Yoder provides a summary of fishing techniques from Egypt, Mesopotamia, and the Levant, along with an in-depth analysis of fishing terminology from the Hebrew Bible. Included are helpful charts that group the context, referents, and versional evidence of key terms. His analysis is an important part of the book and while he is aware of overlapping images (like hunting and fowling), more might have been done to compare and contrast the greater range of contextual imagery.

A key point made by Yoder, early and often, is that fishing metaphors in the OT derive primarily from a common pool of ANE literary concepts rather than from a thriving fishing industry in Israel. Though ancient Israelites ate fish and understood basic techniques, fishing did not play an important role in their economy. In view of the cultural and geographical environment, it is no surprise that the biblical record does not show Israelites fishing, swimming, or in close and frequent proximity to the sea. Rather, they were dependent upon other nations for most seafaring enterprises. Yoder points to the scant evidence from the biblical record and the limited findings of archaeology as well as the lack of any iconographic evidence for fishing from the Levant. He also notes how all of this changed during the Hellenistic period.

The heart of Yoder's discussion is developed in chapters 2 and 3, where he presents a detailed discussion of the imagery of divine fishing from the ANE and how biblical authors employed that imagery. Yoder makes a strong case for his position that the authors of the OT borrowed established literary conventions rather than developing images from their own socioeconomic stance. After illustrating the connection between fishing metaphors and divine retribution from the ANE, he then argues that Israel's use of fishing imagery for divine discipline de-

rived specifically through Assyrian political influence (especially royal inscriptions) rather than from an Egyptian locus. Once established, Habakkuk and Jeremiah later appropriated this imagery and applied it to Babylon. But exactly how these later prophets "recycled" or augmented (p. 74) this imagery from the earlier Amos is not explained.

Yoder's analysis of each OT passage that employs fishing techniques unpacks its metaphorical value and furthers his point about the use of stock imagery. His work then offers deeper insight into how fishing metaphors were employed and why they were chosen by each author, thereby offering greater insight into the biblical passage under study.

Chapter 4 joins three passages from Job and Ezekiel that incorporate images of fishing for great monsters like Leviathan, and while all are united by images of fishing for the biggest catch, Yoder clearly develops the unique application of each author. In Job, for example, the metaphor illustrates Job's inability to "play God" by showing his helplessness to catch the critter (a point repetitiously made by Yoder). But while Yoder's understanding is insightful, his focus on Job's inability to catch the monster places more emphasis upon Job's weakness than Yahweh's ability, which is more in line with the Yahweh speeches. A brief mention of the defeat of Tiamat in Enuma Elish is also included in this chapter.

Yoder then moves to a specific discussion of Eccl 9:11–12, where he pushes the fishing metaphor beyond divine justice to image death itself. He argues from the fatalistic perspective of Qoheleth, his use of the word "evil" (*ra'*), and parallels from Mesopotamia, in keeping with his view of the origin of fishing imagery from that region.

In addition to a closing summary chapter, Yoder concludes his analysis with a chapter on prophetic literature where he groups three remaining passages from the prophets Isaiah and Ezekiel that portray circumstances rather than the act of fishing. Negatively, Isa 19:5–10 and Ezek 26:1–14 enlist fishing imagery to depict the drought of Egypt and the barrenness of Tyre, while Ezekiel's development of a verdant river (47:1–12) images life and great blessing.

A great strength of Yoder's analysis is his consistent and detailed attention to the multifaceted context, including language, genre, history and culture. In a number of cases, including Eccl 9:12, Isa 19:1–15, and Jer 16:16–18, he argues against numerous voices for the unity of the passage based upon his greater understanding and appreciation of the context.

At times Yoder reflects on the theological implication of a passage but only in passing, and while that is not the intention of the study, some comments could be developed more clearly. He briefly mentions Israel's adaptation to Yahweh of the "theological tenet" (p. 59) of divine retribution but does not develop any implications of the borrowing, and though aware of the struggles between mythology and monotheism, he says little about the theological tension behind such borrowings.

Eleven of the thirteen biblical passages developed are from the prophets, so it is surprising so little is mentioned about the role of the prophets, especially given their penchant for metaphorical language. Yoder nicely develops the way Amos morphed terms for "hooks" (*sinnot* and *sirot*) in light of his shepherding background

(p. 65), but argues at length for a fishing context for both terms despite the prophet's familiarity with terrestrial creatures. Some also will take issue with his position (when discussing the admittedly difficult passage Ezek 12:13) that "precise prediction is out of character with biblical prophecy, in general" (p. 90).

Yoder's book is well written, clearly argued, and yields helpful insight from the passages under discussion. His study is enhanced by copious footnotes that amplify each discussion, frequently pitting one scholar's position against another for the sake of greater clarification. This work further illustrates the importance of understanding the cultural environment of the ANE for illuminating biblical passages. While Yoder's book has a chosen focus, it is easily recommended for anyone interested in the cultural background of Scripture, the specific passages under discussion and, of course, the metaphorical development of fishing.

Bob Spender
Lancaster Bible College, Lancaster, PA

An Ark on the Nile: The Beginning of the Book of Exodus. By Keith Bodner. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016, 232 pp., $95.00.

The story of the exodus from Egypt has always captivated readers. This account is also one of the central planks of biblical theology. When the "God of the Hebrews" demands, "Let my people go" (Exod 9:1), his words resonate throughout the biblical canon. The prophets and apostles continue to remember the strategic impact of this account ("Out of Egypt, I called my son," Hos 11:1; Matt 2:15). Noting that this "plot of rescue remains among the foundational paradigms of redemption in the Hebrew Bible" (p. 1), Keith Bodner seeks to demonstrate that the central action of the book of Exodus is preceded by several gripping and hermeneutically significant scenes. He argues that "the opening sequence of the book of Exodus unfolds an exceptional narrative that foreshadows a significant amount of the forthcoming storyline in the rest of the Pentateuch and establishes a lasting paradigm of redemption for Israel" (p. 174).

Bodner states, "There are grounds for suggesting that Exodus 1–2 foreshadows various plot-movements in the rest of the book" (p. 3). "It is striking," he insists, "how many aspects of the forthcoming storyline are presaged early in the book of Exodus, and even in the opening chapters a sense of anticipation is generated" (p. 3). After briefly surveying recent scholarship on these opening chapters of Exodus, Bodner outlines his approach. He employs a "close reading" of these chapters that focuses on "literary devices and aesthetic elements" like intertextuality, irony, characterization, and a variety of narrative techniques (p. 10). With an eye toward these textual features, Bodner adopts a narrative-critical approach that, while mindful of diachronic insights, remains focused on "the aesthetics of the final form of the canonical text" (p. 13 n. 25).

Before his analysis of Exodus 1–2, Bodner explores several "images of Egypt in Genesis" (chap. 1). The exodus narrative is inexplicable apart from its setting within the Pentateuch. As Bodner writes, "Not only is the book of Genesis founda-

tional for the story of Israel as a nation, but also its major themes and characters are presupposed in Exodus" (p. 17). These "refractions" of Egypt in the Genesis narratives include Abram and Sarai's brief excursion to Egypt during a famine, Lot's choice of land, and the plight of the Egyptian servant Hagar. Most significant, though, is the Joseph narrative that contains verbal and thematic links to earlier Abraham narratives and anticipates features of the exodus narrative. As Bodner reflects, "Joseph's slavery and adversity epitomize what the nation will soon experience, and the brothers may have acted as evil as any tyrannical Pharaoh, but God's promise is unwavering" (p. 39). In chapters 2–6, Bodner provides a close, sequential reading of the first two chapters of Exodus. In a concluding section, Bodner discusses the relationship between Exodus 1–2 and the larger story of the Pentateuch. He also suggests a few broader canonical connections with the Esther narrative (pp. 179–85) and also the opening chapters of Matthew's Gospel (p. 179 n. 8).

Because he follows Exodus 1–2 so closely, the coherence of his book as a whole demonstrates his thesis about the coherence and carefully constructed nature of the biblical narrative. Throughout his study, Bodner consistently emphasizes facets of the Exodus narrative that are uncovered by a textual approach. For example, while many commentators expend much effort in identifying the Pharaoh in Exodus 1 in the historical record, Bodner moves in the opposite direction and investigates the literary effect of this "nameless" Egyptian king who is in a mad pursuit of establishing his own name. In direct contrast to the powerful ruler of Egypt, two midwives who lack any social status are both named (Shifrah and Puah) and are given "houses" by the Lord. This notable contrast highlights the new pharaoh's "midwife crisis" (p. 64) and uncovers the powerful irony that pervades the opening narrative scenes.

Another example is the way that Bodner is able to demonstrate the interpretive significance of minor characters in these brief chapters. When the sons of Jacob come to Egypt seeking grain, the "steward" who assists Joseph is "depicted as a character in his own right whose actions and words are integrated into the thematic web of the narrative" (p. 35). The steward speaks a word of peace that comforts the brothers. These simple words and actions "set the tone for the subsequent characters, as his surprising discourse about God's involvement with the brothers and their silver is surely an intriguing element of the storyline" (p. 37). Relevant for a study of Exodus is that "similarly configured minor characters are encountered early in the book of Exodus" (p. 36). In fact, this "pattern of anonymous minor characters who act on behalf of the sons of Israel" is central to the compositional strategy of the immediately following opening Exodus narratives. This type of textual insight is a common feature of Bodner's study. These observations enhance a reading of individual pericopes and uncover intratextual connections between broader swaths of narrative.

In his analysis, Bodner does not interact at length with typical historical-critical questions regarding these texts. However, this omission is an intentional feature of his narrative-critical approach (see pp. 10–11). As Bodner acknowledges, he does not necessarily devalue the legitimacy of historically-oriented reading strategies. Occasionally, Bodner complements his synchronic analysis with diachronic

insights (e.g. the socio-economic impact of the Nile river in Egypt, the possible identities of the Egyptian rulers, the referent of the Egyptian storage cities, etc.). His primary purpose, though, is to demonstrate the hermeneutical fecundity of a literary approach focused on the text's final form. Within these parameters, Bodner clearly succeeds. This brief but packed volume demonstrates the richness of biblical narrative in general, the strategic importance of Exodus 1–2 in particular, and the enduring value of close readings of scriptural texts.

Ched Spellman
Cedarville University, Cedarville, OH

Exodus. By Thomas Joseph White. Brazos Theological Commentary on the Bible. Grand Rapids: Brazos, 2016, vii + 316 pp., $32.99.

The newest volume in the Brazos Theological Commentary on the Bible (ed. R. R. Reno) is on the book of Exodus by Thomas Joseph White. This commentary is not a traditional verse-by-verse explanation of the material, but a theological work that is deliberately ecumenical in scope. As such, there is not an exhaustive introduction and background (although there is some of that), a detailed outline of Exodus, nor interaction with recent Exodus scholarship. Rather, writing under the conviction that "dogma clarifies rather than obscures" (p. xiii), White attempts a doctrinally-ruled reading of Exodus under the influence of early and medieval church fathers.

Several features about the commentary are worth noting, both in White's understanding of the historical nature of Exodus, and in the interpretation of key texts (e.g. Exodus 3, 20, 32–34). First, White regularly employs the classical distinction of the four senses of Scripture in his interpretation: literal, typological (sometimes called "allegorical"), moral, and anagogical. This reveals that White interprets Exodus from within the Catholic Christian tradition (made explicit on p. 8). As a Thomas Aquinas scholar, White's commentary is "Thomist" in character, with quotes and references to Aquinas throughout. For White, the principles of Thomism "constitute a living tradition that has a central vitality in modern Catholic theology, one that engages fruitfully and decisively with typically modern concerns about faith and reason, as well as history and dogma" (p. 8). For example, in Exodus 20, White interprets the Ten Commandments in light of the teaching magisterium of the Catholic Church (pp. 151–91).

Second, within the commentary, the fourfold sense of Scripture is more like a twofold sense, with the literal sense dealing with historical (and sometimes critical) matters, while the spiritual/moral/anagogical senses deal primarily with spiritual matters collectively. Thus, there is frequently posited a literal/historical meaning of a given text alongside of its spiritual meaning. For instance, White writes that the literal/historical purpose of the book of Exodus is "to portray how the people of Israel became God's own chosen people through their deliverance from Egypt and by a divinely instituted covenant articulated to them through a prophet" (p. 25). Its

theological and spiritual purpose is "to call the soul into a deeper union with God" (p. 1).

Third, White reveals his historical-critical leanings throughout the commentary. He opts for an early date for the events in the book (p. 26) but for later redaction, uses the traditional Documentary Hypothesis to delineate the sources, yet without presuming the definitive validity of the theory (p. 14). White believes that Exodus derives from a multiplicity of sources, including the "possibility of Mosaic authorship of some sections" (p. 13). Nevertheless, White remains confident in the divine inspiration of the book and encourages understanding the message of Exodus with the great scholars of church history, namely Augustine and Aquinas. This motivation, with the general purpose of the commentary series, leads to a greater reliance on the theological interpretation of Exodus rather than provenance, authorship, and other introductory concerns.

Fourth, on the typological sense, White argues for a Christological interpretation of Exodus. Read in the light of the NT, "Moses is a figure of Christ" (p. 32), and Pharaoh "represents the powers of the world that strive to eradicate the chosen people" (p. 27). For the divine name, White writes, "the ultimate revelation of YHWH is Jesus" (p. 45). On the building of the tabernacle, White maintains that everything in the text is symbolic of the later liturgical life of Israel, which ultimately finds its *telos* in the person of Jesus (p. 228). The tabernacle is a type of the later Temple, which is idealized in Israelite spiritual life "as an eschatological symbol of creation" (p. 228). Thus, there are several strands within the design of the tabernacle that point to its ultimate eschatological purpose, namely, heaven, creation, temple, exile, and new creation. The constraints of the commentary (i.e. its length) do not allow for White to provide exhaustive biblical-theological support for claims such as these, but he does note a few significant texts that provide sufficient grounds.

Fifth, White often addresses difficult biblical-theological questions via the narrative of Exodus, and this is a welcome addition to a commentary on this book. For instance, Exodus 7 has been the grounds for both the Marcionite heresy and more recent debates on open theism. (A proponent of the open view of God within the book of Exodus is Terence E. Fretheim, *Exodus*, vol. 2 [IBC; Louisville: John Knox, 1991].) White addresses these questions but only as they are revealed in the text. On divine causality and human culpability in the "hardening of Pharaoh's heart," for example, White maintains the historical view—insofar as "historical" refers to the traditional teachings of the apostles, Church Fathers, Reformers, etc.—that God is both omnipotent and innocent of human evil, while still failing to understand comprehensively "the mystery of how God … permits grave evils or accords profound graces in diverse instances" (p. 70; full discussion pp. 59–70).

By way of critique, I offer a few concerns. First, one difficulty for the attentive reader of White's commentary has to do with his sections on the "literal sense." I fully agree that in a commentary of this size and purpose, that historical inquiry can only go so far, and that White need not provide a historical and literary basis for every major section of Exodus. But I also contend that if one takes on such a task, they must not make definitive claims about the text that are contrary to statements within the text, or statements about the text by later authors. Thus,

when White says that *the only parts of Exodus* that stem directly from Moses are the divine name, the Ten Commandments, the ark, some kind of tent of meeting, and the notion of a covenant (p. 14), the reader must wonder how he knows. Without a basis, the authority of Exodus is undermined, as well as the authority of the prophet Moses. As another example, White states that Exodus 32 "accords closely with" Exodus 33–34, although "these latter chapters *seem to stem* from a pre-Deuteronomical tradition" (p. 265, italics added). Yet White provides no basis for the tradition in view, and simply alludes to Brevard Childs's work as the authority.

As many others have argued, the soundness of this method depends on the soundness of the source work and the strength of the evidence for the redactor's role and purpose. I would argue that historical criticism and biblical theology are not mutually exclusive. If a historical-critical view of the OT is adopted, then they are two sides of the same coin, and one affects the other. This is important because White never goes "all-in" with the Documentary Hypothesis, yet he maintains its validity for the final form of Exodus. On the one hand, White claims that such an understanding of Exodus offers "only a superficial interpretation of the biblical text" (p. 60). At the same time, however, he argues for the accuracy of the source theory. This is important because White offers a "literal sense" to every major section of Exodus, and within that section he maintains the "historical event" of the text while sometimes calling into question its literary history. In my view, this interpretive move undermines the message of Exodus and its importance for ecclesiology and biblical theology.

Second, while the historical concern about the "literal sense" is warranted, it is truly the theological and spiritual sense that is White's primary objective. This is a major strength, even for non-Catholics. His "Thomist" application of Exodus is truly unique to Exodus commentaries/scholarship, and reengaging with Thomas's voice is a welcome addition. Yet in doing so there could be a tendency to read the whole book of Exodus as an allegory if White's commentary is the only source. White frequently frames the application of the exodus event as a "symbol" of some larger purpose. For example, according to White, the movement of the Israelites from Egypt into the desert and toward the Promised Land is a symbol of the church's pilgrimage through the world into eternal life (see, e.g., p. 6). I would seek more clarity on statements like these. As an analogy, this interpretive move can be helpful. The apostle Peter seems to picture the church like the Israelites in that they are currently going through the wilderness and being refined in preparation for a holy life with Christ (1 Pet 1:3ff.). But the key word here is "like," indicating an analogous relationship. White puts the cart before the horse, as it were, seemingly indicating that everything in the book of Exodus is symbolic of a greater Christian ideal or principle. For White, the Israelite pilgrimage is not simply *like* the Christian one but is *about* that pilgrimage. On the front end, this kind of interpretation of Exodus "pointing forward" to something greater is helpful. But I would argue that in order to make such a claim, greater emphasis should be placed on the role of Exodus within the covenantal structure of the Bible, which finds its ultimate *telos* in Christ, the head of the church.

Last, one helpful theological section of this commentary is the attention given to the revelation of the divine name in Exodus 3. Yet, a glaring omission is the very little attention given comparatively to Exodus 34. One would think this second revelation of the divine name in full glory before Moses (and its resultant effects on Moses's face, 34:29–35) deserves a full assessment as to the four senses of Scripture, but White relegates this section to a mere three pages.

The truly unique contribution of this new commentary is the interaction with Aquinas and Augustine on the text of Exodus. My concerns with the "literal sense" notwithstanding, White's theological insights are helpful and meaningful for Christians on both the moral and spiritual level, although perhaps more helpful for Catholic Christians. Likewise, White's defense of the omnipotence and benevolence of God, the Christological/typological interpretation of the exodus event, and his attention to the threefold use of the law in Exodus 20, provide numerous insights for those devoted to the task of interpreting Exodus.

Joshua M. Philpot
Houston Baptist University, Houston, TX

Who Shall Ascend the Mountain of the Lord? A Biblical Theology of the Book of Leviticus. By L. Michael Morales. New Studies in Biblical Theology 37. Nottingham, UK/Downers Grove, IL: Apollos/IVP, 2015, 347 pp., £16,99.

L. Michael Morales, professor of Biblical Studies at Greenville Presbyterian Theological Seminary, Taylors, South Carolina, has written an impressive study on the book of Leviticus. This book of the Pentateuch is of utmost importance to understand not only the Pentateuch but also the entire Bible. Morales explains that the fundamental question of the OT cult is how sinful men can become members of the household of God. That is the reason he gave his study on Leviticus the apt title based on Ps 24:3: "Who Shall Ascend the Mountain of the Lord?" This entrance liturgy is at the heart of the book of Leviticus, and also makes clear how the cult actually functioned in the religious practice and faith of the people of Israel in the OT.

The last decade of OT scholars have begun to realize that the Jewish medieval expositors of the OT rightly saw a connection between the creation narrative and the narrative of the building of the tabernacle. The tabernacle is a representation of the cosmos and the paradise and God meant the cosmos and the paradise as a sanctuary. Morales points to the fact that the seven-day structure of the creation account is mirrored by the tabernacle instructions in Exodus 25–31. Both the end of the first creation account and the instructions of the building of the tabernacle conclude with the Sabbath (Gen 2:3; Exod 31:12–18). Man's chief end is to serve God and to find rest in God.

Morales thinks paradise can be compared to the holy of holies of the sanctuary. I would prefer to compare paradise to the holy place of the sanctuary because we can see a parallel between the tree of life and the golden candlestick. The land of Eden, which I distinguish from paradise, can be compared in my view with the

court of the tabernacle, and the earth outside the land of Eden with the area outside the sanctuary. I think the holy of holies represents heaven as the dwelling place of God. The new paradise transcends the old one that the whole new reality according to the book of Revelation can be compared with the holy of holies (Rev 21:16). I realize the tentative nature of my proposal, because of the limited nature of the evidence, but that is also true for the other view.

In the way Morales shows the relationship not only between the service of the tabernacle and the expulsion from paradise of our first parents Adam and Eve, he surpasses what has already been written by other authors about the relationship between the cult and the first chapters of Genesis. Morales argues the cult is God's remedy to undo the Fall; that is, it is the reversal of the expulsion from Eden. Eden's eastward orientation corresponds to the eastward entrance of the tabernacle. When Adam and Eve were expelled from paradise, they went in an eastward direction. Cherubs made it impossible for them to reenter paradise.

By the cult, the way to communion with God is reopened for fallen people. In the cult can be seen a returning to Eden. Certainly worshippers under the OT dispensation experienced that sanctuary as a kind of restored paradise. Quite often it has been stated that the fall of humanity is not very important for OT believers, because with perhaps Hos 6:7 as an exception, the fall is never mentioned apart from Genesis 3. The study of Morales teaches us that the fall and the resulting alienation between God and man is the rationale for the OT cult. The sanctuary and the cult are the center, the heart of the covenant of God with Israel.

Adam was a kind of priest in paradise. Already directly after the expulsion from paradise, he is reinstalled as priest. In the Pentateuch the verb "to clothe" (*lābaš*) and the noun "tunics" (*kuttōneth*) are used both for the vestments Adam received after the fall and the vestments of priests.

I would add that in the service of the sanctuary, the reverse direction compared with the expulsion from paradise. Now the direction is not from the west to the east but from the east to the west. On the Day of Atonement the direction goes mostly to the west when the high priest enters the holy of holies. Communion with God disrupted by the fall is only possible through the service of the tabernacle. And as Morales of course observes, the Day of Atonement is the climax of this service. Leviticus 16 forms the center not only of the book of Leviticus, but of the whole Pentateuch. Morales detects a chiastic structure in Leviticus with Lev 16:16–20—the verses in which the actual rite of atonement is described—as the center.

Morales rightly defends that the laying of the worshiper's hand on the head of the sacrificial animal signifies the animal is a vicarious substitute. I am not so sure whether it is only in the case of the scapegoat, on whom the high priest lays both hands, that we can speak of a transfer of sin. The argument of Morales is that the scapegoat was sent away from God's presence, while the flesh of the sacrificial animal is considered most holy, and the one who incinerates the carcass in a clean place requires no further purification.

I suggest it was regarded that by the sprinkling of blood in front of the veil and putting it on the horns on the altar of incense or burnt offering, the sin transferred to the animal was transferred to the altars and more broadly to the sanctuary.

In my opinion, that was the reason that the flesh of the animal whose blood was put on the horns of the burnt offering altar was considered most holy. We can add that by eating the most holy, the priests also had a part in purifying the people of sin.

On the Day of the Atonement by means of the sprinkling of the blood first in the holy of holies, then in the holy place, and by the putting of the blood on the altars of incense and burnt offering, sin was removed from the sanctuary and now ritually transferred to the carcasses. That was the reason that the one who incinerated the carcasses on the Day of Atonement in a clean place, required purification afterwards. I think that on the Day of Atonement the sins ritually transferred to the priests as he ate what was most holy.

Morales underscores that living holily before God as demanded in the Holiness Code (Leviticus 17–26) is only possible because of the service of the tabernacle described in Leviticus 1–16, including learning of the distinction between clean and unclean (Leviticus 11–15). The climax of this first part of the book of Leviticus is the description of the ritual of the Day of Atonement. That God's people is a holy people living for him and walking in his ways is the final aim of the service of the sanctuary.

In the final chapter, Morales explains that the Levitical cult of the tabernacle and later of the temple, its priesthood and rituals, is all fulfilled in the incarnation, suffering, death, resurrection, and ascension of our Lord Jesus Christ. The coming down from heaven of the New Jerusalem, as the holy of holies with the Lamb as its temple, is the final fulfillment.

I agree fully with the endorsement of D. A. Carson that this volume will spawn some excellent sermons on Leviticus. Research of the Bible in this way shows that academic study of the Bible stands in the service of the devotion of God.

Pieter de Vries
Free University of Amsterdam, the Netherlands

Unceasing Kindness: A Biblical Theology of Ruth. By Peter Lau and Gregory Goswell. New Studies in Biblical Theology. London/Downers Grove, IL: IVP, 2016, xvi + 212 pp., $24.00.

Engaging books attract readers for various reasons—a timely goal, a striking symbol, a refreshing voice. The book under review has a different allure; it is a scenic tour through the multifaceted theology of a seemingly uncomplicated OT story. *Unceasing Kindness* offers various locales of thematically focused, biblical-theological analyses with agile hermeneutics and an impressive mix of scope and depth of exposition. With such an approach, the authors fulfill the general purpose of the NSBT series by examining the substance and role of biblical theology in terms of a central theme. In fact, Lau and Goswell address a number of themes not only within the book of Ruth itself but also intertextually, within the OT and within the Bible as a whole. This wide-ranging vision guides a rigorous analysis across the eight

main chapters, bookended by an introductory chapter and a conclusion that summarizes this lively, challenging volume.

Unceasing Kindness offers a rich interplay of theology, history, and explications of two groups of themes. The major ones, according to the authors, include kingship, redemption, and mission, while those designated minor include *ḥesed*, wisdom, famine, and refuge. While these diverse themes ought to attract readers with specific and different motivations for studying Ruth, the entire structure of *Unceasing Kindness* may appear less unified than some readers would seek. Lau and Goswell are sensitive to this contingency, alerting their audience early on to the demanding work in theology of dealing with biblical themes individually and as part of the unity of Scripture as a whole. Some thematic overlapping does occur in *Unceasing Kindness*, but it rather attests to a unified witness of divine plan and superintendence, even when earthly circumstances appear otherwise, such as departure from a famished Bethlehem to a distant Moab and eventually back to the same Bethlehem, but this time a place of blessing and fullness.

A sample chapter illustrates Lau and Goswell's highly integrative approach. Chapter 8 addresses the theme of redemption, one of the most familiar and most theologically significant themes in the book of Ruth, as well as throughout the entire canon. The authors' thesis for the chapter (p. 117), whether redemption in Ruth has a more technical meaning than the well-known aspect of salvation, offers much needed clarity given other definitions of redemption such as deliverance, liberty, release from slavery, and refuge. Moreover, as the authors note (p. 124), redemption in the OT does not always mean either the payment of a price or a kinship between the redeemer and the redeemed (see Pss 31:4–5, 69:18; Job; and passages such as Num 35:16–29, Deut 19:4–13, and 2 Sam 14:8–11). Redemption in Ruth implies both meanings, as shown by Lau and Goswell's comments about several redeemers, not just one: the unnamed figure (Ruth 3:12–13; 4:1, 6); the wealthy and virtuous Boaz, obviously; and Obed, the "son born to Naomi" (Ruth 4:17), though his actual mother is of course Ruth. The authors' attention to literary detail is clear as they classify the unnamed redeemer as a foil to Boaz, although mention of cosmic irony here would be appropriate as well, that is, a redeemer who does not redeem, in this case because the cost is too high (Ruth 4:6). Boaz can and does pay that price, a reiteration that redemption *does* imply a cost, as it does in a familial relationship. In a particularly fine discussion, Lau and Goswell clarify how Obed will preserve kinship, that is, the line of Elimelech; in addition, Obed will father Jesse, the father of David, whose lineage will include eventually *the* Redeemer Himself. No wonder, then, as the authors note (pp. 135–36), Christians are given a great inheritance and a special intimacy with God, these truths tucked away in the book of Ruth but convincingly set forth in *Unceasing Kindness*. Lau and Goswell go on to address the well-known question of whether Boaz is a type of Christ. He is, they argue (pp. 136–39), reminding readers that he also is an agent of God's redemptive work, a man like Christ in some but not in all ways. Ultimately, chapter 8 calls for special attention because literary merit results from how a book treats the familiar, not just the unusual.

Another familiar aspect of Ruth, addressed much earlier (chap. 2), is the ongoing debate about when the book was written. *Unceasing Kindness* acknowledges a post-exilic date but posits that the book was written prior to Ezra-Nehemiah (p. 6). Interacting straightforwardly with the issues, Lau and Goswell concede that such debate is likely to continue; however, the authors use their integration of history and culture with biblical theology to acknowledge both pre- and post-exilic viewpoints, all of which encourages rigorous discussion of the Scripture in order to identify what is true—the central goal of academic research, after all. One response to the dating conundrums is, of course, to cite divine inspiration, as Lau and Goswell do, to reinforce the major premise of *Unceasing Kindness*, that is, a theology of the book of Ruth should inform the context of the text.

Occasionally, the centerpiece of a book leads to a timely, even pressing question. Such is the case here. Lau and Goswell's thematically framed theological exposition gives rise to the question, "Is there an important difference between theme-focused literary research and theological analysis of the Scripture?" There is, at least to this reviewer, and *Unceasing Kindness* offers a useful setting for theologians and literary critics to collaborate on ways to study and communicate the life-changing truths in the Bible. Such collaborative efforts can provide yet another way to stimulate and challenge an American culture increasingly distant from the loving authority of divine revelation.

Part of that culture is, of course, the church and, in particular, a situation described by Lau and Goswell as a void in biblical-theological discussion of Ruth. They write, "There have been commentaries that have adopted a biblical-theological approach, of one form or another," but *Unceasing Kindness* is not a commentary, and lay readers may appreciate an occasional reminder about the hermeneutical differences between theological exegesis and theological construction. The former, Lau and Goswell's methodological point from the start, is anchored as much as possible in authorial intent and textual meaning at the time of composition for the original audience. This principle is both encouraging and essential when, as in Ruth, we have not identified the human author. The inspired, inerrant Word, however, reliably reveals—and positions readers to seek out—the divine character, mind, and will. This process differs markedly from theological construction, a call to its own land of Moab, an alien region of reader-based ideas *about* theology originating not in the text but in human culture. *Unceasing Kindness*, then, uses a vivid landscape of robust theology to urge its audience to look again toward Bethlehem.

Branson Woodard
Liberty University, Lynchburg, VA

1 Samuel as Christian Scripture: A Theological Commentary. By Stephen B. Chapman. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2016, 349 pp., $36.00 paper.

Stephen B. Chapman, associate professor of OT at Duke Divinity School, has written a commentary on 1 Samuel that is purposely different from other commentaries. Chapman observes that commentaries traditionally offer a new translation,

address text critical issues, discuss the historical background and literary development of the book, interpret the text in compliance with certain interpretive guidelines, and highlight certain themes or lessons that reveal "the text's abiding meaning" (p. 2). This traditional format, Chapman contends, "can ride roughshod over the literary presentation of a biblical book" and its "anticipated strategy for reading" (p. 3). Chapman's stated goal, therefore, is to provide a "theological reading" of 1 Samuel "rather than a commentary per se" (p. 4).

Chapman grounds his theological reading on the same historical and linguistic work that serves as the basis for other commentaries; however, he typically leaves such matters for footnotes, not the main text (p. 4). He goes on to note that his theological reading is not presented as "the 'correct' Christian interpretation of an Old Testament book"; rather, Chapman submits one of many possible ways of reading 1 Samuel (p. 11). In his reading of 1 Samuel, Chapman seeks to honor the book's "historical integrity and literary complexity" while at the same time "listening expectantly" for how the book addresses "a Christian understanding of life before God" (p. 11). Chapman writes, "My approach characteristically treats biblical narrative as posing and negotiating what are essentially theological questions" (p. 11).

Chapman divides his commentary into three parts. In the first part, he focuses on the idea of the Biblical "book" and what type of book 1 Samuel is, arguing that addressing this issue goes "a long way toward determining the best method to use in reading" the book (p. 13). Chapman first directs his attention to the question regarding the proper focus of theological readings: Is the focus on the events related in Scripture, the characters, the themes elucidated, or the doctrines taught (p. 22)? He contends that a theological reading can concentrate on either option, or even multiple options, "without necessarily differentiating or adjudicating among them" (p. 22). The primary task of reading the text theologically, explains Chapman, is to consider the "literary presentation of the biblical text," not to the exclusion of other areas of focus, but in a manner that treats fairly "the written character of the text and its literary features" (p. 29).

Chapman continues the first part by addressing the issue of reading 1 Samuel as a book. He considers the issues of the literary boundaries of 1 Samuel and how the Jews read 1 Samuel in antiquity, as he interacts with the works of David Jobling and Benjamin Sommer, respectively. Chapman concludes that the biblical "book" should be primary "in setting the main horizon for the interpretive task" (p. 43). Moreover, he argues that 1 Samuel must be read together with 2 Samuel, as 2 Samuel 21–24 is important for the understanding of 1 Samuel (pp. 46, 47–63).

In the second part of the book, Chapman commences with the commentary proper of 1 Samuel. He does not proceed verse by verse but divides the text into "broadly manageable units" (p. 14). For example, the first unit is 1 Samuel 1–12; this larger unit is broken down into smaller units ("A Broken Family," 1 Sam 1:1–8; "Worship as a Problem," 1 Sam 1:9–28; etc.). In the commentary, Chapman devotes most of his attention to describing the "full meaning of the narrative" and developing a "literary sense of the text" rather than put forward "Christian questions and concerns" presented by the text (p. 14). He often demonstrates how a

certain text unit is related to its surrounding context and identifies thematic clues to show the relationship, as in his discussion on Hannah's Song in 1 Sam 2:1–10. In other portions, Chapman calls attention to verbal or thematic links of the narrative to other portions of the OT, as in his discussion of the phrase "sad at heart" in 1 Sam 1:1–8 and its link to Deuteronomy (p. 75). One of the main themes Chapman traces through 1 Samuel is the importance of true worship as opposed to rote ritualism (pp. 77, 84, 129, 140).

In the third and final part of the commentary, Chapman addresses two issues: determining a tenable historical context for the narrative of 1 Samuel, and the significance of the narrative for Christian theology and life (p. 15). First, Chapman maintains that the book of Samuel took its present shape in the Deuteronomistic reforms of the mid- to late seventh century BC (pp. 15, 221). Chapman then addresses potential problems of a Deuteronomistic framework for 1 Samuel. Second, he demonstrates how his reading of 1 Samuel informs Christian theology and the Christian life (p. 15). Here he contends that Saul foreshadows "the Christ of Gethsemane and Calvary, the Christ of divine forsakenness" (p. 245). As such, Saul can function as "an icon" to those who struggle with religious belief or feel God is distant in their life (p. 245). Lastly, Chapman contends 1 Samuel places true religion internally, not in "pragmatic needs of the state" (p. 257). First Samuel does not promote a baptizing of the state; rather, it highlights people of faith, whose faith is living and active, who participate in public service (p. 256). On the level of the individual and community, Chapman's reading of 1 Samuel instructs the believing community to live humbly and to renounce any desire for a Christian nation, theocracy, or empire (p. 257).

Chapman's focus on the narrative features of 1 Samuel provides the reader with a good overview of the book, and his discussion on how 2 Samuel 21–24 affects the interpretation of 1 Samuel is very helpful. As is his intention, Chapman's commentary is unencumbered with footnotes and detailed discussions of difficult features or verses, allowing the reader to easily grasp Chapman's reading of the text. Although his commentary is relatively free from footnotes, his sixty-one page bibliography indicates Chapman has done his research.

However, Chapman's commentary does not fully live up to expectations. The commentary proper only makes up 56% of the book (143 pages out of 254 pages). Chapman critiques traditional commentaries for devoting too much attention on matters other than the narrative (p. 3); however, Chapman spends 44% of his book discussing and defending his methodology. While his commentary of 1 Samuel is thought-provoking, its relative brevity leaves more to be desired. Furthermore, his view of Saul as a foreshadowing of Christ is not convincing and certainly moves away from traditional readings of Saul. Chapman critiques David Tsumura, who argues for the historicity of events in 1 Samuel, stating that Tsumura moves his interpretation from theology to history (p. 235–36). However, Chapman's insistence on focusing on the "narrative world" gives the impression that the historicity of an event is minimized in favor of the narrative conveyed (p. 236). While acknowledging that narrative features cannot be ignored, the historicity of an event

cannot be disregarded in biblical interpretation. This is true especially in light of Paul's statements in 1 Cor 10:6, 11; 15:12–19.

While readers may not agree with all of Chapman's interpretations, his commentary can be a helpful tool in reading the narrative of 1 Samuel.

Richard C. McDonald
The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, KY

Honor, Shame, and Guilt: Social-Scientific Approaches to the Book of Ezekiel. By Daniel Y. Wu. Bulletin for Biblical Research Supplements 14. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2016, xii + 228 pp., $47.50.

This work originated as Daniel Wu's Ph.D. thesis. Wu examines various social-scientific approaches (SSA) and how they have influenced biblical studies. He reviews the current understanding of "guilt" and "shame" cultures in the social sciences and shows how the conclusions of these various SSA have provided details that would not have seen using other methods of study. He suggests that his own method, built as a new model of cultural analysis, seeks to go beyond the usual dichotomies of honor/shame and shame/guilt to show a more fully developed understanding of these concepts.

The work consists of seven chapters and an appendix. In Chapter 1, Wu develops his rationale, stating that Ezekiel's major vision is concerned with the glory/honor of Yahweh. The primary importance of this vision is Yahweh's concern for his reputation and as such honor is particularly pronounced in Ezekiel. This theme also results in Ezekiel's emphasis with defilement, impurity, and blood (p. 2). Wu also briefly explains his method which is a contextual semantic analysis of the key terms for each of the main concepts involved (honor, shame, guilt) in Ezekiel. He goes on to indicate that his method incorporates the emic-etic distinction (p. 3). Wu's method is a combination of intertextuality, the canonical approach associated with Childs, and biblical theology (p. 32). The method attempts to utilize the contextual meaning of the semantic analysis to produce a derived etic model of the meaning of the terms within Ezekiel.

Chapters 2 and 3 review the research of various anthropological approaches to biblical studies. Wu briefly treats the major methods of the developmental view and the research of the context group and provides critiques. He then addresses what he sees as gains coming from these various models as well as the dangers of them before turning to his method and approach. He analyzes the range of meaning for each of the main Hebrew roots taken by SSA to show key values of honor and shame. He also analyzes guilt because of the claim by SSA that the biblical text does not support a guilt culture reading. Other terms related to these key concepts are treated in summary fashion due to spatial considerations. The honor/shame model was placed on the analysis of an "ideal type" of biblical culture. Wu adds that while he uses the terms honor, shame, and guilt, he does so without accepting the interpretive framework of other SSA models. He proceeds to clarify this with an extensive discussion of shame (pp. 37–56), concluding that the various psycho-

logical and anthropological models are inadequate, leaving a solely negative characterization of shame. Shame operates in positive and negative connotations and thus using these terms (shame and guilt) requires more care than previous studies suggest. These terms must be allowed to maintain their interconnectedness avoiding false dichotomies because of the shared concepts between the two.

Chapters 4–6 analyze Ezekiel's key terms for honor, shame, and guilt respectively. His conclusion for honor is that the term כבד is a broader concept than the English term "honor" and as such suggests that the term "glory" reveals a wider scope of its semantic sphere (p. 99). Wu sees that this glory/honor is found in Yahweh's person and in the appropriate response to him by his people. Wu's discussion of the semantic range of בוש shows that the common English gloss of shame is too narrow. The term includes concepts of disappointment, disillusionment, despair, failure, and embarrassment (pp. 100–102). He argues that the term's primary meaning should be disappointment and concludes that while the term shares many shame concepts with SSA and psychological definitions, it does not fit perfectly into either model (p. 131). His discussion of guilt also reveals that עוה in Ezekiel should not be linked so directly with guilt. It holds the same meaning as in the rest of the OT, which is "to bend, twist, or distort" (pp. 132, 166). In this regard, the emotional response to sin does have some connection with current psychological constructions of guilt. However, because the term is broader than merely guilt and includes some aspects for the modern understanding of shame, the distinct categories found in psychology and SSA are unhelpful (p. 166).

Chapter 7 serves to recount the general conclusions of the work. Wu then addresses the relationship of these terms in Ezekiel. The conclusion is that honor is what Yahweh judges to be worthy. Shame is what falls short of Israel's correct response to Yahweh. Guilt is the expression of Israel's failure (p. 174). Wu then concludes the study by stating that all cultures have aspects of shame and guilt within them. Thus, cultures must be examined based on how these concepts are related within each culture individually (p. 178).

The work ends with an appendix. Wu uses his method to explore the implications for the various models of atonement. He shows that Aulén's model as well as that of Green and Baker need significant revision. Aulén has incorrectly set grace against justice and Green and Baker have incorrectly set shame against guilt (p. 191). Wu concludes that the penal substitutionary atonement theory best shows the biblical evidence for the atonement based on his method present in the book (p. 192).

This work serves to challenge the previous understanding of shame vs. guilt societies so often taken in SSA studies. It also adds to the discussion of SSA in the prophets and Ezekiel specifically. There have been numerous SSA studies in OT narrative texts but until recently relatively few studies that address an entire prophetic book. This work shows the importance for bringing the prophetic texts into the discussion for those who see SSA models as significant to understanding the text of the OT. Wu moves the discussion of SSA forward showing that the previous "shame culture vs. guilt culture" dichotomy is oversimplified and needs correction because all cultures have both aspects within them. He still acknowledges that there are differences between these cultural types and that these differences remain

important in the discussion. In the case of this study these differences are found more in how these terms are constructed and related within the argument of Ezekiel. He shows that Ezekiel develops these terms primarily to develop his theology. However, adopting Wu's conclusions will also require one to agree with the presuppositions and methodological approach of this work and SSA in general. Those who object to SSA will likely remain unmoved in their assessment of Wu's method. Indeed, he is aware that he is adopting a view of texts and history that will not be shared by all (p. 26). Nevertheless, Wu's work shows much needed development in SSA as well as the need to continue to develop the method by those who seek to use it.

James M. Street
Liberty University, Lynchburg, VA

Daniel. By Wendy L. Widder. The Story of God Bible Commentary. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2016, 288 pp., $29.99.

Wendy Widder's commentary on Daniel in The Story of God Bible Commentary series enjoys the benefits of the design of all the books in the series, which focus on simplicity through telling the story of the text and application for the twenty-first century reader. Using the NIV translation, the story of Daniel can be heard, explained, and lived out in the present. In fact, the commentary follows a threefold outline for each section of the book (but with an emphasis on what the reader is to do): listen to the story, explain the story, and live the story. Widder contributes greatly to the aim of the series through clarity of style even when complicated texts are involved. The flow of Daniel's historical and prophetical sections can easily be grasped by scholars, pastors, and serious laypeople. In addition, usually the reader can find the applications to be appropriate to the interpreted passages.

In terms of content, Widder's work makes several positive contributions. First, while acknowledging the late-second-century-BC date of Daniel commonly held by most non-evangelicals and a minority of evangelicals, she favors the earlier and more traditional sixth-century-BC timeframe for the events and composition of the book, which is more likely based on the evidence (p. 5). Second, one specific delight is the commentary's use of the chiastic structure of Daniel 2–7 to highlight the major theme of the humbling of men (especially "arrogant human kings") in the face of God's sovereign work in the world (pp. 12–13), a timeless theme that is picked up throughout but sometimes overlooked in other commentaries or limited to Nebuchadnezzar and Belshazzar. Another contribution is the attribution of ancient background sources (although not overemphasized) and the provision and discussion of cross references to fill in the full, larger, and theological context of the Bible (e.g. the correlation of Daniel's four world empires to Hos 13:7–8, p. 154).

The best characteristic, however, flows from the series intent of application. At times, Widder does a masterful job of voicing and illustrating present imperatives in light of the historical presentation of God's ways in Daniel. My favorite example is the use of recent interviews of Morgan Freeman in which he boldly

declares himself to be God (pp. 119–20). All men should avoid such blasphemy as was common to Belshazzar in Daniel 5. In this way, the book of Daniel is presented in a fresh and significant way for today's world.

On the other hand, several concerns emerge as one reads Widder's commentary on Daniel. One is tempted to want more detail although it is not the purpose of the commentary to provide it. Yet, at times, such detail in a book like Daniel would seem crucial. More discussion is needed concerning why the Greek view of the four kingdoms (Babylon, Media, Persia, Greece) is to be preferred rather than the more popular Roman view (Babylon, Medo-Persia, Greece, Rome, pp. 158–59). Widder often downplays prophetic details. She is certainly right that the overall big picture of Daniel does not depend upon one's view, but the identification of the world kingdoms appears to be of more significance within the book than is allowed.

Along the same lines, Widder's presentation of the "son of man" in Daniel 7 may have shortchanged the necessary discussion to give the full story of the Bible on this point (p. 157). While affirming that the term "son of man" refers to a man, she uses the contrast to Ugaritic mythology to show that the context of the chapter confirms a "hypostasis" of Yahweh, thus indicating a divine-human figure for the son of man. This much is helpful, but there is a surprising lack of Messianic terminology. In light of the full story of the Bible, it would have been better to relate the language more to intertestamental Jewish literature coupled with the use of son of man terminology in contexts within the Gospels to help flesh out the relationship of Jesus to this son of man figure.

The Seventy Weeks prophecy found in Dan 9:24–27 provides another area for questions regarding the commentary. Widder, following consistently the same interpretation given to Daniel 7–8, sees the seventy weeks being fulfilled historically and brought to an end with the death of Antiochus in 164 BC (p. 204). This is hard to accept exegetically and theologically in light of the futurism in Jesus's words in the Olivet Discourse. Widder, however, does allow ongoing fulfillment by way of application. She notes that the "language and symbolism of the Seventy Weeks transcend the historical events of the second century" (p. 204). This arrangement views Jesus as reapplying the passage in a new way rather than giving a direct interpretation of Daniel's words in historical context as Daniel's readers would have understood them. Many futurists will be frustrated by this approach.

One could continue to discuss other questions such as whether sufficient emphasis has been placed on national Israel. Nevertheless, there is much to commend this work, especially in the area of living out the story of God's ways. Widder has laid out an excellent resource to help readers think about application of the book of Daniel. She has succeeded in alerting all of us to remember that our responsibility as believers is not just to know historical and prophetic details, but to obey the Word of the Lord.

Mike Stallard
The Friends of Israel Gospel Ministry, Westville, NJ

Discovering the Septuagint: A Guided Reader. Edited by Karen H. Jobes. Grand Rapids: Kregel Academic, 2016, 351 pp., $39.99.

The number, quality, and breadth of resources available for studying the Septuagint (LXX) has multiplied over the past few decades, and Karen Jobes, Gerald F. Hawthorne Professor Emerita of NT Greek and Exegesis at Wheaton College, has been solely responsible for or played an important part in the production of several of those resources. Her most recent contribution to this growing cache is *Discovering the Septuagint: A Guided Reader*, a book "intended to aid students who have had at least three semesters of koine Greek begin to read the Greek Jewish Scriptures as found in the Rahlfs-Hanhart critical edition of the Septuagint" (p. 9).

This *Reader* developed out of Jobes's experience of teaching advanced Greek reading classes at Wheaton. In teaching those classes, she came to realize that in order for students with proficiency in NT Greek to be able to read the LXX, two obstacles needed to be addressed. First, they needed help with LXX vocabulary because it is more extensive than the vocabulary of the NT and because some of the words that occur in both works have a different sense in the LXX than they do in the NT. Second, she recognized that, although the syntax of the LXX is similar to the syntax of the NT, in places the syntax of the LXX has been so influenced by the underlying Hebrew that LXX Greek is peculiar and difficult to understand. The notes in the book are intended to help students overcome those two obstacles. The beginning of the book can be traced back to class discussions and questions in Jobes's Greek reading classes. Then at a later stage she and nine of her students collaborated under her leadership to prepare the contents and bring the book to its final form. The nine students are Jesse Arlen, Kimberly Carlton, Hannah Clardy, John Coatney, Caleb Friedeman, Carmen Imes, Judy Kim, Jeremy Otten, and Chris Smith.

The main content of the *Reader* is ten sections of Selected Readings (notes and translations) covering over six hundred verses from nine LXX books (Genesis, Exodus, Ruth, Additions to Esther, Psalms, Hosea, Jonah, Malachi, and Isaiah); each of these ten sections of Selected Readings contains between 48 and 85 verses from one LXX book, and the sections are divided into 38 smaller units that are a good length for daily class assignments. The readings from each LXX book are prefaced by a brief introduction to the Greek version of that book and by a selected bibliography specific to that LXX book. The translations of the LXX in the *Reader* are, for the most part, taken directly from *A New English Translation of the Septuagint*, with the few exceptions marked. The notes on the LXX, which are the most important content in the *Reader*, address the vocabulary, syntax, and important historical referents in the texts. The authors of the *Reader* assume that the students who use it have mastered the vocabulary in *Metzger's Lexical Aids for Students of New Testament Greek*, and, with some exceptions, words that appear in Metzger are not parsed or defined. The exceptions include some forms of –μι verbs, irregular forms, and words used differently in the LXX than how they are glossed in Metzger. One idiosyncrasy of the *Reader* that may be distracting to Greek students is that the LXX words discussed in the *Reader* appear in the *Reader* exactly as

they appear in the LXX, even to the point of not changing grave accents to acute accents on the *ultima* of LXX words that have no Greek words following them.

The book contains several helps for navigating its contents and reading the LXX. They include a table of contents, a preface, a brief section on how to use the book, a brief but helpful introduction to the LXX, a list of grammatical abbreviations used in the book, a list of recommended reference works used in the *Reader*, a glossary of technical terms, and an index of LXX citations in the NT. This two-page index of LXX citations in the NT, which is at the end of the book, complements charts following each section of Selected Readings that list quotations of or significant allusions to those passages in the NT.

I found that the authors of the various sections in the *Reader* differ in the resources they tend to reference, as is expected in a collection of reading notes from various authors. In addition, the notes differ on the extent to which they address grammatical and syntactical issues like the categorization of noun use (e.g. the use of the genitive). Because the *Reader* primarily notes only the words that the authors assume the user does not know, there are also grammatical and syntactical issues left unaddressed that are related to those words. Also, there are many finer points of grammar and syntax, of which the authors of the notes are no doubt aware, on which the *Reader* does not comment. For example, it does not incorporate into the notes recent discussions about laying aside the category of deponency or about Greek verbal aspect. It is interesting that in the *Reader* the identification of so-called deponent verbs is not consistent. Sometimes these verbs are parsed as middle voice when they are thought to be such, and sometimes they are parsed as middle voice and also identified as deponent.

In summary, it should be emphasized that the purpose of the *Reader* is to help the Greek student *read* the text of the LXX. It was not written primarily to teach Greek grammar or syntax, and there are many other resources that can be employed in those areas of study. The notes in the *Reader*, along with the translations that are provided, should enable students to work their way efficiently through the Greek passages in the book. Hopefully this *Reader* will assist many Greek students not only to enter into the fascinating world of the LXX but also to enjoy the journey and to have a degree of confidence to continue using the LXX after they finish working their way through the *Reader*. I thank Professor Jobes and her students for providing this easily accessible entrée into the LXX.

W. Edward Glenny
University of Northwestern – St. Paul, St. Paul, MN

Going Deeper with New Testament Greek: An Intermediate Study of the Grammar and Syntax of the New Testament. By Andreas J. Köstenberger, Benjamin L. Merkle, and Robert L. Plummer. Nashville: B&H Academic, 2016, ix + 550 pp., $49.99.

To the growing collection of intermediate Greek grammars for the study of the Greek NT, three scholars have contributed yet another fine volume in *Going Deeper with New Testament Greek*, dedicated to the great Greek scholar A. T. Robert-

son. Andreas Köstenberger, Benjamin Merkle, and Robert Plummer express two main goals in their publication, both of which have the classroom experience as their target: (1) to provide students with an intermediate grammar that is readable in a format that is accessible and "even fun"; and (2) to provide teachers with a user-friendly grammar that includes pedagogically useful features, structured to fit semester-long classes. These goals are on display in each chapter, as well as in their discussions of exegetical steps not frequently encountered in intermediate grammars. Whether or not *Going Deeper with New Testament Greek* always succeeds in these intentions is an important question.

Following a brief discussion of the historical development of the Greek language up to the NT era, Plummer provides a helpful overview of text-critical methodology. Unfortunately, space constraints demand that this treatment must be extremely brief, resulting in technical density. Inevitably, teachers will need to supplement Plummer's work in this regard with significant resources, raising the question of whether or not the value of including this summary merits the compression of other aspects of intermediate Greek grammar elsewhere in the volume.

The bulk of *Going Deeper with New Testament Greek* is necessarily devoted to the analysis of the various categories pertaining to NT Greek, interacting liberally and conveniently with prior grammars. Accordingly, the authors follow the typical order, progressing from nouns, the article, and adjectives, to the analysis of verbal forms, and concluding with the remaining odds and ends. While predictable and time-tested, it would have been refreshing to see the authors play with this ordering a bit. In my own experience, most students come out of their first year with a very tentative grasp of both participles and infinitives. This is because introductory texts reserve the discussions of these complicated elements to their later pages. As a result, students do not have enough time to achieve anything close to competency. If their second-year experience shadows their first year, they may graduate from their Greek program still stumbling over these important matters. Teachers may decide, then, to reorder the chapters in order to address this potential pitfall.

Most of the discussions of each category are quite brief, allowing the authors to explain succinctly what others treat verbosely. For instance, the treatment of the article and adjectives is extremely compressed, covering in one chapter what takes Wallace four chapters to discuss. While Wallace's discussions at times may be overkill, the discussions in *Going Deeper with New Testament Greek* may at times be too brief. The latter is especially seen in the handling of conditional sentences, which amounts to a summarizing table. Nevertheless, these discussions are always effectively illustrated by what the authors deem to be the best examples from the Greek NT.

The value of this book, however, lies not so much in its distinctive analysis of Greek grammar, as it does in its layout and features. The authors introduce each chapter with an example of the "payoff" that will be forthcoming from learning the succeeding content. This "Going Deeper" feature resonates with the volume's title, offering students added incentive to apply themselves to that material. While usually successful, exceptions do occur. For instance, in chapter 2, Köstenberger's "Going Deeper" section delves into the occurrence of definite anarthrous predicate

nouns preceding the copulative. Though serving as a great example of Colwell's Rule, this discussion is more pertinent to the complexities of the presence and absence of the Greek article, which are examined several chapters later. In another case, Merkle's discussion in chapter 11 illustrates the importance of the nuanced interpretation of idioms rather than the exegetical significance of infinitives.

At the conclusion of each chapter, the authors provide a summary of its content in chart form. These are extremely well done, pairing each category with a brief description and a textual illustration. Students will benefit greatly from these charts, affording them succinct and efficient ways to review and refresh their knowledge.

A welcome feature for an intermediate grammar are the "Practice Exercises" that follow the summary charts. These are sample sentences, drawn from the Greek NT, that require students not only to hone their translation abilities but also to identify the concepts recently learned. This is vitally important, since students best develop the ability to discern the various categories by inductively analyzing the Greek text.

Each chapter concludes with excerpts from the Greek NT, drawn from every NT author. These passages were chosen according to three criteria: (1) they must highlight the concepts of the respective chapters; (2) they must be pastorally or theologically significant; and (3) they must be 10–12 verses in length. This is a remarkably valuable aspect of this text, supplying what most teachers have to provide on their own. To assist students in their translation and analysis of these excerpts, the authors have also provided what amounts to a translational and exegetical commentary on each verse, illustrated by the various major English translations. If students work carefully through these notes, they will deepen their expanding expertise in Greek grammar and exegesis. It would have been advantageous, however, if the authors had progressively replaced their own analyses of elements previously covered by questions that the students should by that point be able to answer. In this way, the authors would wean students off of this exegetical commentary, encouraging them to develop their own syntactical skills.

The authors' approach to the mastering of vocabulary is quite effective. Rather than progressing through sterile lists, arranged by frequency (usually requiring a separate volume), the authors provide vocabulary lists that are derived from the translation excerpts that conclude each chapter. These lists are alphabetized and include the frequency of each word. Students who master these lists will, by the end of the book, have learned all of the vocabulary down to words used 15 times and more in the Greek NT (a total of 830 words). In addition, the authors have provided lists of "vocabulary to recognize." These are words that occur fewer than 15 times in the Greek NT but that are found in the concluding excerpts. The great benefit of approaching vocabulary in this way is that students will have a context in which to begin the learning of each new word.

The authors close out their grammar with three chapters not common to such textbooks. In the first of these, Plummer introduces students to three different varieties of diagramming—a vital aspect of any intermediate Greek class. Unfortunately, he neglects to illustrate each method by means of a specific Greek text. Instead, he settles for merely mapping out the strategy of each method before refer-

ring students to other resources. Given the brevity of this discussion, one wonders if anything significant has been accomplished by its inclusion. Certainly, students who may not otherwise have known of alternative ways of diagramming are hereby introduced to options. However, teachers will still have to provide resources apart from *Going Deeper with New Testament Greek* in order to train their students well. Plummer concludes this chapter with a brief introduction to Discourse Analysis, though once again its brevity will require supplementation by other means.

Following this is a nice chapter on word studies. Plummer begins by conveying some important cautions to overly zealous students who may enthusiastically endow words with more meaning than they have or inadvertently undermine their congregations' confidence in modern English translations. Plummer then helpfully takes students through the suggested method in the examination of κραιπάλη in Luke 21:34. Students are also given an annotated list of vital resources to consult in their study of the Greek NT vocabulary.

Plummer concludes the book with encouragements for students to retain and even expand their Greek facility throughout life. He accentuates this by several exhortations from past exegetes and theologians regarding the importance of the languages for the accurate discernment of the message of the Word.

The authors supply two useful appendices at the end of the book. The first is a vocabulary list of 310 words, arranged by frequency of occurrence in the NT down to words used 50 times. The second is a valuable chart that surveys twelve grammars in the categorization of nouns and the article. They also provide the typical indices to access the book's content. One looks in vain, however, for a list of the principal parts of important verbs in the Greek NT.

Two additional items should be mentioned here. First, the authors have summarized the content of *Going Deeper with New Testament Greek* in a supplementary laminated guide. Even more impressive, however, is the variety of resources available to students and teachers on their website (www.deepergreek.com). Here, students will find summaries, sample quizzes, vocabulary lists and cards, and digital apps to access these items in various ways. Teachers will find a treasure trove of aids in the form of such things as sample quizzes, exams, syllabi, and even PowerPoint presentations.

The distinctiveness of *Going Deeper with New Testament Greek* lies both in its chapter features and its attempt to bring into one volume aspects of intermediate Greek curriculum that are normally found in disparate sources. Though more successful in the former than the latter, the overall design of *Going Deeper with New Testament Greek*, along with the online resources, will prove to be very useful to teachers and students alike.

Jonathan Lunde
Talbot School of Theology, La Mirada, CA

Der jüdische Messias Jesus und sein jüdischer Apostel Paulus. Edited by Armin D. Baum, Detlef Häusser, and Emmanuel L. Rehfeld. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2/425. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2016, viii + 417 pp., €94.00 paper.

Based on the recognition that early Christianity is deeply rooted in Judaism, this collection of essays examines the question of the relationship between Judaism and Christianity along three lines: (1) the relationship of Jesus and Paul to OT Scripture; (2) the relationship of Jesus and Paul to contemporary Judaism; and (3) the relationship between Pauline theology and Synoptic traditions about Jesus.

The volume gathers eleven papers originally delivered at a NT symposium at the Albrecht-Bengel-Haus in Tübingen in honor of Rainer Riesner's 65th birthday by students, colleagues, and friends (not all papers were included). Armin Baum (Professor of NT at the Freie Theologische Hochschule in Giessen), Detlef Häusser (Professor of NT at the Evangelische Hochschule Tabor in Marburg), and Emmanuel Rehfeld (Institut für Evangelische Theologie at TU Dortmund) served as editors.

The contributors are particularly interested in exploring the question of continuity between Jesus and Paul, respectively, and Judaism. The four essays in part 1 deal with Jesus and the Synoptics. The opening essay by Thomas Pola discusses the fact that the Messiah was widely expected to reconstitute Israel, to build an eschatological temple, and to effect end-time atonement. However, according to Matt 11:2–6, in a break with contemporary Jewish expectations, Jesus already inaugurated the new age even prior to the universal judgment.

Roland Deines argues that the early Christians' messianic conception was rooted in the teaching of Jesus who claimed to be a messianic interpreter and teacher of Scripture in the line of David. In contrast to other Jewish expectations, the early Christians believed in a Messiah—Jesus—who had already ascended to God's throne (Ps 110:1) and was going to return.

Emmanuel Rehfeld discusses the tension between the Synoptic portrayal of the pre-Easter proclamation of Jesus and of the post-Easter Christ *kerygma*. While written from a post-Easter vantage point, the Synoptics tap into pre-Easter traditions about the earthly Jesus. Paul's letters, the Fourth Gospel, and Acts serve as hermeneutical commentaries on the Synoptics. In this vein, Jesus is presented as Savior of both Israel and the Gentiles.

Armin Baum explores the role of memory in the formation of the Synoptic Gospels. As part of his investigation, he builds on psychological findings by Robert McIver and Marie Carroll who identified ten Synoptic texts that in their view exhibit a degree of correspondence that is so unusually high that it cannot be adequately accounted for by mere memory. Contra McIver and Carroll, however, Baum contends that results would be different in the case of individuals whose memory is highly trained. He concludes that there are no passages in the Synoptics that can be explained only by direct copying as part of a literary relationship. *Gedächtniskultur* trumps *Abschreibeverhältnis*.

Part 2 features seven essays on the Pauline corpus. Volker Gäckle discusses the continuity between the proclamation of the kingdom of God by Jesus and Paul. While central in Jesus's proclamation, God's kingdom occupies only a peripheral role in Paul. Rather than conceiving of the kingdom in terms of God's rule, kingdom may be understood in terms of a future place and time or a present gift (i.e. eternal life). The author finds two major affinities between Jesus and Paul: the kingdom as a future place as in Jewish thought and the kingdom as eternal life or salvation as in a Greco-Roman context.

Joel White tackles one of the most controversial aspects of N. T. Wright's proposal, namely the alleged implicit exile metanarrative underlying Paul's theology. In interaction with Wright, White raises several methodological and content-related questions. In terms of method, White contends that N. R. Petersen's sociological-narratological analysis is superior to Richard Hays's actantial analysis. In terms of content, White contends that Wright has thus far failed to demonstrate the existence of a permanent exile narrative underlying any specific Pauline text. In contrast, White shows that Paul, in Romans 9–11 and 15:14–20, by drawing on passages from Deuteronomy and Isaiah, assumes that the return from exile had commenced but remained yet incomplete.

Hanna Ruck, in a study of Romans 9–11, asks how Jewish believers in Jesus read and understood Paul who was himself Jewish. She adduced three messianic Jewish interpreters (Jechiel Lichtenstein, David Stern, and Joseph Shulam) who draw extensively on rabbinic literature. Ruck shows that these interpreters find more continuity between Judaism and Paul than many German interpreters. Jewish interpreters are also more familiar and comfortable with Paul's hermeneutic and style of argumentation than their German counterparts. Finally, Jewish interpreters categorically reject anti-Jewish types of interpretation. Unfortunately, however, such Jewish interpreters, who could enrich German interpretations, have been largely ignored.

Guido Baltes investigates the core tenet in Pauline teaching regarding freedom from the Law. He analyzes the key texts Romans 7–8, Gal 2:4; 3:22–25; 4:21–5:1 and concludes that none of these texts speaks of "freedom from the Law." Romans 7–8 speaks of freedom from "the law of sin and death" in contrast to allegiance to God's law. Gal 2:4 speaks of freedom from merely human requirements. Gal 3:22–25 refers not to a confining prison but to a protective fortress. The allegory of Sarah and Hagar in Galatians 4 does not contrast the Law and grace, or Judaism and Christianity, but the slavery of earthly existence and the freedom of heavenly existence. Thus "freedom from the Law" does not accurately describe Paul's teaching; phrases such as "freedom from the *curse* of the Law" or "freedom from the *judgment* of the Law" are more accurate.

Detlef Häusser studies Paul's mission in the context of the church in Philippi in contrast to ancient Judaism, which did not engage in mission understood as purposeful activity aimed at conversion. The Philippians participated actively in Paul's mission (Phil 1:5), proclaiming the gospel (Phil 2:15–16), sending Epaphroditus (Phil 2:25–30), and providing financial support (Phil 4:10–20).

Alexander Weiss proposes that Paul was not the only early Christian who possessed Roman citizenship, since a considerable portion of the population in Roman *coloniae* were Roman citizens. If one supposes that Christians constituted a representative segment of the population, such a conclusion is rendered plausible, even likely. In this regard, Weiss sides with E. A. Judge over against A. N. Sherwin-White. This is the context for Paul's teaching regarding a higher citizenship in Phil 3:20.

The final article was contributed by Michael Theobald who boldly challenges the honoree Rainer Riesner's thesis that Luke wrote the Pastoral Epistles soon after Paul's death. Rather than arguing for authenticity, Theobald argues for an even greater distance between Paul and the Pastorals considering its distance from Judaism, its adoption of Greco-Roman conceptualities, and its espousal of un-Pauline ways of thinking. Theobald also cites the combination of two or three nouns in Titus as syntactical evidence for the Pastorals' distance from Paul and finds several additional indications of their pseudepigraphic character.

All in all, this is a very interesting, at times even provocative, and well-conceived volume (see especially the contributions by Baum, Baltes, and Theobald). I particularly enjoyed the essays by White on Wright's exile motif (caution well taken!) and by Häusser on mission in Philippi (rightly affirming a discontinuity between Jewish and early Christian mission). While space does not permit detailed interaction and critique here (though I should say that Theobald's essay strikes me as unduly hostile to the Pauline authorship of the letters to Timothy and Titus), scholars working on the intersection between Judaism and Christianity and on the relationship between Jesus, the Synoptics, and Paul will do well to interact with the essays in this volume.

If there is one disappointment, it is with the fact that the Fourth Gospel is not included in the purview of this volume. Does John really have nothing to contribute to the biblical witness regarding "the Jewish Messiah"? This would be particularly pertinent to Roland Deines's essay which argues that the Gospels—but apparently not John—should be considered alongside other early Jewish messianic traditions. Emmanuel Rehfeld (p. 112 n. 25) at least attempts to justify the neglect of John's Gospel by arguing that in contrast to the Synoptics, John exclusively reflects post-Easter theology. I would suggest, however, that he and the other contributors read and ponder the article by D. A. Carson on "Understanding Misunderstandings in the Fourth Gospel" (*TynBul* 33 [1982]: 59–91) where Carson shows that John was very well capable of distinguishing between the vantage point of the earthly Jesus and that of the disciples following the resurrection. That said, the omission of John's Gospel in this volume is in keeping with Rainer Riesner's methodology in his magisterial, still untranslated volume *Jesus als Lehrer: Eine Untersuchung zum Ursprung der Evangelien-Überlieferung* (WUNT 2/7; Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 1981), which likewise covers only the Synoptics but not the Gospel of John.

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

Jesus and the Temple: The Crucifixion in its Jewish Context. By Simon J. Joseph. Society for NT Studies Monograph Series 165. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016, xii + 329 pp., $99.99.

Simon J. Joseph opens and closes *Jesus and the Temple* with a simple yet important question: Why did Jesus die? In between he gives a consistent and generally well-argued answer to this question—that Jesus was a non-violent figure who challenged the ethics and efficacy of violent blood sacrifice that characterized the Jerusalem temple in his day. Furthermore, Jesus envisioned an ideal eschatological temple no longer marred by animal sacrifice and in which the original (and non-violent) intent of the Torah would be in force. However, Jesus's challenge of blood sacrifice proved too much for the religious authorities and led to his crucifixion. In what follows I summarize Joseph's provocative argument and offer some analysis.

In chapter 1, Joseph is concerned to distinguish between historical and theological explanations for Jesus's death. He contends that most of the NT texts understand Jesus's death in theological terms—such as the idea that Jesus's death functioned as an atoning sacrifice—and that this explanation obscures the real political and ideological reasons behind Jesus's crucifixion. Joseph then sets up his argument in the ensuing chapters by claiming that Jesus's relationship to Torah is what led him to challenge the first-century temple administration.

In chapter 2, Joseph discusses Second Temple understandings of the Torah as eternal in nature, and, largely relying on Jesus's statements in Q, asserts that Jesus held a similar understanding. Moreover, Joseph argues that Jesus understood the Torah in a highly realized eschatological fashion, based on an appeal to God's original will and intent in creation over against what the Mosaic law allowed. According to Joseph, Matthew, Luke, and John confused Jesus's eschatological views of the Torah and temple in their attempts to make Jesus more Torah-centric. However, Mark and Q reveal Jesus and his followers as neither consistently upholding Torah nor offering animal sacrifices in the temple.

Discussion of Jesus's view of the Jerusalem temple and his actions within it are the focus of chapters 3–5, and it is here that we move closer to the heart of Joseph's argument. He begins by posing the question: What is it specifically about Jesus's attitude to the temple that was the problem? After surveying ancient views of blood sacrifice and objections to this practice, Joseph states that ancient Jews likely had a variety of views/attitudes toward blood sacrifice ranging from necessary to objectionable. He then notes that blood sacrifice was not the only means of atonement available to Second Temple Jews, and that some Jews in the first century AD (e.g. John the Baptist and the Qumran covenanters) were opposed to animal sacrifice. Joseph then places Jesus in agreement with John the Baptist in his opposition to the temple and sacrifices.

In chapter 4, Joseph asserts that Q and Mark reveal a decidedly negative view of the temple and its administration and that this negative critique of temple cult was muted in later Gospels. Matthew, Luke, and John, accordingly, all soften Mark and Q's edginess and understand Jesus's actions in the temple in terms of replacement theology—that Jesus's sacrificial death would replace temple sacrifice and that

the temple itself would be replaced by either the Christian community or Jesus himself. This replacement theology, Joseph asserts, can hardly have been Jesus's own view.

It is in chapters 5 and 6 that Joseph offers the majority of his more controversial claims. He begins by noting that it is difficult to reconcile Jesus's alleged statements regarding the temple's destruction if Jesus also fully participated in the temple cult. Joseph then asserts that Jesus revered the temple as the house of God but did not participate in its cult. Instead, he argues that Jesus was a non-violent figure who, in light of his understanding that the eschatological restoration was at hand, was convinced that the temple cult and its animal sacrifices were inherently violent and desired that these sacrifices cease. For Joseph, Jesus's cleansing of the temple was a symbolic action, one in which he sought to restore the temple to its original intent as a place full of worship, teaching, and prayer, but not a place of animal sacrifice. These actions, along with a life of high ethical norms, constituted bloodless sacrifices and were more closely aligned with God's original purpose for the temple. In short, Jesus was not critical of the temple. He was critical of blood sacrifice.

Since the NT does not explicitly mention Jesus's critique of blood sacrifice and the efficacy of non-violent sacrifices for the atonement of sins, where does Joseph find evidence for this assertion? In chapter 6, Joseph turns to a discussion of Jewish Christian texts, such as the Pseudo-Clementine literature, Gospel of the Ebionites, and the Book of Elchasai, all of which reject animal sacrifice. Joseph then connects the dots between Jesus's rejection of animal sacrifice and the continuing rejection of blood sacrifice in later Jewish Christianity. He argues that these texts contain Jesus's real teaching on sacrifice, but that the canonical Gospels have altered Jesus's teachings on sacrifice, choosing instead to focus on a theology of fulfillment and replacement. He concludes with an impassioned plea to take non-canonical texts seriously in discussions of Jesus's view of Torah, temple, and sacrifice.

In his final main chapter, Joseph discusses the idea of Jesus dying as an atoning sacrifice for sins, arguing that this particular theological understanding of Jesus's death did not and could not have originated with Jesus. Since Jesus (and other early Jewish-Christians) were against the blood sacrifice occurring in the temple, it makes no sense to argue that Jesus thought of his death in blood sacrifice terms. Rather, Joseph argues that Paul and other early Christians are responsible for this particular theological understanding of Jesus's death and the idea that Jesus's death replaced the temple sacrifices.

There is much to be commended in this book. *Jesus and the Temple* is a very readable and well-researched investigation into the circumstances of Jesus's death. The argument is easy to follow, and Joseph's analysis of both the primary and secondary literature is salutary. Even better, Joseph produces a consistent argument—that of a non-violent Jesus who revered the temple but rejected animal sacrifice, who viewed the temple for what it could be (through the lens of eschatological restoration) while disagreeing with what it was (a place of violent sacrifice), and

who based his vision of a restored temple on a particular eschatological reading of the Torah.

There are, however, several issues that I found either concerning or puzzling. First, though Joseph often does well to sift through arguments before arriving at his own, on some occasions he simply assumes that something must be true without offering strong arguments. For example, on pages 138 and 161 Joseph asserts that Jesus's program was one of non-violence. There is very little argument here, and he only footnotes himself. While I can only assume that he laid out an argument for this idea in an earlier publication, such an important component of his overall argument deserved some further attention here.

Second, a number of scholars have argued that Jesus fully participated in the temple cult, which would include animal sacrifice. Joseph is critical of such views, noting that, since Jesus is never explicitly identified as offering sacrifices, the idea of Jesus offering a Passover lamb or any other animal sacrifice is really an argument from silence. Fair enough, but a major plank of Joseph's argument—that Jesus did not participate in, and was critical of, animal sacrifice, and that it was this criticism that landed him in trouble with the Jewish religious establishment—may easily run afoul of the same criticism.

Third, Joseph makes an impassioned plea to give equal weight to non-canonical sources as to canonical sources in historical Jesus research. A fair point, but in this particular case, Joseph places a great deal of weight on second- and third-century texts and argues that they have understood Jesus correctly while the four canonical Gospels (with Mark somewhat an exception) have missed the point. While his argument is fascinating, this seems a possible conclusion rather than a probable one.

On the whole, though, *Jesus and the Temple* is an engaging read and one full of tantalizing possibilities. Joseph's arguments deserve to be taken seriously by anyone interested in the study of the historical Jesus and the question of why he died.

Timothy Wardle
Furman University, Greenville, SC

Matthew's Theological Grammar: The Father and the Son. By Joshua E. Leim. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2/402. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2015, xiii + 298 pp., €84.00 paper.

Matthew's Theological Grammar, a revised version of the author's 2014 Duke Th.D. dissertation supervised by C. Kavin Rowe, offers "an ecclesially located theological reading" of Matthew's Gospel (p. 244). More particularly, it examines Matthew's "theological grammar," his narrative depiction of Israel's God, by attending to the narrative's use of προσκυνέω. Earlier studies of Matthew's use of προσκυνέω have concluded that: (1) Jesus receives full worship, the evangelist having blurred the distinction between pre- and post-Easter convictions about Jesus, but that Jesus is nonetheless not to be identified with Israel's God (so, e.g., Davies and Allison); (2) Matthew *would* not have depicted the characters in his narrative

anachronistically "worshiping" Jesus but instead exploited the ambiguity of προσκυνέω (so, e.g., Head); or (3) the confession of 4:9–10 together with the robust monotheism of Second Temple Judaism suggest that Matthew *could* not have attributed the act of "worship" to the people who approach Jesus (so, e.g., Fiedler). Leim regards each of these positions as unsatisfactory and aims to revisit the problem in a study that takes seriously the narrative's role in shaping the reader's understanding of the προσκύνησις ("worship") offered to Jesus and, in turn, of the meaning of θεός ("God") itself.

In an examination of Matthew's cultural encyclopedia, Leim surveys the use of προσκυνέω in OT, early Jewish, and early Christian texts (chap. 2). Both early Judaism and early Christianity proffer examples of what L. Stuckenbruck and R. Bauckham describe as "the refusal tradition" in which angelic or human figures refuse to accept worship from humans since worship belongs solely to YHWH. For Leim, this is consistent with the fact that, where προσκύνησις is offered to someone other than Israel's God in the OT, it is either censured or qualified. Agents of YHWH (most notably the king) can receive προσκύνησις in Israel's Scriptures but never in a way that infringes upon the worship reserved for YHWH alone.

Leim's third chapter examines the use of προσκυνέω in the Gospel's literary frame and its introduction to Jesus's mission. In spite of the fact that royal themes feature prominently in Matt 2:1–12, the προσκύνησις that the magi offer to Jesus cannot be understood as mere obeisance; the magi are instead worshipers. The distinctive presentation of Jesus as Son of God in Matt 1:16, 18–25, the evocations of the birth narrative in 2:1–12, and the presence of other cultic motifs all prepare the reader to see Jesus as the legitimate recipient of the magi's worship. However, 2:1–12 also points forward to 4:8–10, where Jesus refuses to grant worship to Satan and insists that worship must be reserved for "the Lord God" alone. Matthew thus creates a puzzle (an "ungrammaticality") for his readers: the "worship" that can only be rightly offered to "the Lord God" (4:8–10) has already (rightly) been offered to his Son (2:1–12). Moreover, both 2:1–12 and 4:8–10 point forward, the latter to the Son's climactic testing (e.g. 27:40) and the former to the post-resurrection worship he will receive (28:9, 17). Matthew's narrative presents Jesus as the Son of the Father who participates fully in the Father's universal Lordship and is the worthy recipient of worship. As such, "Matthew's narrative pressures the reader to articulate the identity of the 'Lord God' (4:10) in a way that includes the Son" (p. 88).

In the body of the narrative, four times supplicants approach Jesus offering "worship" (8:2; 9:18; 15:25; 20:20); these texts become the subject of the fourth chapter. Leim argues that the "ungrammaticality" introduced at 2:1–12 and 4:8–10 is reactivated in these passages and that, in each instance, it is too "anemic" to find mere homage or obeisance in Matthew's use of προσκυνέω (p. 106). Instead, these texts offer depictions of "the worshiping leper" (8:2), "the worshiping ruler" (9:18), and "the worshiping Canaanite" (15:25). Together these texts forge a unity between the one the supplicants address as "Lord" and the one who, according to Jesus (4:10), is alone worthy of worship.

Chapter 5 examines Matt 14:22–33. Here it is not supplicants but the disciples who offer Jesus "worship," and here there is none of the dramatic irony at play such as when the supplicants approach Jesus. At the *discourse* level, Matthew's readers see more in the "worship" of the supplicants than the supplicants themselves, at the level of the *story*, may intend. At 14:22–33, by contrast, the gap between the readers' perception and the characters' is "(largely) closed" (p. 166). Not surprisingly, then, most contemporary translations and commentators take προσκυνέω to refer to "worship" in 14:33. Few of the latter, however, allow this observation to "reshape their articulations of Jesus' identity in Matthew, much less the identity of Israel's God" (p. 125). For Leim, this is an important mistake: The intertexts that Matthew activates demonstrate that Jesus does here what only YHWH does. Matthew goes beyond the Jewish agency texts, which emphasize YHWH's ultimate agency, by presenting Jesus as the filial Lord who rightly receives the worship that is reserved for Israel's God.

In chapter 6, for the first time in his study, Leim's focus is not on προσκυνέω but on Matthew's wider narrative where, in confirmation of his thesis, we find "a trajectory that (re)narrates the identity of Israel's God around the Father-Son relation" (p. 176). The question about David's son, who is also his "lord," in Matt 22:41–46 requires of the reader precisely what Matthew's narrative provides—the knowledge of *this* Son of David's divine-filial identity. In addition, Matthew's narrative strengthens the link between Father and Son by pointing to the fulfillment of prophetic hopes for Israel's "Lord" in the life of Jesus of Nazareth. In the more immediate context of 22:41–46, Leim follows U. Luz in finding in 23:8–10 a reworking of Israel's *Shema* around the Son (p. 213). The chapter concludes with a treatment of Matthew's Emmanuel texts (1:21–25; 18:18–19; 28:19–20): here, Matthew appropriates Christologically the prominent OT and early Jewish image of "God's abiding presence." In short, Matthew's narrative places a "filial impress" upon the identity of Israel's God (p. 229).

The strengths of Leim's work are numerous. His readings of Matthean texts are always engaging and often penetrating. As one might expect of a thesis coming out of Duke, *Matthew's Theological Grammar* pays consistent attention to the OT intertexts activated in the texts under discussion and does so in ways that I find (mostly) convincing. Equally prominent, and equally helpful (even if careful readers will occasionally demur), is Leim's attentiveness to intratextual echoes and to the force that the wider Matthean narrative exerts on individual pericopes. In my view, Leim demonstrates convincingly that, at the *discourse* level, Matthew's use of προσκυνέω suggests that, as the Son of the Father, Jesus rightly receives what is due only the one God of Israel because, for the evangelist, the identity of Israel's God has been reshaped: "To name 'God,' for Matthew, is to name the Father-in-relation-to-the-Son" (p. 230, cf. p. 234).

This is not to say that I have no important reservations about the work; here I note only one. Leim is convinced that previous interpreters have often missed the significance of Matthew's use of προσκυνέω. I think that he is right and that his work offers an important corrective. Nevertheless, I also think that Leim's persistent focus on the Gospel's *discourse* (how the evangelist shapes his story to addresses

the reader) comes at the expense of sustained reflection on the *story* itself. Here I have in mind in particular how the characters' actions are to be understood. Does Matthew expect his readers to think that *the magi themselves* were worshiping? And the leper? Does it matter? Leim does note that the evangelist employs dramatic irony when depicting the προσκυνήσις offered to Jesus in the body of the narrative, since the "worship" that the various supplicants offer to Jesus is ambiguous. That being the case, I wonder how helpful it is simply to describe the characters as, for example, "the worshiping Canaanite." Leim offers no extended discussion and certainly no argument that attempts to explain how the action of the supplicants *is* to be understood. In my view, in a study of προσκυνέω in Matthew's Gospel, this comprises an important gap.

Nevertheless, this is an impressive work whose important strengths commend it not only to students of Matthew's Gospel but also to those interested in early Christian reflection on the identity of Israel's God. It deserves a wide reading.

Wesley G. Olmstead
Briercrest College, Caronport, SK

The Davidic Shepherd King in the Lukan Narrative. By Sarah Harris. Library of NT Studies 558. London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2016, xiii + 177 pp., $112.00.

This volume is a revision of Harris's 2012 doctoral dissertation at the University of Otago, Dunedin, New Zealand. Its basic thesis is that the motif of the Davidic shepherd king plays a more prominent role in the Lukan narrative than has been previously recognized. This is evident from the strong Davidic emphasis in Luke's Christology as well as the key role shepherds play at programmatic places in the narrative. This is especially the case in the birth story (2:1–20), in the central parable of the lost sheep (15:3–7), and in the story of Zacchaeus (19:1–10), which forms a climax to Luke's travel narrative. Harris writes, "This study aims to show that Luke's portrayal of Jesus as David is implicitly colored by his nature as … God's faithful shepherd king who always seeks out and saves the lost sheep" (p. 2).

Chapter 1 sets out the basic thesis and methodology. Harris adopts a narrative-critical approach that considers especially the following features: the cumulative nature of narrative, its cohesive structure, its order, its gaps and blanks, and the role of repetition and echoes within the text. With reference to order, she pays special attention to the *primacy effect* (M. Perry), that information situated at the beginning of a work is of utmost importance. She assumes Markan priority and the probable existence of Q.

Chapter 2 examines the LXX story of David. Citing Walter Brueggemann, Harris asserts that "the entire narrative of David's rise is staged from shepherd boy (1 Kgdms 16:11) to shepherd king" (p. 19). Throughout the story there is repeated emphasis on David's shepherd role. In the Goliath episode (1 Kgdms 17), David uses his shepherd background to describe for Saul both his success in fighting off wild animals and his dependence on the Lord. In the establishment of the Davidic covenant (2 Kgdms 7:1–17), the LORD tells David how he took him from the

fields, tending the flock, to rule over Israel. After David's sin with Bathsheba, Nathan's parable of the rich man who steals the poor man's lamb illustrates David's failure as shepherd over his people. In the account of the census, David acknowledges his sin, saying "I am the shepherd" (2 Kgdms 24:17 LXX). Harris concludes that "shepherd" functions as a *Leitwort* for the David story.

In chapter 3, "The Birth of the Davidic Shepherd King," Harris turns to the Lukan birth narrative. Surveying the literature, she asserts that, although Lukan scholarship has acknowledged Davidic messianic themes (a genealogical approach; see, e.g., my *The Davidic Messiah in Luke-Acts* [Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995]), it has largely overlooked Luke's emphasis on the story of David and Jesus as the shepherd king (a typological approach).

While all agree that Luke's birth narrative is permeated with OT themes, Harris shows that these are especially Davidic. The Annunciation to Mary (1:31–33) strongly echoes the Davidic covenant; Mary's song (1:46–55) recalls the song of Hannah (1 Sam 2:1–10), which occurs at the beginning of the David story; the Benedictus (1:68–79) identifies Jesus as a horn of salvation in the "house of David." The shepherds of the birth story (2:1–20), Harris asserts, are not a negative image as it is sometimes supposed but a positive one, meant to reinforce the presentation of Jesus as the Davidic shepherd king. Jesus is further linked with David in the identification of the "city of David" as Bethlehem, rather than Jerusalem. Luke's genealogy through Nathan instead of Solomon is likely a reflection of Jeremiah's curse on the royal line of Jehoiakim (Jer 22:24–30; 36:30) and his promise of a new Davidic shepherd king (Jer 23:4–6). Harris concludes that in the Lukan birth narrative "we hear not only of Jesus' genealogical relationship with David, but … we are presented with a typological portrayal where we find the Davidic covenant fulfilled in Jesus" (p. 81). The role of David becomes a *Leitwort* in which Jesus is viewed in light of David's story.

In chapter 4, "The Faithful Shepherd," Harris turns to Jesus's public ministry. She deals with four passages, three in the Gospel and one in Acts, in which shepherd imagery appears. The four are: (1) Luke 10:3, where Jesus sends out the Seventy "like lambs among wolves"; (2) Luke 12:32, a Q saying where Jesus tells his "little flock" not to be afraid; (3) Luke 15:3–7, the parable of the lost sheep; and (4) Acts 20:28, where Paul tells the Ephesian elders to "keep watch over … the flock" and to "be shepherds of the church of God." All four passages in one sense or another echo Ezekiel 34, which portrays Israel's leaders as wicked shepherds, God as Israel's good shepherd, and "David" as the Lord's eschatological shepherd who will faithfully lead God's people. Harris concludes, "The Gospel shows Jesus who faithfully lives out Ezekiel's Davidic shepherd, while in Acts, Paul mirrors such faithful actions and he calls other leaders to imitate him" (p. 115).

Chapter 5, "Jesus, the Seeking and Saving Davidic Shepherd," turns to the Zacchaeus story (19:1–10). Harris (correctly in my opinion) asserts that it is a salvation story rather than a vindication story (Zacchaeus does not say he has *all along* been sharing his wealth with the poor). She also rightly points to its prominent position at the climax to Luke's travel narrative and its thematic relationship with many other Gospel passages. For example, the blind man twice calls Jesus "son of

David," returning the narrative to the Davidic theme just before Jesus identifies himself again as the Davidic shepherd, seeking and saving the lost (19:10).

According to Harris, the Zacchaeus episode picks up Luke's shepherd imagery in various ways: The shepherd seeks out the lost sheep that they might be saved; he knows the sheep by name; he is inclusive of ethnicity, status, and gender; he brings peace to the community and supports the poor. Finally, Harris suggests a *programmatic inclusio* between Jesus's announcement of good news to the poor in 4:18–19 and the climax to the Zacchaeus episode in 19:10. "The first saying describes the scope of Jesus' mission and the second how that mission is enacted. That is, Jesus' mission to the poor is as the faithful Davidic shepherd king, who is constantly seeking out and saving the lost" (p. 151).

Overall, Harris provides a strong case that, in addition to Luke's emphasis on Jesus as Davidic messiah, there is a typological interest in Jesus's role as the Davidic shepherd king. These two roles are not, of course, mutually exclusive. Even in the OT, the Messiah is sometimes identified as a descendant of David (2 Sam 7:12; Isa 9:7; Jer 23:5; 33:15) and sometimes as a new "David" (Isa 11:1; Ezek 34:23; 37:24). Harris's most significant contribution, in my opinion, is drawing out the possible narrative links between Jesus's Davidic identity established in the birth narrative, his implied allegorical role as the shepherd who seeks lost sheep (chap. 15), and the climactic Zacchaeus episode (19:1–10), where his ministry is seeking and saving the lost (i.e. a shepherd's role).

Like most doctoral dissertations, at times Harris seems to overplay her hand, finding shepherd imagery under every rock and behind every tree. For example, is Saul's failure to destroy the Amalekite flocks really meant to contrast him with David as Jesse's faithful shepherd (p. 22)? Similarly, it seems a stretch to claim that the Hebraic expression "going out and coming in" (1 Kgdms 18:13, 16) is technical language for a shepherd's role (citing Y. S. Chae; p. 27). Harris also seems to suggest at times that every reference to David implies shepherd imagery and that every reference to shepherd imagery necessarily points to David.

Yet in general, Harris's conclusions are measured and balanced. She does not claim the shepherd motif is Luke's dominant Christology. It is "only one of the motifs that Luke has given the reader to understand Jesus." At the same time, it is "more cohesive and systematic than has been acknowledged. The motif comes at key places in the narrative and gradually builds a picture whereby the reader can see the Lukan Jesus as God's faithful Davidic shepherd king extending salvation to the lost sheep" (p. 17).

While this statement is generally true, it may be a bit of an overstatement. Although David and Davidic messianism play a prominent role in Luke's narrative, the author never explicitly connects David to shepherd imagery nor does he explicitly refer to Jesus as shepherd. The thread that runs from the birth narrative, to the parable to the lost sheep, to the Zacchaeus episode is a real thread, but it is a thin one. In light of the agrarian context of Jesus's day, the few other references to sheep and flocks (10:3; 12:32) may be more proverbial than programmatic. Despite

these minor criticisms, this is a helpful volume that makes a valuable contribution to Lukan narrative theology.

Mark L. Strauss
Bethel Seminary San Diego, San Diego, CA

Paul: An Outline of His Theology. By Michael Wolter. Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2015. xv + 476 pp., $79.95.

In this translated volume, Michael Wolter, Professor of NT at the University of Bonn, outlines, as the title indicates, the architecture of Paul's theology. It is not unimportant to note that he bases himself on the seven letters widely considered to be genuinely Pauline. It goes without saying that an outline based on all thirteen letters ascribed to Paul (as I think they ought to be) necessarily would have at least some different emphases. If based on all thirteen letters, a sketch of Paul's theology would inform us more about Paul's message of the church and the offices of elders/overseers and deacons in the church.

Wolter characterizes Pauline Christianity as a religion of conversion, both in view of the apostle himself and in view of the congregations formed by his mission. He takes a narrative approach to examine the various themes, which in Paul's letters are unfolded against the background of the particular situation of the congregation addressed. Often, this background includes elements of problems in the congregation. Any approach to describing Paul's theology has its advantages and drawbacks. The drawback here is that the particular shade of each letter and its contribution to the whole is a little obscured, but I think that the merits of the approach outweigh the demerits. I consider it, however, as a demerit that Paul's message of justification is treated in one of the last chapters. Perhaps one could also interpret this as the message of justification being seen as a climax, but if this volume is a first introduction to Paul's theology for someone, leaving it to so late in the process is a serious disadvantage.

Wolter's outline has several strong points. He rightly stresses that for Paul, the Christ-faith of the communities formed by his mission stands in continuity with God's covenant with Abraham and with Israel's striving for righteousness. The righteousness of God is only found in Christ. Strikingly, he notes that "the gospel for Paul is the 'power of God' in a twofold respect: for those who grant it faith it works for salvation, and for those who do not believe it, for perdition" (p. 68). That is, "faith" and "believing" are not one-off events, but represent "a signature of a permanent orientation of life" (p. 81).

Wolter presupposes that 1 Thessalonians is Paul's first letter. I myself greatly prefer the view that in fact the letter to the Galatians is the oldest and must be dated before the Apostolic Council took place and that the meeting described in Gal 2:1–10 is the famine visit. Certainly there was a difference of emphasis between Paul and James, but I cannot agree with the view of Wolter that after the Apostolic Council the actual controversy remained. If we date the conflict in Antioch before the Apostolic Council, it is much easier to explain why writings connected with the

three pillars mentioned in Gal 2:9, together with Paul's letters, jointly shaped the church universal, as early as the late first century and certainly in the second.

Incontrovertibly, the death of Jesus on the cross followed by his resurrection on the third day is of central significance for Paul. Paul held the soteriological interpretation of Christ's death in common with the movement of followers of Jesus who joined after his conversion. Wolter rightly calls attention to the fact that the sacrificial cult, too, must be seen in Paul's letters as a background for his interpretation of the death of Christ. Important also is his observation that Paul ponders the salvific effect of Jesus's death always and only in connection with Christians.

Concerning the meaning Paul ascribes to baptism, Wolter mentions two things: (1) that in a Christian congregation there is no one who is not baptized; and (2) that baptism separates Christian life from one's previous non-Christian life. Wolter thinks, as do the great majority of NT scholars, that in Paul's congregation only adults were baptized. I would ask: Does this mean that children and young people of Christian parents were not seen as members of the congregation? I would draw more attention than Wolter does to 1 Cor 10:1–13 where Paul warns against sacramentalism and shows with examples from the wilderness generation that it is perfectly possible to have received baptism and partake in the Lord's supper and yet not to be saved. Ultimately, it is faith, not receiving the sacraments, that is decisive for Paul, although he certainly could not conceive of a believer who is unwilling to partake of the sacraments.

Christian congregations knew even before Paul started his mission that the Spirit of God was present among them. Wolter is right that Paul presumes this presence of the Spirit. The Spirit of God denotes the presence of God. For Paul, the Spirit of God is also the Spirit of Christ and so denotes Christ's presence. Surely there is a very close relationship between the Holy Spirit and the Risen Lord. More than Wolter does, I would point to the difference between the two. With regard to 2 Cor 3:17, ὁ δὲ κύριος τὸ πνεῦμά ἐστιν, I think that the word δέ points to the fact that Paul is here giving an explanation of the referent of κύριος in the LXX of Exod 34:34–35. The referent is the Spirit. Therefore, the clause in the Nicene Creed that makes the confession "the Holy Spirit, who is Lord" has an exegetical warrant.

The longest chapter in Wolter's study on Paul's theology is "Justification on the Basis of Faith." Here, Wolter adopts a middle way between the so-called Lutheran perspective and the new perspective. In the light of the history of Christian doctrine, I prefer the designation "Reformational" to that of "Lutheran" perspective. Lutheran, Reformed, and Anglican reformers all confessed Christ's righteousness to be imputed to the believer as the only ground of justification. Besides, it is important to know that Luther acknowledged the difference between his own long struggle and Paul's sudden conversion. In respect to suddenness of conversion, Calvin could more easily identify himself with Paul than Luther could.

Still, the question remains whether the Reformational or Lutheran perspective does better justice to the message of Paul on justification than the new perspective does. Wolter's answer is that "one should not in fact bring the interpretation of the Pauline doctrine of justification into line with its reception by Luther. This would

be anachronistic. Considered from the opposite direction, however, one also will not do justice to Luther's theology if one accuses it of being a falsification of the Pauline doctrine of justification" (p. 399). This answer is true as far as it goes, but it is not wholly satisfying.

Wolter himself demonstrates that Paul's message of justification has not only redemptive historical and ecclesiological connotations but also universal soteriological and anthropological elements—elements, I would argue, that are even more clearly evident if we also ascribe Ephesians and the Pastoral Epistles to Paul. Even admitting that Paul lacked what is called a wounded conscience before his conversion, it remains true that he learned to proclaim that all mankind is guilty before God. The epistle to the Romans, most especially, shows us that this is the background of the gospel.

According to Wolter, that is the background to *reflection* about the gospel but not the background to the *proclamation* of the gospel. He does not place, not even in germinal form, Paul's message of justification directly after his conversion. Martin Hengel and Peter Stuhlmacher, among others, argue for the opposite view. I follow them. Luke's presentation of Paul's preaching in Pysidian Antioch in Acts 13 likewise points in that direction. I cannot agree with Wolter that Luke is positing here his own viewpoint and that he is not theologically reliably rehearsing Paul's sermon delivered in the synagogue of Antioch.

Before finishing with an epilogue, Wolter discusses Paul's view of Israel or the Jewish people. "Israel" has, for Paul, several shades of meaning. In Romans, it is ethnic Israel, but, when Paul speaks in Gal 6:16 of "the Israel of God," it is the community of Christian believers consisting of Jews and Gentiles. In Rom 9:6, Paul makes clear that the electing word of God is also a rejecting word. This is how he explains the refusal of the majority of the Jewish people to confess Jesus as Lord and Christ. He shows the parallels in OT history. In the future, unbelieving Israel will be saved by the Deliverer who comes out of Zion. Paul has a preference for the terms "Israel" and "Israelite" more than for "Jew" when he speaks in a positive sense of the Jewish people, either in the past or in the present. When Paul describes himself as a Hebrew, he is adding an element, I am sure. This is his way of making clear that he is as well-versed linguistically in Hebrew and Aramaic as in Greek. In other words, Paul first and foremost considers himself not as a Hellenized Jew but as a Hebrew Jew. Wolter could have expressed this element more emphatically.

Coming to a conclusion, I would say that Wolter offers an overview of Pauline theology in a readable and relatively concise form. Comparing the translation with the original, I must say that the translator has done an eminently good job. Although I have expressed several reservations, there is much that is rich and insightful in this treatment. Wolter's study on Paul is surely an important work.

Pieter de Vries
Free University of Amsterdam, Amsterdam, The Netherlands

The Epistle to the Romans. By Richard N. Longenecker. New International Greek Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2016, lxvii + 1140 pp., $80.00.

This is an impressive commentary. It excels in its attention to linguistic and textual matters (the sections on textual criticism are the most comprehensive I have ever seen), in its careful attention to the formal characteristics of Paul's argument in light of Greco-Roman rhetoric, and in the extensive discussions on the history of research. Longenecker has a masterful grasp of both German- and English-speaking scholarship, and he is able to situate exegetical questions in a larger historical context. On the debates regarding "the faithfulness of Christ" or "faith in Christ," for example, he traces their origins to 19th-century German scholarship (but does not interact with N. T. Wright).

According to Longenecker, the church in Rome consisted of both Jews and Gentiles, with Gentiles in the majority. Paul's purpose in writing to the church was five-fold: (1) to impart to the Romans a "spiritual gift" (1:11); (2) to seek their support for a planned mission to Spain (1:13; 15:24); (3) to defend himself against criticism; (4) to mediate between the strong (Gentile) and the weak (Jewish) Christians in Rome (14:1–15:13); and (5) to set the record straight regarding a Christian's attitude to the authorities (13:1–7). While Longenecker aptly shows the many formal characteristics Paul's letter shares with Greco-Roman rhetoric, he squarely situates the apostle's thought in its Jewish, rather than Greco-Roman, context. These conclusions place Longenecker's work within the mainstream of evangelical commentaries, but his commentary is by no means a regurgitation of traditional views. Longenecker examines every textual and exegetical question with fresh eyes and an independent mind. No one would accuse him of arguing an unusual position for the sake of novelty, but he is frequently staking out his own course.

The thesis statement in 1:16–17 is not the thesis of the entire letter, but only of 1:16–4:25. Paul avers that he is not ashamed of the gospel because he is responding to specific accusations against his proclamation. The account of God's judgment in 1:18–32 concerns not only the Gentiles, but all of humanity. In 1:26–27, Paul condemns all homosexual practices, not only oppressive, sexual acts. "God's righteousness" primarily refers to his saving activity on behalf of his people. "From faith to faith" in 1:17 means from divine faithfulness to the faith of the believer, and similarly "the faith of Christ" denotes the faithfulness of Christ. His "trust, faithfulness, and obedience" call for "a corresponding response of trust, faithfulness, and obedience to God through Jesus Christ on the part of all people who hear the Christian message and are drawn to God by his Holy Spirit" (p. 415). "The righteous one" in 1:17 is a messianic title. Longenecker takes exception to the new perspective on Paul, as he finds that "covenantal nomism" does not characterize all of Second Temple Judaism; some of it may be appropriately described as legalistic, and Paul's phrase "works of the law" refers to a legalistic understanding of the law. "The better rabbis of Judaism," however, including the Qumran community, opposed legalism. (Longenecker offers no evidence for these claims.) The *hilasterion* of 3:25 is translated "sacrifice of atonement" and may recall the OT sacrificial system, but not any of its specifics, such as the "mercy seat." Without enter-

ing the discussion, Longenecker affirms both the translations "expiation" and "propitiation."

Romans 5:1 is translated "let us have peace with God" (on the basis of the better attested variant that reads the verb as a subjunctive). The verse constitutes an exhortation to the Roman believers not to dwell on the forensic understanding of God's righteousness, but to embrace the more novel, relational, and participationist account of the gospel that Paul provides in 5:1–8:39. The differences between the forensic language in 1:16–4:25 (cf. also 9:1–11:36) and the participationist language in 5:1–8:39 (cf. also 12:1–21 and 13:8–14) are to be accounted for on the basis that 1:16–4:25 is a summary of the gospel in conventional Jewish-Christian terms, whereas 5:1–8:39 represents the more characteristic Pauline gospel, as he proclaimed it to Gentiles. In agreement with Fitzmyer, the prepositional phrase *eph' ho* in Rom 5:12 is seen as not referring to the cause of Adam's sin but its result, although Longenecker opts for the translation "on the basis of which" or "under which circumstances" (following Zahn), not "with the result that." In the same passage, "the obedience of Jesus" (cf. 5:19) should be understood as a synonym for "the faithfulness of Christ." While Rom 7:7–13 is autobiographical (the law came alive [v. 9] when Paul as a Pharisee began to take the law seriously, preparing him for the encounter with Christ on the way to Damascus), the "I" in Rom 7:14–25 represents a "speech-in-character," describing the plight of those who do not know God. Paul's positive statements on God's election in 8:29–30 do not correspond to similar statements on God's rejection.

The purpose of chapters 9–11 is to show that God is faithful to his promises to Israel. Even the evangelization of the Gentiles ultimately serves the salvation of Israel. Paul's hope for the future salvation of Israelites who come to faith in Christ (9:30–32) also applies to members of other religions who find faith in Christ without finding their way into a church. "All Israel" in 11:26 refers to "Jewish people who will be alive when the course of God's salvation history is brought by God himself to its culmination" (p. 897).

Commenting on Rom 12:1–2, Longenecker maintains that "the ethics of a Christian are not set out in any moral code, whether that given by God in the OT for the guidance of his people Israel or that proposed by some philosophical system of thought, either ancient or modern." Rather, "Christian ethical thought and life spring from the new resurrection life that has been given to us by a loving God" (p. 924). Paul's exhortations regarding the government in Rom 13:1–7 are not timeless instructions but addressed to a situation in which the Christians were considering joining a revolt against paying taxes. The passage belongs in a context in which it is still possible to have a positive evaluation of the Emperor Nero. The doxology in 16:25–27 is an integrated and apt conclusion to the letter. Every major unit of the commentary is concluded with sections on biblical theology and contextualization for today. These sections are of varying quality. The most important points of contextualization to be drawn from the theologically profound passages 1:16–17 and 5:12–21 include the need to be open to developments of doctrine.

The interaction with secondary literature is unusually strong but frequently quite dated. Too often, the commentary ignores important recent contributions to

the discussion such as, for example, Francis Watson's work on Paul's use of the OT, Mark Seifrid's studies on righteousness language, Constantine Campbell and Grant Macaskill's works on union with Christ, Desta Heliso's demonstration that "the righteous one" (cf. Rom 1:17) was not established as a messianic title, Matthew Novenson's study of the Christ title, Emma Wasserman's study of Romans 7 in light of philosophical language, James Harrison's studies on the Roman context of the letter, Michael Gorman's works on theological interpretation, Neil Elliott and Philip Esler's sociological studies, as well as works from representatives of the radical new perspective. Longenecker's interaction with Dunn's understanding of "works of the law" also fails to take into account Dunn's more recent treatments in which he has modified his earlier views. (The important recent works by N. T. Wright, John Barclay, and Michael Wolter did of course appear too late for inclusion.) As a result, the commentary often fails to contribute to the contemporary discussion on the theology of Romans. Despite its splendid overview of the history of interpretation, therefore, the commentary cannot serve the student as a reliable guide to the current state of the exegetical conversation.

Nevertheless, this commentary belongs together with the volumes by Cranfield (whom Longenecker frequently cites with approval), Dunn, Jewett, and Moo as one of the premier scholarly Romans commentaries in English.

Sigurd Grindheim
Fjellhaug International University College, Oslo, Norway

Paul and the Stories of Israel: Grand Thematic Narratives in Galatians. By A. Andrew Das. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2016, x + 304 pp., $79.00.

In recent years there has been a flood of studies that attend to "grand thematic narratives" in Paul's letters, and, while A. Andrew Das is prepared to grant that there is a "central and overarching story" and a "narrative logic" to the Pauline corpus, this is not the narrative that he addresses in his newest book, *Paul and the Stories of Israel*. Instead, Das sets out to "splash water onto the faces of interpreters" in order to free them from the grand narrative "parallelomania" that has cropped up in Pauline scholarship (p. 31). He does this by critiquing six different grand narratives: (1) the influx of the nations into Zion (Gal 3:13–14, 22–26; 4:1–8); (2) covenant (Gal 3:16–18; 4:21–31); (3) the *Aqedah* (Gal 3:13); (4) the exodus from Egypt (Gal 4:1–7); (5) the Spirit as exodus and wilderness cloud (Gal 5:18); and (6) the emperor cult (Gal 6:12–13). Das's book is intended to be a clarion call for greater methodological rigor, and his critiques are carefully constructed and forcefully argued. The case Das makes against "parallelomania" is convincing, though at times even as a sympathetic reader I found myself fatigued since the crux of the argument is "all of these readings of Galatians are wrong."

After an overview of the scope of the project, a qualified affirmation of Hays's criteria for detecting echoes, and a discussion of Porter and Beale's critique of Hays, Das argues that a grand thematic narrative must be anchored in clear quotations or allusions (p. 29). If a grand narrative is unanchored, "the question emerg-

es of how to evaluate such patterns, or whether such patterns even exist" (p. 29). In the chapters that follow, Das sets out to demonstrate that the six grand narratives he discusses are without steady intertextual moorings and thus are drifting interlopers that obscure sound interpretations of Galatians.

In chapter 2, Das examines the evidence for the Gentile influx into Zion as the grand narrative underlying Gal 3:10–14, 3:23–26, and 4:4–5. This chapter is a critique of proposals that all, in various ways and with different nuances, argue that "Paul's letter to the Galatians is indebted to this biblical and Second Temple pattern: The Jewish community, which had suffered the Law's curse, must *first* be redeemed before it could function as God's eschatological people whom the gentiles would then join" (p. 35). Das finds this unconvincing for several reasons, and chief among them are the shifts in referents between first and second person pronouns that the influx pattern requires. For example, in order for Terence Donaldson's influx thesis to work, the first-person plural pronouns in Galatians 3–4 must refer only to Jews, and the second-person pronouns must refer only to Gentiles. Das finds this particularly problematic in Gal 4:4–6 where "we [Jews] have received adoption" but "you [Gentiles] are sons." Das rightly sees this shift as unnecessarily awkward and complex, and he concludes that both first- and second-person pronouns refer primarily to the Gentiles and that the second-person pronouns rhetorically emphasize Gentile status as "sons" and "heirs." Das also argues that the influx narrative does not repeat elsewhere in Galatians and that it does not occur elsewhere in Paul's letters. He concludes this chapter with the forceful statement, "A convoluted, problematic 'Influx' pattern would unnecessarily complicate Paul's logic that circumcision and uncircumcision are ultimately inconsequential for enjoying a place in God's people, let alone Abraham's" (p. 63).

In chapter 3, Das attempts to stem the tide of "covenant" narrative that, in his view, is threatening to drown Pauline scholarship (p. 65). Das asserts that Sanders, Dunn, and Wright are largely responsible for Pauline scholarship's fixation on "covenant" as a key motif in Paul's thought (pp. 66–67) but that the concept and definition of covenant in Pauline scholarship is imprecise. Das notes the conflation of "covenant" and "righteousness" language, and he argues that "covenant-keeping is a *subset* of 'righteousness,'" but they are not necessarily closely related concepts in much of the Hebrew Bible (p. 70). Neither is covenant a ubiquitous concept in Second Temple literature, as many have claimed. Das explicitly rejects Sanders's assertion that a covenantal framework is properly basic to Second Temple Judaism. Das would have preferred "elective nomism" (p. 66), and instead argues that many Second Temple authors display almost no interest in covenantal instruments, suggesting that "covenant" was not an anchoring narrative for Second Temple texts (p. 76). Turning to Galatians, Das argues that διαθήκη in Gal 3:15 should be translated "last will and testament" rather than "covenant" since it belongs to an individual (not a group) and since Paul's audience would have been familiar with the practices and procedures surrounding making a will. In Das's view, Paul is deliberately playing with the two meanings of διαθήκη by which he "de-theologizes" and then "re-theologizes" the Abrahamic covenant apart from the expectations of law-keeping present in the Sinaitic covenant. After surveying Paul's use of διαθήκη in 2 Corin-

thians and Romans, Das concludes that "Paul does not employ the term διαθήκη consistently from letter to letter" (p. 90). Therefore, since there is no one understanding of "covenant" in Paul's letters nor in Second Temple literature, the concept of "covenant" cannot function as a narrative framework for Paul's thought.

The *Aqedah* and the obedience of Abraham and Isaac as a grand narrative underlying Galatians 3 come under Das's scrutiny in the fourth chapter of his book. After a brief and helpful survey of the *Aqedah* in OT and Second Temple texts, Das turns to a critique of Scott Hahn's proposal that Paul is deliberately drawing on *Aqedah* traditions to construct an Isaac-Christ typology in Galatians. Das further argues that *even if* there is a reference to the *Aqedah* in Galatians 3 (a tenuous assumption for Das), Paul is most likely *subverting* the message of Abraham's faithfulness because the focus in Galatians is on God's *promise* to Abraham rather than on Abraham's obedience.

In chapter 5, Das critiques James Scott's proposal that an exodus narrative underlies Gal 4:1–7, which has garnered an influential following since the publication of Scott's monograph on the topic in 1992. In his monograph, Scott argues that the heir in 4:1–2 is Israel as a collective, who during their minority (νήπιος) were enslaved under Egyptian taskmasters (ὑπὸ ἐπιτρόπους … καὶ οἰκονόμους) until they were delivered from bondage at the "appointed time of the Father" (προθεσμία τοῦ πατρός). Likewise, there is now a Second Exodus whereby at the appointed time the Son brings about "the adoption" (ἡ υἱοθεσία) of God's people and liberates them from the στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου (the elemental forces of the world). Das finds Scott's proposal unconvincing for a number of reasons: (1) a Jewish background for Gal 4:1–7 is unlikely; (2) Gal 3:29 has both Jew and Gentile heirs in view; and (3) perhaps most problematically, it is impossible to divest υἱοθεσία from its Greek and Roman usage that clearly connotes the adoption of adult male heirs, usually in a last will and testament, as Scott wishes to do. Based on the paucity of evidence in Scott's case, Das concludes that "Gal. 4:1–7 simply does not allude to the Exodus with any particular clarity" (p. 145).

Chapters 6 and 7 address two of the more idiosyncratic proposals for grand narratives in Galatians: The Spirit as Exodus cloud (Gal 5:18) put forth by William Wilder, and Bruce Winter's anti-imperial narrative in Gal 6:12–13. Wilder sees allusions to Ps 143:10 and a whole cluster of texts that associate the Spirit with the guiding cloud of the exodus (Hag 2:4b–5; Isa 63:11–14; Neh 9:12–22). Ultimately, Das is not convinced by Wilder's analysis of these texts and rejects their connection to Gal 5:18 in terms of a Spirit/cloud grand narrative. Das concludes, "The Spirit is not identified with the Exodus-wilderness cloud in *any* of the passages Wilder reviewed" (p. 174).

Chapter 7 is the outlier in this book since it is the only narrative that is not drawn from Israel's Scripture. In Winter's narrative, the Jewish Christian teachers were urging the Gentiles in Galatia to be circumcised so that the Jewish community could continue to avoid Roman persecution. Das disputes this narrative on the grounds that there is no evidence that the empire was acting against deviant associations, that Judaism was recognized as a *religio licita*, that governing authorities were enforcing participation in the imperial cult, or that the early Christians were distinct

enough and significant enough to warrant state-sponsored action against them. Although there is an impressive discussion of Roman sources and Roman history in this chapter, it is curious that Das does not engage Brigitte Kahl's work here. This lacuna in Das's treatment manifests itself in his failure to reckon with the ethnic identity of Paul's *Gentile audience* in Galatia who may have had their own tensions with Rome, preferring to focus on the relations between the Jews and empire.

Those working in the book of Galatians who have grown weary of grand narrative "parallelomania" will welcome Das's helpful summary and critique of recent scholarship. Those who are sympathetic to one or more of the grand narratives featured in Das's analysis will hopefully view his challenge as a chance to refine their arguments, marshal new evidence, and hone their methodologies. Indeed, the hidden gem in each chapter is Das's survey of the relevant primary sources, since he seeks to establish the "grand narrative" in Galatians *and in the relevant Jewish or Greco-Roman literature*. What results from this work is a helpful overview and compendium of primary sources that undoubtedly will provide further material for future conversations.

Erin M. Heim
Denver Seminary, Denver CO

Revelation. By John Christopher Thomas and Frank D. Macchia. Two Horizons NT Commentary. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2016, xxii + 670 pp., $36.00 paper.

John Christopher Thomas (Clarence J. Abbott Professor of Biblical Studies at Pentecostal Theological Seminary, Cleveland, TN) and Frank D. Macchia (Professor of Systematic and Pentecostal Theology at Vanguard University, Costa Mesa, CA) have teamed up to produce the volume on Revelation for the Two Horizons NT Commentary series. This series attempts to bring together biblical studies and systematic theology in order "to help pastors, teachers, and students engage in deliberately theological interpretation of Scripture" (back cover). Thomas produced the commentary proper (pp. 1–403), while Macchia provided essays on various theological topics related to the book of Revelation (pp. 405–624).

In regard to introductory issues, Thomas tentatively supports a date during the reign of Domitian and rejects a connection of the author of Revelation to the son of Zebedee in preference for more generally associating him with the Johannine community in some way. His suggestion that the author may have intentionally disguised the date of composition is not persuasive (p. 34); the original hearers certainly knew what year it was. Thomas seeks to chart a middle path in regard to John's use of the OT by arguing that, even though John was not primarily concerned with the original contexts, he did not simply use the OT as a language arsenal. Most distinctively, Thomas devotes almost thirty pages (pp. 44–72) to the "history of effects" of Revelation: disastrous interpretations of Revelation (Melchior Hoffmann, Charles Manson, David Koresh), other apocalyptic "Johannine" documents (*Second Apocalypse of John*, *Apocalypse of St. John Chrysostom*, *Third Apocalypse of John*, *Coptic Apocalypse of John*), art (Beatus, Albrecht Dürer, Jan van Eyck), music

(Handel's *Messiah*, Charles Wesley), poetry (the *Gawain*-Poet, William Blake, Bro. A. Beck), film (*End of Days*, *The Omega Code*), and commentaries (Victorinus, the Venerable Bede, Joachim of Fiore, Allan A. Boesak). Although this discussion of effects is highly selective, its inclusion is a unique contribution of the introduction.

On pages 73–403, Thomas follows a traditional commentary model and discusses the text of Revelation section by section. He frequently prefers to give a range of interpretive possibilities and does not often explicitly engage many of the popular interpretive debates. He does imply that Jesus is the first of the four horsemen in Rev 6:2 (p. 156), the 144,000 from the tribes of Israel should be understood symbolically as referring to God's people (pp. 167–70, 175, 251), the visions unfold in some kind of linear progression (as opposed to recapitulation; p. 180), John has an optimistic hope for the conversion of most of humanity (p. 209), and the millennium vision seems to follow the events of chapter 19 chronologically (p. 348). Thomas does not interact with text-critical details.

Thomas's most distinctive contribution lies in his consistent attention to connections between Revelation and the other books associated with the Johannine community. John's Gospel and letters have interpretive priority as intertextual allusions and echoes. Thomas sometimes takes this too far, however, since the gruesome way that the birds of the air feast on the bodies of the opposing nations need not be contrasted to Jesus's feeding of the 5,000 (p. 348), and the urgency of the call for the birds to come to the gruesome feast is not helpfully illustrated by comparing it to the Samaritan woman's call to the villagers to come and see Jesus (p. 344). Thomas is a clear writer and a reliable guide for pastors and students of Revelation, but other than his distinctive focus on reading Revelation in light of John's Gospel and letters the present commentary does not move the discussion beyond what has been said by prior commentators.

The content of the volume shifts rather dramatically when Macchia takes the helm on page 405. His 219 pages cover six main systematic theology topics: God, Christ, Holy Spirit, church, salvation, and eschatology. Each topic is covered in two main sections. The first section considers Revelation and biblical theology, discussing the relevant biblical evidence in Revelation, the Gospel of John and 1–3 John, Mathew and Mark, Luke and Acts, Paul, and the rest of the NT books. The second section considers Revelation and systematic theology, focusing on the various contributions that Revelation makes to broader discussions in systematic theology.

The focus on Revelation and biblical theology brilliantly provides the foundation needed for the later systematic discussion. The lack of this foundation is often the main cause for concern when scholars in biblical studies consider the work of systematic theologians. Macchia's work will go a long way towards allaying these concerns. His theological reflections are firmly and solidly grounded in a careful exegetical reading of the texts themselves. The only critique of the biblical theology sections is that the focus on the other books of the NT adds a great deal of length to the book (approximately 60 pages) but does not significantly contribute to the discussion. These sections provide a nice overview of each main theological topic across the whole of the NT but the discussion of the other books is not integrated with the comments on Revelation or significantly drawn upon in the later theologi-

cal reflection. These sections on the other books of the NT could have been omitted without substantially detracting from Macchia's discussion of Revelation's unique contribution to systematic theology.

Macchia's work on Revelation's contribution to various systematic theological topics is the highlight of the whole volume and ably accomplishes the goal of the Two Horizons NT Commentary series to bridge the gap between biblical studies and systematic theology. Helpful subsections include: The Sovereign God of Classical Theism, Worship and Mediation of the Lamb, Christ and the Challenge of Pluralism, The Deity and Person of the Spirit, Missionary Ecclesiology, Israel and the Nations, An Ecumenical Geometry of Salvation, and The Delay of Christ's Coming.

Macchia's essays deserve particular attention at two points. First, he provides a sensitive and nuanced discussion of the relationship between Israel and the church from the perspective of the book of Revelation (pp. 532–36). "It is not the church that fulfills Israel but Christ, and both Israel and the church find their destiny in him" (p. 534). Second, his discussion of both salvation and eschatology is infused with an awareness of how both of these realities are inaugurated in Jesus's life, death, resurrection, and the pouring out of God's eschatological Spirit (pp. 590–91, 609). Many discussions of eschatology completely focus on debates and issues that have only marginal (if any) importance in the text of Revelation itself (pre-, mid-, and post-tribulation theories of the rapture come to mind). Macchia—as well as Thomas in the earlier commentary—avoids this trap and allows Revelation itself to set the agenda. This leads to a clear systematic theological discussion of what scholars in biblical studies describe as inaugurated eschatology.

One notable critique relates to Macchia's fascination with the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world (Rev 13:8). This phrase is pivotal for his understanding of a host of issues, and he refers to it repeatedly (pp. 427, 429, 442, 459, 471, 522, 535, 542, 567, 576). Unfortunately, the Greek is a bit ambiguous and a careful comparison of Rev 13:8 with Rev 17:8 indicates that the Lamb was not slain from the foundation of the world. Instead, names were written from the foundation of the world in the slain Lamb's book of life. Such a shift in the translation of Rev 13:8 would likely have wide-ranging ramifications, since it is central to Macchia's argument at several points. Thomas's accompanying commentary is no help at this point, since he does not mention the exegetical issue and also assumes throughout that the Lamb was slain from the foundation of the world (pp. 236, 241, 284, 298).

In short, Thomas provides a useful and readable commentary for pastors, while Macchia offers an exemplary model for blending biblical studies and systematic theology in order to address the issues of our day. Although dividing the book into two parts follows the general practice of the Two Horizons commentary series, the two halves do not seem to need each other, and in this case the reader might

have been better served with either a heavily redacted shorter volume or two separate books.

Alexander E. Stewart
Tyndale Theological Seminary, Badhoevedorp, The Netherlands

Torah Ethics and Early Christian Identity. Edited by Susan J. Wendel and David M. Miller. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2016, xiii + 271 pp., $35.00 paper.

This volume is a collection of essays written in honor of Stephen Westerholm in light of his remarkable career of contributions to the study of justification and the role of the Mosaic law in the writings of Paul. The volume is broken into three main sections, dealing with the role of the law in early Judaism, the NT, and the early church fathers respectively. The first two chapters concerning early Judaism, in particular, provide a helpful background for the remaining chapters.

The first chapter, which is entitled "Entering a Synagogue with Paul: First-Century Torah Observance," by Anders Runesson, is basically a survey of the variety of halakhic understandings maintained in the Judaism(s) of the first-century period, both in the holy land and the Diaspora. Runesson's main conclusion, drawn from the surveyed evidence of synagogue practices is: "Any attempts at generalizing what Torah observance constituted in communal local-specific settings to apply to all or most Jewish communities are therefore inherently precarious" (p. 25). The one topic that does seem to transcend the various expressions of Jewish Torah observance is an abiding interest in ritual "purity" (p. 25). Runesson calls for greater attention to Exodus, Leviticus, and Deuteronomy (p. 20) in order to balance out "Christian desires and educational programs, which tend to focus on prophetic texts as background material necessary for the understanding of the New Testament," since "various interpretations of the book of Leviticus seem to have been what influenced most people's lives" (p. 25). This appeal seems well grounded, though it would be illuminating to see further exploration of the concern for ritual purity within the prophetic, apocalyptic, and pseudepigraphal literature itself in order to ascertain to what extent purity concerns gave shape to the hopes and eschatological expectations of Judaism throughout the Second Temple period.

The second chapter, "The Meaning and Function of the Law in Philo and Josephus," was written by John W. Martens. Philo viewed the law of nature and the Mosaic law as identical in content: "As a result, Philo believed that the Mosaic law should be observed, its precepts followed, by almost everyone, except those few heroes of the past and present-day sages who could follow the law of nature" (p. 29). Philo included Abraham and the patriarchs as being among those who were able to perform the requirements of the law without the benefit of the written law (p. 31), and he believed in his own day there were still people who were so illuminated by the law of nature (p. 32). It seems clear that Paul expresses virtually the same convictions in Rom 2:12–16, though the exploration of that conviction is not within the scope of Martens's essay. One wonders to what extent the expectation of Jer 31:33–34 informed the shared understanding of both Philo and Paul: "I will

put my law within them, and write it on their hearts." Is "my law" the law of nature, pedantically written on tablets for Israel only to accommodate their human weakness?

Among Martens's observations regarding Josephus, perhaps most interesting is his discussion of the lack of "covenant" language in his writings and an accompanying emphasis upon scrupulous Torah observance. For Josephus, "The relationship of the Jews with God is based on observance of the laws of Moses" (p. 37). This emphasis can be variously explained as an attempt to distance himself from the "land-oriented covenantal theology" of the Zealots, as a desire to combat an overemphasis on the sufficiency of ethnic descent, or as a reflection of customary "patron-client" relations prevalent in the Roman empire in Josephus's time (pp. 36–37). Regardless of the explanation, it would seem that Paul's understanding of the role of the law differs sharply in substance from that of Josephus, advocating as he does, justification by faith in Christ and not by the law; whereas Paul's outlook would be closer to the "covenantal" form of Judaism from which Josephus apparently sought to distance himself (though Paul's understanding of the identity of Abraham's "seed" was profoundly reoriented by his Christological convictions).

The third through tenth chapters deal with the area of the law in NT studies. Wesley G. Olmstead's chapter ("Jesus, the Eschatological Perfection of Torah, and the *imitatio Dei* in Matthew") looks at how Jesus brings the kingdom of God into reality in the Matthean narrative. Jesus reflects the faithfulness of YHWH to his people in his own fidelity to YHWH, thus fulfilling the intended purpose of the Torah and ushering in the age where God's eschatological people show the true character of Israel's God to the world in their own transformation through discipleship. S. A. Cummins ("Torah, Jesus, and the Kingdom of God in the Gospel of Mark") looks at the way topics such as purity, holiness, Sabbath, temple, and Torah observance are addressed in Mark's Gospel. In an essay that complements that of Olmstead in many respects, Cummins looks at a wide-ranging selection of materials drawn from Mark to show "that the Torah (and temple), so constitutive of the life and mission of Israel, is affirmed, taken up, and transposed in the life and mission, and atoning death and resurrection of Jesus" (p. 74).

David Miller extends the analysis of the law of Moses to the narratives of Acts, in "Reading Law as Prophecy: Torah Ethics in Acts." According to Miller, "In Acts, Jews are depicted as consistently Torah-observant: Gentiles, by contrast, are directly obligated to only four requirements of the law, as authorized by the apostolic decree" (p. 91). However, for Jewish and Gentile Christians alike, the whole Torah "remains authoritative and relevant … when it is read as prophecy and applied by analogy" (p. 91). Although in general terms one would not want to quibble with Miller's central thesis, it does not seem that Luke views the earliest Jewish-Christian communities as Torah-observant in quite the way he intends. According to Miller, "Just as the four terms of the apostolic decree (Acts 15:20) were imposed on Gentiles as requirements for those saved by faith, so we may conclude in light of the trajectory of Acts that, from Luke's perspective, the law remained obligatory for Christ-believing Jews" (p. 80). While there is no doubt that the apostolic decree imposed obligations on Gentiles, these obligations are not based on

abiding moral requirements of the law of Moses, so much as they are *ecclesiastical* instructions, intended to avoid needless offence to potential Jewish converts (Acts 15:21). Even abstaining from "fornication" would involve not simply abstaining from immoral acts themselves but from pagan settings that are tainted with immoral behavior. It is true that Jewish Christians are depicted as Torah-observant in Acts, but this should be understood in light of the general Christian obligation to be compliant with one's own national polity (cf. Rom 13:1–7). That Luke does not see Torah observance as still in the same way (as it was under the old covenant) a matter of religious obligation for Jewish Christians is clear not only from Peter's vision (Acts 10:14–15) but also from the observation of Peter that the law of Moses has been "a yoke on the neck of the disciples that neither our fathers nor we have been able to bear" (Acts 15:10).

Adele Reinhartz looks at the question of presumed ethics in the narration of Jesus's raising of Lazarus ("Reproach and Revelation: Ethics in John 11:1–44"). Reinhartz argues that the author of John's Gospel "is not attempting to set Jesus up as a model for human ethics, or, one might add, to prescribe an ethical system for the sake of the Gospel's audiences. On the contrary, he is asserting that as the Son of God Jesus disregards or overrides the accepted ethical norms for a higher purpose" (p. 106). Whatever one thinks of this assessment, the essay certainly provides bibliographical direction for those who wish to explore the question of ethics in John's Gospel more deeply. Essays by Scot McKnight ("The Law of the Laws: James, Wisdom, and the Law"), Beverly Roberts Gaventa ("Questions about *Nomos*, Answers about *Christos*: Romans 10:4 in Context"), Terence L. Donaldson ("Paul, Abraham's Gentile 'Offspring,' and the Torah"), and Richard Hays ("The Conversion of the Imagination: Scripture and Eschatology in 1 Corinthians"), fill out the picture, as they look at the role of the law of Moses in the writings of James and Paul.

In the final section, three essays move beyond the first century. First, Susan J. Wendel explores the apologetics of Justin Martyr ("Torah Obedience and Early Christian Ethical Practices in Justin Martyr"), and then Peter Widdicombe looks at Clement of Alexandria ("The Law, God, and the Logos: Clement and the Alexandrian Tradition"). The volume concludes with a contribution by Stephen Westerholm, comparing and contrasting Luther and Calvin's understanding of the Mosaic law in relation to Paul and the broader canonical witness of Scripture ("Canonical Paul and the Law"). Personally, I found these last three essays to be among the most stimulating and informative of the entire volume, though all of the essays are of a consistently high quality and well worth the investment. This collection could be usefully drawn upon in any college or graduate-level course exploring the topic of the Mosaic law in the context(s) of the historical Jesus (especially McKnight on James and the Jesus tradition), the Gospels (Olmstead and Cummins), or the Pauline literature (Gaventa standing out as especially useful).

Paul Owen
Montreat College, Montreat, NC

One True Life: The Stoics and Early Christians as Rival Traditions. By C. Kavin Rowe. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2016, ix + 330 pp., $40.00.

Kavin Rowe (Professor of NT at Duke Divinity School) rarely—if ever—disappoints. In works such as *Early Narrative Christology: The Lord in the Gospel of Luke* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2006), *World Upside Down: Reading Acts in the Graeco-Roman Age* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), or now *One True Life*, you can count on him to produce a provocative, sophisticated, and stimulating read. Steeped in the primary literature of the ancient world, gifted with a perceptive exegetical eye and philosophical mind, and clearly impacted by the rich theology of the Christian tradition, Rowe presents a controversial thesis in *One True Life*: Stoicism and Christianity are fundamentally incompatible—indeed rival—traditions that cannot be compared *superficially* at the verbal or even conceptual level. Why? Because both traditions affirm that, to understand their teaching, one must live out their teaching. Thought and life are inseparable. Since they promote two disparate ways to live, only dissimilarity will ever mark their comparative relationship. After all, a person can only live one life.

Rowe's argument unfolds in three parts within the book. In part 1, Rowe reads Stoic texts written by Seneca, Epictetus, and Marcus Aurelius before turning, in part 2, to Christian texts penned by St. Paul, St. Luke, and St. Justin Martyr (the designation "St." is presumably an intentional distinction between Christian and pagan writers). In both parts, he provides a broad reading of certain key themes: God, humanity, life, death, and community. He specifically selects these big-picture themes because, although Christians and Stoics expound on them, they do so "in different ways to mean different things" (p. 224). These themes also enable Rowe to describe the larger stories or narratives behind each tradition (see chap. 8). His treatment of Seneca, Epictetus, and Marcus Aurelius may come across to some as cursory or even superficial—a critique he anticipates (see pp. 265 n. 16, 295 n. 15)—but his thorough acquaintance with them and exegetical reflection on their works are manifested through a winsomely witty dialogical style. He writes/speaks as if, for example, Seneca himself, and then he retorts as if a dissatisfied interlocutor. This dialogical, question-answer format does "the hermeneutical work" and enables Rowe to condition historically the imaginative language of dialogue (p. 265 n. 19). Parts 1 and 2, in their own rights, contain many insights on Stoic and Christian texts alike, but the greatest contribution of this book is found in part 3.

Beginning with a chapter entitled "Can We Compare?" we find ourselves at the crescendo of Rowe's argument, gradually increasing until the final word in the appendix. "How should we read [Christian and Stoic texts] in relation to one another?" asks Rowe. Well, he boldly reasons that, since it would be "largely useless" to work with the same assumptions as those in "the majority of modern scholarship," we must "reset" the terms of scholarly inquiry. Put more bluntly, he argues that the modern way of inquiry "needs to be discarded if we are rightly to see what the Stoic and Christian traditions were and how to conceive their relation" (p. 175). He attempts to do just that by drawing on the work of Alasdair MacIntyre who describes what MacIntyre labels "encyclopedic assumptions." Rowe particularly

identifies and criticizes this modern way of knowing in the comparative work of Abraham Malherbe and Troels Engberg-Pedersen. Although he has a wider audience in view (i.e. the "historicist" and "retriever" [p. 266 n. 22] and others [pp. 226, 246]), Malherbe and Engberg-Pedersen are, for Rowe, "focal instances" of encyclopedic inquiry whose conclusions regarding the striking similarity between Christianity and Stoicism are driven by false assumptions.

Rowe levels three criticisms against Malherbe and then three against Engberg-Pedersen. Against Malherbe, Rowe challenges (1) his surface treatment of verbal parallels, since he does not deal with the "more difficult philosophical questions that surround how we recognize similarity/difference in the first place" (p. 186); that is, by asking how words are related to the narrative framework from which they emerge (see chap. 8); (2) his surface treatment of conceptual parallels that leads him to assume that ancient psychagogy is *essentially* identical to, say, pastoral counseling—Rowe questions "to what degree difference in content means difference in thing" (p. 187); and (3) his assumption that Stoicism and Christianity can be placed on a single continuum, that of morality. Both Paul and the Stoics, Malherbe says, shared a "commitment to help people better themselves." Even though they attain that goal with a different self-understanding and method, Paul largely "followed the methods of the moral philosophers" (pp. 187–88). Against this, Rowe will later explain that Stoic morality envisions the human as "its own resource and resolution of its problem," requiring people to rely on themselves through reason (p. 214). By way of contrast, Christianity tells a different story. "Reason's repair occurs only through knowing God in Christ—or, rather, being known by him—and the communal norms that inculcate reason's right workings in a pattern of church life and public witness" (p. 221).

Rowe then turns to Engberg-Pedersen. He criticizes (1) his well-known model that Paul and the Stoics agree on the philosophical logic of conversion and progress, which assumes that ideas can be thought of solely as ideas apart from the human lives where they are found (p. 189)—Rowe calls this "a rather gross anachronism," a modernization of ancient thinking that completely distorts ancient thought. It also promotes the Descartian and Lockian "disengaged self," an objectified self that also objectifies ideas and denies lived experience (see Charles Taylor's helpful example of a toothache on p. 196). To impose this modern self on the ancient self, for Rowe, is just bad historical work: "For the ancients there is no such human being: the self cannot be thus divided, for there is no objectifiable thinking faculty—the mind qua mind or soul qua soul—that can know truth apart from the much denser reality of the I that lives" (p. 197). Ideas, he insists, stem from lived experience. Rowe then goes on to question (2) Engberg-Pedersen's self-proclaimed "naturalistic" understanding of Paul's discourse as merely human rather than "Spirit-enhanced" or divinely inspired. For Rowe, this enables Engberg-Pedersen to insist that Paul's discourse is intelligible "in the same way and same grounds" as any other claim to truth. No divine assistance needed. This "naturalistic" reading is closely related to (3) Engberg-Pedersen's "etic" (i.e. outsider) perspective, which supposedly explains Christian discourse in modern language without hermeneutical harm. Rowe gives the example of "God" in Engberg-Pedersen's work, wherein he

erroneously translates Paul's use of the term "into the modern idiom of 'naturalistic' reason" (p. 193). The end result is that his perception of "God" is neither Christian nor Stoic, Rowe asserts, but part of a "modern scholarly grammar" (p. 190).

Rowe adds further criticism against points (2) and (3) above in his censure of what he calls "modern projects of absorption." These projects are driven by the felt necessity to "suspend or abandon the specific claims of the sources themselves," like, for example, the Bible's claim that "we need God's help to see straight" or that "human language is broken, 'natural' reason deeply damaged, and the cure for such brokenness and damage [is] out of our reach." In claiming to interpret texts, "encyclopedic projects of absorption" position us "critically against the sources they claim to interpret" (p. 195). Rowe considers these projects an "illusion" of knowledge, "self-deceived," and "a very specific kind of blindness" (pp. 194–95). What is needed is "an 'apocalyptic' intervention—something that is entirely outside ordinary human possibilities" (p. 195). What is needed is God to cross the Creator/creature distinction and cause a person's conversion to that specific tradition (see p. 236). The main culprit of misunderstanding in all of this is "the modern divorce between thought and life" (p. 198). Christian and Stoic texts are claims on our existence, not just a call to assimilate information. It is not, "Here is some interesting information from the past," but rather, "Here is the true and wise way to live; you will know it by living in this way" (p. 198). If this is the case, then, Rowe asks, how can we know we understand these ancient sources without living the life they apparently require? What emerges from this critical chapter ("Can We Compare?") is a devastating blow to "the encyclopedic version of inquiry" and accepted methods in comparative studies.

Having "reset" the terms of the discussion, Rowe constructs a comparative method he calls "narrative juxtaposition." Christianity and Stoicism are "traditions" that cannot be separated from what it means to live as a "Christian" or a "Stoic" (p. 199). Again, thought and life are inseparable. However, Christianity and Stoicism are "rival traditions" insofar as they promote two diametrically-opposed ways of living within two conflicting narratives. The most a comparativist can do is "juxtapose" these traditions, all the while being aware that their own life as a Christian or a Stoic will be reflected in their comparison. When Rowe does this as a "Christian" (p. 205), he insists that Christianity and Stoicism are incommensurable. Whatever substantive similarity may exist on the surface level, a deeper analysis of their narrative frameworks—not solely the words or concepts that appear within—shows that "they are, permanently and irreducibly, traditions in conflict" (p. 235). They are "existentially exclusive claims" to truth, since, built into each claim, is a call to conversion. Christians and Stoics "say with the shape of their lives: 'Come and have your life turned to the truth of all things! Here it is and nowhere else!'" (p. 236).

So what can be said about this book? Rowe's approach represents a pendulum swing away from Engberg-Pedersen and Malherbe who sit at the opposite side of the comparative spectrum—with the work of John M. G. Barclay, N. T. Wright, George van Kooten, Runar Thorsteinsson, and many others separating the two. We can thank Rowe for clearly demarcating the two extreme poles of this spec-

trum—after all, this is a necessary step in complex debates—but, at the same time, we should question whether he has swung the pendulum too far. Is it really impossible to "translate" one tradition into another? Is the only value in comparing Christianity and Stoicism to affirm the uniqueness of one or the other? If so, how would he, as a Christian, respond to the familiar criticism that he is acting like an "apologist"? Also, as a Christian, how can he claim to understand Stoicism? If his thesis is correct (see pp. 202–5), the way seems sealed off to him.

Rowe's book will inevitably create just as many friends as enemies. Many will love the stand that he takes against the "acceptable" methods of the academic guild, and they will indeed declare a resounding "Yes!" to his penetrating critique of the all-too-common encyclopedic epistemology. Others will be irritated by his destructive hermeneutical and comparative "method," and they will certainly pronounce an unqualified "No!" to his insider approach to the biblical text, one that inextricably connects what one thinks with how one lives. Irrespective of which side you take, no one will be able to set this book down quietly. You will either embrace it or throw it. But, rest assured, no one will be indifferent. As for this Christian reviewer, I am immensely sympathetic to his argument (though not without questions related to the comparative task). Let the comparative conversation continue.

David E. Briones
Reformation Bible College, Sanford, FL