

BOOK REVIEWS

Hidden Riches: A Sourcebook for the Comparative Study of the Hebrew Bible and the Ancient Near East. By Christopher B. Hays. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2014, xxvi + 425 pp., \$45.00 paper.

Christopher B. Hays created *Hidden Riches* in order to help make “intelligent comparison between biblical and ancient Near Eastern texts possible” (p. 6). Hays, who serves as D. Wilson Moore Associate Professor of Ancient Near Eastern Studies at Fuller Theological Seminary, felt motivated to do this because he could not find a compendium that also offered pertinent discussions of the comparative issues at an undergraduate or master’s level. Since Hays directs and teaches in the ANE Studies emphasis in Fuller Seminary’s M.A. degree, he decided to expand and publish the introductory materials and discussion topics used in his classroom (pp. 5–6).

The primary purpose of the book is to introduce the student to the interpretive value of the comparative method. Consequently, the book focuses on selected texts from all parts of the OT along with the corresponding ANE data (p. 8). In order to avoid having the book become a mere compendium, Hays developed it by following four specific goals. First, questions that would inevitably be raised by an inquisitive reader were to be anticipated and addressed, such as: Where did these texts come from? When were they written? Who wrote them? Second, mere snippets or excerpts of a few well-known texts must be avoided. All texts must be discussed within the context of their larger composition, genre, and literary contexts. Third, the discussions of each section should offer starting points for analysis and comparison. Such starting points were to help individuals new to literary or comparative study get started in a profitable direction. Finally, the book should itself facilitate motivated readers to explore further. Consequently, the reflection questions and further reading lists should point the student beyond the material in discussion and debate (p. 6).

The structure and organization of the textbook is designed to achieve its primary purpose and specific goals. Twenty-seven chapters are divided into five major parts. Part 1, the Prolegomena, contains two chapters, an Introduction (pp. 3–13) and an essay entitled “History and Methods of Comparative Study” (pp. 15–38). The introduction contains a rationale for the work and a general bibliography. (Future editions should expand this bibliography.) It also explains the purpose of the book and the design of the chapters. The second chapter provides a brief excursus on the historical development of the comparative study of the Bible and the ANE. This includes an account of early comparative scholarship, a brief review of the current *status quaestionis*, and a briefer consideration of a possible path forward in comparative intertextuality.

Part 2 examines the comparative ANE texts relating to the Pentateuch in seven chapters (chaps. 3–9). Chapter 3 on creation accounts introduces the reader to the typical format followed throughout the rest of the book. In each chapter, the biblical texts under consideration are generally listed first as citations. The students are encouraged to use their own version to study the text. Hays includes actual biblical texts on three occasions, and all three are adapted from the NRSV or the CEB (Genesis 6–9, along with selected material from Isaiah and Proverbs). The biblical citation is then followed by an ANE text as a whole or as an excerpt. The ANE texts are updated translations by experts in the field (see pp. ix–x). Hays adds helpful footnotes on personal and divine names, places, and other obscure terms or items (p. 9). The chapter ends with a discussion section, several reflection questions, and a list of further readings.

As well as creation accounts, other chapters in Part 2 cover some predictable items. Included are portions from *Enuma Elisb* (chap. 3), the Gilgamesh epic (chap. 4), the Laws of Hammurabi (chap. 7), and Hittite and Neo-Assyrian treaties (chap. 9). Interesting additions are the comparisons of the birth accounts of Sargon and Moses (chap. 6), court stories concerning Ahiqar and Joseph (chap. 5), and ritual texts involving Leviticus and ANE purgation rites (chap. 8).

Part 3 contains four chapters on the Former Prophets. Materials in this unit include the Mesha inscription (chap. 10), temple-building accounts of Gudea and Tiglath-pileser I (chap. 11), the Neo-Babylonian Chronicles (chap. 12), and Senacherib's siege of Jerusalem (chap. 12).

Part 4 on the Latter Prophets begins with a brief excursus on prophecy in the ANE. Then in six chapters it covers symbolic acts (chap. 14), various types of oracles and their compilation (chaps. 15–17), divine abandonment (chap. 18), and praise for Baal (chap. 19). Chapter 18 compares the departure of deities from their respective cities in Ezekiel and the Marduk prophecy.

Part 5 incorporates eight chapters on the Writings. Expected comparisons include the Instructions of Amenemope and Proverbs (chap. 20), *Ludlul bel nemeqi* and Job (chap. 21), and Lamentations and the Lament over the Destruction of Sumer and Ur (chap. 25). Other chapters focus on prayers of wrongdoing (chap. 22), hymns of praise (chap. 23), and prayers of lament (chap. 24). Chapters 26 and 27 on Persian edicts (the Letter Gadatas and Ezra 6) and autobiographies (Udja-horresne and Nehemiah), respectively, round out the last unit and end the book.

The front matter contains abbreviations (pp. xii–xiv), time lines of ancient periods (pp. xv–xvi), and an ANE map listing the sites of composition and discovery of the various texts discussed in the chapters (p. xvii). It also offers a section of eight figures including photographs or depictions of some of the inscriptions and other artifacts mentioned in the text (pp. xviii–xx). The end matter provides indices of Scripture and other ancient sources and of subjects.

A good many items make this book valuable to anyone interested in the give and take of comparative/contrastive studies of the ANE and the OT. Only a few can be mentioned here. First, the inclusion of the most recent translations by experts in the field offers a better understanding of the meaning and import of the literature and culture of the ANE. Second, the sourcebook goes beyond the com-

mon generic comparisons of the *Enuma Elish* or Gilgamesh Epic to examine lesser-known texts. Compare, for example, the comparative issues of wrongdoing in Psalm 26, the Book of the Dead (Spell 125), and the DINGIR.ŠĀ.DIB.BA incantation on appeasing the heart of an angry god (chap. 22). The same can be said of the contrasts between Psalm 104 and the Great Hymn to the Aten (chap. 23), or Leviticus 16 and various Hatti and Babylonian purgation rites. Third, the reflection questions are designed to be diverse, non-exhaustive, and open-ended (p. 10). For example, in chapter 7 on law collections, Hays inquires, “How does a polytheistic worldview affect the idea of justice as compared to a monotheistic worldview?” Lastly, discussions like that of chapter 21 on human suffering (comparing Job and *Ludlul bēl nēmeqī*) bring out significant points of cultural comparison and contrast.

Despite these strengths, Hays accepts a critical stance on biblical interpretation, including the Documentary Hypothesis (chap. 4) and the multiple authorship of Isaiah (chap. 17). According to Hays, since no Hebrew texts were written before the tenth century BC, no biblical account could have been written before then (p. 7). Hence, the birth account of Moses was more likely a traditional tale incorporated into the Yahwistic source of the Pentateuch (p. 118). Such issues may discourage the use of *Hidden Riches* as a classroom textbook by members of ETS.

Stephen J. Andrews

Midwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, Kansas City, MO

Seriously Dangerous Religion: What the OT Really Says and Why It Matters. By Iain Provan. Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2014, 512 pp., \$49.95.

Iain Provan’s *Seriously Dangerous Religion* explores the validity of the OT for modern man. He compares and contrasts the “Old Story” (OT) and “biblical faith” with the major religions, philosophies, and other stories. His methodology is to ask a specific question of a particular passage or theme in the OT. The answer provided serves as the basis for the OT’s interpretation of that text or theme. Provan then compares and contrasts this interpretation with the interpretations offered by such religions and philosophies as the ancient Near Eastern religions and myths, Judaism, Christianity, the Qur’an, Buddhism, Confucianism, and the Reg Veda. Modern authors also enter the discussion; Agatha Christie, J. R. R. Tolkien, Richard Dawkins, Karen Armstrong, and Derrick Jensen, serve as some of the primary exemplars. The book’s organization (acknowledgments, endnotes, bibliography, and separate indices grouped by Scripture, authors, and subject), makes it useful as a textbook for various courses in biblical and Christian apologetics, survey of world religions, or the like.

Chapter 1, “Of Mice, Men, and Hobbits: *Stories, Art, and Life*” (pp. 1–20), describes the background for the study and presents the methodology. Provan summarizes three modern “stories.” The “Axial Age” (800–200 BC) comprises “the wellspring from which all faith once emerged” (p. 6). The “Dark Green Golden Age” is in some ways older than the axial age and seeks to save the planet (p. 7). The “Scientific New Age” embraces the story told by “the new atheists—Richard

Dawkins, Daniel Dennett, Sam Harris, and Christopher Hitchens,” and the like (p. 7). The hostility of the proponents of these stories motivated them to convince as many as possible that “to believe in God (the gods) is to be deluded, that religion is bad for both individuals and societies,” and that the abandonment of religious perspectives leads “to greater human fulfillment and happiness” (p. 8). Provan seeks to counter these beliefs. He desires to substantiate the “Old Story” as “a true and helpful account of ‘life, the universe, and everything,’” which “provides a solid point of departure for precisely the path ... into a better future for which its detractors are often looking” (p. 17). His approach is “religious and philosophical” rather than “historical and scientific” (p. 17).

Chapters 1–14 and a “Postscript” each begin with two epigraphs, which set the stage for the investigation in that chapter. Chapters 2–14 (except 12 and 13) address the ten fundamental questions to both the OT and its challengers. These questions comprise the subtitle of each chapter and focus the specific answers sought. In each case, Provan produces convincing evidence for the superiority of the answers provided by the “Old Story” and “biblical faith” over the contenders. The chapter titles are provoking and the subtitles tantalizing, as they portray the horizon of information sought. (1) Chapter 2 (pp. 21–46), “The Up Quark, the Down Quark, and Other Cool Stuff: *What is the World?*” (2) Chapter 3 (pp. 47–76), “Slow to Anger, Abounding in Love, and (Thankfully) Jealous: *Who is God?*” (3) Chapter 4 (pp. 77–104), “Of Humus and Humanity: *Who are Man and Woman?*” (4) Chapter 5 (pp. 105–32), “It Isn’t Natural: *Why Do Evil and Suffering Mark the World?*” (5) Chapter 6 (pp. 133–62), “On Living in a Blighted World: *What Am I to Do about Evil and Suffering?*” (6) Chapter 7 (pp. 163–90), “Even the Stork Knows That: *How Am I to Relate to God?*” (7) Chapter 8 (pp. 191–220), “Love All, Trust a Few, Do Wrong to None: *How Am I to Relate to My Neighbor?*” (8) Chapter 9 (pp. 221–50), “On Keeping the Earth: *How Am I to Relate to the Rest of Creation?*” (9) Chapter 10 (pp. 251–78), “I Saw the New Jerusalem: *Which Society Should I be Helping to Build?*” (10) Chapter 11 (pp. 279–308), “A Bird Perched in the Soul: *What Am I to Hope For?*” (11) Chapter 12 (pp. 309–46), “Further Up and Further In: *New Dimensions in the Old Story.*” (12) Chapter 13 (pp. 347–78), “On the Judicious Closing of the Mind: *The Question of Truth.*” (13) Chapter 14 (pp. 379–406), “Risk Assessment: *Is the Story Dangerous?*” (14) The Postscript (pp. 407–409): “*Biblical Faith for a New Age.*” In the postscript, Provan draws three strong conclusions: (1) There are “excellent reasons for continuing to affirm this Old Story as the most coherent overall account available to us of the way things are and will be” (p. 408). (2) This “Old Story” is “good and not dangerous—or more precisely ... it is good in *being* dangerous” (p. 408). (3) This “Old Story ... provides the most secure foundation upon which to build the better future for humankind” (p. 409).

The negative criticisms are minor and have more to do with a reader’s personal preferences, than any serious flaw in methodology, argument, or presentation of information. Two come to mind: (1) Provan’s writing style in the first person might be disconcerting to those who would prefer a more focused style in the third person. This may be a commentary on the preferences of particular readers and their exposure to the less formal writing style gaining prominence in today’s society.

(2) Some might prefer footnotes (including this writer) rather than endnotes. Endnotes are very prevalent in today's academic writing. Footnotes have the advantage of allowing the reader to track the documentation while reading a particular page. Endnotes require the reader to leave the page being read to read the note. Publishing standards, rather than personal choices, might also affect such decisions.

However, these criticisms are small indeed when compared to the positive criticisms of the book. (1) The use of the first person, though in a minor way listed above as a negative, creates a "comfortable" style, which engenders an easy dialogue between the reader and Provan that encourages a readiness to heed his arguments. (2) He also continually refers back to previous arguments as he charts his future paths of discussion he is taking. This allows the reader to track easily the development of the arguments throughout the book. (3) The hermeneutics, the apologetics, and Provan's ability to marshal a wide diversity of materials are exceptional in today's academic literature. In fact, this might be the greatest strength of the book. Such exceptional diversity, this "thinking outside the box," creates a broad range of uses for the work, whether in university classes in world religions, theology, apologetics, hermeneutics, as well non-professional areas as discussion groups and church or Sunday school classes. *Seriously Dangerous Religion* is a "must read" for anyone interested in these issues.

Randall C. Bailey
Faulkner University, Montgomery, AL

How Israel Became a People. By Ralph K. Hawkins. Nashville: Abingdon, 2013, 288 pp., \$37.99.

How did Israel become a people living in the land of Canaan? While acknowledging the contribution of the Bible in answering this question, Ralph Hawkins travels beyond the confines of the biblical record to produce a "scientific-historical reconstruction of the appearance of Israel in Canaan" (p. 27). This theoretical reconstruction of Israel's history melds the contents of the OT, archaeological discoveries in this land, and a formula for cultural development anchored in anthropology.

The ten-chapter execution of the author's stated goal follows a very logical and intuitive progression that begins with why such a history of Israelite settlement would be necessary when we appear to have that information in the Bible. On the one hand, the author urges the use of the Bible as a research tool affirming the historical credibility of its reporting; on the other hand, he observes the need to go beyond the Bible in answering the question. That is because the limited and theologically-nuanced reporting we have in the biblical record stops short of providing a full, scientific report of the broader circumstances that attend Israel's arrival in this land. The information gap left in place by the biblical authors is the one Hawkins seeks to fill with this monograph.

Chapter 2 summarizes the classical and more recent models of Israelite settlement. As one might expect, the conquest model, peaceful infiltration model,

social revolution model, and amalgamations of these models are summarized and evaluated for their strengths and weaknesses. Because the date of Israel's arrival in Canaan will be important to his method, the author dedicates chapters 3 and 4 to a discussion of the date for the exodus and conquest. A generally fair and balanced presentation of the data supporting the early and the late dating of these events is offered. Hawkins's own conclusion, which informs much of what follows, allows for a 15th- or 13th-century BC date for settlement but presumes the overall weight of the evidence favors the later date for Israel's arrival in Canaan.

Chapter 5 addresses the archaeology of the key cities mentioned in Joshua and Judges related to Israel's settlement in the land: Jericho, Ai, Hazor, and Dan (Laish). In each case, the history of the field work is summarized and the key evidence from the sites is presented and interpreted with regards to the question of the date and nature of Israel's arrival in Canaan.

Chapters 6–9 probe more deeply into the archaeology of the region. Chapter 6 presents a survey of the archaeological evidence in the 13th–11th centuries BC from Galilee to the Negev and eastward through the Transjordan. Here Hawkins identifies hundreds of unwallled villages that are not built upon earlier Canaanite sites and that are found most extensively in the areas of Ephraim, Manasseh, and eastern Benjamin. Chapter 7 looks at the material culture from these sites and argues that the patterns of settlement, site layout, four-room domestic structures, pottery types, and foodways all point to the arrival of a new people group in this area who are similar in disposition to the Israelites. Chapter 8 uses the archaeological site of 'Izbet Sartah to drive home the point, identifying it as a prototypical Israelite site. Chapter 9 advances the case by examining evidence of early sanctuaries in this region and building a relationship between them and Israelite identity. Here attention goes to the so-called Gilgalim sites and the enclosure located on Mount Ebal.

All the discussion in these chapters leads to chapter 10 and the most innovative contribution the monograph offers. Here Hawkins seeks to bring together the biblical record and archaeological data to create a theory of Israel's arrival in the land that is guided by a culture-scale model based on the work of John H. Bodley. This model suggests societies can be categorized according to power systems: domestic, political, and commercial. In each of these stages of development, power is organized differently, the food objective differs, and there is a different overall level of equality and stability reflected in that society. It further suggests that when societies form, they go through transitions that lead from transhumance to sedentarization to politicization. This matrix becomes the backdrop Hawkins employs, interweaving historical statements in the Bible and the archaeological evidence of Canaan to further describe the time and nature of Israel's arrival in the land.

This book clearly meets the objective set for it by the author. Hawkins creates a scientific-historical reconstruction of Israel's arrival in Canaan that is respectful of the various data sources available to the modern historian. Refreshingly, this reconstruction maintains a high respect for the contribution the Bible makes to the process, striking a balance that offers a worthy model for others to consider. Beyond meeting its objective, the author has also done an admirable job of controlling and

integrating the wide range of sources needed for this enterprise. There is a sense of maturity in the presentation, which suggests the author has lingered around the topic for quite some time. There is also an admirable clarity in the presentation, likely due in no small way to the fact that Hawkins has experience as pastor and college professor. He thus is familiar with taking the more complicated information produced by the academy and translating it into language the non-specialist can engage. For those interested in seeing how the story of the OT integrates with archaeology and for the way in which archaeology fills in some of the historical and cultural gaps left by the biblical authors, there is much to be gained here.

The very nature of this project will mean that not all will agree with Hawkins's method and conclusions. For example, this reviewer felt the argument against an early date for the Exodus stumbled a bit with the insistence that the Egyptian hegemony over Syria and Canaan from 1400–1250 BC was so extensive as to preclude Israel's arrival in the land without soliciting a recorded response from the Egyptians (p. 80). On the other hand, the presentation of the evidence associated with Jericho may be among the best I have seen and would be worth purchasing the book just to have those pages in hand. Here Hawkins effectively addresses the long-standing view that Kenyon's investigation at Jericho led her to conclude Tell es-Sultan held no evidence of occupation from 1550 BC until the Iron Age. This often-cited, initial perspective of Kenyon was later revised by Kenyon herself who believed a more modest fortification may well have existed here between 1550 BC and the Iron Age. If this information is important to you, be sure to read pages 93–102, even if you do not purchase the book for yourself.

Interdisciplinary research is difficult and often goes unrewarded in the academy. But this monograph is a wonderful example of what that integration has to offer for the church and academy when it is done well.

John A. Beck
Jerusalem University College, Jerusalem, Israel

Poetic Heroes: Literary Commemorations of Warriors and Warrior Culture in the Early Biblical World. By Mark S. Smith. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2014, xxiv + 636 pp., \$55.00 paper.

In this volume, Mark S. Smith pursues a study of ancient heroic poetry in the Bible and in other Ancient Near Eastern cultures. His purpose in this pursuit consists of distinguishing and evaluating the glorification of warfare in the ancient texts with a view to confronting what our own society considers attractive about warfare and militarism (pp. xii–xiii). Smith holds the Skirball Chair of Bible and Ancient Near Eastern Studies at New York University. His published works include *Untold Stories: The Bible and Ugaritic Studies in the Twentieth Century* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2001); *The Early History of God: Yahweh and the Other Deities in Ancient Israel* (2d ed., Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002) in the Biblical Resource Series; *The Priestly Vision of Genesis 1* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2010); and *God in Translation: Deities in Cross-Cultural Discourse in the Biblical World* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010). He also

co-authored *Stories from Ancient Canaan* (2d ed., Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2012) with Michael D. Coogan.

Poetic Heroes presents a comparative analysis of some of the ancient stories from Ugarit (Aqhat, Baal Cycle, and Rephaim texts), Mesopotamia (Gilgamesh), Greece (the *Iliad*), and Israel (Judg 5 and 2 Sam 1:19–27). Within these materials, Smith finds evidence that provides at least some understanding of cultural practices and philosophical views regarding warfare and warriors in the respective societies. In Part 1, “The Literary Commemoration of Warriors and Warrior Culture” (pp. 13–47), Smith discusses the matters of evidence and method with which one might examine ancient warrior cultures through their commemorative poetry.

Heroic poetry reveals a variety of practices in the context of battle. First, preparing young men as warriors involved training in the use of weapons, which began with hunting (pp. 16–17). Second, pre-battle preparations (p. 17) included sharpening swords and arrows, stringing bows, and oiling shields. The warriors donned warrior clothing, took pre-battle vows, and sought divine blessings. Third, post-battle practices and rituals (pp. 17–20) included the warriors washing their bodies and cleansing their weapons. They also collected and dedicated their enemies’ weapons as temple trophies. They also destroyed the properties of their enemies and lamented their own fallen comrades. Finally, post-battle commemoration included celebratory feasts and warrior songs (p. 20). In order to examine all these facets, Smith looks also at the values and attitudes that inform warrior practices (pp. 20–23).

Archaeological and iconographic material evidence demonstrate that the warrior ideals show up outside literary compositions (pp. 24–33) and must be considered alongside the heroic poems. Thus, a question arises concerning the differences that might exist between the literary representations and cultural reality (pp. 33–47). Within this particular discussion, Smith suggests archaeologists should use restraint in tying biblical texts to their finds and interpretations without interacting with biblical scholarship and a more careful understanding of the biblical text (p. 42).

Part 2, “Three Warrior Pairs in Mesopotamia, Greece, and Israel” (pp. 49–95), compares three great pairs of warriors from Mesopotamia (Gilgamesh and Enkidu), Greece (Achilles and Patroklos), and Israel (David and Jonathan). Such a comparison introduces readers to interactions between warriors, the issues of gender participation, and the role of goddesses. The heroic poems cast the role of the lesser companion in each warrior pair as a contributor to the heroic image of the greater (p. 52). The biblical account regarding David and Jonathan stands apart from the literature representing the other warrior pairs by not including a goddess and by making God the hero’s chief support (p. 69). The goddess appears in the extrabiblical literature in an inverted gender role—she is a warrior and hunter in contradistinction to human women whose roles fall outside these two cultural areas (pp. 73–79). Smith examines the matter of the bond between warriors as it might be displayed through any homosexual relationship between the warriors (pp. 79–95). He concludes that the literary traditions surrounding these warrior pairs do not promote anything more than the shared experience of physical combat as brothers in arms (p. 94). In fact, readings that take the literature as presenting same sex rela-

tions might be “misplaced and perhaps an anachronistic concern on the part of modern readers” (p. 95).

Starting with the story of Aqhat (pp. 99–136), Smith analyzes Ugaritic heroic poetry in Part 3, “Human and Divine Warriors in the Ugaritic Texts” (pp. 97–208). He also presents detailed analyses of literature concerning the dead Rephaim warriors (pp. 137–61) and the divine warriors involved in the events in the Baal Cycle (pp. 162–208). A supplementary study of ‘Athtart/‘Ashtart/‘Ashtoret closes out this latter section of the Ugaritic studies. Smith’s careful interaction with the most recent scholarship regarding these texts provides a valuable summary of the development and revision of translations and interpretations over the years. The analyses to this point in the volume indicate that heroic poetry “served to express warrior ideals supportive of the monarchy” (p. 208).

Then, in Part 4 “Israelite Warrior Poetry in the Early Iron Age” (pp. 209–332), Smith moves on to the two major biblical texts he has selected for evaluation and comparison with other Ancient Near Eastern heroic poems. Smith first discusses Judges 5 (pp. 211–66) and then 2 Sam 1:19–27 (pp. 267–83). His final two chapters explore “The Cultural Settings for Warrior Poetry in Early Israel” (pp. 284–307) and “The Passing of Warrior Poetry in the Era of Prosaic Heroes” (pp. 308–32). Smith’s dating of Israelite heroic poetry to the tenth century BC, together with a consideration of the role it played, suggests the significance of David to the history of the Israelite monarchy. The biblical heroic poems preserve the cultural memory of David’s status as Israel’s leading warrior hero.

Three major points for scholarly discussion and debate arise out of Smith’s detailed analysis. First, scholars can garner valuable historical and cultural evidence for reconstructing both ancient history and ancient societies from heroic poetry. Those who denigrate, or outright deny, the historical value of poetic texts must ignore the voluminous evidence presented by ancient poetry. Second, careful analysis of ancient poetic texts has shown that poetic style and linguistic evidence do not provide definitive data for dating the composition of individual texts. Finally, ancient leaders and societies used heroic poetry to instruct citizenry and form desirable attitudes in order to promote the preservation of history, the propagation of proper theology, and preparation for kingdom building. Smith examines these issues and identifies how the selected texts of ancient heroic poetry contribute to our knowledge of those ancient societies.

Voluminous end notes (pp. 333–576) present significant added information, illustrative evidences, and supporting documentation. A series of indexes conclude the volume, providing readers with the means to access information easily: “Index of Subjects” (pp. 577–90), “Index of Texts” (pp. 591–616), “Index of West Semitic Key Words, Grammatical Features, and Poetic Terms” (pp. 617–19), “Index of Select Iconography” (pp. 620–21), and “Index of Modern Authors” (pp. 622–36).

William D. Barrick
The Master’s Seminary, Sun Valley, CA

The Authors of the Deuteronomistic History: Locating a Tradition in Ancient Israel. By Brian Neil Peterson. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2014, xiv + 395 pp., \$34.00.

The background, authorship, and growth of the extensive section of the OT known as the Historical Books form no small aspect of OT biblical criticism. From Deuteronomy to 2 Kings, these texts recount Israel's early history with both detail and artistry, and are in many ways the beating heart of OT theology. For this reason, bound to the intricate issues related to these books, often known as the "Deuteronomistic History" (DtrH), is a host of critical implications. While the prevailing winds of OT scholarship blow stiffly in one direction, Brian Neil Peterson has produced a volume that heads persistently in another.

In the introduction to his project, Peterson frames his investigation in terms of a "whodunit?" mystery novel. His aim is not only to establish a cogently argued alternative view of the Historical Books, but even to posit authorship of (a) specific individual(s), an endeavor rarely attempted in favor of concepts like the "Elohists" or a "school of 'X.'" By examining "intertextual clues, possible character motives, and the historical opportunity in general," Peterson posits that "Abiathar the priest [of Anathoth], his sons Jonathan and Ahimelech, their priestly descendants, and finally Jeremiah and Baruch" each had a hand in authoring and editing the DtrH (p. 3). Peterson thus wishes to historicize the DtrH.

The book unfolds in two parts. In the first, Peterson provides an extensive orientation to scholarly trends in views of the authorship, date, and influences on the DtrH (pp. 7–117). Starting in chapter 1 with the work of Martin Noth, Peterson situates the reader in the current scholarly discussion of the DtrH. In this chapter, Peterson also articulates his holistic and synchronic approach to the canonical text, bypassing what he sees as the "slugfest" of redaction-critical debates on the microtextual level (p. 8). In short, the predominant, but often modified, consensus view of the DtrH is that it was compiled by an author (the "Deuteronomist") in the mid-6th c. BC from earlier, fragmented sources. This was prompted by the "discovery" of the Book of the Law (=Deut. 4:44–30:20) by Hilkiah (2 Kgs 22:8–10) chiefly to explain the failure of the monarchy and Israel's exile, and thereby furnish an apology for Josiah's reform.

Peterson draws attention to the disagreement and near "pan-Deuteronomism" among OT scholars. To him this situation suggests the need for a new evaluation of whether the DtrH may have originated from an earlier period in Israel's history, namely the time of Abiathar, David's high priest, after which the DtrH underwent subsequent editorial expansions. In chapter 2, Peterson substantiates this approach by examining Noth's work and the ways in which his own views of the DtrH partially align with Noth. This prompts Peterson to reevaluate other claims made by Noth that have become axiomatic.

Chief among these claims is a late date for Deuteronomy, with which Peterson interacts in chapter 3. He resists a late date for the book on the basis of what he understands as Deuteronomy's second millennium BC Hittite treaty structure. While Peterson acknowledges that his position "may turn off some readers," he expresses hope that his arguments will "speak for themselves" as he posits an alter-

native theory (p. 63). In chapter 4, Peterson examines key grammatical constructions as they occur throughout the DtrH, such as *בעבר הירדן* and *עדהיום הזה*. Examining each occurrence with regard to chronology and geography, and interacting closely with Jeffrey Geoghegan's similar analyses (see p. 113), Peterson suggests the fittingness of these phrases for authorship by Abiathar and the subsequent Anathothian priests, including Jeremiah. Peterson maintains that "very few" of the phrases could be satisfyingly situated after a 6th c. BC time frame (p. 112).

In part 2, Peterson moves into a chapter-by-chapter, systematic investigation of the editing of Deuteronomy and each book of the DtrH. His goal is "to determine how, if at all, the priestly authors from Anathoth may have influenced their content and shaping" (p. 121). To do this, Peterson focuses on "macro thematic and rhetorical indicators that point to authorial perspective," providing a considerable amount of exegetical detail as well (p. 262). Peterson is cautious in his analysis, occasionally conceding that a given point is "inconclusive," (e.g. pp. 131, 140), yet identifying many textual features that firmly support his thesis. For example, in his treatment of the book of Judges (chap. 7), Peterson forcefully argues that the book is "an anti-Saulide polemic ... commissioned by David at Hebron" that underwent later editing before incorporation into the DtrH (p. 197). He proceeds to examine how David's high priest, Abiathar, "had the necessary qualifications, the motive [cf. 1 Sam. 22:14–15], and opportunity to write Judges as a means to draw a war-torn nation together under the banner of one king" (p. 197). Peterson finds in the following DtrH books similar "hints" at authorship.

In conclusion, Peterson rightly reminds the reader that to exclude *a priori* the possibility of an early date for the DtrH "serve[s] only to hamstring open debate" (p. 297). In contrast to the prevailing scholarly view, he proposes that the thematic and ideological diversity in the DtrH is best explained as "a history preserved over a long period of time that was reworked some time shortly after the fall of Judah, with final notations added c. 560 BCE" (p. 298). This position alleviates the need to posit a single theological purpose for the entire DtrH, as it served various needs along the course of its editorial history; yet it is unified by its authors' task of accurately preserving Israel's history.

There is much to commend in this volume, which will primarily benefit biblical studies scholars and students. Despite a few grammatical oddities (e.g. "points up" often for "points out" [e.g. pp. 110, 182 n. 64, 200, 274], overuse of exclamation marks), in terms of content Peterson has made cogent arguments for re-evaluating key aspects of the conventional view of the DtrH. Peterson's synchronic approach and his desire to ground the study in actual history are refreshing in the context of this debate. His approach permits the valuable analysis of editorial phrases to justify the subsequent analysis of each book. This in turn also establishes credibility for taking an early view of the composition of the DtrH. Hopefully, Peterson's volume will generate further scholarly conversation in at least this respect.

Peterson's case for Abiathar *et al.* as original authors is a cumulative one and, while plausible, will certainly face criticism from the broader academy. Nevertheless, Peterson builds a firm argument overall for an early *Sitz im Leben* for the authorship of the DtrH, and his volume has strengthened the warrant for holding such a view.

William A. Ross

University of Cambridge, Cambridge, United Kingdom

Ruth, By James McKeown. Two Horizons OT Commentary. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2015, x + 152 pp., \$22.00 paper.

James McKeown's *Ruth*, as his Preface acknowledges, is in some sense a Genesis-influenced interpretation. The assignment to write it for the Two Horizons OT Commentary series followed immediately upon his completing another (published in March 2008) on Genesis. The two horizons to which the series attends are the past and the present. From the variety of their own theological perspectives scholars address what their assigned biblical book has meant and now means. On the one hand, they consider how it may have spoken to and been seen to reflect its Greco-Roman and canonical context, as also how it has been interpreted through the centuries. On the other hand, they elaborate on how the book's message may contribute to life and living in our diverse twenty-first century world.

McKeown's *Ruth* commentary consists of four major sections, one more than his *Genesis* commentary, and as with others in the series, includes no numbered or lettered sequence (e.g. I, II, III or A, B, C, D) for ordering or identifying chapters or subunits. The first dozen pages answer questions of authorship, date, purpose, genre, and outline, following which McKeown comments, one-by-one, on the twenty paragraphs into which he divides the book. Pages 71–110 treat "Theological Horizons"; and final commentary on "Theological Issues, Themes, and Approaches" occupies another thirty pages. A bibliography and two indices (one of authors, one of references to biblical texts and other ancient writings) conclude the book.

McKeown's commentary, primarily aimed at Christian leaders, may, for its transparency, be equally accessible to those of no considerable biblical familiarity or theological sophistication. His summary of the book points up its appeal to a very wide audience today though it may suggest more alignment with the OT book of Job than with most other biblical books: "The book encourages its readers not to panic during the dark times when God seems far away but to wait expectantly and to keep faith in him" (p. 69).

As mentioned, McKeown, in writing on *Ruth*, is very conscious of Genesis. There is much to be admired in his sensitivity to comparisons and contrasts between Genesis and *Ruth* in terms of theological horizons, issues, themes, and approaches. Multiple similarities between the books, admirably brought out in this commentary, include the pervasive emphasis on "the seed" or descendant in Genesis (12:1–3) and the climax on the same in *Ruth* (4:12, 18–22). There is also the comparison of the chosen and not chosen (see particularly pp. 73–75). Genesis juxtaposes a good and wicked Lamech, and a noble Enoch, descendant of Seth,

over against a Cainite Enoch, author of the “negative and rebellious venture” (p. 73) of building the first city. Similar contrasts in the book of Ruth set our eponymous protagonist over against her sister-in-law Orpah, while hero Boaz stands out by contrast with the nameless Mr. So-and-So who elects not to perform the redeemer’s role. McKeown handles well the cultural and literary significance of the story’s non-identification of a Mr. So-and-So. His notes on common features such as “chosen” versus “not chosen people” (pp. 73–75); or God’s choosing unlikely instead of naturally expected people (pp. 75–76); or the dissimilarities between Abraham and Naomi’s exit and re-entrance experiences (pp. 76, 77), exhibit insightful treatment, insight he credits to his study of Genesis. The same is true of his discussion of such themes as creation, land, and redemption (pp. 111–28).

There may nonetheless be some room for a word of caution: determination of the reason for or point of Elimelech’s death is based on comparison with Genesis 38:6–10 (pp. 16, 18) where we are told that Judah’s firstborn Er dies because the Lord slew him (Gen 38:7). This provokes the reader’s wonder about how determinative the style of Genesis 38 is for all of Scripture, or even all of Genesis. Similarly, Elimelech’s burial in Moab is compared with the repatriation of Jacob’s body as per the patriarch’s request (Gen 49:29). One wonders how many Israelite bodies were in fact repatriated, and what is to be concluded from determining the number.

McKeown has done very well in offering counsel against forced comparisons based on what the text does not discuss. He rebukes Kristin Saxegaard’s speculation (*Character Complexity in the Book of Ruth*, p. 104) that Naomi may have abandoned God, and warns: “The text does not discuss Naomi’s relationship with God at the end of the book” (p. 115). Neither does it describe Elimelech’s relationship with God at the beginning of the book, and “thus we must be careful about drawing too close a comparison between these two books” (p. 115).

That said, McKeown’s parting words on Ruth (“a breath of fresh air,” p. 140) apply very well to his own commentary. It is worth the reading and worthy of a place in the theological library even of those who count themselves outside of the circle of Christian leaders for whom the commentary was primarily conceived.

Lael Caesar
Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI

The Word of the Lord: Seeing Jesus in the Prophets. By Nancy Guthrie. Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2014, 272 pp., \$16.99.

Nancy Guthrie is an author of many titles and frequently teaches at Bible conferences. The work reviewed here—*The Word of the Lord: Seeing Jesus in the Prophets* (hereafter *TWL*)—is the fifth in a larger Bible study series by Guthrie called *Seeing Jesus in the OT*. Others in the series include one on Genesis, entitled *The Promised One*; another on the final four books of the Pentateuch, called *The Lamb of God*; one on the Historical Books, called *The Lamb of David*; and finally, another on the Psalms and Wisdom books, entitled *The Wisdom of God*. All of these titles are published by Crossway Books. For this work in particular, Guthrie’s benediction, so to

speak, is that her reader would “see Jesus and grow in your anticipation of seeing him face-to-face as you study the Old Testament prophets” (p. 14). This, I believe, would adequately describe the desire of Guthrie for her reader in each of her books in the Seeing Jesus series.

I should note for those not familiar with this series that the primary audience of this book is those engaged in the individual and corporate study of basic biblical hermeneutics. However, as I will note later, this should not deter even the seasoned scholar from perusing these titles, since what is found in this series is absolute clarity in writing and helpful insights for personal Bible study.

Guthrie’s books generally follow the same didactic pattern, and *TWL* is no exception. Guthrie first introduces the prophets as a general corpus, in what she calls a “teaching chapter.” This is followed by a discussion section. In her introduction to the prophets, Guthrie is most concerned to introduce what it means that God spoke, and that he did this through men called the prophets. She desires her reader to capture the truth found in Heb 1:1, that God has sent us a message, and now that can be accessed in his word, the Bible. Guthrie billboards right away in her introduction many themes she desires her reader to observe in their study of the prophets. These themes are too many to note here, but are generally application propositions she believes will be found in the prophets’ messages.

Also in the introduction, Guthrie reveals her method for reading and teaching the prophets. At a certain level, I believe this method should be reconsidered in light of the current trend of evangelical scholarship. According to Guthrie, it is likely that in the current state of biblical literacy, presumably in America (though she is unclear concerning what area of the world she would be referring to when she implies biblical literacy is at a low, I think her point concerning biblical literacy is generally agreeable in most places today), the knowledge of the historical setting of the prophets is basically unknown to her readers. She therefore believes it best to order the prophets chronologically so this problem can be solved. Of course, her choice is a difficult one hermeneutically speaking, since she is essentially saying the best way to teach the prophets is by way of a heuristic that moves against the presentation of the prophets in the final form of the corpus (i.e. the canon)—a heuristic that in search of a historical context could potentially undermine the historical event of canon formation itself.

To her credit, Guthrie acknowledges that the prophets do not appear chronologically in the canon, and as *TWL* progresses the prophets are read more canonically than historically. However, one could wish for a way to teach Scripture as both historical texts and as texts that are presented in an intentional order in the broadly received canon. This concern might be especially pressing in light of many of our overlapping interests in Scripture’s final form and Scripture as canon, which are in some theological circles informed by one’s subscription to inspiration, inerrancy, and sufficiency. Guthrie, of course, by no means bears the whole weight of the trend to read the prophets chronologically, and her work does not seriously suffer for this method choice. Her essential concern is valid, namely, that when one is not familiar with the historical and geographical context of the prophets, some essential aspects of the meaning of the prophets’ message can be missed. For ex-

ample, we do not understand simple metaphor that is from a certain historical context (e.g. she uses Amos 4:1 and the likening of the “cows of Bashan” and their inherent rich laziness to morally and ethically lazy women). But as has been demonstrated by other teachers of God’s word, many of the most important analogies to the message of the prophetic corpus are enduring in their significance, intentionally, for the relevance of the supposed first audience *and* the people of God of later generations alike. (See e.g. Christopher R. Seitz, *Prophecy and Hermeneutics: Toward a New Introduction to the Prophets* [Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007] *passim*, esp. 121, 125–26, 134, 137–40.)

Following her introduction, Guthrie moves to the body of *TWL*. For each prophet there are four sections. First there is a section entitled “Personal Bible Study,” where the reader is asked to read the given prophetic book with some helpful guiding questions. This is followed by the “Teaching Chapter” where Guthrie gives commentary and application. Each teaching chapter is followed by a gray box called “Looking Forward.” This typically half-page section gives insight from Guthrie concerning what the message of the given prophet has to say about the return of Christ. Finally, the personal Bible study becomes more corporately oriented in her “Discussion Guide” section. Here, Guthrie asks her readers to “share life together” and discuss insights they have learned in the said prophetic book. I am personally thankful for this section. Reading Scripture in community is so vital, yet often neglected for various reasons.

In the end, one thing that would be helpful for the instructor using Guthrie’s book would be suggestions on how to proceed through this book. For many in the local church who have full schedules, it is hard to imagine that a weekly Bible study could cover a chapter a week, especially when one reaches Isaiah or Ezekiel. More direction would help here.

In *TWL*, Guthrie chooses to cover only nine of the prophets; Jonah, Hosea, Micah, Isaiah, Habakkuk, Jeremiah, Daniel, Ezekiel, and Malachi. Though the entire prophetic corpus would be an unwieldy task to either teach or learn, even at the basic level presented in this book (and it is the author’s prerogative to choose what she will cover), I did not find a clear rationale for the inclusion of these prophets in *TWL* and not others. Presumably these prophets speak more clearly to Guthrie’s thesis, while others would simply be too cumbersome for her aims. That would be fair enough, but a reason would be helpful.

In spite of those areas where I challenge Guthrie, I am actually of the opinion that this book, and indeed this series, deserves a broad readership, from youth groups to twilight years, small community groups to large groups, lay to scholar. However, what I might emphasize even more than those aforementioned spectrums is that Guthrie should be read by both women *and* men. In my experience, Guthrie’s primary readership has been women, and before I read this book and subsequently her others, this experience swayed my opinion concerning her audience. I stand corrected, and I am thankful for that. Guthrie has been given a gift of

insight, wisdom, and clarity that is rare. I recommend this book to anyone who wants to truly dig into the prophetic corpus afresh.

Aaron W. White
Trinity College, Bristol
New City Presbyterian Church (PCA), Hilliard, OH

God, His Servant, and the Nations in Isaiah 42:1–9: Biblical Theological Reflections after Brevard S. Childs and Hans Hübner. By Frederik Poulsen. *Forschungen zum Alten Testament* 2/73. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013, 269 pp., \$135.00 paper.

A revised version of his 2014 Ph.D. thesis completed at the University of Copenhagen, Frederik Poulsen's *God, His Servant, and the Nations in Isaiah 42:1–9* takes as its central focus the biblical theological question of how the OT and NT are related. First, Poulsen considers which version of the OT should be considered as normative (MT or LXX) and second, the significance of the NT's use of the OT. He explores these two issues first methodologically through the biblical theological projects of Brevard S. Childs and Hans Hübner and then exegetically through an analysis of Isaiah 42:1–9.

The book is organized in two parts. Part 1, "The OT in Biblical Theology" (chaps. 1–3), considers the role of the OT in the biblical theologies of Childs and Hübner. Chapters 1 and 2 outline both authors' major works and presuppositions regarding biblical theology. Childs insists on "reading the OT as a discrete witness in its own right retaining its historical, literary, and theological integrity and using the scope and text of the Hebrew Bible," while Hübner "argues that it is primarily the Septuagint version of the Old Testament as it has been received and interpreted by the New Testament authors that is valid for Christian theology" (p. 4). These differences derive from their different perceptions of the formation and authority of the canon. Childs argues that the Hebrew canon was closed before the rise of Christianity and acknowledged as such by Jesus and the first Christians and thus, for him, secures an unbroken continuity between synagogue and church. In contrast, Hübner argues that the Jewish and Christian versions of the OT developed simultaneously and from a wide range of Jewish writings the rabbis selected a smaller number of books (MT) in opposition to the broader selection supported by the church (LXX).

In chapter 3, Poulsen explores how Childs and Hübner understand the relationship of the Bible's two testaments. Childs's concern is to read the OT according to "its own voice" in its historical, literary, and canonical context. Further, Childs argues, in order to read the entire Christian Bible, one must relate the two Testaments not only at "a conceptual level but also a theological one, for 'a theological relationship is pursued both on the level of the textual witness and on that of the discrete matter (*res*) of the two collections'" (p. 68). Therefore, despite its separate testaments, the Bible comprises a theological unity—one that witnesses to Christ. For Hübner, the relationship between the OT and NT is warranted by the

NT authors' decisive use of the OT. Accordingly, biblical theology should include the attempt to read the OT with the eyes of the NT authors—*Vetus Testamentum in Novo receptum*. The modern interpreter, however, must distinguish hermeneutically between the OT as such and as received in the NT. For Hübner, only the latter is appropriate for Christian theology.

As a practical outworking of attending to the OT in a biblical theological framework, Part 2 (chs. 4–7) focuses on an analysis of Isaiah 42:1–9, paying “attention to the differing versions of the Old Testament and the New Testament’s reception” (p. 77). Poulsen’s key concern is to explore the interpretative implications of paying full attention to the Septuagint and the NT in the exegesis of a specific OT passage. In successive chapters, he considers Isa 42:1–9 in the MT, LXX, and Isa 42:1–9 as it is received in the NT (chaps. 4, 5, and 6 respectively).

Focusing attention on the servant figure and his task, Poulsen surveys the text, form, and structure of the passage in the MT. Despite the numerous attempts at identifying the servant, either as an individual (the Persian king Cyrus, a Davidic Messiah, or the prophet himself), or a collective (the people of Israel), Poulsen concludes that in the MT the identity of the servant in Isa 42:1–9 is anonymous. He notes “several terms and phrases are elusive and the exact content and scope of his [the servant’s] task remain unclear” (p. 117).

Turning to an analysis of Isa 42:1–9 in the LXX, Poulsen is careful to keep the preceding discussion of the role of the OT in biblical theology in view. “Hübner and others,” notes Poulsen, “have argued that the Septuagint rather than the Hebrew Bible should be favored for modern biblical theology” (p. 118). And here, Poulsen tests this claim by comparing the MT and LXX versions of Isa 42:1–9 to determine the theological perspective of the LXX. He notes, “the translator has identified the enigmatic servant figure as a collective (Jacob/Israel) and shaped his rendering of v. 1 in light of especially 41:8–10 (παῖς, ἀντιλαμβάνω).” Poulsen demonstrates how the Hebrew and Greek versions of Isa 42:1–9 are markedly different. In LXX Isaiah, the servant figure is explicitly identified with the people of Israel and key terms and statements have been rendered differently compared to the MT. Finally, he shows that the LXX conveys a more positive attitude towards the foreign nations than in the Hebrew, the allusions to Cyrus (Isa 41:2–3, 25) have been eliminated, and a particular “name-theology” has been highlighted.

In chapter 6, Poulsen considers the second main issue addressed in his thesis, that of the significance of the NT’s reception of the OT. Here he offers a brief survey of the NT reception of Isaiah and the servant passages followed by a methodological discussion of the problem concerning the recognition of citations and allusions. The sole citation of Isa 42:1–9 occurs in Matt 12:18–21 as a reflection of Jesus’ public ministry. According to Poulsen, the textual form of the Isaianic quotation fits neither the MT nor the LXX and some of the variants may stem from Matthew’s attempt to bring the citation into alignment with the overall theological purpose of his Gospel. An important observation here is that the servant’s task of being a light to the nations is applied to Jesus and further to a collective, namely, his disciples. This ambiguous use implies that both the individual and collective interpretations of the servant figure are warranted by the NT.

Chapter 7 interprets Isa 42:1–9 within its larger context in the whole Bible. Poulsen argues: “Common to all biblical versions of Isa 42:1–9 is the servant’s role as a mediator between God and the nations” (p. 226). This then leads him to reflect back on the larger synthetic issues with which he opened his monograph. Avoiding a purely “dogmatic approach” where by means of a prophecy-fulfillment scheme the relationship between the testaments is fixed and thus narrows the range of interpretations for the Isaianic servant, Poulsen insists that the relationship remains a complex one. He notes, “A much more productive approach to the Isaianic servant-portrait is to say that Jesus embodies it, but does not thereby exhaust it. Jesus fulfills the role of the servant, but at the same time it remains to be fulfilled by others who follow him, that is, his ‘servants,’ ancient and modern” (p. 224).

Poulsen’s discussion of Childs and Hübner helpfully sets out the crucial issues for understanding the relationship between the Testaments within the discussion of biblical theology. That he makes Hübner’s project accessible to a wider Anglophone readership is significant, too. Though he mentions Stuhlmacher’s contribution, more fully incorporating him into the Childs–Hübner comparison would have been helpful. What is usually missing from analysis and comparison of biblical-theological systems is an example of exegesis; yet, here is where Poulsen’s work makes a further contribution. His analysis of Isa 42:1–9 in light of the biblical-theological questions raised in the first part of the monograph illustrates and illuminates the primary issues. He concludes, “The relationship between the testaments ... can be seen as dialectical, as typological, and as one of continuity” (p. 224). Further, the reception of Isa 42:1–9 in the NT “points to an analogical relationship between the two testaments. ... An analogy can thus be drawn between the redemptive activity of the Isaianic servant in Isaiah 53 and the passion and death of Christ as both of them ‘bear testimony to the common subject matter within the one divine economy’” (p. 225). Here Poulsen demonstrates—rightly, in this reviewer’s judgment—how Childs’s approach allows for historical and theological insights into the continuity of the two-Testament Christian Bible.

Darian Lockett

Talbot School of Theology, Biola University, La Mirada, CA

Daniel: A Commentary. By Carol A. Newsom with Brennan W. Breed. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2014, liv + 472 p., \$50.00.

Daniel: A Commentary is one of the newest volumes in the Westminster John Knox’s OT Library series. Authored by Carol Newsom (Charles Howard Candler Professor of OT at Candler School of Theology, Emory University) with assistance from Brennan W. Breed (Assistant Professor of OT at Columbia Theological Seminary), it succeeds the OT Library commentary on Daniel by Norman Porteous that appeared in 1965. Scholarship on the book of Daniel has changed significantly since Porteous wrote fifty years ago, and the present work reflects many of those changes as well as broader trends in biblical studies.

The commentary's introduction outlines Newsom's views on the text, genre, and composition of the book of Daniel. Newsom argues that the original core of the book was chapters 4–6 and that chapters 2–3 and finally chapter 1 were added during the early Hellenistic period. This collection of court tales, most of which were originally about Nabonidus but were transferred to Nebuchadnezzar, was composed by Jewish scribes to explain Judaism's claims regarding God's sovereignty in relation to the reality of Gentile imperial powers. According to Newsom, chapter 7 subsequently emerged prior to the Maccabean era as a complement to the court tales. Finally, the apocalyptic dream visions of chapters 8–12 were composed by the *maškilim* (cf. Dan 11:33–35; 12:3, 10) in post-167 BC Judea as a response to the Antiochene crisis, which made the Jewish-Gentile symbiosis described in Daniel 1–6 no longer tenable.

The commentary proper is divided into two main sections: the first on the court tales (Daniel 1–6) entitled “Exiled Jews and Gentile Kings: Lessons in Knowledge and Power” and the second on the apocalyptic dream visions (Daniel 7–12) entitled “The Eschatological Clash of Sovereignities.” Each section is subdivided according to its literary pericopes, which roughly correspond with the book of Daniel's chapter divisions.

Analysis of each pericope consists of a brief introduction; Newsom's translation of the Masoretic Text; pertinent textual, lexical, and syntactical notes; an overview and structural outline; and detailed commentary on specific verses. Each pericope concludes with a “History of Reception” section by Breed, which traces that pericope's interpretation, understanding, and application.

Scattered throughout the commentary are several excurses: “Origin and Development of the Four-Kingdom Schema”; “The Harran B Inscription and Daniel 4”; “*Prayer of Nabonidus* (4Q242)”; “The Divine Throne, Judgment Scenes, and Daniel 7:9–10”; “Michael”; and “Skeleton Key to Daniel 11.” These excurses provide detailed investigations of important topics and offer the reader with helpful information that supplements the rest of the commentary.

The present work is characterized by at least two distinctives that set it apart from other commentaries on Daniel and reflect the interests of the academic guild today. First, Newsom writes with an awareness of and interest in postcolonial studies. She characterizes the court tales of Daniel 1–6 as an accommodationist-resistance literary hybrid in that the Jews proclaim God's sovereignty through the narratives but simultaneously legitimize the Gentile rulers' authority. Second, the “History of Reception” sections by Breed reflect current interest in reception history. Breed's captivating analysis reveals the rich and varied history of interpretation that the book of Daniel has enjoyed within Judaism, Christianity, and other religious traditions (e.g. Islam).

These distinctives, particularly the attention given to reception history, make the present volume a truly unique commentary on the book of Daniel. Newsom and Breed have written an easy-to-read and yet engaging commentary. Accordingly, it represents a valuable resource for all who are interested in this fascinating book of the Bible.

At the same time, readers should be aware that—although Newsom certainly engages the book of Daniel in its ancient context—this commentary is not particularly distinctive when it comes to matters of philology. Pride of place for philological treatment of the book of Daniel still belongs to John J. Collins’s commentary in the Hermeneia series (*Daniel: A Commentary on the Book of Daniel* [Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993]), regardless of whether one agrees with all of its conclusions.

Furthermore, some readers may find this commentary’s skepticism regarding the authenticity of the book of Daniel to be unwarranted. As indicated above, Newsom adopts a critical understanding of the book’s composition, doubts the historicity of the events its court tales recount, and presupposes that the apocalyptic dream visions must have been composed after 167 BC à la *vaticinium ex eventu* because the future cannot be foretold. Many of these issues have been adequately addressed elsewhere, even if completely satisfactory solutions are not always available (cf. Donald J. Wiseman, T. C. Mitchell, R. Joyce, W. J. Martin, and Kenneth A. Kitchen, *Notes on Some Problems in the Book of Daniel* [London: Tyndale, 1965], which remains a valuable response despite its age). To pick a specific issue, it is unwarranted for Newsom to claim that the existence of Darius the Mede “cannot be reconciled with other historical sources” (p. 191) in light of persuasive evidence that Darius the Mede was a throne name for the Median king Cyaxares II (Steven D. Andersen, “Darius the Mede: A Reappraisal,” Ph.D. diss., Dallas Theological Seminary, 2014). Newsom’s commentary would have been better had she more actively engaged alternative arguments such as these rather than simply presupposing the validity of the typical critical approach.

In conclusion, Newsom and Breed’s commentary is a significant addition to the OT Library series and a valuable contribution to studies of the book of Daniel. Although not particularly distinctive on philological matters, it makes up for this shortcoming with its clarity of writing and impressive discussion of Daniel’s reception history.

Benjamin J. Noonan
Columbia International University, Columbia, SC

Prepositions and Theology in the Greek NT. By Murray J. Harris. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2012, 293 pp., \$42.99.

This volume is a significant expansion of Harris’s essay on prepositions in *NIDNTT* 3:1171–1215. His intent with this book is not to provide a comprehensive treatment of the use of prepositions in the Greek NT. Instead, he seeks to furnish the reader with a study of texts where prepositions contribute significantly to theological meaning (p. 13, cf. p. 31). Its contents are organized around twenty-four chapters that one may conceptually group into four parts. The first part includes introductory information. The second part considers all seventeen prepositions found in the NT. Next, Harris explores the use of prepositions with βαπτίζω, as well as with πιστεύω and πίστις. Finally, he devotes space to the improper prepositions. The book also includes indices. The first one lists all the biblical references

in the book. The second one alphabetically lists Greek words and expressions found in the book. The final one is a subject index.

Harris begins the book's introductory portion with basic grammatical information. One notable feature here is a detailed 3-D diagram that corresponds to the basic spatial sense of prepositions (p. 29). Next, under the rubric "Distinctive Features of Prepositions in NT Greek," Harris observes that prepositions in Hellenistic Greek give evidence of overlap or confusion of meaning (p. 34). Nevertheless, one should assume a preposition's distinctive use unless dictated otherwise by context (p. 35). Harris concludes the introductory portion with "Dangers to Avoid in the Examination of NT Preposition Usage." For example, the exegete must be careful not to disregard the possibility of either mere stylistic variation or careful distinctions in the use of prepositions (p. 40). Harris also urges the reader not to deny the possibility of double entendre in NT preposition use (pp. 41–42).

The main part of the book is a chapter-by-chapter treatment of all seventeen prepositions. Most chapters begin by considering the preposition's original or basic meaning. Next, Harris outlines the preposition's syntactical use in the NT. Where appropriate, he also discusses its relationship to the meaning of other prepositions. In several instances, the author addresses key phrases that include the preposition. All chapters contain detailed exegesis of passages in which the preposition occurs. Likewise, all chapters conclude with a list of compound words that contain the preposition.

In order to give some sense of the value of this main portion of the book, this paragraph and the following ones give examples of material found in it. To illustrate: Harris maintains that the use of *ἀνὰ μέσον* in the context of Rev 7:17 argues for the divine being of the Lamb along with his personal distinction from the Father (pp. 47–48). The chapter on *ἀντί* includes exegesis of Mark 10:45 (= Matt 20:28), John 1:16, and Heb 12:2. Harris concludes from these and other examples that *ἀντί* "always expresses or alludes to a substitutionary exchange" (p. 56). In the next chapter, the reader will discover the trinitarian implications of the use of *ἀπό* in Pauline salutations (p. 62). Of interest in the chapter on *διά* is Harris's look at Acts 21:4 and the problem this verse poses for Paul's relationship to the Spirit's direction in Acts (pp. 77–78). In the following chapter on *εἰς*, Harris compares it with *ἐν*, concluding with the advice to avoid the extremes of always insisting on either synonymy or distinction (p. 85). He also considers significant phrases using *εἰς*, for example, *εἰς* following *βλασφημεῖν* and preceding forms of *αἰών* (pp. 93–97). Several important constructions with *ἐκ* are found in the next chapter, including *ἐκ . . . εἰς* in Rom 1:17 (pp. 107–8). He also treats other significant uses of *ἐκ* such as the preposition's use with *ὑδατος* in John 3:5 (p. 111) and with *πίστεως* in Rom 3:30 (pp. 111–12). After presenting a detailed classification of the syntactical uses of *ἐν*, Harris wisely opines that "ideally, grammatical categories should be kept to a minimum" (p. 121). Most notable in this chapter is the extended treatment of *ἐν* followed by *Χριστῷ* or its equivalents (pp. 122–33). The following chapter on *ἐπί* is punctuated with a discussion of the phrase *ἐφ' ᾧ* in Rom 5:12 and 1 Cor 5:4 (pp. 139–41). A detailed discussion of the phrase *κατὰ σάρκα*, in both neutral and pejorative senses, highlights the treatment of *κατά* (pp. 147–50).

Harris's work on *μετά* demonstrates his penchant for expanding his exegesis of a passage beyond that of determining the meaning of the preposition. For example, *μετά πάντων ὑμῶν* in 2 Cor 13:13 provides an occasion for Harris to interpret the meaning of the trinitarian formula found there (pp. 166–67). One will note a similar practice with *παρά*. In treating the phrase *μονογενοῦς παρὰ πατρός* in John 1:14, the reader learns that the prepositional phrase is likely an abbreviation of a participial form of *ἐξέρχομαι* plus *παρὰ πατρός* (p. 175). However, one is also provided with a significant treatment of the meaning of *μονογενής* (pp. 174–75). Similarly, *περί* in 1 Thess 4:13 merits only a gloss (“about”), while the discussion of this verse is taken up mostly with the meaning of *κοιμάομαι* (“sleep,” pp. 180–81).

On the other hand, Harris does give the reader numerous examples of detailed and extended discussions centered on the meaning of the preposition. For example, one learns that *πρό* in Col 1:17 signifies priority of status as well as time. In the chapter on *πρός*, he details its use in John 1:1 (*ὁ λόγος ἦν πρὸς τὸν θεόν*, pp. 190–92) and then in 2 Cor 5:8 (*ἐνδημήσαι πρὸς τὸν κύριον*, pp. 192–93). The chapter on *σύν* also illustrates this practice. For Paul, *σύν* stands for “intimate personal union or close fellowship” (p. 200; cf. *σύν Χριστῷ* and its equivalents [pp. 200–204]).

These chapters also are replete with cross-references to Classical and Modern Greek, the LXX and the papyri, as well as the NT. An example is the author's treatment of *ὑπέρ*, meaning “in place of” (pp. 211–15). This discussion naturally leads to a treatment of *ὑπέρ* expressing not only representation (on behalf of) or advantage (for the benefit of) but also substitution (= *ἀντί*), especially with reference to the death of Christ (pp. 215–16). The final preposition, *ὑπό*, includes a succinct discourse on Paul's use of *ὑπό νόμον* (pp. 220–21).

Harris initiates the third section of the book with a chapter on the use of prepositions with *βαπτίζω*. It is organized around the four prepositions which follow the verb: *ὑπέρ*, *ὑπό*, *εἰς*, and *ἐν*. For example, in the case of *εἰς* he tackles Matt 3:11 and Acts 2:38 (pp. 226–28), as well as the phrases (*βαπτίζεσθαι εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τινος* and *βαπτίζεσθαι εἰς Χριστὸν (Ἰησοῦν)* (pp. 228–29). He concludes this section with a chapter devoted to prepositions used with *πιστεύω* and *πίστις*. Harris outlines seven different prepositional constructions that can follow these two words. He gives particular attention to *εἰς* with the accusative, at which point he contributes to the *πίστις Χριστοῦ* debate (p. 236).

The final portion of the book includes two chapters that deal with the improper prepositions. Harris consistently places the word “improper” in quotation marks since, as he points out, the improper prepositions are simply those prepositions that are never prefixed to another word. The first of these two chapters includes an alphabetical list of all forty-two examples of improper prepositions (pp. 242–51). Under each example, he cites instances of the use of the improper preposition and its meaning with those uses. The second chapter explores a notable scriptural example or two for six improper prepositions (pp. 253–65): *ἄνευ* (Matt 10:29), *ἐκτός* (1 Cor 6:18; 2 Cor 12:2), *ἐμπροσθεν* (John 1:15), *ἐντός* (Luke 17:21), *ἕως οὗ* (Matt 1:25), and *χωρίς* (Heb 9:28). Of particular interest is the consideration

of Luke 17:21 in which Harris concludes with the translation of (ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ) ἐντὸς ὑμῶν ἐστὶν as “in your midst” (p. 261).

Classifying this monograph presents some challenges. On the one hand, it is an excellent grammar complete with helpful statistics and excellent charts. Its breadth is evident by the careful way in which Harris delineates every possible nuance of every preposition. For example, in his treatment of διὰ, Harris outlines five different uses of the preposition, each of which he illustrates with extensive models of sound exegesis (pp. 69–82; cf. the treatments of ἐκ [pp. 103–5] and ἐν [pp. 118–22]). In other words, the reader finds more possible uses for each preposition than what is normally presented in a typical textbook. In addition, Harris focuses deeply on single prepositional uses. A good example is his consideration of ὑπέρ meaning “in place of.” For this use he provides six in-depth examples from the NT (pp. 211–15). In the grammatical realm, then, the book seriously rivals BDF and exceeds the contribution of Wallace.

On the other hand, the book’s greatest strength is its numerous examples of careful exegesis. Harris’s choice of scriptural examples demonstrates a mastery of NT and Pauline theology. In particular, he draws on passages that concern theology proper and Christology, especially the divinity of Jesus. As a result, the book feels somewhat like a NT theology, one in which the organizing principle is prepositions. In other words, the book may be viewed as a syntax of prepositions, the uses of which are illustrated by the exegesis of passages that are theologically significant and/or controversial.

As stated above, Harris typically goes beyond the meaning and implications of the prepositions in a passage to provide the reader with detailed exegesis of the entire passage in which the preposition is found (cf. the extensive treatment of the meaning of λύτρον in Mark 10:45 [pp. 52–54]). Often the treatment of the preposition is arrived at quickly, while other controversial matters occupy most of the author’s attention (e.g. the rock in Matt 16:18 [p. 142] and giving in 1 Cor 16:2 [pp. 156–57]). This observation does not indicate a shortcoming. Rather, it testifies to the comprehensive scholarship to which Harris is dedicated.

The exegete who is well versed in Greek will want this book available for constant reference (N.B.: not all of the Greek is translated), especially when running across a crucial preposition in a passage. It is highly likely, however, that by consulting Harris’s careful work, one will find help for much more than the meaning and use of the preposition. Teachers of NT and Pauline theology, in particular, will find this book to be a rich resource for both course preparation and collateral reading. One will find no better source for thorough, yet concise, exegesis of many pertinent passages. Whether or not the meaning of that passage hangs on the meaning of the preposition, one should consult this volume.

Robert Milliman
Bethel College, North Newton, KS

A Theory of Character in NT Narrative. By Cornelis Bennema. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2014, xvii + 216 pp., \$39.00 paper.

Over the past decade, Cornelis Bennema has steadily been establishing his reputation as one of the leading voices in NT character studies. The current volume represents his move from a more specific emphasis on Johannine character studies (see his previous volume, *Encountering Jesus: Character Studies in the Gospel of John* [2d ed.; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2014]) to a broader focus on the NT narratives in general. Combining material from his previous publications with new reflections on Mark and Acts, Bennema aims here to construct a new comprehensive paradigm for analyzing character in the NT.

The book begins with a well-organized and substantive introductory chapter that provides a broad overview of recent character studies, particularly the work done on the Gospels of John and Mark, along with the Acts of the Apostles. In analyzing scholarship on these three narratives, Bennema aims to offer a representative sample of current scholarly conversations about character. Bennema is concerned in this chapter with isolating dominant paradigms in character research; he will go on to use these paradigms as a launching point in subsequent chapters. The rationale for this volume is found toward the end of this first chapter: “The current interest in New Testament characters has, regrettably, not led to a consensus on how to study character in biblical narrative. Nor has a comprehensive, non-reductionist theory of character been proposed and shown to work” (p. 26). Proposing a model that fits this description is clearly one major goal of this volume.

Chapter 2 is devoted to an examination of character formation and function in both ancient and modern literature. Through this chapter, Bennema hopes to deconstruct some of the dominant patterns for analyzing character that are operative in contemporary scholarship. In particular, the patterns he sees are rooted in three, somewhat interrelated assumptions: (1) Hebraic and Hellenic approaches to characterization are radically different; (2) ancient and modern characterization are radically different; and (3) modern literary methods of fiction can be used to examine biblical narratives (p. 31). He spends the bulk of this chapter seeking to convince his audience that each of these assumptions is flawed and needs to be questioned and/or discarded if we are to move forward. I find Bennema’s attempt to overturn these three assumptions problematic for several reasons. First, in my estimation, Bennema severely flattens out the distinctive elements in Hebraic and Hellenic characterization. While there are some similarities, the narratives of the Hebrew Bible make much greater use of direct characterization and description, whereas in the NT, most characterization is indirect; readers ultimately come to terms with a given character’s presentation through an examination of that character’s speech and action. Second, scholars have good reasons for positing the differences between ancient and modern characterization. The construction of personal identity is important to modern individuals and therefore plays an important role in the modern novel—the standard by which we judge contemporary literature in the Western world. When we encounter characters in contemporary literature, we are often treated to inner psychological profiles of figures that move toward and away

from moments of redemption. However, this is not how characters typically functioned in ancient literature. Therefore, when approaching characters of the Bible we must be careful to situate them within the thought worlds that gave rise to them. In ancient literature, action was generally considered the most important element in any dramatic presentation. The practical outworking of this model is that the figure performing the action was nearly always secondary to the action being performed. Consequently, characters in ancient writing were often reduced to the roles of faceless, formless agents who existed primarily to advance the action of the story. Third, the entire enterprise of contemporary character studies is rooted in foundational developments within narrative criticism that began to take shape in the early 1980s. Thus, Bennisma's model is somewhat self-defeating in that he wants to build on the work of narrative critics without actually using one of the fundamental assumptions of their approach to literary analysis. On the whole, this chapter makes some useful points, but it fails to convince me that we need such a radical departure from these three current assumptions.

In chapter 3 Bennisma articulates his own theory of character analysis. There is no question that Bennisma's most distinctive contribution to this entire discussion is his classification of characters. Incorporating previous work by Adele Berlin, Fred Burnett, and Yosef Ewen, he argues for the need to evaluate characters along three continua: (1) a continuum of complexity; (2) a continuum of development; and (3) a continuum of penetration into the inner life. By plotting where each character falls on these three continua, we are then able to classify these figures as full-blown characters, types, agents, etc. While I am in agreement with Bennisma that a classification system like the one he proposes is necessary, I think his system may be a bit too complex to capture the inherent simplicity that exists with most characters in the NT narratives.

Chapter 4—the longest of the entire book at 70 pages—applies Bennisma's complex approach to major characters in John, Mark, and Acts, respectively. One might think that work on character would be undertaken within the context of narrative-critical research, but for most of his exegetical work in this book, Bennisma is simply not in conversation with the major studies on character done by narrative critics. He ignores the relationship between character, action, and plot as well as the implied author's point of view. This is perhaps the most disappointing feature of the book and causes his study to read like an abstract classification of characters with a wealth of information external to the narrative but without an awareness of the most important internal information. In my estimation, this omission represents a glaring lacuna in his attempt to provide an overarching theory. If we are going to discuss characters in the NT, we must be in dialogue with narrative criticism, even if only to discuss our differences.

The book closes with a final chapter devoted to summarizing the foregoing chapters and enumerating the book's contributions to a new way of approaching character analysis. Though I have already listed those places where I find Bennisma's arguments either lacking or problematic, I want to make mention of one more concern. In my estimation, Bennisma does not deal sufficiently with all the complexities involved in moving from narrative to history. I anticipate that this book

will find a sympathetic audience among those who share Bennema's views, but I do not think this book, for all of its merits, will become the dominant choice among a wide range of scholars looking for a comprehensive theory of character.

Christopher W. Skinner
University of Mount Olive, Mount Olive, NC

The Resurrection of the Messiah: A Narrative Commentary on the Resurrection Accounts in the Four Gospels. By Francis J. Moloney. New York: Paulist, 2013, xvi + 203 pp., \$21.95 paper.

Francis Moloney, a senior professional fellow at Australian Catholic University, provides a work that uniquely follows after Raymond Brown's *The Birth of the Messiah* and *The Death of the Messiah*. Moloney's purpose, however, is not to provide an exhaustive study of the Gospels' resurrection accounts nor is his work a commentary in the traditional sense. Rather, he offers a *narrative* commentary that "accepts the canonical text as it has come down" and avoids evaluating a particular event in isolation from its context by always considering "the longer story" (pp. x–xi). In contrast to Brown, who evaluates the passion narratives as four separate acts (Jesus in Gethsemane; Jesus before the Jewish authorities; Jesus before Pilate; Jesus' crucifixion, death, and burial), Moloney follows each Gospel writer's resurrection narrative in its entirety (p. 1–2). As the back cover suggests, this book is one that should be recommended to "the scholar, the theological student, the pastor, [and] the interested lay person." It effectively highlights the unity and diversity within the Gospel accounts, while maintaining a commitment to the unique perspective of each author, by engaging each of their accounts as a whole. It should be noted that since this book assumes the reliability of the Gospels, there is little place for evidential arguments with the exception of the empty tomb (pp. 143–45). His book is organized so that each of the first four chapters is dedicated to a Gospel while the final chapter focuses on various historical and theological issues.

Assuming Markan priority, one of the first issues addressed by Moloney is whether or not Mark originally ended at 16:8 or 16:20. He seeks to show that 16:8 is the appropriate stopping point when reading Mark's account. He accepts the earlier ending because "most ancient manuscripts bring the story to an end at that point" (p. 5), and the theory that the original ending was lost "creates more difficulties than it resolves" (p. 6). Given that 16:9–20 was a later addition it should, therefore, not be considered as part of the original narrative. This move is important for Moloney's narrative commentary since it places boundaries for properly understanding the closing of Mark's Gospel (although he does provide an appendix where he evaluates vv. 9–20). Thus, in arguing that Mark ends at v. 8, Moloney is correct that every "effort must be made to understand the author's literary and theological reasons for closing his Gospel with the fear, flight, and silence of the women (v. 8)" (p. 7). With Mark's ending in place, he draws two important and related conclusions that are significant for Mark. First, there is an *anticipation* of the death and resurrection of Jesus throughout Mark (pp. 3–4) and, simultaneously, no

appearances of Jesus within 16:1–8. Moloney rightly notes that the appearances can be reasonably assumed in light of the resurrection predictions in 14:28 and 16:7, as well as the necessary presupposition of the Christian community to which Mark was writing (pp. 15–16). Second, in Mark's narrative, it is not only the disciples who fail but also the women. Both of these features are important to Mark's ultimate point that in the end "*all human beings fail* . . . but God succeeds" (p. 16, italics his). God, despite mankind's failing efforts, is victorious in his plans.

For Matthew's Gospel, Moloney provides some helpful observations that show the uniqueness of Matthew's account despite its borrowing of Mark's structure. One feature of Matthew is his desire to absolve, at least to some degree, Pontius Pilate from the responsibility of Jesus' death. Contrarily, the Jewish leadership is portrayed as those who will go to great lengths to oppose Jesus (p. 48). More important is the declaration of Jesus' divinity in Matt 28:18, which provides the "logical link" for the commands that follow (pp. 52–53). Jesus has the divine authority, confirmed by the resurrection, to instruct the disciples to carry out the Great Commission. This is vitally important as it presents a twofold eschatological event that emphasizes a *future* hope with a *present* purpose. Moloney writes, "The eschatological turning point of the ages takes place because of the death and resurrection of Jesus. The death and resurrection anticipate the end time and open a new era in the life of the Christian community" (p. 57). Jesus' resurrection inaugurates the future bodily resurrection hope of believers while commissioning disciples to a present task (p. 35, 58).

Moloney finds Luke structurally similar to Mark, but Luke is much more "bold" in his expansion of Mark's material than Matthew. He develops the significance of meals and fellowship (pp. 70–71, 78), of Jesus' disciples not *entirely* abandoning him (pp. 72, 76), and of the empty tomb (pp. 79–81). Although Luke contains the "essential elements" of the empty tomb account, Moloney suggests he has "radically reshaped the telling of the story" (p. 79), communicating to his readers the fact that the resurrection faith, especially that of the women, did *not* simply occur by the fact of an empty tomb. Rather, it was a result of the command in Luke 24:6 to "remember" Jesus' message that was told to them while they were in Galilee (8:1–3) and of the conclusion that the predictions of the death and resurrection (9:22; 18:31–33) have been fulfilled. The importance of the Emmaus account is that it symbolizes a walk *away* from God. As the disciples are walking on the road to Emmaus, *away from* Jerusalem, they are ultimately walking away from the central location of God's story. According to Moloney, this is central to understanding Luke's account of Jesus, who graciously talked with fragile disciples. These disciples finally recognize Jesus as they ate together, and their breaking of bread caused them, like the women, to *remember* the many other previous meals shared with Jesus (Moloney identifies a similar importance of meals in the second appearance account). They thus returned to Jerusalem, which means that "despite all human sin and frailty, the kingdom of God has been definitively established through the death and resurrection of Jesus" (p. 86).

Prior to looking at John's presentation of the resurrection, Moloney provides another brief discussion on textual issues regarding the end of the narrative. John

ends at 21:25 but Moloney concludes that John 21, which is “more concerned with the inner workings and responsibilities in the post-Easter community than about the Christology of the risen Jesus” (p. 117), was added to the original Gospel in a period closer to the actual writing of the Gospel. The first resurrection account (20:1–31) addresses these issues as well but with much more distinctive emphasis upon Christology (as exemplified in Thomas’s response to Jesus in 20:28). The beloved disciple is found throughout both of these accounts as one who believes *without* seeing or touching Jesus (p. 110), and he is called to be a witness to Jesus by recording the events for those who did not see Jesus (p. 126–27).

Moloney’s final chapter seeks to assess various historical and theological issues. In addressing the historical topic of what *really* happened, Moloney discusses an issue that has received attention lately, namely the relationship between history and theology. His position is clear: “we must *not* confuse these issues in an attempt to respond to the contemporary question about what really happened, a question that was of *no concern* to those who passed on the earliest witness” (p. 147, italics mine). While it would be strange to suggest that the early Christians lacked concern about whether or not Jesus *actually* rose from the dead (1 Cor 15:16–19), Moloney argues that, although the resurrection was at the center of the disciples’ proclamation, they did *not* attempt to confirm their testimony according to scientifically controlled criteria (pp. 139–41). Moloney ultimately agrees with Dale Allison in arguing that historians cannot comment upon divine agency (pp. 146–47). However, both believers and skeptics have recognized problems in such strict divisions between history and theology (see, e.g., Michael Licona’s recent article “Historians and Miracle Claims,” *Journal for the Study of the Historical Jesus* 12 [2014] 106–29; Gregory Dawes, “In Defense of Naturalism,” *International Journal for Philosophy of Religion* 70 [2011] 3–25). One issue is that this dichotomy could empty the content or reality of one’s faith. If this occurs, one should not be surprised that the object of faith would then be found to “be rated rather low in a person’s scale of things that matter” (p. 149).

In conclusion, Moloney’s book provides a valuable commentary on the individual Gospel accounts of the resurrection. He seeks to address the intent of the Gospel writers as they describe the death and resurrection in their own perspective and according to their own needs. While noting the aforementioned issues in historical method, this work accepts the text as it is and mainly focuses upon the meaning within each account as envisioned by its author.

Benjamin C. Shaw
Liberty University, Lynchburg, VA

Irony in the Matthean Passion Narrative. By InHee C. Berg. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2014, xiii + 231 pp., \$39.00 paper.

Irony is a concept often noted but not always defined or explained. By way of contrast, InHee C. Berg, Associate Professor in Religious Studies at Concordia University College of Alberta, discusses ironic elements of the Matthean passion

narrative in light of a thorough consideration of the nature of irony in this monograph. Her study demonstrates how irony is a key feature of Matthew, as there is a differentiation between what is seen and what is true in the climax of the story of Jesus: the passion narrative. The book consists of five chapters and includes a bibliography (pp. 209–23) and indices of authors (ancient and modern) cited (pp. 225–27) and subjects (pp. 229–31).

The first chapter introduces the volume's purpose, methodology, and structure (pp. 1–23). Berg notes how irony has marked literature from ancient times and has been an integral part of Western rhetoric. Scholars adopting literary-critical methods have recently found this literary device present in biblical narratives and studied particular verses of Matthew (e.g. 27:25) or features of the text (e.g. characters such as Herod the Great, Herod Antipas, and Pilate), but no scholar had offered an extended study of irony in Matthew. Berg enters this gap with her study of the passion narrative in Matthew. Her primary method is narrative criticism, and she utilizes Wayne Booth's concept of "Stable Irony," ironies intended by the author and identified based upon elements in the text that point beyond the surface meaning.

Chapter 2 (pp. 25–78) offers a historical examination of irony that sets up a working definition of the term and the various elements contained in it. In her analysis of the word "irony" and its concept, Berg examines ancient authors (Aristophanes, Plato, Aristotle, Cicero, and Quintilian) and writers in the Middle Ages, Renaissance, and modern period. From this historical analysis, she is able to show a number of ideas concerning irony, including that it came from the world of Greek comedy in which a clever figure whose words and actions were deceptive was known as an εἰρων, that it was often connected to Socrates, that it began to be discussed as a literary and rhetorical device by the Romans, and that it was applied to God by medieval writers and agents who then imitated God in their work. In light of this complex history, Berg defines irony as "a persuasive, indirect, and economical revelation, pointing to a reality different from that which first appears on the plane of word, event, or character" (p. 62). This definition of irony includes and assumes concepts such as the ironist (the one who offers the irony, usually the narrator), the reader who is able to detect irony, the act of communication whereby the "ironically competent reader" can find this irony, a dualistic story in which what is seen differs from what is real (but hidden), the fact that there are "victims" who are not aware of the true reality, and the pleasure or reward that a reader finds in discovering this irony.

The third chapter (pp. 79–99) considers three types of ironies: verbal, dramatic, and character. Berg defines each type and provides illustrations of each from Greek dramas as well as from the biblical text (and in one case from the film *Amadeus*). Verbal irony is the most basic form of irony, in which something is said but the opposite is true. It is similar to sarcasm and often difficult to distinguish from it, but sarcasm seems to have more ridicule in its tone and is more fitting in vocal discussion. Dramatic irony (also known as Sophoclean irony) is a plot device in which the reader has knowledge the characters do not. Finally, character irony, the least discussed of these types, features a person's manner or appearance differ-

ing from that same individual's true character; for example, a king or political leader is actually powerless and weak.

The way in which these three types of ironies appear in the Matthean passion narrative is the subject matter of the fourth chapter, which occupies almost half of the monograph (pp. 101–92). The first part of the chapter (pp. 102–10) defines the limits of the Matthean passion narrative as 26:1–27:66, something necessary in light of proposals for the unit to be 26:30–27:66 or 26:1–28:20. This section also offers some overarching analysis of Matthew, arguing along with other narrative-critical scholars that Matthew is a story of Jesus that consists of “kernels and satellites” and that 1:21 serves as the key verse that explains Jesus' mission: he will save his people from their sins. The second major section of the chapter walks through the passion narrative to note various types of ironies that occur (pp. 110–92): situational irony in the discussion of a “disturbance” among the people in 26:1–5; character irony regarding Peter and the sons of Zebedee (26:30–75); verbal irony in Jesus' trial before the Sanhedrin (26:59–68); verbal irony in the words of the religious leaders in 27:4–6; character irony between Jesus and Pilate (27:1–37); dramatic irony in the use of the word *παράδιδωμι* throughout the section; verbal irony in the cry of the people for Jesus' blood (27:24–25); verbal irony in the mocking of Jesus (27:7–31, 35–44); dramatic irony in the defeat of Satan in the crucifixion (27:31–36); and character irony in the accusation of Jesus as a deceiver (27:63–64).

The final chapter (pp. 193–208) examines the theological contribution of Matthew's use of irony in understanding Jesus' death, synthesizing and explaining the significance of the ironic elements noted in the previous chapter. Berg highlights four themes: (1) Jesus' identity as the Christ, the son of David, and the Son of God who brings salvation to Jew and Gentile; (2) the will of God to save people from sin but in a way different from what humans would expect; (3) God's salvation of “many” that includes Jew and Gentile through the innocent blood of Jesus; and (4) the victory of God over Satan in the disgraceful and tragic events of the cross.

There is much to commend in this monograph. The analysis of the meaning of irony and its historical development offers a new understanding into this often undefined or misunderstood term. Berg provides insightful analysis of the biblical text as well as classical texts. Moreover, the literary-critical approach to the work offers a holistic reading of the Gospel of Matthew, with Berg noting interesting connections between various texts (such as the situations of Herod the Great and Pilate). In fact, the work presents insights beyond the Matthean passion narrative and should be read by scholars interested in Matthew as a whole. The approach adopted likely will resound with readers working from evangelical presuppositions, since the idea of divine inspiration of Scripture is consistent with the “god-like” perspective found in the narrator and with the viewpoint that takes the narrative as a coherent whole.

At times, however, the presentation detracts from the content of this work. The book features many typographical errors. Most of these are minor issues involving formatting or other easily identifiable mistakes, but the large number of them distracts the reader and lowers the quality of the work. Another feature that

can frustrate the reader is that footnotes often do not appear on the same page on which they are cited, causing the reader to have to turn the page to check the source. The chapters are widely uneven in length and some quite long; splitting some of the material in these chapters over multiple chapters might help the reader more easily digest the material. In addition, at times the thoroughness of Berg's analysis of the history of irony and the passion narrative can overwhelm the reader or cause one to wonder what is most important; more summaries or reviews along the way could help the reader, particular in the fourth chapter.

A reader will likely have quibbles with Berg's explanations of particular passages or elements, but overall Berg presents a thought-provoking discussion of the Gospel of Matthew and its passion narrative. In addition, the stress of the monograph demonstrates that for Matthew the way things appear in the world are not the true story and that, at times, reality and appearances are opposite. Such a perspective may comfort those facing adversity and challenge Christians to look beyond how things appear in this world. Therefore, there may even be some irony in this book about irony, as a work that is academic in appearance also offers pastoral insight when one looks below the surface.

Brian C. Dennert

Trinity Christian College, Palos Heights, IL

The Gospel of John and Christian Origins. By John Ashton. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2014, xii + 228 pp., \$49.00 paper.

John Ashton, former Lecturer in NT Studies at Oxford University, is well known for his work on the Fourth Gospel, including his *Understanding the Fourth Gospel* (2d ed.; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007) and *Studying John: Approaches to the Fourth Gospel* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994). The current book, based on a short series of lectures delivered at St Mary's University College, London in 2012, stands in the same excellent tradition. The book consists of nine chapters and four excursuses, framed by an introduction and conclusion.

In the introduction, Ashton reveals that his aim is to tease out how Christianity emerged from Judaism. He sees the stark incompatibility of the two religions reflected, for example, in the Johannine Prologue: "For the law was given through Moses; grace and truth came through Jesus Christ" (1:17). His central argument is that "the Gospel represents a deliberate decision to supplant Moses and to replace him with Jesus, thereby substituting one revelation, and indeed one religion, for another" (p. 3). Ashton is a fervent critic of many contemporary developments in biblical scholarship such as (1) viewing the Gospels as ancient Greco-Roman biographies; (2) understanding the Gospels to address a general Christian audience; and (3) using narrative criticism to approach the Gospels. Instead, Ashton embraces historical criticism, especially the interpretation of the Fourth Gospel's historical situation by Louis Martyn (in its basic outline).

In chapter 1, Ashton briefly examines the various Johannine texts where "Moses" occurs to show that the opposition between Moses and Jesus was at the

heart of the conflict between the Johannine Christians and the synagogue Jews. He discusses the Moses passages in “chronological order,” by which he means the composition history of the text—an initial missionary document (i.e. the Signs Source), a second missionary document directed to the Samaritans, the first edition of the Gospel, and the second edition of the Gospel. According to Ashton, “in ousting Moses from his central place as God’s representative in his dealings with his people, the fourth evangelist ... was effectively establishing a new religion” (p. 9). While agreeing with Ashton’s main point that the fourth evangelist presents Jesus as superseding Moses, I see this more in terms of Jesus going *beyond* Moses rather than *against* Moses.

In excursus 1 on the genre of the Gospels, Ashton critiques the theory that the Gospels belong to the genre of ancient Greco-Roman biographies. He especially takes issue with the work of Richard Burridge, who has been influential in advocating this theory. Ashton contends that proponents of the Gospels as biographies have ignored the kerygmatic purpose of the Gospels, namely, to promote faith in Jesus as Messiah and Son of God. While I doubt that Burridge has overlooked the bearing of the stated purpose of the Fourth Gospel on its genre, I also see little difference in Burridge’s view of the Gospels being “Christology in narrative form, the story of Jesus” and their being a narrative of Jesus to promote faith (p. 28).

As an aside, chapter 2 is a literary inquiry on how the text of the Fourth Gospel presents itself, while the remainder of the book is a historical inquiry about the origins of the Fourth Gospel. So, in chapter 2, Ashton explores the tension inherent to the Gospel’s genre, namely that the story of Jesus about his words and works *before* the resurrection was operative in the evangelist’s own community. Ashton’s position reflects his conviction concerning the basic correctness of Louis Martyn’s two-level reading of the Fourth Gospel (which becomes explicit in the remaining chapters). In my view, we always engage in some sort of two-level reading of the Fourth Gospel, since the evangelist tells the pre-Easter story of Jesus from a post-Easter perspective. However, there is a crucial difference between saying that the evangelist drew out the significance of Jesus’ pre-Easter words and works with a post-Easter, Spirit-enabled understanding for a general, late first-century Christian audience, and saying that he read the post-AD 70 historical situation of the Johannine community in a specific geographical location in Asia Minor back into the early life of Jesus in Palestine. Admittedly, Ashton does not use these latter words but it is the effect of claims such as “he [John] is probably retrojecting his current enmity with the Pharisees back into the story” (p. 51; a statement he makes when discussing the historically awkward conjunction “chief priests and Pharisees” in chapter 3).

In chapter 4, Ashton looks closely at the Essene community at Qumran. Although he admits that there is “no immediately obvious link between the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Gospel of John ... there is at least one very important feature shared by the teachers of the community and the fourth evangelist ... namely, *a readiness to accept further divine revelations*” (pp. 60–61, italics his). He argues that the Essene community claimed access to new privileged revelation that allowed them

to interpret the revelation to Moses (the law) correctly. Ashton brings this finding back into play in chapter 6 when he looks at the Gospel's apocalyptic background.

In excursus 2, Ashton challenges the case presented by Richard Bauckham and his former doctoral student Edward ("Mickey") Klink that John's Gospel was written for a general Christian audience and not for a Johannine community, as advocated by Raymond Brown, Louis Martyn, and Ashton himself. Ashton argues that the information in 9:22, 28, for example, reflects a controversy that most likely did not occur in Jesus' lifetime—"there is not the slightest likelihood that the expulsion of Jesus' disciples from the synagogue began during his [Jesus'] lifetime" (p. 77). I should point out, however, that the recent work of Jonathan Bernier argues the very opposite (*Aposynagōgos and the Historical Jesus in John* [Leiden: Brill, 2013]). Logically leading on from this, Ashton examines the socio-historical situation of the Gospel in chapter 5. Following Martyn, Ashton argues that John's Gospel addresses the controversies between two groups in the synagogue towards the end of the first century. While Ashton continues to defend Martyn's diachronic two-level reading (the time of Jesus and the time of the post-AD 70 Johannine community), I maintain that we can also view the Gospel as reflecting John's post-Easter understanding of the pre-Easter reality he had experienced, which he considered relevant for a broad Christian audience.

In chapter 6, Ashton explores the Gospel's apocalyptic background, where "apocalyptic" denotes "revelatory," related to the disclosure of mysteries. While he highlights various aspects of Jewish apocalypticism, I found that Ashton did not establish many links between the Fourth Gospel and the various apocalyptic writings. What I considered more problematic, however, is his argument that John adapted the spatial dualism (of heaven and earth) in the apocalyptic literature into a temporal dualism to communicate his two stages, thus seeing the events of Jesus' life and the later experiences of the Johannine community in a stereoptic vision. The Fourth Gospel unmistakably evidences a spatial dualism, where Jesus descends to the realm below to reveal the reality of the realm above.

In excursus 3, Ashton deals with the various aporias (textual discontinuities) in the Gospel and, consequently, the composition history of the text. It is here that Ashton is most severe in his critique of narrative criticism, and he has a point. I agree with Ashton that we cannot gloss over "bumps" in the text and ignore its possible history. Nevertheless, not everything is always as it seems. For example, Ashton considers the end of 14:31, "Get up, let's go from here," an aporia because rather than doing this Jesus carries on talking for a further three chapters. Ashton's "straightforward" (his words) solution is that chapters 15–17 were inserted at a later stage. Yet, an equally straightforward solution is that Jesus and his disciples did get up and move toward the Kidron valley (18:1), and he taught the material recorded in chapters 15–17 *on the way*. If an editor has inserted these three chapters, why would he not have "covered his tracks" and removed those three Greek words at the end of 14:31 to facilitate a smooth transition into 15:1? Nevertheless, while solutions to alleged aporias will undoubtedly differ, we cannot simply assume that the Johannine text is seamless like Jesus' tunic.

Then, over two chapters, Ashton explores John's presentation of Jesus, focusing on the Prophet like Moses (chap. 7), incarnate Wisdom, and the (Danielic) Son of Man (chap. 8). While these are indeed important aspects of John's Christology, I am somewhat puzzled by Ashton's remark that Jesus' messiahship was unimportant to both Jesus and the evangelist (p. 138). According to 20:31, the whole purpose of the Fourth Gospel is to persuade its readers that the Messiah is to be identified as Jesus.

In excursus 4, Ashton returns to a largely ignored article on the prologue that he published in 1986. Developing an idea suggested by Paul Lamarche in 1964, Ashton argues that 1:3 does not deal with creation but with God's plan for humanity. Instead of the standard rendering, "all things were made through him," he argues that the correct rendering of 1:3-4 is: "Everything came to pass through him, and apart from him not even one thing came to pass. What came to pass in him was life, and the life was the light of men." Ashton understands this as a reference to God's activity by means of his Logos throughout human history, but what has come about *in* the Logos was illuminating and revelatory life as God's special intervention on behalf of his people. I like this, and Ashton is right to lament how scholars have failed to take notice of his argument.

In the final chapter, and extending into the conclusion, Ashton proposes a single comprehensive answer to Bultmann's formulation of the first great riddle of the Gospel: what is the historical origin of the key features of John's Christology? Bultmann's own single large explanation (the Gnostic redeemer myth found in Mandaean sources) has failed, and Johannine scholarship has not yet provided a satisfactory account for the whole picture of John's depiction of Jesus and hence where John's Gospel should be located in the development of early Christianity. Ashton's own hypothesis is that John had received a revelation of the glorious Christ—a revelation that he shared with the members of his community and one that replaced the law and Moses. According to Ashton, this shared *religious experience* of the continuing presence of the glorified Christ in their midst explains John's shift in allegiance from Judaism/Moses to Christianity. Ashton insists, therefore, that we should not speak of John's theology but of his religious experience.

I end by giving my verdict on the strength of Ashton's argument. I am intrigued by Ashton's case but not (yet) entirely convinced that John's Gospel is directed toward Moses. Could we not simply accept that John aimed to show how Jesus superseded all that *Judaism* stood for, since the Jewish festivals (rather than Moses) seem to be the primary topical canvas on which John paints his portrait of Jesus? I would also want to test Ashton's proposal against Richard Bauckham's case for viewing the Gospels as eyewitness testimony. Could John's ongoing experience of the risen Christ have shaped his understanding of his personal experience of the pre-Easter Jesus? In that case, John's eyewitness account of the life of Jesus is not simply a recall of past experience but also informed by his present experience of Christ, where the latter provides a deeper understanding of the former. Nevertheless, this book is an outstanding piece of scholarship, and I enjoyed engaging a great mind. One may not agree with all Ashton proposes, but his questions and

probes are appropriate and stimulating, and his solutions original. I highly recommend this book for any serious student of the Fourth Gospel.

Cornelis Bennema
Wales Evangelical School of Theology, Bridgend, UK

Apostle of the Last Days: The Life, Letters, and Theology of Paul. By C. Marvin Pate. Grand Rapids: Kregel Academic, 2013, 320 pp., \$22.99 paper.

In this work, C. Marvin Pate, Professor of Christian Theology at Ouachita Baptist University, argues that when Paul's already/not yet eschatology is properly understood and appreciated, this theological strand unites and theologically illuminates all of the letters attributed to Paul in the NT. It also explains, most basically, the opposition he faced from his contemporaries as a clash of eschatologies. Finally, he contends that it provides important insights for the life of the church today (though what these insights might be are not really developed in the body of his work). To establish his claims he makes three basic moves. First, he delineates Paul's eschatological vision, which he argues is a central theological thread that unites the *Hauptbriefe*, the so-called "disputed" letters, and the eschatology of Paul in Acts, and he sets it alongside other contemporary, competing eschatological visions. Second, he works through the whole Pauline corpus to substantiate the previous construal of Paul's eschatology and also to show how it accounts—in the main—for the nature of Paul's opposition and his response to that opposition. Third, he concludes with a development of these insights for Paul's theology in general. Here he uses the typical systematic *loci* to spell out the contours of Paul's theology when read through this eschatological lens.

To set the groundwork for his discussion, he first argues for and initially develops Paul's inaugurated eschatology over against scholars who see Paul's eschatology as consistent (futurist) or realized. According to Pate, Paul came proclaiming a "fourfold eschatological proclamation" (p. 49). This was a declaration formulated in the light of his Damascus road "conversion/call." It represented a partial embrace of the prevailing two-age structure of apocalyptic (non-Christian, non-*merkabah*) Judaism, a significant strain of Second Temple Judaism (*à la* Schweitzer). Apocalyptic Judaism and Paul both expected the first age of sin and sorrow brought about by Adam's fall to be followed by the age of righteousness and peace established by the Messiah. Yet, Paul diverged significantly from Jewish apocalypticism in that, whereas the latter saw the messianic age as replacing the former age of sorrow, Paul saw the Messiah as inaugurating the new age without fully displacing the old age. This creates an overlapping of the ages leading to an inaugurated, already/not yet conception of eschatology as opposed to the replacement, consistent (futurist) conception of Jewish apocalypticism. Not only does this theological thread tie together all the letters of Paul, but when it is coupled with justification ("that the sinner is declared righteous before God through simple faith in Jesus Christ, not by the works of the Torah/the law of Moses"; p. 14), this complex functions as the "center" of Paul's thought. In addition, this complex provides a

“frame of reference for interpreting Paul’s letters” (p. 14). In the end, Pate argues that Paul’s “eschatological proclamation” consisted of four major claims: (1) Jesus is the long-awaited Messiah of Israel; (2) it is his death and resurrection that inaugurated the age to come; (3) entrance into the age to come is by faith apart from the law; and (4) Gentiles are included among those who know the blessings of the coming age (p. 49).

After setting the baseline for his work, Pate next lays out the competing “eschatologies” forming the context within which Paul articulated and defended his inaugurated eschatological vision. Pate contends that Paul’s proclamation fell like a thud in the ancient world since it challenged the competing eschatologies of its day. Here he relies primarily on the “five component model” which H. Koester uses to describe the eschatology of the Roman imperial cult as a heuristic device to detect and describe other current eschatological visions. Though he admits this model is not entirely helpful for describing the contours of the consistent eschatology found among non-Christian, non-*merkabab* Jews, Pate finds the model useful when inaugurated or realized eschatological schemes are in view. Using this model he finds three other eschatological visions competing with the realized eschatological vision of the Roman imperial cult and the inaugurated vision of Paul. In the end, Pate sees at least five competing eschatologies with three versions of realized eschatology and two of inaugurated eschatology. Forms of realized eschatology include Hellenistic/syncretistic religions, the Roman imperial cult, and *merkabab* Judaizers. Forms of inaugurated eschatology include Paul’s theology and non-*merkabab* Judaizers. For Pate, all of Paul’s writings essentially revolved around a “conflict in eschatologies that Paul’s apocalypse of Christ generated” (p. 49). As something that can describe Jewish, Christian, and Greco-Roman conceptions of the end, one could say that “eschatology” comes to be used by Pate (through Koester) to refer broadly to a particular vision of maximal human flourishing accompanied by conceptions of how, when, for whom and through whom (human/divine agents) it would be attained.

At this point Pate engages in a survey of all of the writings attributed to Paul. He addresses them chronologically, sometimes individually (Galatians, Romans, Philippians, Colossians, Philemon, Ephesians) and sometimes as groups (1 and 2 Thessalonians, 1 and 2 Corinthians, and the Pastorals). Each treatment begins by trying to identify the competing eschatologies occasioning the correspondence, looking at historical background matters (Greco-Roman and Jewish), pertinent material in the book of Acts, and the relevant information in the text(s). He then proceeds by working through the text(s) to show how this clash of eschatologies figures into Paul’s response. Most likely, those conversant with Pauline scholarship will find little that is new here aside from: (1) the consistent portrayal of the writings as attempts to resolve multi-faceted eschatologically-driven conflicts; and (2) the particular combinations of competing eschatologies that are seen to lie behind each correspondence. In the end, Pate’s Paul, time and again, helps his congregations navigate through the swirling eschatological currents attempting to displace or dissolve the tension in Paul’s already/not yet eschatology.

Pate's final chapter attempts to lay out the contours of Paul's apocalyptic-influenced theology organized according to the systematic *loci* of theology proper, Christology, pneumatology, anthropology, soteriology, ecclesiology, and eschatology. This is a helpful and insightful summary. Nevertheless, it sits awkwardly within the flow of the book in that it shows no clear connection to the material developed in the preceding survey of Paul's writings. In addition, the fact that its contents are methodologically tied to the number of occurrences of key terms is not really defended or explained.

As with any work of this size covering such a large swath of textual material and attempting to chart a course through such disputed territory within Pauline studies, Pate does paint with a somewhat broad brush (e.g. his footnote summary and dismissal of the new perspective; p. 72). Consequently, not everyone will be convinced by the exegetical trajectories and individual moves he makes as he works his way through each book (e.g. a rapture-less 1 Thessalonians 4; p. 98). Yet it does seem that Pate has successfully identified *a* key that opens up an important vantage point for understanding and appreciating Paul's theological outlook. His work is also especially helpful in identifying one of the theological threads that runs through the Pauline corpus as a whole, *Hauptbriefe* and "disputed" alike. At the same time, whether or not he has identified *the* "center" of Paul's theology, the point from which everything else emanates, remains an open question. More work would need to be done to show how competing models for the Pauline center fail, and, in particular, a more thorough piece of work is needed to show how his conception of the center actually accounts for other rich strains of Paul's theology (assuming, of course, the notion of a center is granted at all).

This is an informed and competent introduction to Paul's eschatology. Aside from the somewhat excessive editing issues (e.g. see the curious duplication of the Introduction's theological summary on pp. 31–34) and a lack of indices, Pate's work would serve well as a supplementary text in an upper-level college or a seminary class on Pauline theology.

Greg A. Couser
Cedarville University, Cedarville, OH

'God is One': The Function of Eis ho Theos as a Ground for Gentile Inclusion in Paul's Letters. By Christopher R. Bruno. Library of NT Studies 497. London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2013, xvi + 243 pp., \$112.00.

The central importance of the *Shema* for Jewish identity in the Second Temple period is widely recognized. Thus when a scribe asked Jesus about the greatest commandment in the Law, he heartily affirmed Jesus' answer, which quoted Deut 6:4–5 (Mark 12:28–34). This, of course, is not the only place in the NT where the *Shema* is either quoted or alluded to; in addition to parallels in the other Gospels both Paul and James appropriate it in their letters. The presence of the *Shema* in the NT has led to a number of studies on monotheism, with particular attention to how early Christians maintained their commitment to monotheism while incorpo-

rating Jesus into the divine identity. Yet less attention has been paid to how the *Shema* functioned as the basis for Gentile inclusion within the people of God, as it does in Rom 3:30 and Gal 2:20. That is the issue that Christopher Bruno helpfully tackles in this slight revision of his dissertation at Wheaton College under the supervision of Douglas Moo. The result is an engaging and well-written monograph that both illuminates challenging Pauline texts and helpfully contributes to the larger conversation on monotheism, Gentile inclusion, and justification by faith in Paul's letters.

Bruno begins by examining monotheism in the ancient world and laying out his methodology (chap. 1). After noting the difficulties with the word "monotheism," Bruno defines first-century Jewish monotheism as "the belief system that considers the one unique God, who creates all things and rules all things, including all other spiritual beings, as the particular God of Israel" (p. 10). Using a slightly modified version of Richard Hays's criteria for identifying intertextual dependence, Bruno seeks to identify references to the *Shema* in the OT and Second Temple Judaism before discussing its use in Rom 3:30 and Gal 2:20.

Chapter 2 addresses the *Shema* in the OT. Arguing that the *Shema* occurs in a context that stresses covenant loyalty to YHWH, Bruno concludes that the best way to translate it is "Hear, Israel. As for YHWH our God, YHWH is one" (p. 37). In its original context the *Shema* has a twofold significance: "To Israel, he revealed that he alone is the true God; to the nations, he revealed that Israel had a special status" (p. 48). Much of the remainder of the chapter is devoted to a close study of the allusion to the *Shema* in Zech 14:9. Bruno argues that this text foresees a day when not only Israel but the nations as well will confess that YHWH is the one true God and enjoy a covenant relationship with him.

Since allusions to the *Shema* in early Jewish literature are abundant, Bruno focuses his survey on those texts that connect it with some reference to the nations (chap. 3). The central takeaway from this chapter is the conclusion that the *Shema* often functioned as a boundary marker distinguishing Jews from Gentiles. This conclusion is borne out not only by the Jewish sources but is corroborated in Greco-Roman writings as well.

Chapter 4 deals with the use of the *Shema* in Rom 3:30. The complexity of both the text itself and of Bruno's exegetical discussion permits only the briefest summary. In Rom 3:30 the phrase "God is one" is the grounds for Paul's contention that God is the God of both Jew and Gentile alike. Bruno contends that Paul has taken his cue from Zech 14:9, and thus his allusion to the *Shema* implies that with the dawn of "the Messianic era both Jew and Gentile know Israel's God as the one true God" (p. 151). Thus in Rom 3:30, "Boasting is excluded because the Law is fulfilled in history by the dawning of this era in which God has revealed that justification is by faith in his Messiah, Jesus. Thus, the expectation of Zech 14:9—that in the Messianic era both Jew and Gentile know Israel's God as the one true God—is now being fulfilled" (p. 151).

Bruno sees a different, albeit related, use of the *Shema* in Gal 3:20 (chap. 5). The contrast in Galatians 3–4 between the Law and the fulfilled Abrahamic promises suggests that when Paul writes the statement "Now an intermediary implies

more than one, but God is one,” he “may be contrasting the failure of the Mosaic Law to produce the promised seed and the promised Abrahamic blessings for the whole world through a reference to the knowledge and confession of God as one” (p. 191). Once again Bruno concludes that Zech 14:9 likely lies in the background here. The knowledge that “God is one” spreading to the nations promised in Zech 14:9 has come to pass not through the Mosaic Law, but through the one seed Jesus Christ.

The final chapter summarizes the author’s findings and situates his contributions within current discussion in biblical studies regarding monotheism. In a quick survey of other probable Pauline allusions to the *Shema*, Bruno sees hints of eschatological overtones and suggests that it is worth exploring whether other NT allusions to the *Shema* betray similar eschatological content.

There are a number of strengths in Bruno’s monograph. His clear prose enables the reader to follow what are often detailed and difficult discussions of ancient texts and technical scholarly views. Bruno demonstrates a refreshing combination of exegetical skill and theological sensitivity. He demonstrates knowledge of the relevant scholarly literature while at the same time interacting critically with it. The order and progression of the chapters and the content within them not only make sense but enable the reader to follow Bruno’s argument.

The most significant contribution Bruno makes is his (in my view persuasive) argument that Zech 14:9 shaped Paul’s eschatological understanding of the *Shema* and the justification of Jews and Gentiles alike by faith in Christ. As such he provides further evidence of what Richard Bauckham has termed eschatological monotheism and shows how this conclusion sheds light on Paul’s arguments in Rom 3:30 and Gal 3:20. Thus Bruno is spot on when he concludes that “biblical monotheism presumes a people to which the ‘one God’ reveals himself and relates,” which now “includes the Gentiles who believe in Christ” (p. 204).

My most substantive critique of Bruno’s monograph is that there were points where I thought he could have enhanced or pushed his argument even further. For example, in his treatment of the singular seed in Gal 3:15–18, his discussion of Paul’s citation of Gen 17:7 would have been further strengthened by noting that in the larger context of Genesis 17 the word “seed” is used both collectively and singularly in reference to Isaac (Gen 17:15–19). As such it would enhance Bruno’s contention that the reference to a singular seed goes back to Gen 3:15. Additionally, some (including myself) have argued that that Paul’s connection between the blessing of Abraham and the promised Spirit in Gal 3:14 comes at least in part from Isa 44:3–5. Since Isaiah 44–45 is marked by “eschatological monotheism,” Bruno may have found even further support for his reading of Gal 3:20 and its surrounding context by incorporating a brief discussion of this possibility. Yet these minor quibbles in no way detract from my appreciation of Bruno’s work. In fact, one mark of a good book is that it leaves you wanting more, not less.

In conclusion, *God is One* is a valuable contribution to the scholarly conversation on biblical monotheism, intertextuality, Gentile inclusion, and justification by faith in Paul. Scholars working in these areas will benefit from Bruno's careful and thoughtful work, even in places where they may disagree.

Matthew S. Harmon
Grace Theological Seminary, Winona Lake, IN

1 Corinthians: An Exegetical and Theological Exposition of Holy Scripture. By Mark Taylor. New American Commentary 28. Nashville: B&H Academic, 2014, 473 pp., \$32.99.

With the recent publication of Mark Taylor's commentary of 1 Corinthians, the New American Commentary series progresses closer to completion. Written primarily for students and pastors, the series seeks to provide readers a reliable treatment of the biblical text with an eye for its application in modern contexts. Throughout his volume, Taylor exhibits a high view of Scripture and a solid treatment of the main theological themes addressed in Paul's first canonical letter to the Corinthian congregation. Taylor's stated goal is "to produce an up-to-date commentary of mid-range length that interacts representatively with the most recent scholarship" (preface). While his treatment of some passages is not always as thorough as what is offered in the recently published commentaries by Garland, Ciampa and Rosner, Fee, Fitzmyer, or Thiselton, one would be challenged to find an exegetical commentary on the text of 1 Corinthians less than 500 pages in length that is as accessible, up-to-date, exegetically sound, and even-handed as that of Taylor's. In addition to its value for preachers and Bible teachers, the volume is well suited for use in undergraduate or graduate courses on the Corinthian correspondence given its solid exposition of the text in a size most students will find manageable.

In his treatment of the more controversial and difficult passages, Taylor does not always argue strongly or decisively for one particular viewpoint (with his treatment of 15:29 serving as an example, in addition to some of the passages discussed below), but he does well interacting with recent scholarship and typically offers the reader a clear, concise, and judicious explanation of the major interpretations. Throughout the volume, Taylor demonstrates an appropriate interest in understanding the text in its historical and literary context, a concern that enables him to identify the primary concerns of Paul successfully, if not the most plausible meaning of each passage.

Taylor offers a helpful treatment of the various instructions Paul provides relating to marriage, singleness, and divorce. With regard to believers who have been abandoned by their unbelieving spouse, Taylor seems a bit reluctant to accept the viewpoint that the believer is free to remarry. Instead, he entertains the alternative perspective that Paul's reference to one not being bound to an unbeliever (7:15) should be understood rather as an affirmation that "the abandoned believer is not enslaved in their newfound circumstance and is free to serve the Lord without distraction" (p. 176). If this interpretation holds, Taylor reasons that the deserted

spouse is to remain unmarried. Concerning the identity of the “virgins” discussed throughout 7:25–38, Taylor concludes that the term “refers to betrothed young women of marriageable age” and that Paul seeks to address “what those currently engaged should do about marriage” (p. 185).

With regard to Paul’s instruction in 11:2–16 relating to the covering of one’s head, Taylor does not find persuasive the possibility that the word *kephalē* used in 11:3 should be understood in the sense of “source” or “origin.” In addition to citing recent scholarship that has contested this alternative meaning of *kephalē*, Taylor also raises the possibility that “the ‘source’ view opens the door to a view that holds that God the Son is less than God the Father” (p. 259). Taylor does not raise any objections to the traditional view that the term “indicates a hierarchy in which the husband occupies a position of superior relational authority that corresponds to the principle of subordination within the Godhead” (p. 258). In addition to this traditional view, he also discusses the possibility that *kephalē* refers to “a prominent position in relation to a group or individual” (p. 259). Taylor does not clarify which precise understanding of the term he finds to be the most persuasive, simply noting that “the broader biblical and theological framework [is] that woman is functionally subordinate to man” (p. 259).

The more recent suggestion that Paul’s reference to men and women covering and not covering their heads refers to hairstyles rather than some type of clothing is dismissed in favor of the view that “Paul’s chief concern is the shame that wives bring on their husbands by the lack of proper attire” (p. 261). Although the commentary provides a helpful discussion of the possible meanings of Paul’s instruction regarding head coverings, some readers may feel disappointment that the contemporary application of the passage is not discussed more fully or directly. Taylor observes that “there are numerous elements of the passage that are of a universal, timeless character” (p. 254), but he does not offer a clear explanation of how Paul’s instructions regarding head coverings are to be applied in contemporary settings.

Throughout his discussion on the use and nature of spiritual gifts (1 Corinthians 12–14), Taylor rightly emphasizes their important function of edifying the body of Christ as well as the futility of the exercise of gifts apart from love. The gifts of prophecy, tongues, and knowledge are regarded by Taylor as temporal and limited in scope. Based on his understanding of the language in 13:8 and other clues in the immediate context, Taylor concludes that some gifts are limited only to the present age. For example, the verb *katargeomai* (used twice in 13:8) is understood in an eschatological sense, leading to the conclusion that the gifts of prophecy and knowledge are merely temporal. As he writes, “Both prophecy and knowledge are presently incomplete, and in the age to come both gifts are no longer necessary” (p. 315). Also understood as a reference to the consummation of the coming age is the reference to the coming of that which is perfect (13:10). Taylor’s discussion of the possible interpretations of 13:10 could have been more robust considering the importance of the verse to our understanding of the present status of certain spiritual gifts and because of the number of conflicting interpretations of the passage that have been presented.

Those looking for a clear discussion of the present status of the so-called “sign gifts” may not find Taylor’s discussion of the spiritual gifts to be particularly satisfying. Taylor focuses nearly exclusively on the situation in first-century Corinth and offers few remarks relating to the present status of these gifts, merely noting that these gifts are imperfect in their usefulness and that they must be exercised according to Paul’s instructions. Ultimately the reader must find contentment with vague remarks such as: “Whether or not any gifts have ceased already is a matter of God’s choice” (p. 316). Taylor does conclude that spiritual gifts are given without regard to gender, but gender distinctions “are important in the exercise of the gifts in light of the relational hierarchy inherent in the created order” (p. 255). Taylor also finds unpersuasive the possibility that the exercise of tongues may include unintelligible language expressed in private prayer. He reaches this conclusion on Paul’s assertion that the purpose of tongues is to edify (p. 324). This purpose, Taylor reasons, is the same in all contexts, whether private or public.

With regard to 1 Cor 14:34–35 and the place of women in the gathered assembly, Taylor strongly argues for the text’s authenticity and concludes that the passage does not preclude women from engaging in all types of speech but is concerned primarily with maintaining proper order and avoiding speech that unnecessarily shames the wives’ husbands. Taylor finds no contradiction between 1 Cor 11:2–16 and 1 Cor 14:33–36, arguing that the latter passage does not call for the restriction of all speech within the assembly. As he states, “Paul’s concern is not with the wives’ speech per se or with their participation in the evaluation of prophecy but with behavior that would be offensive to their husbands” (p. 361). This offensive behavior, Taylor concludes, would have included disruptive questions that would have been considered shameful.

No biblical commentary will satisfy every reader’s curiosities, interests, or expectations, and this will undoubtedly prove to be no different with Taylor’s volume. At times readers may be less than pleased with the considerable degree of restraint he exhibits in some of the more controversial passages or with what some may consider to be a lack of concern for the modern application of certain texts relevant to Christian living or life in the local church. Taylor often seems content to present the reader with a variety of possibilities without clearly articulating his own viewpoint. On the whole, however, Taylor’s work is to be praised for its clear and lucid explanation of the text and for its ability to account accurately for Paul’s handling of the various problems in the Corinthian assembly.

Benjamin Laird

Liberty University Baptist Theological Seminary, Lynchburg, VA

The Power of Children: The Construction of Christian Families in the Greco-Roman World. By Margaret Y. MacDonald. Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2014, viii + 239 pp., \$49.95.

Seeking to fill the gap in which scholarship has passed over instructions to children and parents in the household codes of the NT with little comment (p. 4),

MacDonald argues that “Children play a more important role . . . than is usually acknowledged. Children were more generally valued in certain early church groups than is often recognized” (p. 4). Her attention to these handful of references yields a wealth of insight: about the complex relationships in Greco-Roman families, about the apologetic and also counter-cultural features of the household codes, and, most importantly, about the presence and valuing of children in these early Christian communities. MacDonald allows her reader to learn about families, children, the texts that discuss them, and the communities that welcomed them.

Her introductory chapter lays a foundational understanding about families in the first-century Greco-Roman context. Utilizing other discussions of household management from the ancient world, her book presents several important differences from contemporary and especially Western conceptions of families. First, childhood was, as she says, “a flexible concept.” Without any legal demarcations, one would continue to be a “child” who owed honor to a parent as long as the parent was living. Conversely, although marriage would signify an adult role, brides were often so young at marriage that they continued to need the education and support of their mothers. As further evidence of this flexible category, slaves in some senses were perpetual children who never inherited and therefore who never reached true (financial) maturity. A second important difference to which she devotes her attention concerns the overlaps between parent-child and master-slave relationships. The children addressed in the household codes might very well have also been slaves. She argues that those multiple identities might alter how a listener would hear the household codes.

She concludes this chapter with a focus upon a similarity in thinking about children. All ancient groups (and most modern ones as well) seemed to emphasize the importance of children’s obedience to parental authority. In the ancient world, this was even put into close comparison with divine authority. She concludes that the household codes of the NT share “deep similarities” (p. 17) with others of their time. Nevertheless, following the example of Jesus preserved in the Gospels, these instructions about children could also include counter-cultural elements.

Her focused treatment on the texts begins with the household code in Colossians (3:18–4:1) with special attention to the overlap between the categories of slave and parent/child. The makeup of the ancient world indicates the likely possibility of the presence of slave children in the Colossian congregation. If, indeed, the listeners were largely slaves or freedpersons, the household codes could reflect a “longing for family preservation and continuity” not normally allowed to slaves. One great reason the family unit of slaves remained precarious was the widespread sexual use of slaves. MacDonald posits that the instructions about sexual purity in the letter indicate that an ethic of avoiding sexual contact with slaves “runs just under the surface” (p. 47). Slaves and slave children would also long for the protection of inheritance. Hence, the promise of inheritance offered to both slave and free (3:24) takes on a new weight of importance. Since slaves were not allowed to inherit, this promise provides a great hope for the future that might have reflected back to the present and demanded changed relationships among the slave and free in the church. For the slave child especially, the household code, while it recom-

mends obedience, would have also offered a sense of belonging, stability, protection, and hope.

The household code of Ephesians and its focus on education supplies the content of the next chapter. Addressed directly again, the household code “constructs a world of belonging” for all children, slave and free (p. 71). All should be educated, and though the paternal role of teaching is important, MacDonald also highlights that many in the community could serve as educators and therefore as pseudo-parents.

The focus on education segues into the next chapter whose attention turns to the Pastoral Epistles. The house church context, she asserts, “emerges as a home-school context.” The home/school setting begins with Timothy and Titus, leading instructors in the community, who have a pseudo-filial relationship with Paul. In addition, MacDonald highlights the women in the community who play an important role in educating their children, just as Timothy’s mother did. Older women influence young men to be leaders who defy some of the cultural norms for men. Whereas typically men were to “couch their discourse to suit the circumstances of a particular audience,” Timothy has learned, from youth, to defy convention and preach in all times and situations (2 Tim 4:1–2; p. 118). MacDonald also discusses the important role of fathers in education in this chapter.

Structuring the chapter in such a way gives new insight into the gender issues present in the Pastorals. For example, if very young women married older men, their need for instruction and protection makes good sense. Specified roles for the genders also make sense in a setting where men are now taking teaching roles over groups that gather in the house, a place where typically women would have positions of leadership. Early Christians have no public space, so that both genders are figuring out how to live in the home space. In these ways, I found her historical work and sociological reading offering fresh and helpful insight into these complex and well-trod topics.

The second major benefit of this text comes with her insights into Greco-Roman slavery. MacDonald presents evidence that the life of slaves was often brutal. If they were welcomed, honored, protected, and given hope, then early Christians who did so were surely living out the ethic of caring for “the least of these.” Like legitimate sons, they were now worthy of both discipline and expectation of an inheritance. She proves that for the slave, the household codes would never have been viewed as a hierarchical oppression of their freedom but as a chance to participate in the order and stability of the free family.

My critiques lie in two areas. First, she assumes, as do many biblical scholars, that Paul did not write these texts. If that assumption were questioned and her positive readings of the household codes adopted, one would have even more evidence of the Paul who uses his language to transform the social norms he seems to adopt (e.g. his persuasive appeal to the slave master in Philemon). Her readings, attributed to Paul, might allow a more compassionate and inclusive view of Paul. Consequently, the school of thought that disdains Paul for his “oppressiveness” (either his own or through his influence) would have less reason to do so.

Second, her treatment of sexual ethics needed, in places, a discussion of Jewish sexual ethic. MacDonald rightly draws attention to the new sexual ethic believers are called to in distinction from the surrounding Greco-Roman culture, but in addition to the example of Jesus, Jewish commitment to purity in sexual ways would provide an important link between the transition from Greco-Roman to Christian life. The converts were being adopted into a way of life as old as the law of Israel.

The only qualm I had with the book regarding its form was repetitiveness; it did seem the product of several paper presentations. Maybe if used in a class, the reiteration of key ideas would be a good thing.

MacDonald, in my opinion, achieves her goal: "A focus on children leads to a more complete vision of what was at stake" (p. 64) in these letters and the communities who read them. MacDonald did uncover things about the early Christian movement previously overlooked. Children were present everywhere in the home, and so the early church welcomed them into their gatherings and honored them with (unique) direct address. These children included slave and free, so the categories in the household codes must not be viewed as mutually exclusive. Specifically, for slaves the house churches offered a place of belonging, protection from sexual abuse, and hope for future inheritance in the family of God. The members of the church, both biological family and fictive kin, served as parents for the young of the congregation teaching them the principles of the Christian movement. "Conventional and countercultural elements" in the household codes reveal the great valuing of all children, no matter the class or age, by Christians as exemplified in the life of Jesus and continuing into the communities who followed him.

Amy L. B. Peeler
Wheaton College, Wheaton, IL

Christ Absent and Present: A Study in Pauline Christology. By Peter Orr. *Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament* 2/354. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014, x + 259 pp., €79.00 paper.

Where is Jesus? If you think that is an easy question, you may change your mind after reading this book, a highly stimulating doctoral dissertation written under the supervision of Francis Watson at Durham University. Orr has identified a serious imbalance in Pauline scholarship. The focus is placed almost exclusively on the texts that describe Jesus' presence with his followers, with a consequent neglect of the passages that refer to Jesus as absent (chap. 1). Providing an intriguing avenue into his project, Orr begins with an overview of the significance of Christ's continued presence in the works of Albert Schweitzer and Ernst Käsemann, respectively (chap. 2). Schweitzer locates Christ's presence in heaven and views believers as present with him through a mystical union. Käsemann locates the presence on earth, as the exercise of his lordship. Both scholars ignore the texts concerning absence.

Orr follows up (chaps. 3–5) with a good discussion of the texts that describe Christ as absent (Phil 1:21–26; 1 Thess 4:15–17; 2 Cor 5:6–8; Phil 3:20–21), as well as a treatment of the nature of Christ’s resurrection body (1 Cor 15:25–49; Rom 8:29, 34). He concludes that “the location of Christ at the right hand of God should not be understood in cosmic categories (that need to be demythologized). Nevertheless, in describing Christ in his humanity *with* God Paul is operating in *spatial* and *locational* terms. The risen, exalted, human Christ is not here, he is with God—beyond the realm of this universe. He is not making a point about the *geographical* location of Christ but about his *bodily absence*” (p. 100, italics his).

Turning to the texts that describe Christ’s presence (chaps. 6–8), Orr makes use of three helpful categories (wisely insisting that they are heuristic categories, not philosophical ones; p. 5): his epiphanic, dynamic, and bodily presence. To Christ’s epiphanic presence, Orr counts the texts in which Christ is made available to the senses, as aroma (2 Cor 2:14–17), letter (2 Cor 3:1–3), Spirit (2 Cor 3:4–17, 18), glory (2 Cor 4:1–6), and as life through the life of the apostle (2 Cor 4:7–12). The dynamic presence is found in texts where Jesus is portrayed as active: providing revelation (Rom 15:18–19; 2 Cor 13:1–4) and discipline (1 Cor 11:27–34). Christ’s bodily presence is located in the church (1 Cor 12:1–31), the individual believer (Rom 8:9–10), and the Eucharistic body (1 Cor 10:1–16). In all of these cases, Orr finds that Christ’s presence is a mediated presence. He is not bodily present; his presence is mediated by the apostle, by his Spirit, and, in the case of discipline, by sickness and death. As an analogy, Orr refers to the spiritual presence of the apostle in the case of discipline in Corinth, even while he is absent (1 Cor 5:3; pp. 132, 174). With respect to the Lord’s Supper, he concludes that the elements are not the locus of Christ’s presence; the Christian assembly is (p. 216).

It is the mark of good scholarly work that it raises questions for further research and discussion, and this book does not disappoint in this regard. It is clear that the absence of Christ becomes the controlling idea in Orr’s account, and one wonders if he has not fallen into an error opposite that of Schweitzer and Käsemann. Whereas they ignore Christ’s absence because they focus on his presence, Orr chooses to interpret the texts about his presence in light of the idea that he is absent. For example, he chooses to read the reference to Christ’s presence in the believer in Rom 8:10 in light of the reference to Christ’s being at the right hand of God in Rom 8:34 (p. 207), and he understands his presence as a presence mediated by the Spirit (p. 210). Yet this just raises a further question: where is God’s right hand? Orr understands it as being “beyond the realm of this universe” (p. 100), which is yet another invitation to a further query: if so, is it not possible to understand these descriptions in a complementary way? Orr understands Christ’s presence as a mediated presence, so that the idea can be harmonized with the idea of his absence. However, if Christ is located “beyond the realm of this universe,” would it not be possible to understand his absence and his presence as two different perspectives on or modes of his current existence?

Orr’s move to understand Christ’s presence as mediated by the Spirit is not a move that is explicitly made by Paul. Paul does not say that Christ is present through his Spirit. He simply says that Christ is present and that his Spirit is present

(Rom 8:9–11). Do we have to choose the one or the other and subordinate the presence of one of the persons to the presence of the other? Orr discusses the fluency of the persons of the Trinity in his exegesis of 2 Cor 3:17, and he points out that God was encountered as Yahweh in the OT and as the Spirit in the NT (p. 141). Perhaps there is more to these Trinitarian texts than what we can account for with a hypothesis of mediation.

I also wonder what Orr would make of Paul's encounter with the resurrected Christ. He affirms that "the exalted Christ is . . . the 'ultimate source' . . . of Paul's apostleship" (p. 161). If so, was the exalted Christ present or absent when Paul encountered him?

Orr does not say why, but he has limited himself to the undisputed Pauline letters. That is unfortunate, as the later Pauline letters make Orr's question even more complicated. For example, Col 3:3 and Eph 2:6 place believers in heaven with Christ, and Eph 1:23; 4:10 have Christ fill the universe. The contribution of these letters must be seen in relation to Paul's thought, whether he wrote these letters himself or not.

In his conclusion, Orr gives a nod to theological interpretation (p. 222), but he does not explain what he means by it. He is clearly interested in theological questions and reads the Pauline texts with a direct view to how they address such questions, interacting with a number of systematic theologians along the way.

As I read his book, I was reminded of the classic discussion between Lutherans and Calvinists regarding the location of Christ according to his human nature. The Calvinists held that Christ was located in heaven and that he therefore could not be present on earth. In particular, he could not be located in the bread and wine shared at communion. The Lutherans, in contrast, maintained that Christ was omnipresent and that the personal union entailed that he also had to be omnipresent according to his human nature, though with an exalted body. Consequently, he could be present in the Eucharist. Orr does not address this question directly, but his entire discussion would have a direct bearing on these debates. Orr is to be congratulated for this stimulating work, reminding his readers not to be satisfied with easy answers to the central question it raises.

Sigurd Grindheim

Fjellhaug International University College, Oslo, Norway

You Are My Son: The Family of God in the Epistle to the Hebrews. By Amy L. Peeler. Library of NT Studies 486. London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2014, xiv + 224 pp., \$120.00.

This book is Amy Peeler's Ph.D. dissertation accepted by Princeton Theological Seminary in 2011. Peeler was a post-doctoral teaching fellow in the John Wesley Honors College of Indiana Wesleyan University before assuming her present position as Assistant Professor of NT at Wheaton College in 2012.

Peeler argues that familial rather than priestly imagery is dominant in Hebrews and that this imagery "shapes the author's presentation of the three primary

persons of the sermon: God, Jesus, and the humans in relationship with them, the author and his audience” (pp. 5–6). While God is called “Father” at only two, though pivotal, points (Heb 1:5, 12:9), the frequent references to Jesus as “Son” invoke this relationship throughout Hebrews. Four chapters bear the weight of Peeler’s argument—in chapter 1 Peeler examines Heb 1:1–14, the passage most pivotal to her thesis; chapter 2 examines Heb 2:1–16; chapter 3 addresses the familial theme in the cultic central section of Hebrews; and chapter 4 focuses on the recipients’ identity as children of God as developed in Hebrews 12–13. She concludes by summarizing her argument and pointing out its significance for a better understanding of Hebrews. Familial imagery provides a better context for understanding Hebrews than the oft suggested patron/client imagery. It also substantiates the deity and pre-existence of the Son of God.

In chapter 1 Peeler argues that Heb 1:5 is pivotal to a correct understanding of 1:1–14. God’s double address to the Son in this verse establishes his own pater-nity as much as it does the Son’s filiality. It is in light of this double divine affirmation that we correctly understand the description of the Son in 1:1–4 as universal heir, the exact representation of God, and as a partner in the creation and sustaining of the universe. God’s subsequent scriptural declarations to the Son in 1:6–14 affirm and expand this paternal/filial reality by asserting the Son’s deity, creatorship, and exaltation as the heir of God’s own name (*theos, kyrios*).

Heb 2:1–16 (the subject of Peeler’s chap. 2) shows that God brings the Son into his universal inheritance through his incarnate obedience and suffering. By obtaining his inheritance in this way, the Son enables God’s people to become his sons and daughters and to enter into their own inheritance.

In chapter 3 Peeler argues that Jesus’ priestly vocation is dependent on his sonship. It is the Father who calls him to be priest, and he is qualified for this effective priesthood because he is the eternal Son who became the incarnate, suffering, obedient Son. Through this effective priesthood he enters his inheritance and thus enables God’s sons and daughters to join him in that inheritance.

Finally, in chapter 4 Peeler turns to Heb 12:1–13:25. The author uses Prov 3:11–12 to show that God as the recipients’ Father uses suffering to bring them to perfection as his sons and daughters just as he used suffering to perfect Jesus. They are urged not to follow Esau by abandoning their position as God’s “firstborn” but to persevere until entrance into the inheritance of the “firstborn” in the heavenly city.

Peeler is correct in her insistence that the identity of Jesus as the Son and the identity of the people of God as his sons and daughters are both fundamental to Hebrews. The “household” of God imagery in 3:1–6 enables the author to expand “family of God” into “people of God” in the central cultic section without losing the familial context. It is clear that the Son brings the sons and daughters into their inheritance through his high priestly work. However, the most unique part of her thesis is her contention that, by speaking his final word to/through one who is Son, God reveals himself as Father. Before evaluating this thesis, I want to discuss two exegetical issues.

First, in discussing Prov 3:11–12 (Heb 12:1–4) Peeler fails to see that the relationship between the suffering of the “sons” and that of the “Son” is more complementary than parallel. The “sons” are not perfected through suffering in the same way that the “Son” was perfected through suffering. Through his incarnate obedience despite suffering, the Son is perfected as the one able to “perfect” the sons and daughters by cleansing them from sin and bringing them into God’s presence. Their being perfected by the Son (through cleansing and access to God) is the prerequisite for and means of their perseverance in obedience through suffering. Holiness/perfection (access to God) is provided by the Son, not attained through endurance. The sons and daughters are not called to “pursue” a holiness they do not have, but, by their faithfulness, to “pursue” the maintenance of what Christ has provided.

Second, along with many commentators, Peeler fails to see that God’s people were already his “household,” his “sons and daughters,” *before* the incarnation. According to Hebrews, the Son does not make God’s people God’s children. Instead, he enables them to enter the inheritance that is already theirs as the “sons” of God “who will inherit salvation” (Heb 1:14). Heb 3:1–6 makes it clear that God’s pre-incarnate people were just as much part of God’s household as the recipients of Hebrews (3:6). After all, Moses was the “steward” in God’s household. Heb 2:14 attests this same reality. It is because God’s children were human that the Son of God assumed humanity. It is because both the Son and the “sons” are “of one”—both have a filial relationship with God (1:10)—that the Son assumed the human condition of the “sons.” This understanding gains certainty by the way it brings clarity to the entire book of Hebrews. Hebrews is not simply about the eternal Son identifying with humanity; it is about the eternal Son identifying with the sons and daughters of God by taking on *their* humanity. Hebrews *never* speaks about the Son bringing “humanity” to God. From the beginning it is “us,” the heirs of the “fathers.” “We” are the ones who must not neglect “such a great salvation,” the “sons and daughters” of God, the “brothers and sisters” of the eternal Son, the “household” of God. “We have such a great High Priest” and “we have a Great Priest over the household of God.” It is “we” whom God addresses as “my son” in Prov 11:1–4. The author does not adopt this perspective from belief in a limited atonement (Heb 2:9) but out of his pastoral concern for the perseverance of his hearers. This understanding of God’s sons and daughters strengthens Peeler’s case by making this theme even more central to the argument of Hebrews.

What about the role of God’s fatherhood in Hebrews? Peeler argues that God’s revealing himself in one who is *Son* means that he has revealed himself as *Father*. At one level this is true. The author of Hebrews clearly shared the common Christian belief in God’s fatherhood. The real question, however, concerns the purpose of Hebrews. Does Hebrews affirm God’s revelation in one who is Son in order to make the point that God has revealed himself as Father? In my judgment, the answer is “no.” I base this answer first on the significance that Hebrews gives to God’s revelation in his Son. The fact that God has revealed himself in one who is Son signifies the completeness, finality, and full effectiveness of this revelation. The Son is the “exact imprint” and “radiance” of God. He fully reveals God by

providing “such a great salvation.” It is misleading to say that “every mention of Jesus” as Son “invokes” God’s fatherhood (Peeler refers to 1:2, 5, 8; 3:67; 4:14; 5:5, 8; 6:6; 7:3, 28; 10:29 on p. 3). The assumption of God’s fatherhood is the opposite of making it the point of one’s statement. In short, to affirm that the mere mention of the Son shows that the point in Hebrews is the revelation of God as Father is to claim what must be proved. Thus, *pace* Peeler, there is no contextual reason to believe that Hebrews quotes Ps 2:7 in Heb 5:5–6 in order to affirm that it was God as *Father* who appointed the Son as priest.

Despite these concerns, I want to express my appreciation to Peeler for helping us to see the centrality of the familial imagery in the letter to the Hebrews.

Gareth Lee Cockerill
Wesley Biblical Seminary, Jackson, MS

Polycarp’s Epistle to the Philippians and the Martyrdom of Polycarp: Introduction, Text, and Commentary. Ed. Paul Hartog. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013, 402 pp., \$275.00.

The Epistle to Diognetus (with the Fragment of Quadratus): Introduction, Text, and Commentary. Ed. Clayton N. Jefford. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013, 281 pp., \$185.00.

The past decades have seen numerous books that guide novice readers through the Apostolic Fathers, others that assist students in reading and studying them in their original language, and still others that mine them for insights into the Jesus tradition. With the Oxford Apostolic Fathers commentary series, we now have three critical editions that surpass most that have gone before them.

The format of the series is threefold: extensive introduction, text in its original language with a facing English translation, and commentary. Christopher Tuckett wrote the first volume in the set, *2 Clement*, published in 2012. The following year, two more volumes were released within a month of each other: (1) Polycarp’s *Epistle to the Philippians* and the *Martyrdom of Polycarp*; and (2) *The Epistle to Diognetus* (with the *Fragment of Quadratus*). This review will evaluate the two most recent works in the order of their publication and then provide some overall comments.

Paul Hartog, now vice president of academic services and dean of Faith Baptist Bible College, starts his volume with Polycarp’s letter to the Philippians. This epistle, according to Hartog, dates sometime between AD 100 and 140, with external and internal evidence possibly converging around AD 112–117 (the late Trajanic period). The other work included in his study is the *Martyrdom of Polycarp*. Many scholars have attempted to pinpoint the exact date of Polycarp’s execution as either Saturday, February 23, 155, or Saturday, February 22, 156. Hartog avoids taking sides in this debate by simply sticking to the more general range of 155 to 161. In turn, he separates Polycarp’s death from the date of the document and argues for “an enhanced composition in the third quarter of the second century (rooted in earlier traditions)” (p. 186).

As Hartog churns his way through the other introductory issues—historicity, theology, influence, etc.—he skips back and forth across the complicated terrain of previous Polycarpian scholarship. On these surveys, he can be illuminating. Under the topic of “Unity,” for example, he spends eight pages discussing how Percy Harrison’s composite theory in 1936—which essentially highlights the inconsistency between *Phil.* 9 and *Phil.* 13:2 regarding the status of Ignatius and argues that these two passages could not have come from one original source—has influenced subsequent scholarship. Harrison’s basic contention still holds strong sway over current scholarship, Hartog writes, albeit to varying degrees.

Turning to the texts and translations, Hartog provides the reader with the most comprehensive critical apparatus to date. For example, the critical editions of Polycarp’s Martyrdom by Bart Ehrman and Michael Holmes each footnote one textual variant in *Mart. Pol.* 9:1 (p. 379 n. 41 and p. 314 respectively) to Hartog’s nine (p. 250). Hartog does this—both here and throughout—with a positive apparatus showing the variations and evidence to the reader.

Regarding his new English translation, he states upfront, “My ET has leaned toward formal equivalency, and the bracketed words reveal materials that have been added for clarity’s sake” (p. 27 n. 43). Certainly, every translation has its own strengths and weaknesses, and his is no exception. As he captures the content with a responsible rendition, there are times when he seems to opt for an unconventional rendering in order to distinguish his new translation. Not that it is necessarily bad to try to differentiate one’s translation from others, but it can obscure scriptural connections in the process and/or produce a flat reading. For example, he offers this translation of the first part of *Pol. Phil.* 4:3: “The widows [are to be] serious about the faith of the Lord, unceasingly interceding on behalf of all” (p. 85). By using the phrase “unceasingly interceding on behalf of all” rather than the more conventional “pray without ceasing for everyone,” his commentary has to perform a double duty. Fortunately, this time, it does. He alludes to the more conventional terminology and notes one of the main scriptural connections when he writes, “... and the widows were to pray ‘for all.’ 1 Tim 5.5 also discusses the unceasing prayers of widows” (p. 118).

Beyond the texts and translations, his commentary sections highlight well the main interpretative options available. For simplicity’s sake, consider *Pol. Phil.* 4:3 again. Hartog helpfully outlines the standard ways the genitive *κυρίου* can be taken and points the reader to some of the key academic discussions regarding the debate, such as Michael Whittington’s article in *JTS* 61 (2010) 82–109.

At the same time, the commentary sections would have benefited from more connections with the other areas of the volume, especially the introductory material, as well as within the corresponding commentary section. For instance, regarding the latter, Hartog footnotes a citation from the Palestinian Talmud within his commentary on *Mart. Pol.* 2:2 (i.e. “*y. Ber.* 9.7, 14b”; p. 276 n. 45), but then never makes the connection for the reader (more importantly?) with *Mart. Pol.* 9:1 when highlighting the importance of Jewish martyrdoms in parallel literary traditions (p. 296). Given that Rabbi Akiva ben Joseph was executed only about twenty years prior to Polycarp, according to parallel Talmudic traditions (cf. the account in the

Babylonian Talmud not referenced in Hartog's work; *b. Ber.* 61b), this link ought to have been explored or at least footnoted again here, especially because he already cited one version of the account twenty pages earlier.

The next commentary is by Clayton N. Jefford, professor of Scripture at Saint Meinrad Seminary and School of Theology. He has read widely and well in the Apostolic Fathers and shows a gift for summarizing the spectrum of research in Diognetan scholarship. The challenge before him, though, is far greater than the previous two volumes in this series, in that he is examining a work of literature for which there is no extant ancient manuscript, no clear reference from an author in the early Christian period, and its author, intended recipient, location, and date are all unknown. What we currently have, he argues, is a "greatly evolved rendering of the original literary form of the work or the 'autograph'" (p. 4 n. 6). Therefore, he is right to highlight upfront, "Any commentary on *Diognetus* must thus be speculative to some extent" (p. 5), and reiterate halfway through the volume when he introduces the original text and English translation, "This is hardly a secure foundation on which to make assertions about the nature of an intriguing piece of early Christian literature. Nevertheless, it is what remains for scholars today" (p. 130).

Despite its pitfalls, *Diognetus* still has obvious appeal according to Jefford. It is arguably one of the first examples of early Christian apologetic literature, written by an educated member of society, and reflects one of the best defenses of the ancient tradition of faith among its contemporaries, such as the writings of Justin Martyr, Theophilus of Antioch, Melito of Sardis, and Apollinaris of Hierapolis.

With all that in mind, Jefford sets out to accomplish two main tasks. First, he aims "to provide a general setting for the text as it is remembered from literature prior to its destruction [on August 24, 1870 ... so that the reader will find] some new ideas that will shed additional insight into the text and history of *Diognetus*" (p. 5). Second, he seeks "to offer English-speakers an opportunity to review the status of research on *Diognetus* since the last great commentaries on the text from [sic] the mid-20th century" (p. 5). With these goals, he succeeds admirably.

His points about the state of research are all perceptive and important, and he often makes difficult debates easy to understand. The background of the text is a good example. He first traces the three schools of thought on authorship, date, and provenance, even though he ends up following the majority view that the text is most likely a late second- to early third-century composition by some author(s) within this period, with Egyptian Alexandria being the likely final setting. Unfortunately, as publishing luck would have it, his work was presumably submitted before he had a chance to read *A Diognète: Visions chrétiennes face à l'empire romain* (eds. Gabriella Aragione, Enrico Norelli, and Flavio G. Nuvolone; Prahins: Éditions du Zèbre, 2012). One reason this is unfortunate is because Norelli strongly challenges Charles Hill's argument that Polycarp of Smyrna was responsible for the work, a position toward which Jefford is sympathetic, such as when he states, "Hill's ingenious contention that *Diognetus* derives from the hand of Polycarp and is a lost work of the bishop is certainly worth considering" (p. 103; cf. pp. 6, 11, 22–28, 103–107).

As with Hartog's volume, Jefford's text, translation, and commentary also surpass previous English editions in numerous ways, such as offering a fuller criti-

cal apparatus. He also clearly identifies certain literary devices for the reader, such as the confessional pattern seen by the structured use of relative pronouns in *Diog.* 7:2, and helpfully sets them out in both the Greek text and English translation. This is not done in other editions, such as those of Holmes or Ehrman.

Jefford frames his criticisms of previous research cautiously throughout the volume. To be more precise, he carefully uses language that will not bother anyone, and conjecture is *de rigueur* in this volume—sometimes to its peril. On the one hand, he says that there was “a vibrant oral tradition, perhaps associated with catechetical practices, that helps to define and delineate the nature of Christian identity behind the text” (p. 41). On the other hand, he states, “There was little concern for catechetical instruction in this process” (p. 71). To put it another way, his attempts to make sense of *Diognetus* are valiant, but the dearth of evidence necessarily forces him to die the death of a thousand qualifications and sometimes appear to contradict himself.

The main shortcoming of these volumes is that they too often err on the side of reporting the debates rather than entering the fray and opening up new vistas. Granted, they sometimes explicitly tell the readers when they are proposing a new idea, such as when Jefford initially discusses his view about how the text evolved (p. 5 n. 8). But at the end of the day the “new ideas” were often qualified away, like when Jefford recognizes at various stages that his evolutionary hypothesis is “almost pure conjecture” (p. 119) and “largely speculative” (p. 125).

A broader complaint relates to the sloppy editing and indexing. Only one of each will be noted here. In Jefford’s volume, on pp. 11–14, he narrates the order in which he will pursue the introductory issues. Yet his stated order is different from both the table of contents and that of the volume itself. In Hartog’s volume, the author index identifies the bird leaving Polycarp during his execution in *Mart. Pol.* 16:1 as Michael F. Bird, not once (p. 315), but twice (p. 316). This multi-volume pattern of careless editing is not what one might expect from Oxford University Press.

There are a couple more annoying bits worth mentioning, especially if the series’ editors might take them into consideration for the future volumes that will complete the series. The first one is the lack of a thematic or subject index in both works. The second one is the lack of explanation of the symbols and abbreviations found in the critical apparatus of Hartog’s volume. Thus, future editions and volumes in the series would do well to provide these.

In sum, there is no doubt these volumes are now the most comprehensive treatments in the English language. They provide outstanding surveys of scholarship, fresh English translations to consider, fuller text critical issues to examine, and remarkably up-to-date bibliographies. They are also a sobering reminder that the Apostolic Fathers have often been minimized, misunderstood, or ignored. Students of early church, classical studies, and patristic studies, then, have been rendered a

great service and would benefit greatly from consulting this compendium early on in their studies.

Brian J. Wright
Ridley College, Melbourne, Australia