THE HEYTHROP JOURNAL

HeyJ LVIII (2017), pp. 266–356

BOOK REVIEWS

The Invention of God. By Thomas Römer; translated by Raymond Geuss. Cambridge/London, Harvard University Press, 2015, £25.00.

Römer is Professor of the Hebrew Bible at the Collège de France and Professor at the University of Lausanne. He here brings us up to speed, including contributions from contemporary archaeology and epigraphy, on what can be said about the composition of the Bible and the evolution of the Hebrew concept of God – two versions of the same problem. As for the Bible, the rough principle holds: what happened first was written last, and what happened last was written first. The Hebrews were an indigenous Canaanite tribe, or federation of tribes; for a majority of the Biblical period, like the tribes around them, they worshipped several gods organized in a pantheon under the chief Canaanite god, El and his 'Asherah'. Yahweh began as a storm or war god from the 'South' who was likewise worshiped by a variety of non-Israelite tribes. Throughout its history, Israel was more like its neighbors than unlike them in its religious practices. Since Moses was working for his father-in-law in Midian when he experienced a theophany at the burning bush, the Bible is frank that Yahweh was not the traditional tutelary god of its territory, but was accepted or 'borrowed' from outside. What was unusual was that Moses, who produced its Law code, was not a king, as with the other nations, nor did he succeed in entering the Promised Land. Right from the beginning this introduced an ambiguity into the Israelite religion. How essential or deeply wedded was Israel to the 'promises of the covenant' that Israel struck with this new patronal deity – Land, King, and Temple? Or are they from the beginning an incipiently 'modern' people, not in being monotheistic – that came last, only during the Persian period, and as a knock-on effect of their equally accidental failure to rebuild a 'statue' of Yahweh in the second Temple, because they had forgotten what the first one looked like – and if they had banished statues of the hated gods of their oppressors from their place of worship, why go to the trouble of making a statue of their own god at all? – but 'modern' in the sense of being an essentially *diaspora* religion – or 'religion 'lite' – of a people dispersed, on the move, dispensing with the anachronistic baggage that weighed down the other nations? Several serious questions arise here: was this a fate they *chose*, or was it thrust upon them? Secondly, if their tribal god does not provide them with *that* (as well as with the security and prestige that goes with that), what exactly does he give them? It was a series of defeats and disasters that brought the distinctive changes to the Israelite concept of their god – the loss of the northern kingdom that swelled the Jerusalem population and that led Josiah in his 'reform' to claim exclusive proprietorship of the cult of Yahweh for his own Temple, closing down the others. Thus the claim that 'Yahweh is One' meant in effect 'He is ours – hands off!', which, since almost all meat was slaughtered in sacrifice, was advantageous for tax purposes. Similarly, after backing into this 'monidolatry' through negative military and political – rather than theological – experiences, this position was boosted up to 'monotheism' during the Babylonian Exile in an outrageous and perhaps contradictory psychological compensation for what they had lost – and, for those who stayed on in Babylon, voluntarily gave up: their god is the *only* god, the creator of the entire universe, even though he has failed miserably as a patronal deity and given them nothing 'solid' of their own; instead he has given them 613 codicils of a 'Law' by which they can please Him! For that is the second part of this fantasy – that this single universal god has coincidentally selected them for a special relationship! Is this a step up to a more 'purified', 'spiritualized', or 'transcendent' concept of the deity, or rather just making the best of an extremely bad situation through a world-record masterpiece of unhealthy denial? Römer adopts a 'panglossian' optimism that the entire experiment with the 'Land, King, Temple' alternative was a deviation from what was intended, and that a 'providence' led Israel back, in Rabbinic Judaism, to a 'portable' religion-for-the-diaspora which is ultimately its genius and contribution to the nations. The ambiguity only gets deeper as the tension between the universality of the Jewish deity, together with his 'special relation' to Israel, unavoidably leads to resentment among its

neighbors, scapegoating during bad times, the intensification of an de-centred 'diaspora' situation through persecution into the motif of a perpetually 'wandering Jew', and finally the perhaps unassimilable experience of the holocaust. The genealogy of the 'One God' here is unsurpassed; the response calls for further conversation.

Heythrop College Patrick Madigan

How the Bible Became Holy. By Michael L. Satlow. Pp. xi, 350, New Haven/London, Yale University Press, 2014, £25.00.

Satlow puts an uncritical lay view of the history of the Bible in the Judaeo-Christian tradition through an astringent, not to say acidic bath, so that many, not to say most of our common assumptions are pulled away. The fundamental bombshell is that, for most of its history, Judaism was not Biblically-based; there was no 'text' that was regularly consulted for the basic stories of creation, the giving of the covenant on Mt. Sinai, the Decalogue, the history of the kings of Israel, the construction of and practices within the Temple, or the 'Law' that observant Jews should be following essentially as a surrogate and compensation for the inability to offer sacrifices in the Temple after its destruction. All these were governed by home-grown traditional practices that developed spontaneously over time. No one felt the need until quite late to write them down or to test a prevailing practice against the criterion of a written guideline until, basically, the Jews made contact with Greek culture (not in Palestine but primarily around Alexandria in Egypt) and for purely literary motives wanted to vie with what saw itself as a superior text-based culture that revered philosophers and Homer as cultural treasures that were appropriate objects for on-going artistic elaboration and scholarly commentary. Synagogues as places of public prayer where comparable Jewish 'texts' (actually ornate 'scrolls') were kept as coffee-table fetishized objects for display only developed out of such status anxiety in Hellenistic culture (not in Babylon or after the return under Persian control). This had more to do with 'keeping up with the Jones' than with a re-discovery and on-going conversion into the white-hot spiritual riches of one's own tradition.

Until the Greek period the only people who could read and write is Israel (and in the entire Middle East) were scribes. These were essentially employed for administrative, diplomatic, and archival work. The ability to read and write was not essential for any other profession (including the religious cult). The scribes' job was copying important documents and sending these off to other scribes, where both copies would be deposited and gather dust in state archives. Eventually scribes got good at their work, wanted to demonstrate their expertise, and occasionally, for the benefit of other scribes (the only ones who would appreciate it) would re-write documents in a more coherent, systematic, complete, artistic, or utopian fashion to show society how it *should* work rather than how it too often *does* work. Creativity and showing off artistic skill was encouraged rather than repressed among this first class of 'intellectuals' or literary rivals in world history; what they wrote, however, was not meant to be taken literally. Eventually some of these 'improved' versions of state documents would also be deposited in archives, where they would occasionally be 'rediscovered' as the true, lost version of how the state *should* actually be run (as in Josiah's 'reform' after the loss of the northern kingdom to the Assyrians, and Ezra's 'rediscovery' of the Deuteronomistic Law for the re-built Temple – and perhaps Moses' reception of the 'Tablets' on Mt. Sinai). Such texts could easily be manipulated by would-be rulers, but contrary to the impression often recorded in the texts, it is far from certain that these text-based specifications very seriously challenged or modified traditional practices.

Satlow revises the popular view of the Pharisees and Sadducees coming out of the Hasmonean dynasty and influential at the time of Jesus. It was the Pharisees who were the conservative defenders of unwritten ('oral') traditional practices, often allied with powerful aristocratic families (rather than compassionate casuists helping the common people). The Sadducees by contrast were radical intellectuals and revolutionaries who put their faith in new critically-established texts to make sure everybody was playing fair and who were impatient with such things as the anachronistic, outdated lunar calendar, versus the more scientific and systematic solar calendar, for specifying Temple feast days, the new year, and the cult generally. Unfortunately the 'gap' between what was going on and what *should* be going on became too great for them; a 'teacher of righteousness' arose who called for an overthrow and thorough revision of tradition-based Judaism (as happened later through Judah the Prince in the *Mishnah*, Maimonides – and also Spinoza, Marx, and Freud) so that it could

for the first time attain ritual purity and become acceptable to God. He was closer to Mohammed than to Jesus – a 'prophet' receiving a new, improved 'revelation' that supplants the earlier version rather than a 'messiah' fulfilling archetypes and prophecies embedded in the earlier version – but both the Qumran group that followed him and Islam show a victory by the new 'text-based' scribal utopian religion (which the rabbis had innocently introduced through their jewel-encrusted scrolls and promotion of the study and veneration of 'Torah' (versus Homer) as the highest religious activity). In this case 'fulfilment' or 'new revelation' runs the risk of patricide or cutting away one's own base; there is the further danger that the motives animating such revolutionary purging – artistic rivalry or ideological purity - may be other than 'religious'.

Heythrop College Patrick Madigan

Historical & Biblical Israel: The History, Tradition, and Archives of Israel and Judah. By Reinhard G. Kratz; translated by Paul Michael Kurtz. Pp. viii, 280, Oxford University Press, 2015, $68.63.

This is a must-have book for anyone interested in keeping abreast of the most recent developments in theories of the composition of the Hebrew Bible, or the Christian Old Testament. Kratz is Professor of Old Testament Studies at Göttingen, and more than holds up the German reputation of leading the way in proper methodology, extremely thorough application, and laying out the results dispassionately (There are over four pages in the bibliography listing his publications). This is a revolutionary work predicated on the collapse, gradually building over many years, of the classic modern theory of the four-strand interweaving of sources (J, E, D and P) in this composition. Steady growth in the results of epigraphy and archaeology have made scholars aware of a widening chasm between what the bible *says* happened in the history of Israel, and what we think *really* happened; the chasm has today become so wide that we must conclude that the 'biblical tradition' is basically useless for the reconstruction of this history. For 'what happened first was written last' and 'what happened last was written first.' Rather than later events 'fulfilling' prefigurements and promises made earlier, a fictive history was projected backwards to interpret or justify what had happened recently – chiefly around the post-exilic Persian and Hellenistic periods when the scrolls that became the 'bible' were finally edited, harmonized, and arranged in a continuous narrative from creation, covenant, punishment for sin through loss and exile, to forgiveness and restoration through Cyrus the Great and beyond. The chief fiction is the claim that the patron deity of two Canaanite petty kingdoms – Israel and Judah – was 'one' god for 'one' people whom He had 'chosen'. This was a strategy for psychological survival after the 'caesura' of the loss of the two kingdoms to the Assyrians and Babylonians, respectively; promising a restored 'kingdom'. The Pentateuch or 'Torah of Moses', a product of the prophets and their scribal schools, actually prepared the Jews to carry on in a 'kingdomless' condition, by fashioning a new, and historically unsupported, identity as 'one people', who had been plucked exclusively from the nations by an equally exclusive deity, to whom they are bound by the gift of the 'Law' and thereby held in esteem through his embrace no matter what otherwise happens. In this Law He commands worship apart from all other gods at one exclusive site, towards which He will lead them.

This obvious psychological compensation and wish-fulfilment remained an 'ideal', a marginal and optional position for elites which relatively few Jews followed. The temples in Samaria and Judah – as well as shrines on numerous hilltops – already had 'torahs' of cultic customs and sacrificial practices to their common patronal deity – and his consort – with side veneration for other local gods as well; these continued undisturbed – as the prophetic objections bear witness. The 'purity' laws that accompanied this elevation of their patronal deity, first to a 'high god' over all others, and finally – in 2nd Isaiah during the Persian period – to the *only* god – were never followed in Samaria, Judah, Babylon, or Elephantine. Jews mixed and inter-married with other ethnicities freely, they traded and conducted business on the Sabbath (the 7-day Sabbath replaced the earlier 'new moon' Sabbath only late in the tradition). It was the political turmoil surrounding the Ptolemaic-Seleucid rivalry that led the Maccabees to invoke this growing 'biblical tradition' as a religious tool in their propaganda war to muster support for their insurrection, and the subsequent Hasmoneans to celebrate their expansion of an autonomous kingdom to the dimensions claimed for David – overlooking their unprecedented, opportunistic and illegal unification of the high priesthood and kingship. This was the first time this 'ideal' was turned into a practical program to which Jews should conform their conduct. Even so, it was only with the defeat

of all hopes in this 'glorious restoration' by the Romans in 70 CE – and thus of alternative psychological support for their continued existence – that with the rise of Rabbinic Judaism this fictive version moved from being a minority fantasy to the official version of their historical identity and hence the blueprint for religious piety and ethical behaviour. Again, the 'one' God for 'one' people who were thereby 'redeemed' from their defeated and stateless condition, functioned as an 'ideological couple', the one mirroring and adhering to the other, which held Jews up without even the modest external support they had earlier enjoyed as petty buffer states on a frontier between major powers.

Kratz supplies an astringent eye-wash to make us realize how recent and fictive this entire ideological construction was. This does not mean there is nothing worth retrieving from it, but we must do so fully aware of its convoluted, inverse, and psychologically problematic development.

Heythrop College Patrick Madigan

The Legacy of Israel in Judah's Bible: History, Politics, and the Reinscribing of Tradition. By Daniel E. Fleming. Pp. xxii, 385, Cambridge University Press, 2012, £60.00/$99.00; pap: £22.99/$32.00.

Fleming counters sceptical scholars who claim that the Bible has undergone so many, and such deep, revisions at the hands of the final Jewish editors in Babylon or later that, even if we could identify and liberate passages that Judah received from Israel at the fall of Samaria to the Assyrians, these have been so thoroughly re-worked and distorted that they are useless for attempting to reconstruct the historical landscape and assumptions of the initial Israelite storytellers. This is not necessarily so, and Fleming demonstrates this by stripping away the centralizing, pro-monarchical plotline introduced by the editors from Judah to expose an alternative 'history of Israel' in which the single pre-monarchical society mirrored the collaborative politics of combined pastoralist and settled populations connected by extended kinship lines which retained consultative and veto powers when called to muster against an enemy or to ratify a 'judge' to lead such campaigns.

The Jacob cycle is the original Israelite story of origins: this was extended backwards to Isaac and Abraham to explain how, together with other clans from Mesopotamia, they had migrated west along the green banks of the Euphrates to the environs of Damascus, and thence to the green swath along the Mediterranean in the Southern Levant. Egypt had expanded to control a portion of these tribes, in a territory the Egyptians called 'Canaan' and whose kingless political organization they never really understood. Israel produced the stories of Joseph and the descent into Egypt, the bondage they experienced there, the liberation under a prophet called Moses, and the Exodus. However, Israel knew nothing of an encounter with Yahweh on a holy mountain, the reception of a 'Law', or a military 'invasion' of Canaan from the east: all this was introduced by later scribes from Judah.

After the Exodus the Israelite tribes returned to their traditional lives; the savior-stories of the 'judges' reflect their contentment with staying at this low level of social organization. There was never any desire felt, as in the Samuel cycle, to advance to the state of having a 'king'. Specifically, it is not clear that Saul was anything more than a 'judge': later Jewish scribes made him into a 'king' to justify and validate David's claim to inherit his 'crown'. In fact, all this was done much later, when David's grandson Rehoboam was deposed as leader in favor of Jeroboam I, but broke with the Israelite tribal custom by refusing to accept this verdict, instead retreating to Jerusalem and carving it into a separate 'kingdom' – 'Judah' - and more basically introduced the monarchical motif as having been implicit in the earlier 'Israelite' stories as well. With Samaria defeated and dismantled by Assyria, Judah was alone in the field and had a free hand to 'steal Israel's birthright' so to speak, by appropriating both the name 'Israel' from the formerly larger group, and all its stories as well, which it then gradually reconfigured (to suit the taste of a Judahite audience which was then itself in exile) to make monarchy appear to be what the Israelites wanted and finally achieved – it was all invention. Rather than Jacob stealing Esau's birthright and becoming 'Israel', Judah stole Israel's birthright, and presented itself as the 'new' or 'true Israel'. Rehoboam transformed himself from a disobedient sore-loser, and rejected candidate for judge into the grandson of the greatest 'king' of Israel, and implied that dynastic kingship – and exclusively of the 'House of David'! – was in fact the covenant Yahweh had contracted with Israel much earlier through Moses and later renewed through David. We thus have a shameless 'grand theft' of the Israelite patrimony, with a further distortion to make Rehoboam's repudiation and betrayal of the Israelite political system seem to be Yahweh's intention from the outset. However, the later

Jewish scribes finally did not get away with it. Fleming demonstrates that their efforts at obscuring and distorting the earlier Israelite traditions are not completely successful; rather, the latter can be recovered, the betrayal reversed, and truth thereby can be restored.

Heythrop College Patrick Madigan

The Composition of the Pentateuch: Renewing the Documentary Hypothesis. By Joel S. Baden. Pp. x, 378, New Haven/London, Yale University Press, 2012, £50.00.

Baden produces a *tour de force* by not only articulating the theory behind a revised form of Wellhausen's Documentary Hypothesis – that the theory starts *not* from the postulation of distinct sources based on the divine names, distinct themes, or supposed stylistic differences, but rather starts from the final form of the Pentateuch, where it joins hands with contemporary critics who want to appreciate the Bible as *literature*. The fly in the ointment are the numerous contradictions, inconsistencies, repetitions, etc., that impede the latter and force the serious literary critic to the speculative *postulation* of distinct sources that a compiler has at some point braided together to produce a single story, showing cleverness at hewing to a single time-line but unable to iron out all the wrinkles. Following this exclusively *literary* evidence Baden shows it is relatively straightforward to separate out four independent versions of the common Israelite story, from the creation of the world to the death of Moses, and further to uncover and articulate the dominant themes or emphases, the preoccupying interests of each earlier text; but as said, this is a *conclusion* of proper literary method, not its starting point. The bulk of the book consists in a close reading of key episodes in the Pentateuch, and a 'God-is-in-the-details' demonstration of how and why the compiler wove together the different strands at his disposal. He has retained almost everything in the received documents and has minimized his own interventions. *Contra* Wellhausen, we cannot date or align in a temporal sequence the four independent texts the (single – not three) compiler worked with; we must rather say he had all four to hand at the same time.

Baden is modest but firm in his prodigeous achievement: this revised form of the Documentary Hypothesis is the only explanation a serious reader can reach to account for the final form of the Pentateuch. Further, as with the advance in simplicity and economy the helio-centric theory delivered over the geo-centric theory of the solar system, this theory surpasses earlier versions of the Documentary Hypothesis which foundered and lost popularity through a proliferation of 'layers' and postulated intermediary stages in the 'evolution' of the Bible that produced an 'epicycles-on-epicycles' complexity that was beyond scientific control. Defenders of all other explanations take heed: ignore this definitive accomplishment at your great cost.

Heythrop College Patrick Madigan

A Theological Introduction to the Pentateuch. Edited by Richard S. Briggs and Joel N. Lohr. Pp. xiv, 210, Grand Rapids, MI, Baker Academic, 2012, $18.70.

In this innovative approach to Pentateuchal studies, five biblical scholars offer a theological reading of selections from the Torah. Each of the volume's contributors draws on the work of Walter Moberly, for whom this collection of essays represents 'something of a small-scale *festschrift*' (ix). The introductory chapter delineates the contours of theological interpretation of biblical texts, proposing several 'working guidelines' (6). These include reading texts 'with full imaginative seriousness' (5) and interpreting them in light of the theological concerns and insights of interpreters both ancient and modern, Christian and Jewish.

In the subsequent chapters, the contributors examine the individual books of the Pentateuch, focusing on key themes and passages. This narrow approach allows them to devote more attention to the theological import of those themes and texts, in contrast to other introductions which aim to explicate the main content of each book. The contributors also utilize historical and literary criticism in their study of these passages, and they round out each chapter with an outline of the Pentateuchal book in question and a discussion of the significance of its location within the canon.

Briggs's chapter on Genesis considers the themes of family and blessing in the patriarchal narratives and concludes with a theological reading of the Babel story in Gen 11:1-9. Jo Bailey Wells's chapter on Exodus examines the character of God, the motif of liberation, the holiness of God and Israel, and the institution of the priesthood. She ends with a theological reading of God's second theophany to

Moses in Exodus 19. Commenting on Leviticus, Joel Lohr look at the themes of corporate responsibility, Protestant bias against priests and rituals in modern scholarship, death and life, anthropological readings of Leviticus, and the Leviticus's relationship to the New Testament. He then offers a theological reading of the feast of Yom Kippur in Leviticus 16. Nathan MacDonald's chapter on Numbers discusses the themes of Israel as the "church militant," the role of priests and Levites, and the reception history of Numbers. He then presents a theological reading of Israel's wilderness wanderings in Numbers 20-21. Finally, Rob Barrett surveys the Deuteronomic themes of loyalty to Yahweh, blessings and curses, and the context and genre of Deuteronomy's laws and their relationship to the book's framework. He concludes with a theological exposition of two texts: Moses' sermon about divine providence in Deuteronomy 8 and the law of debt release in Deuteronomy 15.

In many respects, this introduction to the Pentateuch is a breath of fresh air. Lengthy discussions of authorship and provenance are bypassed in favor of more meaningful topics, i.e. theological ones. The contributors also demonstrate how biblical exegesis benefits from the employment of multiple methods concurrently rather than in isolation. To be sure, their methodology would benefit from greater clarity beyond mere 'working guidelines,' and the first two chapters would be even better if they added discussions about the theologically rich topics of God's image and the revelation of the divine name. Nonetheless, these five scholars have provided a valuable resource for Pentateuchal studies that will be useful for graduate students and biblical scholars alike.

St. Louis University Geoffrey Miller

Exile and Return: the Babylonian Context. Edited by Jonathan Stòkl & Caroline Waerzeggers. Pp. vi, 371, Berlin/Boston, De Gruyter, 2015, $119.95.

Most biblical scholars would agree that almost all books in the Hebrew Bible were either composed or substantially edited during the Exilic and post-Exilic periods among a community that identified itself as returning from Babylonian captivity. At the same time, a dearth of contemporary written evidence from Judah/Yahud and its environs renders an understanding of this writing process within its social, cultural and political context virtually impossible. And yet during the Neo-Babylonian (post-Assyrian) and Persian (Cyrus, Cambyses, Darius, etc.) periods – the time of the Exile – Babylonia produced extraordinarily rich deposits of cuneiform texts, making it one of the best documented epochs of ancient Mesopotamian history. If anything, there was too much data rather than too little, but recently it has become possible to catalogue and document every mention of a Judean at the time of the Exile and to embed these occurrences in the deeper social texture of the time and against the backdrop of the larger political transformations in the Babylonian and Persian Empires. This anthology collects papers presented at a conference 'By the Rivers of Babylon' held at University College London from 10-12 November 2011 on how these new materials allow us to integrate the local history of Yahud, the return from Exile, and the restoration of Jerusalem's Temple within larger developments of the time. Specifically, the discovery of the 'Al-Yahudu' tablets, a cache from 'Judah-town', allows us invaluable extra-biblical insight into everyday life in a rural community of Jewish exiles – as well as other nearby exilic groups – in the Nippur region. These afford us a control upon what (chiefly) Ezra constructs about the Return for Hebrew memory. For example, it is unlikely that Cyrus ever issued a proclamation specifically for Jews to take their Temple goods, return to their native land, and helped them re-build their Temple. He would have issued a general proclamation *allowing* various groups the Babylonians had deported to return to their native lands. Perhaps the most valuable result so far has been increased insight into the complex psychological and sociological interactions between 'returning' emigrés and Jews who had never left the land. The Jews in Babylon had inevitably constructed an imaginary and ideal 'Judah' to stave off assimilation to the host culture, which would have led to an 'underwhelming' disappointment for the returning generation which had to confront the desolate conditions of a ravaged Israel and remnants of its people. At the same time, having been to the 'big city', the returnees – although self-proclaimed enthusiastic 'Jews' – would have unconsciously acquired a 'hybrid identity', involving a complexification and sophistication in functioning and perceiving themselves in two contexts, derived from their multi-generational stay in their host culture – which would distinguish them from the local Jews whom they would inevitably view by comparison as uncouth, one-dimensional yokels. Also, there were questions of property ownership to be renegotiated. Which group were the 'true Jews'? The

option for each side was to view itself as either superior, or inferior, to the other; there was no neutral option, since there was now palpably an 'other' way of being a Jew. The returning Jews apparently soon formed an 'in group', establishing social borders, a distinctive identity-construction and a claim to being the 'true Jews' by alone funding the restoration of the Temple (along with support from other 'true Jews' who had elected to stay in Babylon) and forbidding intermarriage with local Jews – who had indeed over the years intermarried with non-Jews. In other words, they refused to 'assimilate' *again* – this time with Jews 'at the bottom'! The latter policy, however, seems not to have worked as well. In one sense the 'returnees' were the 'winners', for they composed, edited, and controlled the scriptures. The tensions – and mutual spoofing – are still present in the latter, however - for example coming down through the Tobias stories.

Heythrop College Patrick Madigan

Josiah's Reform and the Dynamics of Defilement: Israelite Rites of Violence and the Making of a Biblical Text. By Lauren A. S. Monroe. Pp. xi, 203, NY, Oxford University Press, 2011, $82.00.

Monroe's published revision of her doctoral dissertation occupies that sub-discipline of OT studies which is concerned to understand its 'literary history': how the corpus of texts grew into the form in which we now have it, including questions of when particular texts were written. Its success is due in large part to its choice of focal text for such an enquiry: the story of Josiah's reform in 2 Kings 23, long linked to the book of Deuteronomy in critical OT studies. Monroe essays the argument that in fact the links between the substance of whatever Josiah read, on the one hand, and the book of Deuteronomy on the other, are somewhat weak. In essence, she thinks the Holiness Code is a more likely approximation to the content of any scroll read by Josiah, although in fact she is cautious about seeing actual historical backing to the various narratives concerned, and would rather frame the account in terms of ideological complexes operative in various traditions and locations at the time of the texts' productions. The last third of this relatively short book is endnotes and indices, and the font size is generous throughout, with the result that the text itself is not over long. That is intended as a positive comment in the current climate of ever-longer monographs and reconstructions. It is engagingly written, and it is persuasive at least on the level of plausibility.

Chapter 1 sets up the enquiry. Monroe sees 'destructive rituals' as a key to the composition of 2 Kings 22-23 (thus a link between Josiah's destruction of sacred places, and the ritual language of defiling, burning, beating to dust, and, ultimately, *herem*. Chapter 2 focuses on the argument that the Holiness Code rather than Deuteronomy is a much better match for the language of Josiah's reform. Chapter 3 is a highlight: she offers a metaphorical account of *herem* (destruction/the ban) as a powerful image of state-formation, which leads to a portrayal of Josiah's reform as an act of *herem* (without using the word) – drawing thought-provoking typological links between Joshua, Josiah and Ezra all as 'agents of renewal'. Perhaps slightly less convincing is the deployment of this argument in favour of locating the deuteronomistic hand in redacting 2 Kings 23, as a proposed reason why the priestly emphases noted in chapter 2 have gone undetected in scholarship. Chapter 4, 'The Mechanics of Transformation', then develops this theme centre-stage: how the holiness code (which Monroe declines to define exactly) was worked over in deuteronomistic fashion, over a time period spanning Josiah to the post-monarchical era. A final chapter explores the implications for the wider project of literary history, offering a reading of an earlier version of Kings focused around Hezekiah as the hero (somewhat after Ian Provan), and then offering a self-confessedly 'head-spinning' account of the multiple cross-fertilisations between the different literary strands being discussed. The result is a mix of editions, elisions, additions and alterations, all taking place 'through a Jerusalem-centred scribal matrix that transcended textual and institutional specificity'. (132)

Monroe has offered an intriguing set of reconstructions of some key texts in the Old Testament, and certainly succeeds in giving pause for thought regarding the commonplace identification of Deuteronomy with Josiah's scroll. This reviewer must confess to wondering whether one can ever do more than point to possibilities with this kind of detailed literary reconstruction: the plausibility of her argument is one thing, but it seems unlikely that other, different, plausible arguments will not be forthcoming in due course. But there is much of interest and value in the detailed handling of various texts, making this a helpful contribution to OT studies.

St John's College, Durham University Richard S. Briggs

Biblical Criticism: A Guide for the Perplexed (Bloomsbury T&T Clark Guides for the Perplexed). By Eryl W. Davies. Pp. ix, 165, London: Bloomsbury, 2013, £14.99.

Davies offers an elegant little guide to a range of biblical criticisms in this compact and efficient book. He aims 'to outline some of the fundamental principles which undergird certain of the more recent approaches to the interpretation of the Bible' (ix). It is certainly striking how little the resultant volume overlaps at all with John Barton's 2007 work on *The Nature of Biblical Criticism*. Where Barton spoke of historical and literal and religious factors pertaining to the various practices of biblical criticism, Davies looks instead at identifiable recent currents within it, one at a time.

A brief introduction rehearses an outline of trends over recent decades, before exploring three benefits of biblical criticism: all of which are guards against negative alternatives, namely that one might read uncritical of one's own assumptions, or that one might think Bible reading is harmless, or that it is easy. Strange perhaps that no straightforwardly positive justifications could be given?

Four chapters then follow, on four different criticisms: reader-response, feminist, ideological and postcolonial. Davies seeks to illustrate with respect to both NT and OT texts, though as he admits his OT expertise tends to show through. While the reader-response chapter offers something of a case study on Mark's gospel, the best of the illustrative sections was his account of ideological approaches to OT history, which sorts a vast amount of material with clarity. The chapter on feminism goes over some ground he has covered elsewhere, though is none the worse for that. The postcolonial chapter felt a little like an annotated survey of disparate issues, not quite coming to the same sense of overview that the others manage.

A final chapter rounds up three further approaches in briefer compass: rhetorical criticism (which felt a little oddly placed in this company), canonical criticism (mainly on Childs, despite his well-known aversion to seeing his 'approach' as a 'criticism'), and ethical criticism (focusing in particular on David Clines).

The guide is reliable and sane, broadly sympathetic enough to present each view on its own terms and yet still able to delineate the major caveats which scholars might have in each case. Davies writes with an enviable clarity and exercises fair judgment, apart perhaps from a somewhat over-egged description of Bultmann as saying that the answer to 'Is presuppositionless exegesis possible?' was a 'resounding no!' (p. 54) when in fact his brief article of that name clearly says both yes and no depending on the nature of the presupposition. Although this guide makes no attempt at being comprehensive, it will admirably resource beginning students to get involved with the different conversations described herein.

St John's College, Richard S. Briggs
Durham University

Biblical Interpretation and Philosophical Hermeneutics. By B. H. McLean. Pp. viii, 320. Cambridge University Press, 2012, $30.99.

Biblical and philosophical hermeneutics often occupy clearly demarcated realms of study, with scholars in one field seldom venturing into the intricacies or complexities of the other. McLean's recent volume has the rare merit of effectively combining these two areas of discussion, uniting them in a clear, well-organized, and thought-provoking presentation. This feature alone earns the text a welcome place on the bookshelves of scholars in both disciplines. Yet the volume is also notable for its further constructive argument, as McLean aims to sketch a course that moves beyond the impasse inherited from the rise of historicism in modern textual exegesis and to illuminate new possibilities for contemporary biblical interpretation.

The work's opening chapter outlines the constructive elements of this proposal. McLean distinguishes each text's 'founding sense-event' – the significance it possesses within its original historical and linguistic context – from its elusive but indispensable 'present sense-event,' found in the ongoing discovery and enlargement of meaning in the lives of present day interpreters. While acknowledging the undeniably significant gains brought about by the modern historical and critical attention to the original or founding sense of biblical texts, McLean argues that the narrow historicist approach to interpretation has also served to sever the living connection between biblical texts and their readers in the present.

The heart of the work is devoted to a survey of major thinkers and movements in the field, and McLean engages each of these in order to unearth insights and resources for productively meeting contemporary challenges in hermeneutics. The treatment centers on developments within twentieth-century

thought, and McLean navigates these discussions skillfully, with admirable clarity and attention to detail. After a brief overview of the Enlightenment ideal of objectivity, the Romantic search for authorial intent, and the ensuing early twentieth-century crisis of historicism, the volume turns to a close reading of thinkers who offer alternatives to purely historicocritical approaches to exegesis. In this vein, McLean considers Heidegger's groundbreaking analysis of *Dasein*, Bultmann's program of demythologization, Gadamer's dialogical interpretation, the recovery of critique in Habermas and the Frankfurt school, Ricoeur's hermeneutics of suspicion and recollection, Levinas and the demands of alterity, and the radically embodied interpretative strategies of Deleuze and Guattari. In the course of these more targeted investigations, the volume also frequently engages the insights of a number of other notable thinkers, such as Dilthey, Nietzsche, Husserl, Saussure, and Foucault. Through this patient treatment, McLean charts the emerging possibilities for a non-historicist practice of biblical interpretation. In place of a controlled search for historical objectivity performed by an isolated rational subject, he presents exegesis as a daring quest for meaning modeled on the nomadic experience of early biblical figures: a prayerful journey into the unknown.

This ambitious work has a number of clear merits. As an extended discussion of the complex historical development of twentieth-century hermeneutics, it provides a lucid, rich, and instructive treatment of many notoriously difficult thinkers and movements. In so doing, it embodies the kind of ongoing critical dialogue that itself constitutes the hermeneutic tradition. The volume also offers refreshingly concrete examples and helpful illustrations, often taken from notable works of modern art and literature. Yet its most distinctive contribution consists in uniting biblical and philosophical perspectives in a clear and constructive proposal, as McLean consistently joins insights from the hermeneutic tradition to the practice of biblical study without sacrificing conceptual rigor.

While readers interested in earlier, nineteenth-century developments in hermeneutics may at times desire a fuller or more nuanced discussion than the volume provides – the thought of Schleiermacher, for example, receives a familiar but unfortunately one-sided treatment – McLean's study offers a disciplined and comprehensive overview of recent and contemporary hermeneutic thought that will hold continuing appeal for graduate students, teachers, and researchers. As such, this study marks a welcome contribution to ongoing conversations of meaning and interpretation for philosophers and biblical scholars alike.

Villanova University Kevin M. Vander Schel

The Oxford Encyclopedia of the Books of the Bible. Edited by Michael D. Coogan. 2 vols. Pp. xxx, 600 and xii, 578, Oxford University Press, 2011, £265.00.

Oxford commences a new series of 'Encyclopedias of the Bible' with this handsomely produced and heavyweight 2-volume collection clocking in at over 1200 pages of double-columned text. Future volumes are promised on Bible and theology; Bible and law; Bible and ethics; and others, with the result that this opening foray is kept on a tight leash: it is books of the Bible which are in view, with minimal accommodation of allied topics such as how to read them or how the canon of such books was settled. The result is a bulky reference work clearly aimed (if only by its price) at academic libraries, with on-line access to the articles also purchasable.

This reviewer will admit to not having read every one of the 1200 pages, but the overall impression is definitely favourable. The focus on Bible books results in fairly substantial articles, written by experts, with enough space to give clear and helpful accounts of key issues. Although projects such as this are often beset by the tendencies of busy scholars to run off brief generalities about old and familiar topics, the resulting encyclopedia does in this case offer quite considerable access to current discussion of key issues, and this production is to be recommended for libraries in spite of the price tag.

109 contributors, mainly American but including a few working in Canada, Israel, UK, Germany, and one or two other European countries, combine to give articles on every Bible book, and a few related topics. Book entries include every OT book (incorporating deutero-canonical additions); every NT book; and every major book of standard lists of 'apocrypha and pseudepigrapha' (including six such NT entries – three 'Acts' and three 'Gospels'). Then there are a (small) range of articles on other ancient texts: the Dead Sea Scrolls, the Nag Hammadi library, the apostolic fathers (covered in four separate pieces), and 'rabbinic literature' (one general essay and an entry on 'Targumim'). There are eight different pieces on various kinds of genre (though no entry on 'genre' itself). A further selection falls under the heading

'Formation of the Bible': possibly the main category after 'Books' which receives good treatment. Here one will find lengthy discussions of the canon as well as material on translations (ancient and modern) and text criticism (another thorough discussion). There are, perhaps surprisingly, no articles on groups of books, of sub-sections of canon (e.g. Pentateuch) with the sole exception of one on 'Letters of Paul'.

Each book entry is arranged according to a standard format, taking in such topics as the book's name(s), its canonical status, questions of authorship, composition, structure and contents, and then some attention to its interpretation from the time of its origin and on through later reception. There are good bibliographies, which only on occasion include invaluable annotation (thus, e.g., the bibliographies on Deuteronomy and Mark are excellent as they offer digests of the various literature mentioned – it might have been good for this feature to have been standard). One can see from the listing of topics covered that this reference work falls squarely into the middle of the classic scholarly genre of introduction, and in general one is not going to find any particular challenges to the scope or nature of the enterprise of biblical criticism. This is mainstream modern (Western) discussion, with excellent coverage of major options in critical scholarship, rather than an occasion to wonder how far this particular interpretative tradition should or will remain the main option for readers of these texts. What emerges, therefore, is an admirable resource for the beginning student, who will be led as quickly and painlessly as possible to a position from which they can enter the scholarly debate. The level of detail is probably too dense for the putative casual reader (and in any case are there any such readers of academic reference works anyway?). One final potential use would be for those beginning research to see how one particular leading voice in their area summarises the issues at stake, especially in those cases where they present an annotated bibliography.

All in all one anticipates a fine series of strong encyclopedias to follow this one, and editor Michael Coogan and his contributors are to be congratulated on setting a strong opening standard. It will be interesting to see whether works such as these increasingly become on-line resources only, open to regular updating. One suspects the future lies that way, via institutional subscription. The way that that would ease setting these essays as classroom reading, which need not go out of date, is also much to be desired.

St John's College, Richard S. Briggs
Durham University

T & T Clark Handbook of the Old Testament. By Jan Christian Gertz, Angelika Berlejung, Konrad Schmid, and Markus Witte. Pp. xxviii, 840, London, T&T Clark, 2012, £27.99.

This door-stop of a book is an English translation of the 2008 German original, with minor bibliographical updating. It is surely (at least) two books in one.

The first, running up to p 234 of this fairly large page and frequently small print book, considers 'sources and methods', relatively briefly, and then launches into a thorough review of the 'history and religion of ancient Israel'. This consists of one chapter of useful orientation (terminology, basic ideas, various religious concepts, and some discussion of geography and calendar), before offering a full four-part historical reconstruction of what we know about the Old Testament period. The story starts briefly in the late Bronze Age, before sporadically intersecting with the canonical version in the iron age with selected extracts from Judges. By the time it reaches the Babylonian/Persian period we are in the familiar territory of negotiating the differences between the canonical version(s) and the data of other historical reconstruction. The story is followed through up to 63BCE.

The second, clocking in at a mammoth 440 pages, is a traditional 'introduction' style coverage of the literature of the OT. This is a convenient one-stop shop overview of where current German scholarship is at, and as such is quite a gift to the scholarly community. I find it harder to imagine a beginner knowing what to do with this text, since it moves fairly quickly through orientation to 'Genesis–2 Kings' before hitting a 90-page chapter on 'The Partial Compositions'. Here the state of play is faithfully reflected by introductions to, in turn: P, Deuteronomy, non-P (in 3 parts in Genesis: in the Primeval history, in the Ancestral story, and in the Joseph story), before tackling 'the deuteronomistic composition' from exodus to exile. The rest of the canon is rolled out in Jewish order with divisions matching the canonical books: thus the latter prophets; the writings; and then also the apocyrphal/deuterocanonical books. A typical treatment will set the chosen text in its biblical context, rehearse textual and major issues in the history of its critical interpretation, look at the book's origins,

more briefly at its theology, and then, interestingly, at its history of reception. The editors note that this section retains its most obvious Germanic traces: it is arguable how informative these brief summaries of German reception are illuminating, and they tend to focus on what one might term 'high culture' rather than anything else. Several of the shorter texts move through all these sections rapidly, with a slight sense that the form has been preserved over and above its functional usefulness in getting to the heart of the matter.

The discussions are fair and thorough, and typically confident in the way of Germanic introductions: 'we now know that…' and 'it is clear that…' are common locutions, although it is also common simply to pile up different scholarly reconstructions alongside each other (e.g. 'More recently, scholars have come to yet another, completely different conclusion…' – p. 437). The German origin shows in various ways. I wonder how many of these discussions are in fact discussions of German scholarship. On books I am less familiar with I confess to coming across summarised theories which I had never heard of, while where I was more familiar with the issues I wondered whether other traditions of enquiry were quite surprisingly omitted, such as with the Psalms, with very little on Brueggemann's work, for instance. Again, this suggests that a prime audience for this (English) book is English-language scholars (such as myself) being helped to catch up on continental theories. The translation of perspectives is generally well-handled, though it will not make much sense to an English reader to read 'The ineradicable title "1st–5th Books of Moses" in many modern Bible translations suggests to this day that Moses was the author' (p. 252, on the Pentateuch), since it is of course only in German Bibles that one finds 1 Moses, 2 Moses and so forth. And just occasionally an English-language reference is given in German even where the original was in English (such as Jon Levenson's 'Why Jews are not interested in Biblical Theology', cf pp.781-82).

A brief concluding section offers about 25 pages on a 'Basic Outline of a Theology of the Old Testament', which rehearses some standard problems in locating what we mean by 'OT theology' – ancient religious beliefs? traditions which grow out of the texts? a canonical construction, and if so which one? – and some gently insistent observations that the OT must be allowed to shape its reader's interpretations rather than the other way around. I missed, in such a book as this, some recognition that the framing of the whole 800+ pages as a handbook to 'the Old Testament' was already a move indebted to Christian constructions of the text.

The overall product is massive: a state-of-play survey of so many (German) opinions and such a broad diversity of topics, and yet presented as one continuous text rather than an encyclopedia or reference format. It will orientate the reader rapidly on topic after topic. I was less convinced that it will *satisfy* the reader who finds it helpful. And interestingly, one back cover commendation describes it as 'a snapshot by leading researchers of the rapidly changing field of Old Testament study'. Well, if that is true, then I guess it will soon be out of date. So those who would like to see what is going on Germany – read up quickly! I will be fascinated to see what sort of impression has been left by a work such as this in 10, 20 or 50 years. Will this book's successors be confidently declaiming that we have moved on to something else?

St John's College, Richard S. Briggs
Durham University

The Ten Commandments: A Short History of an Ancient Text. By Michael Coogan. Pp xiii, 176, New Haven/London, Yale University Press 2014, £16.99.

Coogan's brief book on the ten commandments combines a useful basic overview of interpretative issues with a certain running agenda about the status of the biblical text(s) in current American social and political life. The result, to this UK-based reviewer, is a slightly unexpected hybrid of styles, mixing scholarly comment with slightly sharp-edged polemic about current American life. Perhaps in the desire to write something accessible to a wider audience, a certain inelegance of formulation occasionally glosses over complex issues too.

The book opens with the text of 'the three biblical versions of the ten commandments', which turn out to be Exodus 20, Deuteronomy 5, and rather surprisingly what Coogan calls 'the ritual decalogue' in Exodus 34. Clearly there are overlaps between this text and the other two, but surely it rather begs the issue to call this the same text, and then in turn to draw conclusions about how flexible the text was! Coogan does not note that among the massive recent literature on the ten commandments (some of it approvingly cited in a brief final bibliography) no other book bluntly asserts a three-fold and deeply variable recension of one single text.

Four brief chapters explore framing issues of context and approach. These include useful summaries

of ancient treaties; textual variation (despite the caveat noted above); and a brief discussion of dating, which Coogan sees as possibly located in the period of the Judges, c. 12^{th}–10^{th} centuries BC. A lengthy chapter on 'Original Meanings' then offers a broad-based reading of the details of the text. This is more or less a standard critical exegesis, but with some notable simplifications, perhaps for ease of general reading? Thus 'do not kill' is dismissed as an unhelpful translation, despite the complexities of unravelling how the terminology is used in different biblical traditions; while the wife is persistently described as 'belonging' to the husband even though most discussions of ANE social structure tend towards seeing 'wife' as a category that does not map straightforwardly between then and now.

The book ends with some chapters on authority, applicability and negotiability of the ten commandments. Coogan's own view, made clear by the end, is that this is one among many influential texts, and might be so honoured in contemporary US life as long as it is not elevated to any kind of public or authoritative status. He is particularly enamoured of the last six commandments, especially if edited to remove any reference to Yahweh.

Coogan is clearly frustrated with American conservative Christianity and Judaism, and indeed with his own Catholic upbringing in one or two places. This is not a book without merit regarding the text, but one feels that it might have been a more subtle and thoughtful contribution to contemporary socio-political American reflection had it not let the frustration show quite so obviously, and had it managed to avoid setting up so many somewhat flat-footed literalist readings apparently for no other purpose than to knock them down again.

St John's College, Richard S. Briggs
Durham University

Abraham: The Story of a Life. By Joseph Blenkinsopp. Pp. xv, 240, Grand Rapids/Cambridge, Eerdmans, 2015, £19.99/$29.00.

The emeritus professor of Biblical Studies at Notre Dame, USA, extends his list of commentaries on biblical figures - including David, the prophets, Isaiah, and Ezra-Nehemiah - with this superb discursive commentary on the Abraham cycle, Genesis 11-25. He joins the majority of contemporary scholars in holding that Jacob (later 'Israel) was the iconic patriarch who received promises of land and people, whose son Joseph explained the descent into Egypt, the oppression, Moses, the exodus, the conquest of Canaan and the fulfilment of the promises in the kingdom of Saul-David-Solomon. Sand was thrown into the gears of this story, however, with the loss, first, of the northern kingdom to the Assyrians and then the loss of Judah to the Babylonians, with the deportation of the upper classes outside the land Yahweh had given to his people. The national story had to be re-written to take account of these unanticipated setbacks. This took place most likely during the time 'Yahud' was a province in the Persian empire, with priestly scribes supplying the core plot with the help of deuteronomist historians adding complicating features, and later additions into the Hellenistic period.

Basically the tribal genealogy was extended *backwards* from Jacob, with a new patriarch introduced who would come at God's command from *outside* Canaan *to* the promised land (thus repeating – or 'anticipating' - the later 'exodus' from Egypt, and whose conduct would serve as a model for the now-returning deportees as to how they should behave both towards God (instant obedience, even under severe testing – unlike Moses' hesitance and questioning) and towards the people they would find there – native Jews who were not interested in the new self-segregating policies the deportees brought back with them and who resisted giving back the land they had taken over, and the other Canaanite tribes - just as Abraham had to purchase decorously a burial plot for his wife Sarah, as a 'first instalment' on what would become with David the full 'kingdom of Israel' - which Abraham would never see. The purpose of this addition was to supply consolation, assurance, and direction to a disoriented people by first assuring them that Yahweh had not deserted them. The priest-prophet Ezekiel had surprised them earlier with his vision of the *kabod*, the divine glory, departing from the temple and appearing in Babylon as a mobile chariot throne; thus their patronal deity could apparently 'travel' and be effective outside Canaan. The promises made to Jacob (and before him to Abraham) would be fulfilled. However, the deuteronomist authors added the reality of sin, and the reaction by God with punishment to bring home the point that they must become a 'holy' people worthy of his covenantal and providential care. In fact, the history of God's relations with the human race now becomes a series of disasters, in which God first came close to destroying and calling off the experiment he had

started, followed by a new initiative on his part to see if he could find a 'holy remnant' who would respond better to the opportunity he had opened to 'walk in God's presence'. The Noah cycle was inserted even before the Law was given, to show how serious is God's threat, and incidentally to reduce the human population to only eight, who were then reassured through a new covenant and could be linked through genealogy to all the peoples of the earth. Yahweh, the patron deity of the Israelites, is shown to be one with the creator God of the whole world and of all people; everything is in his hands.

In their unprecedented and precarious situation, the deportees needed a role model to re-assure them of God's fidelity and to show them how to act, in this, their new 'exodus' back into Canaan. Abraham was enlisted for this role; he was severely tested, even to being told by his supposedly 'faithful' God to sacrifice his only son, the unique basis for the future people, but he always responded with immediate trust and obedience. St Paul and the gospels urge their fellow Jews to reach back to a time before their self-segregating policies raised by the Mosaic Law to retrieve a 'circumcision of the heart' into faith, hope, and trust by which Abraham was judged righteous and lived, as Blenkinsopp concludes, 'in the presence of God'.

Heythrop Journal Patrick Madigan

The Call of Abraham: Essays on the Election of Israel in Honor of Jon D. Levenson. Edited by Gary A. Anderson and Joel S. Kaminsky. Pp v, 390, Notre Dame, Indiana, University of Notre Dame Press, 2013, £42.00.

This eclectic collection of fifteen essays is a tribute to Jon Levenson, marking a sustained engagement with his thesis that the particularity of Israel's election ensures the universality of God's relationship with all humankind. Organized chronologically by subject matter, the scholarly material ranges from lexical analysis of Hebrew texts (Garr) to theological appropriations of Luther and Calvin (Schramm and Batnitzky). Overall, this diverse anthology offers three major themes emergent from the call of Abraham.

First, the question of why Israel was chosen. As Levenson has shown, the narrative of 'beloved son' winds through Jewish and Christian Scriptures. For authors in *The Call of Abraham*, the events surrounding the Akedah show forth God's mysterious and inscrutable affection for the chosen people. Madigan sees the Akedah as an intersection point between God and humanity, and the opening of a community faithful to God. Pivotal events like the near-sacrifice of Isaac, for Kaminsky and Schifferdecker, highlight the ambiguous privilege of being elected to suffer—to bless the world, but also to be held accountable for its course. Clifford notes that, in a theocentric universe, there is always space for a sovereign God to intervene and direct Israel toward the fulfilment of its calling. Through the exilic period and beyond, the drama of Israel's election is continually replayed. For example, Hirshman's midrashic study reveals that Jerusalem's temple was viewed both as a locus of international judgment and as a peaceful house of prayer for all people. While modern Biblical scholarship tended to see Judaism as exclusivist and particularistic, this anthology—and particularly Batnitzky's piece, which engages twentieth century Jewish scholars like Wyschogrod and Rosenzweig—embodies the growing consensus that God's particular love for Israel makes possible God's love for humanity as a whole.

The second predominant theme involves Scripture and the ramifications of Israel's election. Almost all of the authors in this collection wrestle with a productive tension between the contingency of Israel's election (i.e. the need for works and obedience), and the inevitability of Israel's election (i.e. the gift faith or trust). The majority opinion is that these two aspects are of equal importance—to downplay one runs the risk of distorting a complex picture of divine-human interchange. To paint such a picture, the essays in this anthology offer a sweeping exegetical overview. Kaminsky, for example, hones in on the irrevocability of God's covenant with Israel. On the other hand, Schifferdecker emphasizes the need to bargain with God in the stories of Abraham and Job. Likewise, Batnitzky is convinced that God's election of the Jewish people depends on human action (318). But Garr, Moberly, and Anderson temper this view by critiquing the rigor of Deuteronomist texts. Specifically, Anderson sees Job as a bulwark against 'retribution theology' (116), and raises Tobit as an exemplar for the daily life of Hebrew faith. In the realm of pseudepigraphal literature, Henze and Kugel use the *Jubilees* to show that Israel's responsibilities change with the evolution of scriptural interpretation in history. Finally, Goering's impressive read of *Sirach* brings forward a compatibilism between divine sovereignty and human action, placing this text between the particularism of *Jubilees* and the universalism of third Isaiah.

The final major theme is theological. Does God's sovereign nature imply absolute mastery in the selection of the elect, or can there be room for distinction and ambiguity within the economy of salvation? Today, Jewish and Christian scholars are asking difficult questions about the relationship between God's irrevocable covenant with Israel and Christ's offer of sacramental life to all through the Church. Batnitzky and Schramm point out the historical animosity between these two positions (e.g. 293, 315), and Madigan parses the distinction between allegorical types and anti-types in the Church Fathers' views of Old Testament characters like Isaac (242). Marshall and Reasoner, however, are more optimistic. The latter argues that Paul ties salvation to the earthly flourishing of Israel (260). The former engages with Catholic tradition, from Aquinas to the Second Vatican Council, to show that 'Jews and Christians alike await the same Messiah' (343). Ending on an ecumenical note, *The Call of Abraham* accentuates God's particular choice (e.g. of a Jewish man who lived and died two thousand years ago) as what is necessary for humans to probe the mysterious ways of YHWH. While the anthology is loosely organized and sometimes in need of closer editing, common themes emerge when contemplating the whole. Specifically, the book explores fruitful questions about the source, development, and end of Israel's election. Scripture scholars are the target audience for the majority of the essays, but historians and theologians will also benefit from reading this volume, which reveals how assumptions about Jewish and Christian exegesis have changed over time.

Saint Louis University Benjamin Winter

Divine Evil? The Moral Character of the God of Abraham. Edited by Michael Bergmann, Michael J. Murray, Michael C. Rea. Pp. xii, 337, Oxford University Press, PB 2013 [HB 2011], $43.59.

'God certainly does not exist, and anyway it's all His fault.' This aphorism sums up the contradictions at the heart of this richly fascinating but rather unfocussed book. The words are borrowed from the late and much regretted Tony Judt and appear in an epigraph to the concluding essay here, by Howard Wettstein, 'God's Struggles'. Judt was not by then a practising Jew (and had not been for a long time), but Wettstein is. That an atheist should be cited by a believer is apt for a book which consists of scholarly debates about the eccentric and irascible sadist (for one contributor at least) who is the God of the Bible. The participants came from various backgrounds, so that atheists were pitted, as in the original Notre Dame conference, against theologians, biblical experts against professors of philosophy. The book is not entirely free of theological jargon ('the reflexive collation of the ontological and the economic', p. 299) or of editing errors (Judt's essay was a tribute to Leszek, not Leslie, Kolakowski), but for the most part it provides a feast of intelligent and challenging readings of the Hebrew, and to some extent the Christian, Bible.

'How might one even begin to come to terms with divinely mandated horror?' is the way that Wettstein's essay formulates the issue. Unlike some of the participants, he is neither inclined to minimize the problem nor to explain it away. Some take the view that since God has granted the gift of life he can justifiably withdraw it at will (p. 233), and after all, being with God in Heaven is likely to be better than life on earth. Hence the killing of babies, when divinely mandated, may be not only OK, but required. Others (Eleanor Stump in particular, but also Richard Swinburne) write about the need for Israel to learn gradually how to behave in light of its peculiar dispensation (being Chosen), and this takes rather a long time. The Canaanites are destroyed, or moved out, not so much because of their own behaviour as because of the way Israel refuses to learn its lessons. For some, questions of genre (allegory, stylized quasi-history for example) supervene and require a reading that does not go looking for historical fact: God does not require the destruction of the Amorites or Canaanites and the rest but rather wants readers of the narrative to destroy sin in their own lives. Other contributors argue that the Conquest, especially the elaborate story told in the Book of Joshua, should be read in the context of the Babylonian exile: it is thus projecting an 'ideal' representation of Israel's history and should not be taken literally.

Surprisingly few of the contributors (Gary A. Anderson, Nicholas Wolterstorff and Christopher Seitz) take into account the question of the historicity of the Conquest itself, but then that is largely because the point of the volume lies in debating what the Bible says about God, and so it will not make much difference whether the commands to destroy the Amalekites, women and infants too, in 1 Samuel 15.1-23, or the bashing of babies in Psalm 137, is an accurate reflection of what the ancient Israelites actually did. The Christians among the contributors wriggle even more uncomfortably than

their Jewish counterparts in their efforts to defend a perfect and omnipotent God. He after all is the one who, according to the New Testament, prepares eternal damnation for many of us, in whose new improved world the Law is even more stringent because inward and about desires as much as acts, who mandates the gory scenes of the final judgement, and who requires his own son to suffer a long and painful death. More than one of the Christian participants has honest trouble, for example, with Augustine's assumption that the rock on which the enemy babies are bashed is actually the Rock, Jesus Christ.

The intensity of the discussions and the powerful emotions evoked by several of the topics make the volume at times hard to put down. The author of the first essay, Louise Anthony, sets the tone for the non-believers. She is outraged that Moses is denied entry to the promised land because he has the temerity to strike a rock when God had told him simply to speak to it (39). In a witty essay, she shows that what really matters to God is not adultery and murder but whether the deed is authorized. Nathan the prophet tells David, who has committed both sins, that because he admitted his guilt God has 'put away his sin' and vacated the death sentence. 'Nevertheless, because by this deed you have utterly scorned the Lord, the child that is born to you shall die', as the text of 2 Samuel 12:14 says. Anthony adds: 'Adultery and murder are one thing: dissing the Lord is *serious*'.

In spite of the high level of philosophical sophistication shown by several of the essayists, the book as a whole suffers from the lack of any clear definition of its goals or its general purpose. The word 'evil', for example, is never defined, nor did the organizers of the conference, and so the editors of the volume, apparently ever ask themselves whether they need to try for a definition. Thus no-one broaches the key issue of whether the word should be read primarily as a noun or an adjective. In the title it is apparently a noun qualified by the adjective 'divine', yet the book never quite allows itself to reverse the words and invert the concept: is God evil? That is understandable for a book written within the traditional or orthodox Judeo-Christian framework, though some attention might have been given to Gnosticism or other heretical tendencies. Marcion is mentioned more than once, not only as a stimulus to the formation of the Christian canon, but also for his key notion that the god of the Old Testament is not the same as the god of the New. But his views get little discussion. This allows the participants to avoid any unpleasant mudslinging between Jews and Christians, and the conference was convened, after all, at a leading Roman Catholic university. Only once does anyone quote Isaiah 45.7, and it is, once again, Howard Wettstein: 'I am Y-H-W-H and there is none else:/ I form light and create darkness,/ Peace is my doing, and I create evil,/ I Y-H-W-H do all these things'. He explains that he prefers to cite the Tetragrammaton in this way because the form 'the Lord' obscures the fact that it is a proper name, and thus introduces what he regards as inappropriate distance and formality. Indeed his argument goes on to describe a god who is far from perfect, who is angry and resentful, who changes his mind, who is subject to flattery, who struggles.

With this kind of god, the one portrayed in the Song of Songs for example (and Wettstein stresses the erotic component), it is possible to have a personal relationship, 'someone with whom we share our deepest longings, pains, and joys. There is also the suggestion of a certain longing on the part of God, for intimacy with His people, for sharing their love in the context of a transformed world'. Wettstein does not mention Kierkegaard but he is surprisingly one of only two contributors to spend time, as Kierkegaard did so movingly in *Fear and Trembling*, discussing the parallels between the Book of Job and the *Akedah* (God's command to Abraham to kill Isaac). Louise Anthony is the other, and she adds Adam and Eve to the paradigm. Her essay poses the question 'Does God Love us?' and answers with a loud 'no': God is 'a terrible parent'. Wettstein's rather more sympathetic reading (he is a believer after all) argues that both Abraham and Job are 'moral heroes' precisely because they challenge what they regard as God's injustice, and both are, eventually, induced to go along with him, to follow the path he lays out. In the end, Wettstein's essay reproduces what is called several times elsewhere in the volume 'sceptical theism' but in a more memorable way. A student of his had said that one needs an understanding of doctrine in order to know to whom one prays. Not so, replied Wettstein. 'One prays; one achieves (sometimes) a sense of intimate contact. But exactly who or what "stands on the other end" is another question, a matter well beyond us.' A Christian would, I suppose, have had another response.

The volume is introduced by the invocation of a quite different God, one who is 'morally perfect and unconditionally deserving of devotion, obedience, love, and worship'. Therein lies the problem. For this same God condones and even commands such 'moral atrocities' as slavery, rape, genocide, and child sacrifice. If these 'texts constitute divine revelation', as the authors rather awkwardly put it, how can that God be worshipped? The time is ripe for a reappraisal both because of terrorist attacks

performed in the name of God — which seems to mean Islamist attacks, since Samson is never mentioned — and because the so-called 'New Atheists' like Richard Dawkins, Daniel Dennett and the late Christopher Hitchens have made much of the way 'the sacred texts of the great theistic religions' glory in such violence (p. 3). A few participants add that global politics should also be considered in this light — or darkness. In an essay simply entitled 'What About the Canaanites?' Gary A. Anderson discusses the way the Bible has authorized the activities of the Puritans in New England, the Boers in South Africa, settlers in Australia, as well as right-wing Zionists and their Christian allies in Israel. But he continues that, since God promised the land to Abraham and his descendants, they have a providential or 'supernatural right' to it. And anyway, its present inhabitants were wicked. So... er... that's all right then.

The helpful introduction contains brief abstracts of each of the essays as well as a useful list of the various options and strategies for dealing with the problematic texts. One can a) deny that the texts are divinely inspired, an option taken by three of the contributors, all atheists (Louise Anthony, Edwin Curley for whom God may be 'a sadistic bastard', Evan Fales), and in some degree one believer (Wes Morrison); one can b) allow for the texts as inspired but deny that they say what they say (early Christian fathers like Origen, Jerome, even Augustine took that line quite often, preferring spiritual allegory to literal history; in this volume for example, 'It does not follow from God's giving the command 'Exterminate the Jerichoites' that God's end was that there be no Jerichoites', p. 175); or one can c) allow the texts to be inspired and insist that they serve a greater good, one of which might be the punishment of sin. A slightly more savoury version of this strategy is often called the 'unknown goods' defence. We lack the cognitive capacity, or perhaps simply the information, necessary to see how the destruction of Canaanite children might be a good thing. We cannot, furthermore, know that God was wrong to command the destruction of Jericho, since God and human beings do not share what Mark Murphy calls 'a dikaiological order'. God in fact can do no wrong. By definition.

Since this is a book constructed by philosophers of religion, it is perhaps to be expected that there are few considerations of the kind that have been common in the scholarly worlds that generated those magnificent compilations usually known as ANET *(Ancient Near Eastern Texts*) or ANET2. Indeed the editors admit that Ancient Near eastern culture in general, especially literary styles, are areas that need what they call 'further research'. Even more striking is the absence of any real discussion of what constitutes the authority of scripture or religious tradition. True, the formation of the Jewish and Christian canons is too complex an issue to be succinctly treated, although one essay, by Christopher Seitz, does make use of the interpretive 'canonical tradition' associated with Brevard Childs in order to explain, or excuse, the story of the Conquest. Throughout the volume, however, if the idea that only part of a divinely inspired text should be authoritative for either belief or practice is raised, it is immediately rejected, virtually without discussion (eg 181). And exactly how a text gets to be regarded as divinely inspired in the first place is not considered, even though one fine chapter (by Evan Fales) is called 'Satanic Verses' (without mentioning Rushdie or the whole issue of Satanic interference with inspiration on which Rushdie's book turns). Rarely is it even allowed that the Bible is actually more like a library, consisting of books that conflict with each other. In Richard Swinburne's fine essay on the history of interpretation, this idea, that the Bible is a patchwork of passages from different centuries and cultures, and has thus been variously and not always literally interpreted, somehow and rather desperately requires that the whole Bible be regarded as inspired (213). Thus Paul at 1 Corinthians 9.9-10 could deny that 'You shall not muzzle an ox while it is treading out the grain' should be read literally. In fact it means (a long tradition of priests and prophets speaks here) that congregations should provide adequate remuneration of church leaders. Or the baby-bashing verse at Psalm 137:9 can be read as a blessing on those who destroy their evil inclinations through the power of Christ. Elsewhere the concept of a divinely inspired bible is ridiculed by a splendidly articulate sceptic like Edwin Curley, whose debate with Peter van Inwangen is the only place the problem of inspiration or divine revelation is seriously broached.

The title for the original conference, though not retained for the book, contained a tag from Isaiah 55:8: 'My ways are not your ways'. That motto was taken to mean what one sceptic calls the '*Higher Ways Objection*' although in its original context, as Edwin Curley points out (68) the statement simply means that God is more forgiving than men usually are. The change of tone in the new title certainly makes for a more eye-catching concept. The addition of the question mark aptly sums up the entire issue.

Université de Lausanne Neil Forsyth

'Israel Served the Lord': The Book of Joshua as Paradoxical Portrait of Faithful Israel. By Rachel M. Billings. Pp. x, 177, Notre Dame, IN, University of Notre Dame Press, 2013, $30.00.

In this expansion of her doctoral dissertation, Billings takes up the apparent contradiction in the enigmatic book of Joshua between the proclaimed verdict at the end that Israel 'served the Lord during all the days of Joshua' (24:31) and the embarrassing and apparently disobedient or unfaithful actions recorded in the course of Israel's entry into the promised land, as well as its incomplete annihilation of the native Canaanites in flagrant opposition to Yahweh's express command. Billings reviews the scholarly conversation starting with von Rad and Noth and coming down through Brevard Childs, Richard Nelson, David Gunn, Daniel Hawk, and Gordon Mitchell, but finds the work of Robert Polzin the most helpful for building her own more adequate explanation of what is going on here.

A Deuteronomist redactor has edited the book during the Exile, including it in his history for a Jewish readership that has now lost Temple, King, and Land. His selection of the episodes and evidence of Israel's less-than-complete observance of the Law it was recently given by Moses to grow into, shows that the failures that have led finally to the loss of everything Yahweh promised are no late development but started even at the beginning, as Israel began its apparently successful entry into the Land. But the Law has to be 'applied', and thereby 'extended' to situations not foreseen by the law-giver - and thus 'interpreted' by Israel without direct supervision by Yahweh. The spies sent to reconnoitre Jericho are given shelter and protection by a Canaanite prostitute, Rahab, who professes faith in their God and extracts a promise from them to let her stay on the Land. Is this a violation of *herem*? Achan secretly keeps some of the booty from the victory for himself, thereby bringing punishment upon all Israel; he must be identified and destroyed. But such severity cannot become a knee-jerk reflex; rather, the Law must be adapted to more complex situations. Israel finds it has sworn toleration oaths to sly Gibeonites who claimed to come from afar when actually they live close by; again, this appears to violate *herem*. Should Israel act immediately in fear of its own destruction? Instead it decides that the oaths sworn before its God must be given priority; it was its own mistake not to check further into these strangers' story. And nothing happens; there is no punishment. It was apparently the right decision once the oaths had been taken. The Gibeonites are treated appropriately, tolerated but reduced to bond servants for the cult of Yahweh. The tribes whose land allotments are on the far side of the Jordan build an altar that *could* violate exclusive devotion to Yahweh; what should the other tribes do? Israel has learned from its past mistake; now caution, investigation, and discussion, rather than an immediate, fear-based response, diffuses the anxiety of the situation.

The author concludes that, despite appearances, Israel *has* indeed 'served the Lord' under Joshua. The Law is a subtle and flexible discipline that requires gradual maturation to grow into and 'occupy', even as Israel seeks simultaneously to 'occupy' the Land. Apparent acts of failure or disobedience are to be resolved by subsequent acts of repentance and forgiveness, after which Israel can again benefit from the presence and support of Yahweh, in a 'pedagogy' designed to show that the Law is an open-ended relationship to be continually re-negotiated by adults rather than a terrifying set of orders to be obeyed rigidly by children. Even for a readership that has lost everything, the future is wide open and everything is possible, as Yahweh is only too ready to restore his covenant fidelity once Israel shows the first sign of repentance.

Heythrop College Patrick Madigan

The Lost Temple of Israel (Revised Edition). By Zvi Koenigsberg. Pp. xi, 197, Boston, Academic Studies Press, 2015, $39.00.

Scepticism about the history of Israel as recorded in the Pentateuch had recently become *de rigueur*, but now the pendulum has begun to swing the other way. And the key text is not one of the historical books, but (surprisingly) *Leviticus* and the larger *Torat Kohanim*, or *Laws of the Priests* of which it is a part. It had been assumed that the 'D' (for the Deuteronomic History) strand in the Pentateuch was composed after the reign of Josiah, no earlier than 620 BCE, and that the 'P' (for 'Priestly') strand is late, probably from the Second Temple period; but if the 'P' strand is early, and can ratify or corroborate much of what the 'D' author says, this means the 'D' strand is early as well, and out of a clear blue sky Jewish history as recorded in the Pentateuch is back in business. This is what Koenigsberg is proposing.

Koenigsberg worked with Dr. Adam Zertal on the excavation of an archaeological site half way up Mount Ebal near the ancient city of Shechem. Underneath thousands of pottery shards they could date to the early Settlement period, they uncovered a strange structure involving two interior walls which they gradually realized resembled in outline and dimensions (but smaller) the design of the altar in the second Jerusalem Temple, which the Romans had destroyed but which was recorded in the *Mishnah*. This was an astounding discovery. The building was an 'altar for burnt offerings' that quickly revealed itself as the first Temple the Israelites built after crossing the Jordan river and entering Canaan (but 50 kms north of Jericho, where the Bible records this happening). The laws as recorded in *Leviticus* are for the care of the Ark of the Covenant which was housed in this first Temple until it was moved to David's Temple in Jerusalem, after the destruction of which by the Babylonians it was lost. It has been assumed that the phrase 'the Place that He will choose', which occurs 34 times in *Deuteronomy* but nowhere else in the Pentateuch, was referring to the first Temple in Jerusalem. But *Deuteronomy* includes an episode that describes an important ceremony – the story of the blessings and the curses - that was to take place at Gerizim and Ebal. The Israelites came into Canaan from opposite Shechem, a prominent Canaanite city, achieved a sense of national unity there (this first Temple functioned for about a century), and dispersed from there. But why did Ebal subsequently fall out of the record? Genesis 48 records that when Joseph brought his two sons to his father Jacob for the patriarchal blessing, Jacob mysteriously crossed his arms and ended up blessing the younger, Ephraim, first and the elder, Manasseh, second. In fact, this is the scribe's *ex post factum* explanation for the transfer of the Israelites central holy site from Ebal, which belonged to Manasseh, to Shiloh, which was in the region that belonged to Ephraim. Gideon, a descendant of Manasseh, was an important figure in Israel, but Joshua, the descendant of Ephraim, was more important. Thus Shiloh supplanted Ebal after about a century, and the cult was centralized there. This became the biblical memory, and the first Temple at Ebal was airbrushed out of Israel's history.

Heythrop College Patrick Madigan

David, King of Israel, and Caleb in Biblical Memory. By Jacob L. Wright. Pp. xii, 271, Cambridge/NY, Cambridge University Press, 2014, £55.00/$80.00.

This text performs a revolution in our interpretation of the Hebrew Scriptures. The 'historical books' of the Old Testament are not to be interpreted as even an attempt at an accurate record or reconstruction of 'what really happened', but rather on the model of 'war commemorations' from long ago, in which the valorous exploits of some are exaggerated, and the shameful betrayals of others are denounced, to provide grounds for contemporary claims to land possession, water rights, 'belonging' to Israel or reputation and status within the distant and very different world of exile, where the agendas of interested parties and lobbying groups manipulate and freely create whole traditions to underlie these later demands. That the Book of Numbers contains deviations from the Book of Exodus in order to justify claims by the priests in exile for a role and status in a future return and reconstruction of the Temple, has long been recognized; now this interpretation is extended to all the historical books; in their case, however, we lack the sources they worked from; these have to be postulated as a function of who benefits from the 're-write' they produced. In approaching them as straightforward 'history' we have misunderstood their purpose and asked the wrong kinds of questions; this left us puzzled over apparent contradictions, gaps in the story, and differing evaluations of the same person or event. We have been thrown off by puzzling aspects – for example, the reason for the inclusion of a host of details, vanished place names and obscure tribal references - whose role in the story in advocacy of the briefs of the authors or redactors we failed to grasp.

Originally there were two separate accounts of the exploits of Saul for the northern kingdom – 'Israel' or Benjamin - and David, the youngest of eight brothers without material prospects who became a mercenary for the Philistines, a warlord for the southern tribes, and eventually 'king' of Judah. After the loss of the northern kingdom to the Assyrians in 722, scribes for the southern kingdom spliced the two accounts together to make David a 'successor' to Saul in a unified kingdom which until then had never existed; southern ideologues were offering inclusion or 'belongingness' to refugees or the remnant in the north, with whom they had previously been frequently at war, by accepting their tribal god Yahweh as their own, continuing and indeed adopting the name 'Israel', and depicting David, the southern hero, showing

deference and consideration for Saul the northern hero, to soften the blow of their recent defeat as well as a reversal of their relationship within a possible assimilation and submission to Judah, with the new capital at Jerusalem rather than Hebron. The experience of defeat is again the essential backdrop for the scribes writing in exile in Babylon, for the version of Jewish history they produced; the life of David is artfully crafted to move from a 'good example' to a 'horrible warning', to illustrate what happens when the community of the 'people' who fight with their deity for their land and Temple is replaced by a 'state' where a powerful but distant monarchy wages wars for its own interests – and eventually loses everything to the great empire of the day.

The history books are not repositories or recordings of events, but arguments over historical *memories* that provide the only leverage now, in exile, for how the people should maintain faith and continue along a more sure-footed path into the future. Read this book and put on new spectacles by which to appreciate the books you know so well. There is theology there, but in constructed cultural *memories* rather than archives of uncontested or freely admitted historical *realities*.

Heythrop College Patrick Madigan

The Rebellion of Absalom. By Keith Bodner. Pp. viii, 122, London/NY, Routledge, 2014, £24.99.

The story of Absalom's rebellion in *2 Samuel* ranks as the most elaborate and extensively narrated political event in the Hebrew Bible. While fully conversant with the advances made through source criticism and form criticism, Bodner chooses to join Robert Alter and Meir Sternberg in focusing on the literary artistry of the final editor in bringing these pieces together to offer the reader a 'warts-and-all' picture of the greatest hero in Jewish history, who seemed momentarily to bring to fruition the promises God had made to the Jewish people through the covenant under Moses. At the nadir of his fortunes, as he trudges out of Jerusalem fleeing his 'golden son' who seems the 'new David', David touches bottom, ends his evasion and denial, confesses his many sins, and appeals directly to God to be faithful to his sensational promise to him. And God *is* faithful, reversing his fortune in a gradual but extraordinary way so that David survives and overcomes this apparently legitimate rebellion by his most beloved son whom he has deeply wronged by doing nothing when the latter's sister is raped by the mentally-troubled oldest son and heir apparent. God is faithful to David, but David still must live through the full consequences of his many departures from Yahweh's commands that began all the way back with his first marriages, losing children of unions that never should have taken place, drinking to its dregs a cup he had hoped to lay aside because he was God's favourite - like Israel, His 'special choice'. Just the opposite, and thus this story becomes a stern warning to Israel as well, who will shortly lose unity, monarchy, land and temple. Onto this deepest plot of mutual fidelity is overlaid a brutally honest and shockingly cruel and complete counter-plot that exposes the high standard to which God holds those whom He has chosen. At the end of the rebellion David disgraces and humiliates himself by wailing all night in the presence of his troops over the loss of the son who was the man he should have been, but was not; at the end of his life, still stunned, David has to be reminded by Bathsheba that he has promised the throne to Solomon, whom he appears to have forgotten.

Bodner writes incisively, brings in scholarship lightly at appropriate moments, and at every turn in the plot puts the reader in contact with every parallel situation from elsewhere in the Hebrew Bible; a few of his interpretations, however, may be questioned. He sees Absalom's character as essentially ambiguous, motivated from the beginning as much by a calculating ambition and narcissistic vanity as by outrage over David's inaction in the face of Amnon's rape of Tamar. But burning the fields of Joab to force a meeting with David after his return from Geshur is not the act of an opportunist seeking to ingratiate himself with the powerful men in the kingdom in preparation for an eventual *putsch* – and it will eventually cost him his life, when Joab disobeys David's order to 'go gentle with the lad'. Reciprocally, David has not turned 'against' Absalom after the latter has fled to Geshur, but sincerely recognizes his fault and longs for Absalom. David is the 'ambiguous commodity' or 'loose cannon' Joab must deal with, not Absalom. Joab is loyal to the regime, but not necessarily to its current occupant. He is a pure Machiavellian and political realist. He brings Absalom back following the principle 'Keep your friends close, and your enemies closer'. He has no feelings one way or the other for Absalom, but he wants him nearby so that he can respond quickly when he sees which way he is going to jump.

Heythrop College Patrick Madigan

Zadok's Heirs: The Role and Development of the High Priesthood in Ancient Israel. By Deborah W. Rooke. Pp. xiii, 386, Oxford University Press, 2000, pb. 2012, $58.00.

In this revision of her doctoral dissertation, now reissued by Oxford University Press in an attractive paperbook format, Rooke challenges an assumption that has been in place since the time of Wellhausen, that 'once the line of Davidic descendants fell into obscurity or otherwise failed, the high priest moved into the position of being the highest-ranking native authority figure in the Judaean community, thereby emerging from his spiritual enclave into the arena of government and politics.' (p. 1) In short, 'the high priest became a substitute for the monarch and as such sooner or later rose to prominence in the civil sphere.' (p. 4) After exposing the ideology of the high priesthood in the Priestly Writer (P), Rooke studies the role of the high priest in the Deuternomistic History, from the wilderness wanderings to the Conquest, the Judges, and the Monarchy, then in the absence of the monarchy during the Exile, in the diaspora Temples in Egypt, and finally during the Greek period and the introduction of Hellenism which troubled the Maccabees and the Hasmoneans. Employing an unhurried historical-critical method, Rooke succeeds in showing that the high priesthood never became an office that bestowed *ex officio* civil leadership prerogatives; rather, the basic function of the high priest remained that of a cultic figure. Even during the Greek period when the duties of cultic officiation and political leadership were vested in the same individual, 'the high priesthood was a function of the political leadership role rather than the leadership role being a function of the priestly role'. This late period went back to the model of 'sacred monarchy' that had prevailed centuries earlier, where the king was regarded as the ultimate authority in both the civil and religious spheres.

The feast this book offers is the thorough engagement with the scholarship on each point as it becomes relevant to this thesis as either challenge or support; the reader is given a masterful overview of the developing discussion and a persuasive demonstration of how the evidence falls on the conservative side of this important question: the kings sometimes added the high priestly honour to an already-established political and military identity, but the high priests never aspired to cross from the cultic arena to the political or military spheres.

An aspect Rooke exposes but cannot here develop is how far Hellenism infected and disturbed the theory and practice of 'holiness as separation' that was axiomatic to the traditional Jewish sense of proper cult, hence the prosperity of the nation, and hence of the kind of 'priest-king' that might bring to an end their extreme oppositions and embarrassing conflicts during especially the Hasmonean period. The aristocracy and middle classes became and remained strongly hellenizers; an ultimately satisfying priest-king would have to find some way to combine this with the insistence on a proper Davidic and priestly ancestry as well as zeal for the Law and execution of proper cult to deliver a new point of stability for the people. Here Alcimus, the last Zadokite priest-ruler, is instructive. He was a hellenizer, and attempted to demolish part of the Temple complex, persuing a policy of anti-particularism, to render freer access to the Temple for everyone. Specifically, he tried to knock down the wall separating the court of the Gentiles from the rest of the Temple (p. 279). The rendition in the LXX of the various titles for the high priest found in the Hebrew originals became most commonly *ho hiereus ho Christos*. Jesus found his programme waiting for him. He would deflect the zeal for proper cult from a preoccupation with external form into a study of interior motive, dismantling along the way the ideology of 'holiness as separation' and particularism through an ethic of service, self-sacrifice, and inclusive reconciliation.

Heythrop College Patrick Madigan

Jeroboam's Royal Drama. By Keith Bodner. Pp. x, 167, Oxford University Press, 2012, $220.00.

The rendition of Jeroboam's story in 1 Kings 11-14 reflects the ideology of the Deuteronomic historians writing from exile in Babylon after the destruction of their Temple in 587 BCE, in spite of proper cult, whose neglect they charge Jeroboam with as the chief cause for his own demise and eventually that of the new Northern Kingdom of Israel, of which he was the first king. This does not mean that the account in 1 Kings does not bring forward earlier traditions or that it cannot be mined for historical clues as to what really happened. Bodner is primarily interested, however, in the narrative-critical aspects of the edited final version; his study is a close reading of these books for word-play,

repetition, analogous situations, etc., bringing them into detailed comparison with other parts of the Hebrew Bible, to bring to the surface just how the text produces the effects it does and how it would have impacted its first Jewish audience. In this he is fully abreast of the current scholarship and makes the reader the beneficiary of his textual learning.

At the same time one may wonder if he goes to the deepest level in plumbing the reason for Jeroboam's sudden attack of self-doubt and quick demise thereafter, subsequent to his equally impressive rise from a widow's son from the North whom Solomon placed over the *courvé* of the house of Joseph as part of his building program. The degree of corruption, oppression, and manipulation of the priesthood and prophets under Solomon has recently been brought to the surface by scholars. Jeroboam had risen through industry and patience and was not associated with the Solomonic oppression from which the northern tribes suffered, notoriously under the overseer Adoniram. At the death of Solomon Jeroboam was the clear favourite over the true heir, Rehoboam, such that the latter fled back to Judah and Jerusalem; the ten northern tribes then separated from Judah to form a kingdom of 'Israel' under Jeroboam. The prophet Ahijah assured him of Yahweh's support for a David-like everlasting dynasty if he would continue to walk in the ways of the covenant. Three factors, however, may have led to Jeroboam's reversal and failure. First, the new and complicated arrangement of having two kingdoms with a single Temple and cult in Jerusalem may have seemed too daunting and unworkable to Jeroboam. Secondly, Jeroboam seems to have been most comfortable as a second-in-command, an industrious and loyal underworker, but not as someone promoted and thrust into command himself - perhaps a bit like Saul, he did not naturally aspire to such a position. Finally, his self-doubt was not a personal weakness but reflected his awareness of the personalities of his fellow-northerners. These interpreted their new independence as permission to return to their imagined autonomous 'wilderness' ways, as well as to mix freely with the practices of their Canaanite neighbours, rather than maintain a Jerusalemite exclusivism. Under such circumstances syncretism was inevitable, bringing with it a sense both of awe and of embarrassed inferiority when they made their annual pilgrimages, taking in the splendours of the orthodox Solomonic Temple. The self-doubt was not personal, but communal; Jeroboam knew his 'country-boy' constituency too well. He tried to stabilize them by fashioning 'golden calves' and mimicking the Jerusalem liturgy with an alternative cult of their own, but this was no lasting solution. Perhaps the challenge would have defeated any man; in any case, it defeated Jeroboam and the later northern kings.

Heythrop College Patrick Madigan

Esther in Ancient Jewish Thought. By Aaron Koller. Pp. xiii, 262, Cambridge/NY, Cambridge University Press, 2014, £60.00/$95.00.

Koller has hit upon an ingenious method for identifying the original intent of this anonymous (not to say 'mysterious') author of this second-most-commented-upon book in the Hebrew Bible (after *Genesis*) – which really doesn't belong in the Bible at all! He meticulously examines its reception history, positive and negative, and then notes the differing geographical, chronological, political and sociological 'locations' of the various audiences that have reacted to this puzzling book. For 'puzzling' it is, not to say 'controversial', not to say 'scandalous' – not to say 'heretical'! For it presents a totally secular view of Jews handling the supposedly temporary or anomalous situation of being a minority in exile, not lamenting, groaning, or longing to return to the 'promised land', Jerusalem, or the Temple (which are not even mentioned) but fully assimilated, rising to high positions within the civil service of the host culture, inter-marrying with the ruler without observing any Jewish practices at all, and dealing with the recurring problem of jealousy and unjust persecution by their own wits and wiles without calling upon their 'God', whom they treat as absent and in general unavailable for miraculous intervention. In short, this apparently innocent story was unquestionably composed as an 'anti-type' or incendiary provocation to delight the lay audiences in exile in Babylon or Alexandria who were doing very well, thank you very much, and to outrage the religious elites by contradicting at every point the conventional plot of every other story of Jews in exile in the Bible – famously Daniel – even undermining Joseph's poorly concealed bitterness by exaggerating it into comfort, lightness, and comedy. The author did not write this book to have it become part of the canon; on the contrary, he wrote it as a blasphemy against

Jewish faith and practice to reconcile Jews to exile as a permanent condition – indeed, as the 'new Israel' – in which God's 'actions' are no actions and 'redemption' takes the form, not of an unrealistic, wish-fulfilling return to autonomy or a new 'exodus' to the promised land, but staying in place and dealing with the problems of being an oft-scapegoated minority that keeps to itself and minds its own business by mastering the laws and 'rules of the game' that prevail in the dominant culture and making them work in their favour. Koller shows how this assimilationist strategy worked well for the Jews under Persia, less well under Rome (despite Josephus' efforts in this direction), mainly because Rome had an equally egocentric sense of its own pre-eminence, superiority, and universal vocation. Rivalry was inevitable. The common people loved the story and the resulting feast of Purim (although it told them not to fast during Passover), but the later rabbis broke their heads trying to assimilate this depth-charge into the calm waters of their traditional master narrative – for instance, by rewriting it as in *Judith*, or by placing it before *Ezra* and *Nehemiah* as a 'first' (secular) redemption achieving survival before the second (supernatural) 'redemption' of a new *exodus*, to which it served as a platform – a first pulse in a two-beat syncopation. This was the only way it could be domesticated, but Koller has allowed the 'teeth' to grow back into the de-fanged version and given the book back its 'sting'.

Heythrop College Patrick Madigan

Judith (Commentaries on Early Jewish Literature). By Deborah Levine Gera. Pp. xii, 571, Berlin/Boston, Walter de Gruyter, 2014, €119, 95.

Gera has produced a handsome addition to the de Gruyter commentaries. Her scholarship is exhaustive but lightly worn, and her prose is a pleasure to read, touching on all the relevant issues in an unhurried style, giving to each point its proper emphasis yet refusing to be pressured by fads, so that she builds confidence in the reader and has him on her side when she refuses to rush to judgment, and at the end of a long survey can announce simply 'We don't know' or 'We can't say.' The reader has grown through the experience. Further, Gera brings a classicist's background to this study which enables her to point out, beyond the author's evident mastery of the traditional Hebrew and Aramaic writings, influences from classical Greek history, tragedy, and comedy, the Septuagint, as well as earlier compositions in deliberately affected 'Septuagint Greek' that are echoed in the stereotypical story patterns of this book composed probably about 100 B.C.E. 'give or take a decade or two at either end' (p. 44). This Hellenistic Jewish book knows of the Hasmonean developments but not yet of the Roman incursion. By its bizarre introduction it advertises itself as an historically fictitious but deeply enjoyable and theologically inspiring re-expression of the standard Biblical credo of the fidelity of God to his chosen people by raising up a surprising and unprepossessing champion who can thwart and overturn the most dire threats that the foreign nations can throw against Israel and its Temple in Jerusalem. Judith is a composite figure (her name simply means 'Jewess') – 'beautiful and wise, a warrior and a widow, deceptive, bold, seductive, and pious' (p. 6) - what's not to like? The tale gives signs of being 're-written Bible' in the sense that the author may have wanted to give a 'corrected' or 'improved' version of basically the same story told slightly earlier about the 'Jew' – Judah Maccabeus – as well as Esther. Deciding whether it was composed originally in 'Septuagint Greek' (with classically elegant dialogue and descriptions) or is a translation from a Hebrew urtext is rendered difficult by opposing tendencies within the work. On the one side is a rigid, defiant, and even hostile deuternomistic orthodoxy which shows no concessions or softening accommodation towards the Gentile nations, which argues for a Palestinian origin for this Hellenistic work; on the other hand is the heavy use of irony and the playful attitude as the author encourages his Jewish audience to luxuriate in the humorous futility of the pagan nations falling over themselves as they attempt to harm Israel and end up being decimated themselves, which pushes the genre towards a Hellenistic novella, but intended for a Greek-speaking Jewish audience, perhaps in the diaspora.

There was as yet no 'Bible'; indeed, many of the texts now regarded as 'early Jewish' were 're-written Bible' – re-tellings with expansion or revision of the classical texts, with no sense of guilt or apology for the changes. Exact quotation as we know it was a rare thing; 'creative citation' was standard. What is evident is that Jewish theology was growing in all directions, making contact with Persian and Greek influences, expanding in an uncontrolled way that the later rabbis regarded ruefully as allowing the incendiary apocalyptic texts during the Roman period that encouraged the

revolts that led eventually to the loss of Jerusalem and the destruction of the Temple – and for many Hellenistic Jews, the inevitable end of deuternomistic belief. This led to the formation of the first canon, but the horse was already out of the barn.

Heythrop College Patrick Madigan

The Theology of the Book of Amos (Old Testament Theology). By John Barton. Pp xx, 216, Cambridge University Press, 2012, £15.99.

John Barton offers an elegant little book covering several different angles on what might pass for theology in relation to Amos.

An opening chapter offers a masterly review of 'the critical issues', by which he refers to the standard 'historical-critical' questions concerning the originating context of the book, its various levels of redaction, and the vexed question of the relationship between the man Amos and his book. Barton is cautious about drawing too many conclusions from recent scholarly emphases on 'the book of the twelve'. The chapter concludes with an iteration of fourteen redactional passages. This opening 50-page salvo is a fine presentation of the state of the question with regard to traditional approaches to Amos. Whether it is quite in the spirit of what the series editors describe as the 'changed ethos' with respect to 'many of the old consensuses and certainties, even the most basic ones relating to epistemological framework' (p. xv) is perhaps debatable. One detects throughout that for his part, Barton would find the loss of such consensuses with regard to the value of good modern critical study of Amos is all rather regrettable.

A transitional chapter 2 follows something of a 'mirror-reading' project: drawing conclusions about the context(s) within which Amos operated by imagining what sorts of convictions must have been in place if his critiques and assumptions are to be comprehensible. This is an important line of approach, that Barton has used elsewhere with regard to ethics and the Old Testament, for example. It leads here to a three-tier analysis of what Barton thinks constitutes the main topic of a book on Amos in a series entitled Old Testament Theology: what Amos was saying with respect to key theological issues. The three chapters which pursue this course separate all this out into (a) the theology of Amos and his circle, (b) theological themes in the additions to the book, and then (c) a single chapter which intriguingly bears the same title as the book: 'the theology of the book of Amos'. Here he presents a careful set of options for such a project: either reading the book in terms of a core with supplements (as he himself has done); or offering a literary and synchronic reading; or thirdly a canonical reading (after Brevard Childs). Barton is clear that the first of these is preferable, the second is possible (and he makes some interesting observations about what happens if one takes one's literary cues from ancient literary conventions rather than modern ones), while the third is largely unhelpful, even though he recognises that an account of it can be offered. Indeed, his account of Childs' reading of the epilogue additions in Amos 9 recounts what has always struck this reviewer as a parade example of a canonical approach as one which combines theological, historical and literary questions. The reasons for Barton's dislike of this third approach are well known from elsewhere, and resurface here in the final chapter, on 'The Theology of Amos Then and Now': 'it becomes difficult to hear the book as saying anything different, or at least radically different, from what we already believe on other grounds' (p. 181). It has never been clear to me why this should be the case: ability to be surprised by a text is surely not solely a function of whether or not one is predisposed to take it as Holy Scripture? And while many Christian readings do indeed prematurely assimilate the text to one's prior horizons, so do many critical readings, since as Gadamer long ago noted this is simply something that human readers of all sorts are prone to do. The question is always whether, in actual practice, the readings are incisively attuned to the text, rather than where they come from.

Anyway, the final two chapters take in turn the reception of Amos (an excellent brief review, from inner-biblical citation through to the Fathers, the Reformation, and on to Liberation Theology), and then Amos as dialogue partner for theology today. Interestingly, Barton supports a strongly Protestant reading of Amos' critique of sacrifice, though it would have been good to see how he might have treated Daniel Carroll's analysis of this issue in liberation terms.

All in all this is an excellent little book to put in the hands of the student of Amos, and serves scholars well as an up-to-date overview of germane interpretative issues, particularly those arising within the interpretative paradigm which the series editors suggested might not any longer be assumed. I shall recommend it to students ... along with Childs' chapter on Amos as an alternative view.

Richard S. Briggs

St John's College,
Durham University

Lamentations (The Two Horizons Old Testament Commentary). By Robin A. Parry. Pp. xii, 260, Grand Rapids, MI/Cambridge, U.K., Eerdmans, 2010, $22.00/£14.99.

The series of which this commentary forms part is introduced at the beginning of each volume. Two features distinguish it: theological exegesis and theological reflection. Exegesis since the Reformation era and especially in the past two hundred years emphasized careful attention to philology, grammar, syntax, and concerns of a historical nature. More recently, commentary has expanded to include social-scientific, political, or canonical questions and more. Without slighting the significance of those sorts of questions, scholars in this series locate their primary interests on theological readings of texts, past and present. The result is a paragraph-by-paragraph engagement with the text that is deliberately theological in focus. The introductory text goes on to say that theological reflection in this series takes many forms, including locating each Old Testament book in relation to the whole of Scripture – asking what the biblical book contributes to biblical theology – and in conversation with constructive theology of today. How commentators engage in the work of theological reflection will differ from book to book, depending on their particular theological tradition and how they perceive the work of biblical theology and theological hermeneutics. The heterogeneity derives as well from the relative infancy of the project of the theological interpretation of Scripture in modern times and from the challenge of grappling with the book's message in antiquity, in the canon of Scripture, the history of interpretation, and for life in the admittedly diverse Western world at this beginning of this century. The books in this series are written primarily for students, pastors, and other Christian leaders seeking to engage in theological interpretation of Scripture.

This project is carried out excellently in the present work. A lengthy introduction of 34 pages treats of the series' approach: 'The Two horizons'. Western cultures are notoriously averse to pain and tragedy. The book of Lamentations accosts us by the wayside as a stranger who offers us an unasked-for, unwanted, and yet precious gift – the poetry of pain. We would be wise to pay attention. When we reflect theologically on Lamentations, issues of method require some comment. First of all, Lamentations was not written to present a theology. It *assumes a* 'theology of destruction' in which destruction and exile are punishments for sin. Second, Lamentations was not written *by* Christians or *for* Christians. The theology of Lamentations is not Christian theology. However, for the Christian, once one has heard the distinctive voice of Lamentations one has to bring that voice into dialogue with God's revelation in Christ to discern how God is addressing the *church* through it. This is an art, not a science. Thus the aim in the first part of this commentary is to hear the distinctive theological voice of Lamentations, but in the second part, it is to hear the acoustics change when that voice is heard in the Cathedral of Christ.

The text goes on to note that it ought to be said that there will never be such a thing as *the* Christian interpretation of Lamentations. After these introductory words on the aim of the commentary, the preface goes on treat rather fully of the relevant questions: authorship, date, and place of composition; the exile context of Lamentations; the Ancient Near Eastern context of Lamentations; the poetry, structure, and canonical locations of Lamentations; the theology of Lamentations in key modern studies (Norman Glottal, 1954; Betel Albertson, 1965; Claus Wassermann, 1990; F.W. Dobbs-Also, 1997; Todd Leaflet, 2000; Kathleen O'Connor, 2003; Paul House, 2004; Elizabeth Boise, 2006; Carlene Mandolkfo, 2007), then on sin and punishment in Covenant context, hope in Covenant context, and finally Present Suffering.

A detailed exegetical analysis of each of the five chapters of Lamentations follows, verse-by verse, with chapter headings: Lamentations 1, No comfort; 2, Wrath, 3, Hope, 4, Siege and salvation, 5. Restore us, with appropriate inner headings and special excursuses as seem indicated; (problems with the exegesis of 3:34-34, 5 issues discussed; the perfect tenses in 3:52-56; does Lamentation 3 undermine Lament?; the meaning of *ki 'im* in 5:22).

The third section is devoted to theological horizons of Lamentations: Jewish and Christian liturgical use of Lamentations; Lamentations in the context of Jeremiah, of Isaiah 40-55, in the context of the New Testament; Expanding contexts: Lamentations and Christian Anti-Semitism; Lamentations and political theology, followed by treatment of Lamentations and the Rule of Faith; does Christian interpretation neutralize Lamentations?; the anger of God and 'The Day of YHWH', followed by sections on theodicy and divine suffering; the place of Lament in Christian spirituality, and finally Lamentations and ethical reflection. These last sections are particularly informative. Unusual in Lamentations is the designation of the Day of YHWH as past (cf. Isa 22:1-4; Jer 46:3-12). Clearly, then, it is seen not as the end of history but as a time when God acts openly to bring judgment *in* history. This leads on

to a consideration of final punishment (hell etc.) in Christian tradition. The section on theodicy and 'divine suffering' is particularly good, not just in the context of Lamentations but also in our own day. Parry includes reference to the groaning of creation and the 'suffering' of God, but with the wise observation: 'However, we must be aware of imagining that God is just like us and should remain reverently agnostic about what it is like for *God* to '"suffer"'. There is a final and lengthy (30 pages) section on the place of lament in Christian spirituality, with treatment of lament by Jesus, Paul's deep spirituality in the contradictions and weaknesses he incurred and many other relevant matters. Given the theme of Lamentations and issues raised in this section, there may be a place for a developed 'theology/spirituality of the absurd' (given our unanswered and probably unanswerable questions in the realm of theodicy), unless this has been already done. Despite the revelation of the Father by Jesus, God remains the great unknown, working through weaknesses and apparent contradictions. Do these apply to tsunamis and geological fault lines and such like as well?

There is a bibliography of ten pages, a name index and a Scripture index.

Milltown Institute, Dublin, Ireland — Martin McNamara

Qoheleth: the Ironic Wink. By James L. Crenshaw. Pp. x, 170, Columbia, The University of South Carolina Press, 2013, $37.95.

The emeritus professor of Old Testament at Duke University Divinity School expands his recent writings on wisdom (or anti-wisdom), including Job, the Psalms, and Biblical responses to the problem of evil, with a monograph on 'the preacher' or 'the teacher' - evidently a somewhat pompous and self-centred member of the traditional guild of sages, now peevish, self-absorbed and bitter at the hard times upon which his traditional vocation has fallen, together with that of the prophet and priest, during the Persian and later Hellenistic period when real power lay with a foreign potentate who is fleecing and leeching his conquered provinces for ever higher revenues through local tax farmers who extort a generous percentage themselves, conscription of local men for his foreign wars that impoverishes families, and in effect turning the once-proud and autonomous Jews into second-class citizens within their own restored country, kept off-balance, insecure and anxious through unpredictable imperial ukases as well as biased, unjust decisions by an easily-corrupted judiciary. The preacher now models the traditional Hebrew God on the behaviour of this foreign human potentate who in fact controls the conditions of day-to-day life, so that the fundamental Hebrew belief in a 'covenant' is broken – ironically, even after the Land, the Temple, and its cult have been restored! Everyone is just going through the motions; there is in fact no 'providence' for the 'chosen people'. All the strings are being pulled by a self-centred strong man far away, and his layers of bureaucracy in between designed to extract as much from the local population as possible; but for now – short of political rebellion that will come only with the Maccabees – all the preacher can offer is a spit-in-your-eye anti-wisdom that denies or inverts the traditional consolations of the Hebrew scriptures. There is no physical escape possible through the 'safety valve' of a frontier that could be crossed into a new 'exile'; they are locked in for the duration. The closest outside analogue to his teaching would be the Buddha, or possibly Schopenhauer, who diagnose universal suffering that they trace back to desires that, in the present dispensation, must be frustrated and thus should be modified. Specifically, God has planted a desire for knowledge in humans about the ultimate mysteries, but simultaneously made the acquisition of such knowledge impossible. Nothing endures, nothing lasts; there is no basis for wisdom. All is '*hebel*' – mist or opaque fog – and the unavoidable attempt to understand things exhausts itself in trying to 'shepherd the wind'. The resulting sense of futility should not paralyze us into a stunned or despondent lassitude, however; enjoy the incidental consolations of your in-between state and the pleasures of the different phases of life - especially youth - for that's all there is. If you don't take those, you will have none, and consequently feel cheated. After death, which certainly comes and often unexpectedly, will there be a 'judgment' that will recompense you for all the injustices you have suffered? Don't count on it. Although the Exile is officially over, the Jews feel abandoned by their God, who appears himself to have gone into exile. Now they are given the bitter honour of carrying on the charade of the Law and the Cult - but all is vain and absurd.

Heythrop College — Patrick Madigan

The Story of Israel in the Book of Qohelet: Ecclesiastes as Cultural Memory. By Jennie Barbour. Pp. xv, 225, Oxford University Press, 2012, $135.00.

In this expansion of her doctoral dissertation Barbour displays both control of the history of commentary on Qohelet dating from the Rabbinic and Patristic eras as well as a thorough engagement with contemporary scholarship on this enigmatic book. Long looked upon as a species of 'Wisdom' literature (or 'anti-Wisdom'), with an almost complete absence of historical interest or awareness, Barbour argues persuasively for a haunting, all-pervading historical presence in the work, manifested through an 'echo-chamber' of vocabulary, allusions, and references that would mean little to an outsider to the Biblical tradition, but would be instantaneously recognizable, as well as immediately painful, to Jewish exiles in Babylon or during the Hellenistic period who had invested their hopes, as well as deriving most of their identity as members of a 'chosen people', from belief in a God who would be faithful to his covenantal promises as regards land, Temple, and monarchy, when these all had been lost, admittedly through the follies and infidelities of their kings (a view which inter-testamental literature such as Ben Sira and Baruch reinforces) rather than through a lapse on the deity's part. Barbour makes her case by developing the notion of a 'collective memory', as described by Maurice Halbwachs and advanced by Jan Assmann and Yosef Yerushalmi, to show that specific references are unnecessary when the parade of inadequate and unacceptable kings becomes so long that they begin to appear interchangeable and so many variations on a single regrettable type. Indeed, it is the 'royal fiction' of the book that it is a 'king' himself on the throne in Jerusalem who is scandalously giving voice to this depressed, dispirited and 'politically incorrect' inversion of the official Israelite 'salvation history' – where there is no salvation, and never will be again. So the great adventure is over; the kingdom was a mistake from the beginning, as Samuel warned the Israelites who came asking him to anoint them a king 'like the other nations'. Now the Jews had better get used to being 'Jews', not 'Israelites' – that is, get used to a Temple-less condition where they have only the Law and an apophatic faith in a speculatively inscrutable deity (and the cold cinders of their lost, burned hopes) to support precariously their identity and to resist assimilation to the more impressive kingdoms and empires surrounding them. The shame and pessimism is all about man, rather than God, but this does not make it less bitter. Such is the spirit coming into the Hellenistic period: if He did not have in mind to manifest His glory to the nations through this obedient, covenantal people on this land with a great king in the glorious 'high' city of Jerusalem, what did He have in mind for them?

Heythrop College Patrick Madigan

Jonah In The Shadows of Eden. By Yitzhak Berger. Pp. xviii, 149, Bloomington, Indiana University Press, 2016, £44.00.

Berger displays a virtuoso mastery and exemplary control of a spectrum of literary devices, including inner-biblical allusion, multiple resonances, and various types of wordplay, with an ear also for phonetic analogy that only a thorough familiarity with the Old Testament and a control of the intricacies of Hebrew can give one, to propose a new interpretation of the Book of Jonah, as a homily addressing Jews returning from exile where the 'Eden-like' glories of Israel seem to have faded; in short, they were under-whelmed. God seems still to be punishing them or simply to have reneged on his promises. Their temptation is to regress to a lower level of religious and psychological development, to approach their Law externally, literally, and moralistically, to announce that 'there'll be pie in the sky bye and bye' and ask, 'Haven't we been exemplary in carrying out its codicils?' We can fall back to a self-justification and self-righteousness by reducing religion from a living relationship with an unpredictable and potentially dangerous *mysterium tremendum et fascinans* to a *quid-pro-quo* relationship or exchange of services rendered that leaves both of us unchanged, whereby if the believer pays his dues or gets all his tickets punched, he can cash them in big at the final judgment. The Law becomes not the link with an ultimate and precious reality, but a protection hedging round its unforeseen initiatives with an iron-clad pre-nuptial agreement we insist be fulfilled to its final detail.

Mothers know the characteristic labour of raising a child where one must use a battery of devices – both a 'carrot' and a 'stick' – to encourage the child to advance to the next stage in its development, towards a less simplistic, more sophisticated and realistic vision of outside reality, to have them oriented forward and outward rather than retreating

backward and inward, intimidated by the demands of doing justice to or being adequate to a more complex world that has evil and even hostile elements. Jonah is not a bad person, but he is under-developed and childish in attempting to use religion to stay at a less mature stage by filtering out or denying less attractive elements of experience, especially the need for transformation or conversion itself to recognize others' need for compassion and one's own need for repentance, rather than to close off the question of time altogether and insist that all agreements be fulfilled immediately and according to one's current level of development. Jonah constructs a series of 'inner Edens' or alternative versions of the aboriginal 'Garden of Paradise' where we lived before the Fall, where everyone was perfect, or where the Law could be imposed literally in all its severity. Instead the author shows God gradually schooling him to see that other people – and he himself – need time to transform completely into what they could be, and to accept the basic need for transformation so that one is progressing outward towards a more realistic engagement with the world rather than turning inward, trying to construct an ephemeral childish 'eden' as a permanent condition, and insisting that the world be admitted only if it approaches us according to pre-established, approved and non-threatening routes. Jonah flees from God's invitation into a series of false 'wombs' – including the city of Nineveh and the belly of the 'great fish' itself – all of which repeatedly 'vomit' him forth to be birthed towards his unavoidable fate of moving towards the real world. As with the later gospel stories about the labourers who have worked all day being aggrieved that some hired late are paid the same, and the exasperated older brother with arms akimbo watching his younger 'prodigal' within enjoying the fattened calf, we are left not knowing how this story will turn out.

Heythrop College Patrick Madigan

Job 38-42 (Word Biblical Commentary 18A). By David J. A. Clines. Pp. xxxv, 1039–1539, Nashville, TN, Nelson 2011, $49.99.

The volume in hand was apparently finished by the author in August 2008 but publication was delayed for technical reasons. Thus only in 2011 is David Clines' majestic opus on the book of Job completed, and thereby also is the OT section of the Word Biblical Commentary completed. The Word commentary began planning in 1977, and early volumes came out in the early 1980's. While a couple of NT titles remain to be published, it has established itself for some time as a leading evangelical-critical scholarly commentary, and includes many noteworthy volumes.

Clines' 3-volume work on Job is among its more detailed offerings. The format will doubtless be familiar to anyone likely to use it, although once again Professor Clines offers us copious bibliographies (over 200 full pages at the back of the book) relating to all and sundry potential angles on the book, as well as a 'classified index to the book of Job'.

Here the God-speeches are explored with the same care and attention to detail as the earlier chapters, and the handling of the ambiguities of the Hebrew remains a strength. A key aspect of Clines' own reading is that the crucial verse at 40:6, one of many which are patient of multiple readings, is not to be read as Job acquiescing to God's judgments or admonitions, but rather as the withdrawal of his complaint (his 'lawsuit') because, having heard and seen what has been offered (40:5, read non-constrastively). Job recognises that God has not answered his questions. This, simply, is the way the world is: 'No doubt he [Job] is better off knowing where he stands and having nothing left to hope for.' (1224).

Whether or not Clines' particular reading persuades, his commentary will be a wonderful resource for all who would attempt to track their own reading through the book of Job. For this, and indeed for the whole Word OT commentary series which this closes, we may be grateful.

St John's College, Durham University Richard S. Briggs

The Holy One of Israel: Studies in the Book of Isaiah. By John N. Oswalt. Pp. xii, 161, Cambridge, James Clarke/Cascade, 2014, £22.50/$45.00.

Oswalt has spent 30 years on the study of the Book of Isaiah, producing the two volume commentary in the *New International Commentary on the Old Testament* and the one volume commentary in the *New International Version Application Commentary*. Along the way he has produced

journal articles and chapters in books on Isaiah that he here gathers together so that the reader might skim off the cream of his interpretation and conclusions, along with the data and arguments which make them up. His fulsome enthusiasm for this book lifts the reader effortlessly to savour his complete mastery of this book and the scholarship devoted to it; all the more so in that Oswalt goes against several of the 'progressive' critical trends of modern scriptural exegesis to argue in support of the primary and extensive use made of this book by the authors of the 'New' Testament to announce that Jesus of Galilee is the long-awaited Messiah, that he was a 'Son of David' born of a virgin, that his ministry and death was that of a 'suffering servant' by which Yahweh, the god of the Hebrews now boldly lifted up as the unique god of the universe, has come as he promised among his chosen people as 'God with us', first in judgment to curb their pride, complacency, and refusal to put their trust fully in Him, and then in deliverance when they were in despair in the Exile and unable to make a move by their own power – two forms of 'witness' by which Israel will live out its larger vocation to become a 'light to the nations' in God's plan to have *all* people join the Jews in worship of Himelf. Against those who would divide the book into three or even four sources simply placed next to one another and stitched together, Oswalt argues for a final redactor of genius who produced an interconnected whole, with each section placed deliberately where it is to generate a tautly constructed argument and rhetoric to produce the conversion it describes. This editor had two audiences in mind: the generation surrounding Ahaz dealing with the Assyrians in the eighth century BCE, and the generation centuries later when the judgment made necessary by Israel's decision to place its trust in the 'nations' rather than in Yahweh would result in the bitter harvest of the loss of king, land and temple and maroon them in exile. Further, as said, this redactor looked forward both to a short-term deliverer from the current crisis, but also to a decisive and definitive Messiah who would come, not in power and military might, but with the fruits of conversion in a child-like simplicity and mildness, who by his atoning suffering in the midst of and derived from their continuing waywardness would bring about the definitive 'deliverance' of his people. Actuality implies possibility; his example would show them what their god expected them to become and provides the spirit – his presence – by which to bring this about. This makes Isaiah the prophet of *both* Testaments; his one book contains a *complete* biblical theology. This is an exhilarating and instructive reading of Isaiah from which any student of this book will derive great benefit.

Heythrop College Patrick Madigan

Tales of High Priests and Taxes: The Books of the Maccabees and the Judean Rebellion against Antiochus IV. By Sylvie Honigman. Pp. ix, 554, Oakland, CA, University of California Press, 2014, £65.00.

Building on the work of Daniel Schwartz, Victor Hurowitz, Christophe Nihan and Ehud Ben Zvi, Honigman advances a bold revisionist thesis on the historical events which underlie the accounts given in the books of the Maccabees on the fraught relation between the invading 'Hellenism', in the person of the Selucid king Antiochus IV of Syria, and the Hebrew 'patriots' – the Maccabee family and the later Hasmoneans - to keep fidelity with their traditional patron deity. Contrary to current scholarly opinion, the books are not devoid of historical value, but it requires a subtle *literary* analysis, sensitive to theological and rhetorical 'codes' that had been built up over millennia which rested upon and brought forward patterns of appreciating and reporting opposition to practices the Hebrew authors - here almost certainly court historians working in Jerusalem - considered objectionable, and whose later agenda was to justify not only the Maccabees' armed resistance to the dictates of Antiochus IV but the scandalous, historically unprecedented unification of the monarchy and high priesthood by the Hasmoneans, to pierce through and identify the actual events these books are reporting indirectly and obliquely, distracting us and distorting their true significance by subordinating them within a self-justifying theological 'master narrative' and set of priorities whose true role is to serve as the backbone for their forensic defense. For the Temple was the one 'value in itself' by relation to which all novelties were to be evaluated and the seriousness of potential 'impurities' to be measured and responded to, just as it was the 'piety' of a claimant that was the one quality by which his legitimacy for either the monarchy or high priesthood was to be decided – sometimes after the fact. This was the only way any story attempting to allot praise and blame over a protracted period of political upheaval and dynastic conflict could be told or intellectually assimilated; it was the chief

way 'causality' was understood to work in all ancient Near Eastern societies. Once we know how to appreciate, translate, or filter out this style, we can peer 'beneath the surface' and see what was actually going on.

The most likely historical reconstruction is as follows: to finance his wars with Egypt Antiochus IV did impose an economic reform which involved higher taxes. After rumours of his death in battle reached Judea, there was a revolt which Antiochus put down brutally on his way back to Antioch. He appointed a new high priest more amenable to higher taxes from the Temple, confiscated land and moved in foreign settlers (the underlying reality behind 'set up foreign altars throughout the land'), installed a military garrison at the *Akra* and set up a *gymnasium* which provided military training; these last two could be viewed as raising purity issues since both were near the Temple. Preoccupied with his larger Egyptian campaign, however, and rendered insecure by rivals to his position back home, Antiochus sued for peace. The Judean revolt therefore continued, and eventually brought in the Hasmoneans.

The two books of the Maccabees are complementary accounts, with differing emphases, following the pattern, not of a temple liberation, but of a temple *foundation* (or *re*-foundation), since the latter was the traditional motif employed when arguing for the legitimacy of a new political dynasty or of a new high priesthood, both of which occurred during this period, by seeing heaven's favor with the outcome.

Honigman presents a sophisticated, encompassing, and ultimately persuasive reconstruction of the political, economic, cultural and literary forces at work that resulted in the production of these two puzzling books.

Heythrop College Patrick Madigan

The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Bible. By James C. VanderKam. Pp. xiv, 188, Grand Rapids, Eerdmans, 2012, $15.50.

This book is the compilation of several lectures delivered at Oxford by James VanderKam, a senior scholar in the study of the Dead Sea Scrolls. VanderKam distills modern scholarship on the scrolls into a very readable work that will benefit both seasoned scholars and newcomers to the topic, although the latter seem to be the primary audience.

The first chapter surveys the roughly 200 scrolls containing books from the Old Testament. The lion's share belong to the Pentateuch and the Psalter, although most books from the Jewish canon are included (save that of Esther). VanderKam also includes related texts: Greek translations of Pentateuchal books, targums (Aramaic translations), pesharim (commentaries), and Tefillin/Mezuzot (phylacteries). He next gives an overview of the textual nature of these biblical scrolls, describing their orthography, their noteworthy variants compared to other textual traditions, and their relevance for modern biblical scholarship.

The second chapter examines the practice of biblical interpretation performed at Qurmran, which VanderKam characterizes as a 'thriving cottage industry' (26). He begins by contextualizing Qumran exegesis in its first-century milieu, discussing the biblical interpretation done by biblical writers as well as authors of non-biblical texts such as 1 Enoch and Jubilees. VanderKam then looks at continuous pesharim, which provide running commentary of a biblical book (e.g. Habakkuk). These seek to 'explicate something unclear,' especially 'to decode a mysterious communication from the divine realm' (36). VanderKam also considers other types of exegetical works such as collections of related Scriptural passages.

The third chapter discusses the problematic topic of canonicity. The biblical canon as we know it was not formally set until after the time of Jesus, although passages from the New Testament indicate that the canonization process was well underway. VanderKam combs through the Dead Sea Scrolls for various references to texts being viewed as authoritative or canonical by the Qumran community.

The fourth chapter presents the collection of non-biblical texts (often called 'apocrypha') contained among the scrolls, many of which constitute the oldest versions of such texts we have today. These include Jubilees, Aramaic Levi, the Book of Giants, Sirach, Tobit, 1 Enoch, Epistle of Jeremiah, and Psalms 151, 154, and 155. The fifth chapter considers how the scrolls cast light on early Judaism, especially in comparison to the descriptions of the Essenes, Sadducees, and Pharisees offered by Josephus. The Qumran community seems to have been a branch of the first but also has affinities with the other two.

Chapters Six and Seven consider the importance of the scrolls for understanding the New Testament. The scrolls not only offer a view into ancient Judaism but also help us 'to interpret a

series of New Testament passages in a fuller way, with a greater appreciation for them against the backdrop of their time and world' (120). Noteworthy New Testament topics include messianic expectations, Scriptural interpretation, legal matters and 'works of the law,' rebuking wayward members of the community, and communal ownership of property.

Altogether, these lectures cohere nicely into a fine introduction to the Dead Sea Scrolls. The book's focus is on the relevance of the Qumran texts for understanding the bible, and so readers interested in other aspects of the scrolls or in the unique sectarian works of the community (e.g. the Manual of Discipline) will need to look elsewhere. The book is also relatively free of technical jargon, and despite a moderate amount of attention to textual criticism (especially in Chapter Two), knowledge of Hebrew or the tools of biblical criticism is not required. Vanderkam's book will work nicely as an introduction to the scrolls for a seminary or lower-level graduate course or for any reader interested in the subject.

St. Louis University, USA Geoffrey David Miller

The Essenes, The Scrolls, and the Dead Sea. By Joan E. Taylor. Pp. xvii, 418, Oxford University Press, 2014, $29.95.

Taylor's magisterial treatment of 2012 on where we stand in the controversial relationship between the 'Essenes', Qumran, and the Dead Sea scrolls is now published in paperback, and it should be a cause for rejoicing. You will find no more exhaustive study of the history of the discovery of jars containing the scrolls in caves around the Dead Sea in the late 1940s, the archaeological exploration of the (various strata) of the ruins and theories about Qumran, the community that occupied this site for a relatively short period, basically during the Herodian period, and which came to an end, not in 70 CE, but in 115 CE, with the much more ruthless suppression of the Bar Kokhba revolt, and the history of the Essenes – not a marginal or recent aberration within Judaism, but an ancient and esteemed society who took the obligations to piety and purity incumbent upon all Jews further than most, and were highly revered for doing so – indeed, they could be called the 'beating heart of Judaism', the 'purest of the pure', since the High Priestly families had been compromised since the Hasmonean period. Even Herod the Great, not known for piety himself, respected this almost 'Amish' or Mennonite expression of Judaism for their honesty, courage and simplicity. They also had picked up the mantel of prophecy, which otherwise was thought to have fallen to the ground since the return from Babylon (although like Lutherans, they held you must accept whatever civil authority it has pleased God to place over you, rather than 'prophecy' against this). One reason Herod respected them was that one of their number, Menahem, an expert in their craft of predicting the future, had told him as a boy that he would one day rule the kingdom. He gave them the parcel of land around Qumran that the Hasmoneans had developed for the lucrative trade in bitumen and balsam that flourished around the Dead Sea. The Essenes were most likely the 'Herodians' of the gospels, as they were called jealously by their rivals.

The Essenes were not a few but numerous – second only to the Pharisees – and lived in towns and villages all over Judaea. They were one of the three great schools of legal interpretation Josephus mentions, along with the Pharisees and Sadducees, but were not given to wrangling with the others – or with Jesus, whom they visited but probably found too free, unencumbered, or indifferent towards the Law for their tastes. His revolution in overthrowing purity and traditional piety regulations was too radical for any of the schools. The Essenes were more like Quakers in avoiding disputes, preferring 'friendly persuasion' and cultivating a peaceful sobriety, hoping to 'convert' the hostile other by their example rather than by words. This was also the reason they did not allow women into their compounds (although women – usually wives of men who joined in their retirement or senior years) could join, and had their separate compounds); they created too much disturbance and strife.

The scrolls were not precious scriptures hidden away quickly as the Roman legions advanced, either in 66 or 110 CE. The outpost of the Essenes was placed at Qumran specifically to take advantage of the local bitumen and balsam to treat old and tattered scrolls that could no longer be used in services – first to deposit them in 'storage' (*Genizah*) until this embalming process was complete, and then to be placed in sealed jars in a 'scroll cemetery' in the caves, to last until the 'end of time', when they would be restored and used again. Sacred objects may not be simply thrown

away when they grow old or useless; their holy status must be respected. Scrolls came from Essene communities all over Judaea to Qumran to be properly processed on the shores of the Dead Sea. This was not done quickly at the approach of the Roman legions, but was rather the point and purpose of the installation from the outset – as well as to take advantage of the trade in medicines from the rich flora and minerals available in the area, which were known from antiquity.

So complete and thorough is Taylor's analysis of the literary and archaeological evidence that it is difficult to imagine her conclusions being overthrown in the future.

Heythrop College Patrick Madigan

Parables and Conflict in the Hebrew Bible. By Jeremy Schipper. Pp. xiv, 168, Cambridge University Press, 2009, $100.00.

Schipper challenges the received view on the use of parables in the Hebrew Bible. Writing primarily of the prose sections in the Deuteronomic History, but including also a concluding examination of the use of parables by the later prophets Isaiah, Ezekial and Jeremiah, he shows that parables were not used in the ancient Near Eastern societies either to educate their audience or to calm an agitated situation. They belong rather to the genre of taunt or ridicule, and are typically deployed to confuse, indict, and insult the addressed party at a stage when all diplomatic endeavours have been broken off and no further relation with the addressed party is of interest to the speaker. Specifically when addressed to a king or powerful person, with whom normally indirect and delicate euphemisms are the order of the day, parables are employed to convey a blunt sense that the addressee lacks *the* essential quality that any ruler was expected to possess and by which he was judged – practical wisdom, in the sense of savvyness in knowing how to read both domestic and international situations, with a keen sense of people's motives, inclinations, and likely course of action. Every ruler was evaluated carefully according to this criteria, by prophets as well as by his fellow rulers, and a parable was typically used only as a last resort to inform a ruler in a deliberately painful way that he was dim, dense, or obtuse in matters about which he should be most expert; that as a consequence he had no business being a ruler, and that the speaker in particular wanted nothing more to do with him – indeed, that he was intending treaty betrayal or imminent military activity to dethrone the addressee and take over his kingdom. Recourse to a parable thus marked the end of an alliance or relationship, rather than an attempt to preserve such.

A parable was typically intended to be confusing, defying clear or adequate interpretation, thereby piling up further evidence to the addressee that he was a simpleton, naïve, and easily misled, as well as being vulnerable to being mocked and insulted before an international audience with impunity. The purpose was to demonstrate to the addressee that he could no more correctly decipher a parable that delivered a stinging insult than he could correctly interpret the intrigues and factional politics of his own realm. A parable is thus typically deployed, not to reduce tensions between two groups, but as confirming evidence of the definitive and decisive inadequacy of the recipient to occupy his position of prominence and power, of which he will be shortly relieved. It is usually delivered just before military action is undertaken to defeat the addressee or destroy his dynasty. The use of a parable increases the rhetorical force and underscores the unambiguous insulting purpose of the communication, such that no redemption of the situation is possible or desired. No reply was thus expected to a parable, nor was it even intended to be understood as a serious attempt at communication, but rather to confuse, embarrass, and break off a relationship – implying international and even divine support for this decision – and as a prelude to the violent removal of the individual who receives the parable. Surprisingly enough, this is continuous with the use Jesus makes of parables in the New Testament.

Heythrop College Patrick Madigan

Contesting Conversion: Genealogy, Circumcision, & Identity in Ancient Judaism & Christianity. By Matthew Thiessen. Pp. x, 246, Oxford University Press, 2011, $78.00.

Through a close textual reading of Genesis 17, Leviticus 12, Ezra-Nehemiah, Jubilees, the *Animal Apocalypse* and other Enochic writings, and Luke-Acts, Thiessen propounds a revolutionary thesis.

Many groups in the Near East carried out male circumcision. It was not this practice that distinguished the Jews or that sealed the covenant, but rather circumcision *on the eighth day* after birth. This crucial timing had the effect of making Jewish identity a matter of having the right genealogy – of being born of Jewish parents – which effectively excluded Gentiles from becoming Jews, since presumably they would attempt this as adults. While there were dissenting voices to this opinion, it remained remarkably strong up to the Second Temple period (when under the Hasmoneans, for example, several conquered groups converted), and beyond. This means that a Jew need not practice his faith to be considered a 'Jew of the covenant'. Religion is an ethnic matter, something *imposed upon* a Jew, not a matter of choice. This exclusivity is a measure of how deeply the assumption of 'holiness as separation' was entrenched and all-pervasive in the Near East, and particularly among the Jews. Religion was essentially tied up with national pride, with being distinct from (and superior to) one's neighbors.

What is more surprising is that early Christianity into at least the 2nd century CE, as represented in Luke-Acts, did not tamper with this principle. Neither Luke – traditionally held to be the lone 'Gentile' evangelist – nor the Lukan Paul expect Jews and Gentiles who believe Jesus to follow a common set of practices. Not only was the Jerusalem church of James and Peter 'judaizing', but in Antioch and all the diaspora churches that Paul founded it was the expectation of Paul, Luke, and the readers of Luke-Acts that Jewish believers would continue to live according the 'customs of Moses' (which Luke depicts Paul as being falsely accused of rescinding for Jews – and fighting the accusation), while – because of the surprising new act by God whereby the Spirit of God could 'cross over' and possess even Gentiles such as Cornelius, and thereby remove their identity or genealogical impurity, Gentile believers need thereafter only follow the traditional rules for aliens residing in Jewish territory. According to this view it was universally expected (and accepted) by both groups that there would be 'two disciplines' in the Church, one for Jews who would continue to live as Jews, and another for Gentiles. Gentiles would not have to 'become Jews' in order to become Christians; as a matter of fact, because 'Jewishness' was a matter of identity or genealogy, this was strictly speaking impossible. A Gentile could not become a Jew. But God's Spirit had erupted in a new way to unexpectedly and compassionately open up a new avenue by which Gentiles could now be grafted onto the covenant of salvation which the Jews had always enjoyed, while Jewish believers in Jesus as the fulfilment of the covenantal promises should continue to live according to the practices which they now will legitimately display with greater pride than ever. Two church disciplines will emerge: Jews need make no change in their practices, while adding the Christian Sabbath, while Gentiles must undergo conversion to the norms specified by the Apostolic Council.

Heythrop College Patrick Madigan

When God Spoke Greek: the Septuagint and the Making of the Christian Bible. By Timothy Michael Law. Pp. 216, Oxford University Press, 2013, $26.95.

This is the fascinating story of the rise and fall of the Septuagint which turns its popular estimation on its head. Conventionally viewed as the Greek translation of the Hebrew original, which was always there and to which Jerome returned to make his superior Latin translation in the Vulgate, the Hebrew version on which the Septuagint is based is actually an alternative version that is *older* than the one the rabbis finally agreed upon in the second century CE, four centuries after the principal part of the Septuagint had been completed. The Hebrew texts were always works-in-progress, subject to on-going revision under pressures of mutual harmonization and the correct decipherment of words written without vowels. The Septuagint is best viewed, not as a translation, but as a new scripture, with tendencies, literary creativity, and an underlying theology quite different from what became the official Hebrew version. As the rabbis would tell astounded Christians, Jews would study the Septuagint to discover an *earlier* version of their *own* Hebrew Bible. Thus, what is viewed as *progress* – getting back to the 'original' Hebrew Bible – was actually *decline*. Virtually all the 'Old Testament' citations in the New Testament are to the Septuagint, and its theological doctrine was decisively shaped by the latter – notably Paul's reliance on the Greek *Isaiah* in *Romans*, and in *Hebrews* – such as Jesus' title of *Kyrios* (Lord), which is the Septuagint translation for *Yahweh*, and Jesus' status as 'Son of God', based on the Septuagint *parthenos* ('virgin') where the Hebrew has only 'young woman'.

The situation becomes more tragic (or comic) as we see what actually happened with the two Christian scholars who attempted to go 'behind'

the Septuagint to the 'original'. Origen produced his *Hexapla* which contained the Hebrew text produced by rabbis, the Septuagint, the later Greek translations by Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion, and a fifth column that was a hybrid text that combined the Septuagint with readings from these later versions for exegesis and textual analysis. Origen used signs in the text to indicate these changes. When Constantine converted, he charged Eusebius of Caesarea to produce a standard Bible for all the churches. Eusebius chose this fifth column and dropped Origen's signs, which thus produced an *altered* Septuagint at the beginning of imperial Christianity.

When the single emperor gave way to two, one in the East and one in the West, Augustine warned Jerome not to produce a new translation but to accept the Old Latin Translation of the Septuagint, which was in use in all the churches of the West. A different translation might decisively break the unity of Church and Empire, which were increasingly fragile. Jerome's egotism and pique at having been expelled from Rome makes it seem that his decision to embark upon a new translation was actually an act of *résentiment* or revenge against the Church that had treated him badly. He knew that the Septuagint translation was superior and that the Hebrew version was more recent, but lied about both, to justify producing the 'advance' of his Vulgate, which was indeed instrumental in bringing about the split in Christendom. If one doesn't laugh, one cries.

Writing as an historian, Law could have done more with the increasingly 'eschatological' cultural atmosphere created in society as a whole by Alexander's attempt at a grand *ecumené* (there was no comparable translation of the Jewish scriptures into Persian, for example); the expectation behind Virgil's *Aeneid* that Rome was divinely appointed to achieve what Alexander had begun; the popular dissatisfaction with the way Rome imposed inferior procurators and its brutal legions around the Mediterranean; Virgil's fourth *Ecologue* which spoke of a divine child coming into the world; the 'touching bottom' through the rise of an alternative to faith in divine providence with the appearance of Gnosticism and its accompanying hatred for the 'creator' God, perhaps by Jews distraught at the suppression of successive Jewish revolts, with the loss of King, Temple, and 'Promised Land'; and the altered cultural world between the Septuagint produced under the high priests with the Temple, and the later translations produced under the emerging rabbis after both high priests and Temple had been swept away (and the first version, the Septuagint, 'hijacked' by the Christians, who were more Hellenized, producing a '*Judaism lite*' or 'Judaism for the masses' - so that all 'eschatological' emphases and messianic tendencies should be removed, leaving only what the Christians said had been superseded – the Law - as the lone vestige of Jewish heritage, which must therefore become enough for them not to assimilate in the new permanent exile.) Some mention of these would have supplied motivation for the changes in the translations.

Heythrop College Patrick Madigan

Did Jesus Speak Greek? The Emerging Evidence of Greek Dominance in First-Century Palestine. By G. Scott Gleaves. Pp. xxvi, 214, Eugene, OR. Pickwick, 2015, $24.89.

The Aramaic Hypothesis is dead. Since the Protestant Reformation conceived the desire and urgent need to get back to the '*ipsissima verba*' of Jesus to uncover what he *really* preached, as the basis for authentic teaching and true redemption, first Protestant and then Catholic scholars have outdone one another in over-pious *Sitzfleisch* projecting an increasing number of phases between when the words parted Jesus' lips, to when they were remembered, re-ordered, and finally translated into Greek in the gospels. In fact Jesus, like every other adult Jew in Galilee in the first century of the common era, was bi-lingual, and probably tri-lingual (Aramaic, Hebrew, and Greek); but increasing evidence coming from a wider variety of angles makes it overwhelmingly likely that he preached in Greek. No Aramaic account of his preaching has ever been discovered, nor any 'Q' document from which Matthew and Luke supposedly drew. Jesus preached in Greek – a semitically-inflected Palestinian version of '*koiné*', but Greek nonetheless – and powerful Greek at that. The version of the Torah he knew and that was in use in all the synagogues of Palestine was the Greek Translation (XX). He chose his close disciples not only for their piety, but also on the basis of how at home they were in speaking Greek, as they were routinely expected to go out and preach. All the gospels were written in Greek, even Matthew, which certain Church Fathers because of a misinterpretation thought had a Hebrew or Aramaic original. All such speculation is unnecessary and now scholarly redundant. There is no 'going behind' the gospels to access a 'more authentic' Jesus. In fact, it was

during his lifetime that Hellenization had deeply infiltrated even the countryside of Galilea and Judea, opening up new possibilities, and perhaps providing some of the content, as well as the vehicle, for the 'eschatological' message Jesus was preaching, a fulfilment of the single '*ecumené*' Alexander the Great had envisaged four centuries earlier, where ethnic, social, and linguistic barriers would fall and a new behaviour on the world's stage was called for. So obvious does this now seem that one rubs one's eyes and wonders how one could ever have thought otherwise.

Heythrop College Patrick Madigan

Jesus, Criteria, and the Demise of Authenticity. Edited by Chris Keith and Anthony Le Donne. Pp. xvii, 230, T & T Clark, 2012, $39.95.

Tell it not in Gath, but there are strange developments in the quest for the historical Jesus. Half a century ago (more, in some ways) New Testament scholars started looking for copper-bottomed criteria for assessing the authenticity of words and deeds attributed to Jesus in the gospels. Forty years ago, Morna Hooker sounded an alarm, and warned that it might be a pipe-dream; so it is appropriate that she is given the foreword to this collection of essays on the criteria, and is enabled to say 'We were right all the time'; her contribution is also recognised in the concluding essay, by Chris Keith, one of the two editors of this interesting volume. This is only one of several recent books that emphasise the growing awareness that two hundred years of careful and attentive biblical scholarship has left more or less as it was the reliability of the New Testament as a basis for Christian living. Not that there is any claim here that the scholarly work has all been a waste of time; it is, rather, that what some feared would mean the discovery that the gospels were all a pack of lies has come full circle to reveal that their value lies precisely in the imprint that the words and works of Jesus has left on the memory of the community; and that any other view leads in fact to unhelpful distortions. We are left with a Jesus who taught in parables, who spoke with impressive authority, performed miracles, spoke of the Kingdom of God, stayed close to the marginalised, offended the establishment, and was executed by the Romans; not only that, but his followers believed, very soon, that he had been raised from the dead, and there was never a time when the 'historical Jesus' was not also 'Christological'. We need, as T. W. Manson told us eighty years ago, to see Jesus in his Christian and Jewish context (and therefore to ditch the tired old criterion of 'double dissimilarity'). More and more we are now ready to see the gospel narratives as representations of Jesus' historical impact. The overall thesis of this book is that the traditional criteria for authenticity that have dominated the discourse of NT scholars over the last half-century do not work as they have commonly been employed; and that in turn raises the all-important meta-question: what do you mean by 'authenticity'? In the form-critical approach (as Chris Keith argues) 'authentic' came to mean 'what does not represent the theological interpretations of the gospel authors and their communities'; but, of course, you cannot possibly separate the 'real thing' from 'early theological interpretation', because everything that Jesus did and said was already from the beginning 'Christological'. Many of the authors in this admirable volume insist on the importance of the recent trend towards 'memory studies' (Jens Schroter, for example, though he has perhaps been unlucky in his translator). A question of growing interest is that of the complexity of the interface between Greek and Hebrew/Aramaic, whose multi-lingual dynamics mean that we can no longer make the confident assertions that were once fashionable, so that the value of Semitisms, and especially Aramaisms, as a criterion for historicity is now far less certain than it was. Anthony Le Donne is likewise sceptical of 'simplistic dichotomies between historical memory and revisionist history'; he makes the point that all memory, including autobiographical memory, is always in flux. Rafael Rodriguez turns his attention to the 'criterion of embarrassment', beloved of so many of us, and insists on seeing the gospels as coherent artefacts of social memory, designed for performance in the first century. Martin Goodacre has a characteristically perceptive piece on the criterion of 'multiple attestation' and the problem of using Q, if (like Goodacre) you do not believe in Q. Scot McKnight offers a very challenging title: 'Why the Authentic Jesus is of no use for the Church' (because 'at its core, the historical Jesus enterprise is designed to call into question the Church's interpretation of Jesus', whereas 'the remembered Jesus is the Church's Jesus'). Dale Allison's autobiographical offering is fascinating (though slightly marred by having two Hebrew phrases printed in the wrong order) in its persuasion that we know too little about Second Temple Judaism and about 1st Century Galilee to be able to handle the criterion

of dissimilarity; and he reaches three interesting conclusions that you will have to read for yourself; but consider the following remark: 'memories of Jesus can inform sentences that he did not utter, and stories that never took place'. Chris Keith brings the book to an end with a thoughtful essay expressing his view that 'the traditional criteria for authenticity do not work'. There is more to come, of course, on every side; but this book needs to be heard attentively.

Campion Hall, Oxford Nicholas King

Oral Tradition and the New Testament: A Guide for the Perplexed. By Rafael Rodriguez. Pp. x, 167, London, Bloomsbury, 2014, £16.99.

'Media-critical studies', the subject of this book, is a term to make the heart quail, but the study of ancient orality is something that is not going to go away, and Rodgriguez gamely approaches the task, with the admirable aim of bringing the difficult discourse of orality within reach of the ordinary reader. He will win the gratitude of many people with his handy glossary of the language of this new approach, including some fairly horrid neologisms (such as 'equiprimordiality', 'ethnopoetics', 'mnemohistory' and 'mouvance'), and some familiar words used in new ways. More important, the author reminds us of the key point that our NT texts were originally experienced, not by way of private, silent reading, but orally and communally, which means, of course, that every performance was different, so that our search to know the 'original' text may be misplaced. The book also includes a very useful chapter on the history of research into the oral tradition, and properly stresses the importance of the work of Gerhardsson and Kelber and many others, though with perhaps too dismissive of other scholars as rigid, inflexible, naïve or simply wrong. Coming to Hecuba, the book identifies two approaches to oral tradition: the first, the 'morphological', is to look at the 'identifiable' features of orality, a word that is comes easily to the lips, but is hard to define; the second, 'contextual' approach, favoured by Rodriguez, has to do with the question of how texts get composed, in the setting of a lively oral tradition. The problem with the first is that it is in practice difficult to be sure whether the features evinced by a particular text represent oral or written 'psycho-dynamics'. The second approach assumes that our written NT texts are first oral, then written down by authors, but recited by performers, and received by audiences, and may be classified as 'works of verbal art'. So Luke and Matthew regarded Mark as an instance of the Jesus tradition, in which not only tradition but also performance is important: not only 'inherent' memory but also 'conferred' memory. A final chapter offers a very interesting account of the use of *ekballō* in the exegetically interesting account of the temptation of Jesus in Mark, then a persuasive treatment of the orality of the Prologue of John's gospel. This is followed by reflection of the very different circumstances of the composition, performance and reception of NT epistolary texts (Romans 10 in this case), and of the Book of Revelation. It is a book worth reading, especially if you feel that you have never quite grasped what they mean when they talk about orality in the New Testament. It must be said, though, that at times Rodriguez is a bit obscure, to a point where it is not always clear what precisely he is saying; and I should like to enter a plea about the notes: if we must have end-notes (though footnotes are enormously preferable), publishers should at least head them with convenient page numbers, so that we can actually find them.

Campion Hall, Oxford Nicholas King

Reading the Bible with Giants: How 2000 Years of Biblical Interpretation Can Shed Light on Old Texts. By David Paul Parris. Pp. xii, 220. Cambridge, Lutterworth, 2015, £20.00.

The Practice of the Body of Christ: Human Agency in Pauline Theology after MacIntyre. By Colin D. Miller (Foreword by Stanley Hauerwas). Pp. x, 218, Cambridge, James Clarke, 2014, £22.00.

Verbum Domini *and the Complementarity of Exegesis and Theology*. Edited by Scott Carl, Pp. xvi, 176. Grand Rapids, MI, Eerdmans, 2015, $25.00.

Text messages are new and interesting phenomena. Arriving directly from the device of another, there is no doubt about the origin of their transmission, yet their relative terseness often raises questions of interpretation—Is she being snide or silly?—ambiguities sometimes resolved by the addition of an emoticon to the text, the sketch of a facial expression, which is, in its way, the admission of linguistic failure or, at the least, of its frailty.

The transmission of texts messages parallels two concerns in the reception of sacred scripture: origin and interpretation. Acknowledging the divine provenance of the scriptures does not mean that they have been transmitted directly to us, like a text, and it definitely does not preclude the need to interpret scriptural texts in a living, historically continuous community. Each of these works grapples with the question of scriptural interpretation.

After only eight years, a second edition of *Reading the Bible with Giants* has now been published. David Paul Parris is clearly a gifted teacher, a compliment offered without benefit of an emoticon. This is not a research monograph but a superb, general-audience introduction, offered to those who read scripture as a fundamentalist, an approach, defined as the failure to recognize and acknowledge one's own act of interpretation. Parris introduces the student to 'an organic relationship between the Bible and its interpretation'. The text is not 'hermetically sealed off from how it is interpreted,' rather there is 'a dynamic relationship between the text and the interpretations that grow out of it. Understanding springs from the interaction between readers and the texts' (9).

Parris roots his inseparable triad of text, reader, and tradition in a theology of history. 'One of the fundamental themes of the Bible is that God is active in history: he initiated it, has been active in it, has a plan for it, and will see it through to the end' (95). And, if students insist upon rejecting an interpretive tradition on theological grounds, the professor offers a sobering *reductio ad absurdum*: 'If tradition reaches a point in time where its foundational documents are no longer accepted as relevant or meaningful it is doubtful whether that tradition could continue to maintain its identity or coherence' (108). Students will find Parris replete with concrete examples of how the translation of a single word, or advances in cosmology or biology, profoundly altered the reception of texts.

Miller's book presumes that texts are always read in the context of other texts and poses a relatively simple, yet stark question, one long needing to be raised: did Luther really grasp something latent in Paul that had eluded the Church for fifteen hundred years? Or is the very idea of a suddenly decisive interpretation, and implementation, of sacred scripture something idolatrous, because it suggests our own mastery of the text? This revision of a dissertation successfully forges connections between contemporary 'apocalyptic' readings of Paul, which gives primacy of place to his Christology and 'virtue ethics' as championed by Alasdair MacIntyre. The latter revives 'the ancient or classical ethical theory wherein character, community, and narrative play central parts' (2). In an ethical tradition stretching from Aristotle to Aquinas, humans are understood to act towards the common good, as they collectively conceive it, in order to achieve their own, communal flourishing. After surveying modern interpreters of Paul, Miller's aim is to provide a more fruitful reading of the apostle than that which is offered by—as he characterizes Lutheran or Reformation—interpretations that 'subordinate Christ to an *ordo salutis* wherein natural law always precedes revelation' (1). Miller argues that ethics is not simply a foil to Paul's soteriology, but rather, in the light of a revived virtue ethics, we must understand the virtues, as Paul did, which is to say, as a natural consequence of what it means to live 'in the body of Christ'. Here's how Miller would read Rom 5: 18: '*Now if through the one trespass [of Adam] condemnation came to all people, in the same way through a just action the practice of justice that leads to life comes to all people*' (71). One need not interpret the text, as Luther did, as Paul's assertion that we are simultaneously sinful and justified.

This work is a well-argued reading of Paul, one which seeks the implications of salvation, where Aristotle and Aquinas—and as Miller shows, the Fathers of the Church between them—would have located them: in the active transformation of the community rather than in a transcendental, forensic decree regarding the individual. This approach allows Miller to reject the Reformation polarities of Spirit, ethics, and sacraments. He sees the latter two as evidence and implication of the community's acceptance of the spirit.

This is a superb, sustained reading of Paul, in which the apostle is concerned 'with the concrete practices of the church,' ethical and sacramental. '[F]or Paul there is the closest relationship between ecclesiology and Christology, so that the concrete practices of the church *are* the church performing Christ' (198). Miller's exegesis is entwined with an adequate and operative ontology. For Paul 'as with other classical Christian accounts of agency grace is the condition of the possibility of human action and nothing something added to it' (205).

Verbum Domini *and the Complementarity of Exegesis and Theology* is the work of American Catholic seminary scholars, examining the contribution that Benedict XVI has made to reception of scripture in the Church. It's a superb collection, perhaps because its fodder is the well-articulated, astute apostolic exhortation *Verbum Domini* (2010), which asked that 'the study of the word of God, both handed down and written, be constantly carried out in a profoundly ecclesial spirit' (§47). The authors discuss the distinction-to-the-point-of-divide that now exists between historical-critical study of scripture and its acceptance in faith by the

Church as a community of believers who receive scripture as divine revelation. Each writer presumes upon the relationship between community and text, which Parris writes so effectively to establish in the mind of his students.

Denis Karkasfalvy opens the collection with an essay on the theology of revelation and sacred scripture's role within it, insisting that *Verbum Domini* explicates and expands *Dei Verbum*, the Second Vatican Council's Dogmatic Constitution on Divine Revelation. 'Sacred Scripture must be regarded as the product of one single sacred history that brought about the coming of Christ at its peak, with the people of Israel in its first phase and the Church in its second phase as the recipients of revelation."

Francis Martin follows with 'Spiritual Understanding of Scripture,' another essay in the theology of revelation, which succinctly identifies the lacuna that this volume targets: 'Perhaps the single most misleading presupposition in the historical study of the Bible is that there is no transcendent cause operative in history' (15). Martin find two theological assertions in the Lucan Emmaus story: 'First, Jesus is the fire of Sinai, the revelatory light and unifying reality of all Scripture. Second, the experience of being instructed by him is one of the proofs of his resurrection' (13). His intriguing conclusion: 'Just as physics reduces the material universe to the "superior" language of mathematics, so critical history reduces the mystery of human existence to the "superior" viewpoint of a certain understanding of causality and the attainability of knowledge of the past: both are prisoners of a loss of transcendence' (21).

'The *historical fact* is a constitutive dimension of the Christian faith.' (29). But, Brad Pitre also insists, historical methodology must not truncate the transcendence of God, in history or in text. '*Verbum Domini* stresses that the *theological* significance of the literal sense of Scripture is an essential aspect of "exegetical science"' (30).

The theological perspicuity and cohesiveness of this collection can be further illustrated when, in her essay on 'The Catholic Use of Scripture in an Ecumenical Dialogue' Christian Washburn pushes the point that 'while many contemporary biblical scholars shy away from allegory, the Fathers were clear, as Augustine notes, that "no Christian would dare to say that the words of God are not to be taken figuratively." It is, after all, a method used repeatedly by St. Paul in interpreting the Old Testament; in this he was followed by the Fathers' (77).

In *Middlemarch* George Elliot wrote, 'For we all of us, grave or light, get our thoughts entangled in metaphors, and act fatally on the strength of them.' Because a text has the ability to endure in time, an attribute the human voice lacks, it's much too easy for us to forget that every text begins life, not as an artefact needing interpretation, but as an entry into, and a participant in, a conversation. Colloquy emerges from community, which is why a living community is still our best hope of understanding the significance of what a text both freezes in time and launches into the future.

The text is the bubbling of the brook. It is all that we hear, but its meaning must be drawn from the silent current. Parris writes to those who hear only the babble, their own reception of the text, and would dismiss the silence of the waters. Miller asks that we re-examine the belief that a single reading, thousands of years later, captured something in Paul that had eluded the Church and her fifteen centuries of life until Luther. In *Verbum Domini* contemporary scholars find delight in adding their insights to those of Benedict XVI, who insisted that the bubbles testify to the life of the brook, drawing both sound and significance from it.

Dodge City, Kansas Terrance Klein

Echoes of Scripture in the Gospels. By Richard B. Hays. Pp. xix, 504, Waco, TX, Baylor University Press, 2016, $47.48.

This is the book that we have all been waiting for since Hays' earlier work on Paul's use of Scripture, and the more recent *Reading Backwards* (2014), in which he directed his and our attention to the gospels. More than this, however, this volume was, impressively enough, completed in the face of his diagnosis with pancreatic cancer, a fact that makes the Preface to this book unusually moving.

The basic message is what Hays taught us by way of this work on Paul, the importance of 'figural interpretation', seeing Old Testament passages in the New Testament not as prediction but as prefiguration, so that it is accurate to say that the events of Jesus' life, death and Resurrection took place 'in accordance with Scripture', and that, as Hays taught us with regard to Paul, we need 'a conversion of the imagination' in order to see texts and the world through the evangelists' eyes and through their deep engagement with Israel's Scripture, which they assiduously reread in the

light of the story of Jesus, a kind of 'retrospective hermeneutic' of Israel's sacred texts, reading them 'backwards'. Hays' approach gives him a wonderfully fresh way of looking at the familiar.

The best way to approach this book might be to offer a hint of the rich interpretation that it offers of the distinctive voices of the four evangelists, in the order in which he discusses them. For Mark, he argues, the idea of 'New Exodus' is a central organising principle for understanding what happened in Jesus' appalling death and the resistance of his contemporaries. Hays finds an extraordinary freshness in Mark's reading of Old Testament texts, and it is a convincing one. The elusive identity of Jesus in Mark (what Wrede termed the *Messiasgeheimnis*) is a part of this exploration, towards which Hays directs what is perhaps his greatest strength, his ear for Old Testament (primarily LXX, of course) allusions and echoes in the New Testament. He suggests that Mark offers a 'demilitarised' Son of David, Jesus as both prophet and Messiah, even though these titles are incomplete as an account of Mark's understanding of Jesus. For in addition to this, Hays correctly observes, Mark identifies Jesus as the embodied identity of the God of Israel. Jesus in Mark, he argues, 'seems to be at the same time…*both the God of Israel and a human being not simply identical with the God of Israel*' (p. 78; his italics). Mark, that is to say, *narrates* who Jesus is.

Matthew, Hays tells us, is much more explicit than Mark in picking up scriptural allusions, and in particular identifying Jesus as 'Israel'. This leads, for example, to an extraordinarily rich reading of Matthew's use of Hosea 11:1 at 2:15, reconfiguring Torah with a 'hermeneutic of mercy' (p. 123). This offers a complex and multi-layered Christology, interweaving many different scriptural traditions and images in the light of the Resurrection. Matthew, argues Hays, transfigures Torah and the prophets, to demonstrate how Israel's story demands a transformation of heart, with emphasis on obedience and mercy, in response to Jesus-Emmanuel.

For Hays, Luke is writing the continuation of biblical history; there are no less than 15 uses of 'fulfilment' terms in his first four chapters, which Hays characterises (p. 194) as 'a narrative world thick with scriptural memory', and speaks of 'the ripple of Pentateuchal echoes' (p. 201). He challenges the common but unreflective characterisation of Luke as evincing a 'low Christology', and picks out the several different Christological strands of the third gospel, including that of Jesus as 'agent of liberation', in the context of Isaiah's vision of the end of the Exile. Hays speaks, tellingly, of the 'intricate portrait woven into Luke's narrative' (p. 243) of Jesus as Lord and God of Israel, confronting the power of empire. In this section, Hays gives a quite brilliant account of Luke's compositional technique, and aptly describes Luke's narrative as 'symphonic'. There is much to ponder on here.

The section on John's Gospel is perhaps the least compelling, the focus hard to see; but even so there is much to commend it. John, Hays shows, does not explicitly cite many OT texts, but is certain that 'Moses and the Scriptures' wrote about Jesus; although it is an oddity that the only explicit citation of the Pentateuch is at 19:36, given the strong claim made by the evangelist at 5:46, it is nevertheless accurate to speak of John's 'fragmentary references' to the story of Israel's Scriptures. In contrast to the Synoptics, the focus of the fourth evangelist is less on the 'narrative continuity' with the history of Israel, but allusions to the text absolutely leap off the page (and we must be grateful to Hays for insisting on this). At times it seems that Hays' main concern, reasonably enough, is to deny any supersessionist interpretation of the gospel. On the difficult word *Ioudaioi*, which appears on no less than 70 occasions in John, Hays correctly states that it refers mainly to 'religious authorities in Jerusalem', not to the Jews of Jesus' time, and certainly not to Jews throughout history. In the fourth gospel, we see the disciples 'reading backwards' and remembering (the important passage 2:13-22, on the cleansing of the Temple, is an obvious example of this). Jesus is God's dwelling place or *σκηνή*, who embodies both Sabbath and Passover. He also suggests (and I have not seen it put so explicitly) that the point about the great *Ego Eimi* discourses is that they evoke deep Scriptural images, such as 'Light of the World', 'Good Shepherd', 'True Vine'; Jesus' body is the place where God dwells.

At the end, it is impossible to be certain whether all the allusions and echoes uncovered by Hays are really there; perhaps occasionally he pushes them too far. However they undeniably they make for a rich and persuasive reading of the gospels. This book certainly takes the reader a good deal deeper into the text of the gospels, and familiar verses gain a refreshing *approfondissement*. Above all we must welcome Hays' insistence on the importance of the LXX for readers of the NT. The book's basic question remains a good one for us to wrestle with: '…what sort of hermeneutical landscape might open before us if we learned to read Israel's Scripture not only through the filtering lens of modern critical methods but also through the eyes of John and the other authors of the canonical gospels?' (p. 347). Hays' conclusion is to be welcomed, revealing to

us the 'symphonic variety of the four-fold gospel', and the irrelevance of much that passes for scholarship in the quest for the Historical Jesus. Hays offers us a God who in the gospels is still alive and creative, and this book deserves to be widely read.

St Mary's University, Twickenham Nicholas King

Beginnings: Ancient Christian Readings of the Biblical Creation Narratives. By Peter C. Bouteneff. Pp. xv, 240, Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2008, pb, £12.99.

B. offers a thorough and well-written account of the early reception of Genesis 1-3. The opening chapter explores the OT texts, including reference to the LXX, OT reception of Gen 1-3 (very limited), and early renderings in Jubilees and other ancient texts. Chapter 2 looks at the NT, focussing on Paul (especially Romans 5) but taking in a range of NT emphases. Chapter 3 is 'Recapitulation' on the second-century apologists: five thinkers from Justin Martyr to Irenaeus. Next are Tertullian and Origen, who is described as 'dropping a very great stone in the water' whose waves are felt to the present day. Chapter 5 traces the reception of Origen's view of Genesis through the Cappadocian fathers. A concluding discussion looks at matters of history, myth, type and allegory, noting the persistence of treating Adam as a literal forefather, Paradise as a place on earth, but, in contrast, a wide range of approaches to the 6 days of Genesis 1 (the 'Hexaemeron'). Although the study suggests up front that it will be driven by some concerns with historicity, by the end it is urging that the paraenetic and christological focus of patristic exegesis 'strips the historicity question of significance'. A careful translation/transliteration of the key Genesis texts makes a useful appendix. This fine study is to be commended for any who want to make statements about 'what the church has always said about Genesis 1'. It is to be noted also that this work represents a serious engagement with the traditions of (eastern) orthodoxy, from a writer at St. Vladimir's Orthodox Theological Seminary, and yet published by a press with more of an evangelical heritage: an encouraging sign.

St John's College, Durham University Richard S. Briggs

Reading Backwards: Figural Christology and the Fourfold Gospel Witness. By Richard B. Hays. Pp. xxii, 155, London, SPCK/Waco, TX, Baylor University Press, 2015, $34.95.

The Dean of Duke Divinity School follows up his classic *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul* (1993) by performing the same service for the four gospels, that is, unfolding the 'joint hermeneutic' that controlled the authors of these texts, specifically, defending the thesis that a deeply embedded knowledge of the Jewish scriptures, or 'Old Testament', is necessary for properly appreciating the ministry, passion, death, and resurrection of Jesus, the carpenter's son from Galilee, and reciprocally and somewhat shockingly, that a knowledge, acceptance, and even conversion to discipleship to Jesus is necessary for a proper reading and appreciation of the significance of the Jewish scriptures. As the evangelist John in his first chapter has Philip tell his friend Nathanael, 'We have found the one about whom Moses wrote the Law, and also the prophets … Come and see.', and as Jesus scolds the two discouraged disciples trudging their way from Jerusalem towards Emmaeus at the end of Luke's gospel: '"O foolish and slow of heart to trust in all that the prophets spoke! Weren't those things necessary: for the Messiah to suffer and enter into his glory?" And beginning from Moses and from all the prophets, he thoroughly interpreted for them the things concerning himself in all the scriptures.' In other words Hays defends, and brilliantly executes, a figural or typological reading of *both* 'testaments', a pattern of promise and fulfilment, whereby the 'Old' provides the precursors of God's acting among his covenant people, and the 'New' presents the paradoxical, destabilizing, and expectation-shattering climax to this historical-cosmological plot. It is a bit disingenuous for Hays to introduce Luther at the beginning of his book as a defender of figural interpretation, and as his ally against 'modern biblical interpretation'. Typological interpretation was a pillar of the Church's traditional reading of both scriptures; it was the reformers who, in their translations of the Bible into the vernacular languages, insisted on the 'plain, simple' meaning of words and who rejected figurative readings as a device whereby the institutional Church could impose non-scriptural 'speculations' upon ignorant and gullible believers. Apart

from that, Hays provides a deep and perspicacious appreciation of each evangelist, and is a superb writer. He does not, however, conceal the point that the reader is thereby called to the same painful conversion as the first audience, as a result of their disappointed expectations based on a scripture they thought they already understood. By exposing unmistakeably the evangelists' figural strategy, Hays nevertheless invites us: 'Come and see'.

Heythrop College Patrick Madigan

Old Testament Theology: Reading the Hebrew Bible as Christian Scripture. By R. W. L. Moberly. Pp. xiv, 333, Grand Rapids, MI, Baker Academic, 2013, $26.13.

The purpose of this book is not to argue, as some of the early apologists operating in a Syriac context argued, that the Jewish scriptures (which were for some time the only Christian scriptures) continue to be revered as true; it is just that Christians claim that Jesus Christ (and the Spirit) were present and operative in the first 'testament' as well as the second. Rather Moberly is combating what he regards as a reduction of Christianity in the modern period to its speculative or theoretical claims, and the correlative belief that one 'understands' or can even present oneself as a Christian when one assents to this intellectual core. This is perhaps an 'occupational hazard' or recurrent temptation for members of the Academy who make their living from teaching, or at least discussing, religion; one is reminded of the professor who thought he knew what love was, because he had read a book about it. This represents a serious impoverishment of the social practices that from its first days marked out Christians, sometimes for persecution, and whose 'bite' we have ceased to feel as we have come to live in a society that, though secular, continues to be deeply shaped by Judeo-Christian values. As Pierre Hadot has reminded us, a similar relaxation happened as 'philosophy' became secularized; in the ancient world philosophers were immediately recognizable by an ascetical transformation and rigorous lifestyle that was common to proponents of various positions and which imbued their teachings with weight, integrity, and credibility.

Judaism is Christianity's parent religion, and this unity and mutual implication between theory and practice has perhaps been more evident in Judaism than in Christianity; 'hear' in the Hebrew scriptures means 'understand *and obey*'. Moberly's method for restoring the practical or performative dimension that should characterize ongoing Christian transformation is to stress the continuities that should be felt by Christians between Judaism and their own faith as the latter read passages in the Hebrew Bible dealing with themes such as monotheism, idolatry, election, covenant, torah, prophecy, psalms, and wisdom; Moberly selects key passages in these areas to bring this Janus-faced (theory *and* practice) aspect to our attention. The heart of the book appears in the chapter 'Does God Change?' which takes up the puzzling scriptural teaching that God can sometimes 'repent' or be dissuaded from a course He has apparently decided upon by the prayers or penance of the people. How can God be both unchanging and changing? The issue is resolved, if at all, at the level of practice and not of theory. God is out-going, inviting us into a relationship of love, and seeking a response – to which He himself will then respond. There is no evading this aspect – or the practical consequences – of this theoretical claim. God's invitation to us through the prophets is both personal and corporate, to co-operate with God in his transformed vision for the world, and 'human greatness is re-envisaged, over against common understandings, in terms of appropriating and displaying the moral qualities of God Himself.' (p. 281) God is jealous for the intimate life with Himself to which He has invited us, but this requires that we learn and voluntarily assume 'a self-dispossessing integrity that practices justice' (ibid.) Here we enter the realm of conversion, providence, and the fidelity of God, which is an aspect of the mystery to which only those who take the practical step have access.

Heythrop College Patrick Madigan

Introducing Theological Interpretation of Scripture. Recovering a Christian Practice. By Daniel J. Treier. Pp. 221, Grand Rapids, Baker Academic, 2008, pb. $17.99.

Daniel Treier has boldly ventured to survey the still nascent area(s) of theological interpretation, and has written an engagingly readable and even-handed introductory text in the process. Recognising that 'theological interpretation' is now an identifiable practice (or family of practices) within the academy,

he sorts through its roots and off-shoots, faithfully mapping several key voices and pointing towards ways to join in the conversation.

An introduction takes its cue from Karl Barth as the great critic of the critics, rehearsing his analysis that so-called critical interpretation of the Bible is not in fact critical enough since it operates with limited horizons as to what counts as relevant. Treier helpfully pinpoints a key issue: 'The Christian freedom to which Barth points is a gift from God *in and through the church*; many disagreements among advocates of theological interpretation of Scripture concern how this churchly reception of divine grace works.' (p.20) He then also takes in evangelical Protestants (unduly beholden to E.D. Hirsch's meaning/significance distinction), Roman Catholic emphases on spiritual exegesis (or 'participatory' exegesis, to use Matthew Levering's term), and the 'postmodern turn', with its concomitant throwing open of all manner of doors leading to various interpretative paths.

Part One of the book then looks at 'Catalysts and Common Themes', in three chapters. One explores the recovery of precritical interpretation, with emphases on piety, Christological reading, and the four-fold sense of scripture (including figural and typological reading). Another focuses on the rule of faith and the interplay between text and doctrine, affirming, along with David Yeago's well-known article on Philippians 2, that the biblical text is already inherently theological, rather than serving as some sort of base or foundation for a second stage of theologising. Treier offers some comments on recent developments on commentary writing too, though perhaps he is a little too easy on Jaroslav Pelikan's *Acts* commentary with its shoe-horning of the text into doctrinal locii. The third chapter is a good review of emphases on readerly virtue and the importance of the community in interpretation, drawing on the work of Stephen Fowl and others influenced by MacIntyre. Treier may be overstating the case when he says 'Advocates of theological exegesis agree that the formation of Christian virtue is a crucial aspect of interpretative practice, perhaps even the most appropriate way of stating its central aim' (p.92), though personally I think this would be all to the good if it were indeed true.

Part Two turns to consider 'Continuing Challenges', again three in number. The first is a review of options for 'biblical theology', looking at the varying perspectives of D.A. Carson, Brevard Childs and Francis Watson. Of these perhaps Childs' approach could have been given slightly more focus as a key prospect for theological interpretation. The second seeks to situate the discussion with respect to general hermeneutics, and is a particularly helpful survey of general and special hermeneutical approaches. The third feels slightly disconnected from the rest of the book, looking at issues raised by the globalisation of the church, and considering some issues arising from cultural perspectives on reading. This is certainly one way to tackle the avowed topic of 'social location', but it would perhaps need greater integration into the ongoing concerns of specifically theological interpretation (as against Bible reading more generally) to show the real coherence of these concerns with the rest of the book. A brief but clear conclusion looks at aspects of theological interpretation, and suggests, probably rightly, that the frequent recourse to discussion of the church as the locus of interpretation needs at least to be supplemented or reframed around a central preoccupation with the God who is 'the ultimate interpretative interest of the church.' (p.204)

This introduction may be recommended to any who sense that new winds are blowing in the world of biblical interpretation but have not been able to catch up with the key issues and thinkers. As an introductory text, Treier provides a sure guide through complex terrain, and is largely successful in avoiding simply providing lists of who said what. Even so, the evaluation is quite light, and one senses that he could have brought interesting perspectives of his own to add to the mix. Perhaps this is a future project, for he is clearly alert to all the various nuances of the issues at stake, and shows an enviable ability to bring together disparate streams of thought. In particular he is to be applauded for including a recurring case study, on the question of how to interpret 'the image of God' in the various perspectives canvassed here. This at least begins the task of earthing all this hermeneutical reflection in the presenting task of reading scripture, and it is good that this is (in one sense) an Old Testament example, thereby avoiding the way in which NT examples can quickly devolve on to ecclesiology and Christology. Such moves are more complex with OT concerns, and Treier offers many helpful insights here. Notably it is the case study which prompts him to his reflective question regarding which intertexts to bring to a 'proper' reading of Genesis 1:26-27: which texts (biblical, ANE, later traditional…) are to be counted as context? This, indeed, is a fundamental matter and is a point rightly raised here. The success of the case study made me want to ask what a case study would look like which focused on interpreting a passage rather than a topic, and whether this might clarify the benefits or drawbacks of particular approaches surveyed herein, but perhaps that would have been to ask for a less introductory and more engaged book.

In short: a valuable introduction, bringing the reader to the right area wherein further discussion is to be had.

St John's College, Richard S. Briggs
Durham University

Theological Theology. Essays in Honour of John Webster. Edited by R. David Nelson, Darren Sarisky and Justin Stratis. Pp. xiii, 363, London, Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2015, $146.00.

St Andrews' Professor of Divinity, John Webster, has reached 60, and this is a *Festschrift* in his honour. It is a substantial collection of 21 theological articles, most of them themselves substantial, and framed by an orientating editorial overview from Sarisky, a lengthy and appreciative personal appreciation of Webster from his St Andrews colleague Ivor Davidson, and a bibliography of Webster's publications that testifies to his remarkable productivity over many years.

Webster is known for his attention to 'theological theology', the title of his Oxford inaugural lecture in 1997, borrowed here for this book. This volume also draws attention to his subsequent inaugural address in 2014 at St Andrews', unpublished at the time of this book but now available free online in the open access *Journal* of *Analytic Theology*: 'What Makes Theology Theological?' (*JAT* 3 (2015): 17-28). The focus is on letting God (*in se*) set the agenda for theological work, and the results have tended to be confident articulations of what the responding human being can say to God – articulations much shaped by Barth and Aquinas. The volume under review does a good job of showing what theological dialogue can look like when informed by such confidence, especially since it does not completely abandon an appropriate humility.

The best essays here evince a willingness to ask big questions about traditional Christian understandings in the belief that it is a failure of nerve to reduce theology to sociological, psychological or anthropological rumination. Several of the most engaging (in this reviewer's opinion) relate to scripture, a topic on which Webster's own work has often focused, albeit in sometimes attenuated relationship to the actual reading of texts. Of particular interest to *Heythrop Journal* readers may be Lewis Ayres' account of Catholic biblical interpretation, arguing that the church passed down not just a scriptural canon but a set of approved interpretative moves alongside it. Functioning as a sort of companion piece is Matthew Levering's 'What is the Gospel?' which takes some recent Protestant apologia for the importance of the church (in the writings of Scot McKnight) and shows how this broader vision of gospel was already found in the work of Aquinas. From the Protestant side on this topic we also have helpful accounts of theological interpretation from Kevin Vanhoozer and from Francis Watson, the latter's a delightfully trenchant piece entitled 'Does Historical Criticism Exist?' This argues that one rhetorical move to be resisted is the aligning of mainstream biblical criticism with specifically historical and critical moves, which has the effect of marginalising theological interest and making it in turn apologise for encroaching on alien territory. Such 'historical criticism', says Watson, is a fabrication, and the label should be abandoned in favour of a thicker and more accurate description of multiple interlocking angles of inquiry. Editor Darren Sarisky also offers 'A Prolegomenon to an Account of Theological Interpretation of Scripture', mapping the requirements to speak theologically of both reader and text in order to arrive at the kinds of practices to which Webster's work points. Finally, regarding scripture, Rowan Williams writes on the plurality of the fourfold gospel witness as constructive for a faithful account of how Jesus reveals the Father.

There is much else of interest in this volume too: on ecclesiology, the Holy Spirit, on love, and on particular writers (where Bruce McCormack offers a probing reading of Barth on Schleiermacher that seeks to show how Barth's own view requires a more positive evaluation of Schleiermacher than is often found among those indebted to Barth). It must be said that one or two pieces seem unduly vague and unfocused: a rather strange set of 'riffs' on Aquinas is short but hard to follow, and there is a piece on 'new and old' that remains gnomic as well as brief. While the book as a whole runs to fewer than 400 pages, each page is dense with text. The thickness of the pages also contributes to the sense of a weighty volume.

Any collection of essays, and especially a *Festschrift*, is inevitably highly varied in focus and content. Even so the editors have done a good job of bringing together at least a good number of contributions that do offer strong reflection on 'theological theology', with a subset of essays on scripture that may make a good contribution to a renewed theological depth of engagement with the Bible, both in practice and in deeper conceptualisation of the task. This is a worthwhile volume for all theological libraries, and contains pieces that deserve to make their mark.

St John's College, Richard S. Briggs
Durham University

Christ among the Messiahs: Christ Language in Paul and Messiah Language in Ancient Judaism. By Matthew V. Novenson. Pp. xiii, 239, Oxford University Press, 2012, $31.81.

This is a book about messianism in Paul and whether Paul developed a messianic Christology. To the casual reader with no background in modern Pauline scholarship it would seem odd that there is an issue here given the fact that Paul, writing in Greek, uses the word *christo*s well over 200 times. However, something odd has happened in that scholarship. It started in Germany in the middle of the nineteenth-century with Ferdinand Baur, who had an agenda – like a number who followed him – that now seems more than a little Marcionite: to reduce the influence of Judaism in Paul's letters in order to emphasise how Paul was creating a Hellenised and gentile version of Christianity. He was seen as drawing gentiles into what was effectively a new religion. There are in fact surprisingly few references to the messiah in Jewish texts between 200 BC and AD 100 and Baur claimed that the word had no determinate meaning by the time Paul came along. So Baur claimed that on the 200 and more occasions when Paul refers to Jesus as Christ the word has no meaning and is used by Paul as no more than a name. It is the equivalent of Tudor or Windsor – but not a *family* name. The only major scholar who took a different and messianic line before World War II was Albert Schweitzer, who associated it with Jewish eschatology. After WWII Pauline scholarship turned towards Judaism and since then a small number have insisted that Christ was a *title* with a meaning, a messianic meaning – Jesus the Messiah. But still the academic orthodoxy was that it was a name with no meaning. Even E P Sanders who shed so much light on Paul through Rabbinic Judaism said that Paul developed a *kurios* Christology and not a *christos* christology.

Those who have held to a messianic meaning for *christos* are Schweitzer, Davies, Dahl and Wright, but the problem for Matthew Novenson is that all four assume that Judaism in Paul's time had a fixed meaning for Messiah that presented Paul with a fixed agenda, so that when he used the title Christ of Jesus, there were certain predetermined consequences: either to present Jesus as a particular kind of Jewish Messiah or as a new kind of Christian Messiah who went against the Jewish prototype. Novenson, however, uses a different methodology. He uses Paul's letters (the seven definitely authentic ones) in addition to other messianic texts of the period as evidence of how 'messiah' was used. So Novenson writes that 'strictly speaking this is not a study of Christ language in Paul but rather of messiah language in ancient Judaism, with Paul as a test case'. While most writers on Paul think they know what "messiah" means (though they add that whatever it means Paul did not mean it), recent Jewish scholarship regards it as an open question. So does Novenson and he throws Paul into the mix.

After showing how late messianic texts are part of a linguistic tradition that is explicitly related to a limited number of earlier, mainly scriptural texts, Novenson looks at the title-or-name debate. By looking at how names worked in the ancient world, he shows that we are not restricted to these two categories. There are also honorifics. His main example is Gaius Octavius Thurinus, who went through a series of astute name changes to become Imperator Caesar Augustus made up of title – name – cognomen, where Augustus (august, venerable) first shows his character and then is taken as a name. His other chief examples are King Antiochus Epiphanes, Judas Maccabeus (hammer) and Shimon bar Kokhba (star). Simon Peter (rock) might be another example. Novenson suggests that this is how 'Christ' works for Jesus in Paul's letters, as an honorific; not a name or a title exactly, but a characterisation.

He then analyses a number of Paul's Christ-phrases to see if they will bear the weight of this categorisation. He refutes Dahl's four philological arguments that are designed to exclude messianic meaning from Paul's use of 'Christ', but at the same time he admits that one is not obliged to translate Christ as 'anointed' or 'messiah' in any of Paul's uses.

As the question of meaning cannot be settled by formal grammar, Novenson moves towards a conclusion in the final chapter by examining nine major passages in Paul's letters to see whether they share the characteristics and function of other Jewish messianic texts. He concludes that in these and other texts 'Paul's prose does all that we normally expect any ancient Jewish or Christian text to do to count as a messiah text', and 'it is possible to trace the particular contours of Paul's messianism by noting which scriptural source texts he cites', texts overwhelmingly from the Davidic tradition. These passages, then, are not just important for understanding Paul's Christology but are 'invaluable examples of messiah language in ancient Judaism'.

Novenson hopes that he has closed off the line of argument that strips Paul's use of 'Christ' of any meaning. Messianism in Paul's Christology is back on the agenda. This a splendid and important study that opens up new projects, some of which are listed by the author at the end.

Harrogate, UK Geoffrey Turner

The One who is to Come. By Joseph A. Fitzmyer, S.J. Pp. xvi, 205, Grand Rapids/Cambridge, Eerdmans, 2007, $18.00/£9.99.

In the outside back cover, this work is aptly described by one specialist as vintage Fitzmyer—corrective, comprehensive and compelling. Surely this work will become the benchmark for all further discussion of the concept of 'Messiah' both in Judaism and Christianity. And by another: A magisterial work; after reading this work, scholars will re-evaluate many cherished assumptions. In his preface F. notes that the title of his book resembles that of Sigmund Mowinckel, *He that Cometh,* the influential book from which he has learned much. His intention is to review the data brought forth by Mowinckel and others in order to put them into what he regards as the proper historical perspective so that one may see how the biblical tradition about a Coming One gradually developed in pre-Christian Judaism and fed into the Jewish tradition about a coming 'Messiah'. Once messianism in the true sense emerged in that tradition, it also fed into the early Church's tradition about Jesus of Nazareth as God's Messiah, or 'Jesus Christ'. This nook is, then, an attempt to respect properly the history of ideas and to reckon with the late emergence of the concept of the Messiah in pre-Christian Judaism.

The book is very systematically laid out. The first brief chapter is devoted to the term 'Messiah'. His concern in this book, Fitzmyer repeats, will be to let the Old Testament use of *msyξ* and its teaching about the continuing Davidic dynasty reveal their developing senses, from the preexilic period to the exilic and post exilic periods of Palestinian Jewish history, so that the reader can see how in the course of time the concept of a Messiah merged in Israel and how it continued to develop. In doing this, he will discuss briefly many of the Old Testament passages that have been drawn into the discussion of the 'messianic idea' in order to establish for them what he regards as the proper sense that they have, when they are not slanted by Christian 'messianic' hindsight. Chapter 2 examines the use of *msyξ* in the Old Testament with regard to kings (generic; Saul, David, Solomon, Zedekiah and Cyrus), priests (3 texts), prophets (2 texts) and Daniel 9:25-26 (to be discussed in chapter 5), with detailed comments on twenty-two of the texts. The final conclusion is again the same: in the original and religious sense of these Old Testament passages, a 'messianic' meaning is out of place. Chapter 3 continues the examination: Other Old Testament passages of often regarded as the background to the term 'messiah', seven texts in all (Genesis 3:14-15; 49:10; Numbers 24:17; Genesis 9:25-27; Genesis 12:3; Exodus 12:42; Deuteronomy 18:15-18). One of the problems with Gen 3:15, as adverted to in a note, is whether with regard to the Hebrew root *swp* there are one or two verbal roots involved (with reference to different editions of Koehler's lexicon). *The Dictionary of Classical Hebrew* (vol. 8, Sheffield, 2011) thinks there are five roots involved with this verb (1. crush, rub; 2. conceal; 3, sweep over; 4. graze, rub; 5. spy; with bibliography for each), with possible relation of Gen 3:15 to 3 of them (1, 4, 5). The conclusion is again similar: While these texts contain promises to bless Israel, and in which Israel is called to be mindful of God's continuous providence for it, it is an unwarranted stretch of interpretation to regard such promises as early instances of 'messianic prophecies' or expressions of a 'messianic hope'. Granting all this, one may note, many of these texts will be understood messianically in later Jewish traditions, as the later section (chapter 9) on rabbinic texts and the targums will show.

Chapter 4 examines twenty texts with Old Testament passages that reveal a developing understanding of the Davidic dynasty, with a few others (Haggai 2:23; Zechariah 9:9-10; Isaiah 55:3-5 and various passages of Qoheleth) and others, but, in his view, the use of the adjective 'messianic' to describe them leaves much to be desired. Mowinckel called many of the 20 texts 'the Authentic Messianic Prophecies', but qualified his statement by saying that 'they are not Messianic in the strict sense'. Fitzmyer ends his chapter, in part citing Mowinckel: 'When the Messiah does appear, however, he will indeed be "the future, eschatological realization of the ideal of kingship"'. Chapter 5 examines the role of Daniel 9:25-26 (the Seventy Weeks of Years) in the emergence of messianism. There (verse 25) there is mention of 'an Anointed One a prince' (*msyξ ngyd*), and (v. 26) of an Anointed One (*msyξ*) who will be cut off. Fitzmyer ends his consideration of the text noting that even if one cannot determine specifically to whom *msyξ ngyd* refers, this passage in Daniel 9 shows that messianism truly emerged in pre-Christian Palestinian Judaism and was not merely a visionary foreshadowing of what New Testament writers would predicate of Jesus of Nazareth. He next goes on to consider the Septuagint's interpretation of some Old Testament passages, 26 in all. These he divides into different classes: 1-3, those in which the Hebrew text has the term *msyξ*, 4-13, passages in the Septuagint where *christos* occurs, without a corresponding

msyξ in the Hebrew; other passages without either, but in some way seen related to the topic, for instance Genesis 3:15; 49:10; Numbers 24:17 where 'a sceptre (shall arise from Israel)' is rendered as 'a man' (*anthropos),* but where this individual man is not given any identifiable 'messianic' designation; finally Ezekiel 17:22d-23a where the Hebrew 'on a mountain top in Israel will I plant it' becomes in the central Septuagint text: 'I will hang him on a mountain top in Israel' taken as a reference to the crucifixion of Jesus. In a Greek papyrus, however, the ending is 'on a high and suspended mountain', indicating Christian interference with the accepted Septuagint text. Apart from the last (and debated text) the survey shows that the contribution of the Septuagint translation to development to the theme of the continuation of the Davidic dynasty is really minimal. With regard to this, one may note that while this holds for these particular texts relating to the Davidic dynasty. This does not necessarily hold for other themes which may have a bearing on eschatology, and indirectly on later messianic teaching. Thus, for instance, the Wisdom of Solomon (composed probably about 30 BCE) with its developed eschatology and retelling of the Genesis 2-3 account, identifying the serpent with the devil (Wis 2:23-24), with some traditions comparable to what is found in the Aramaic Targums; or Jeremiah 31:8 (Septuagint 38:8) where the Hebrew Text ('I will bring them back)…, among them the blind and the lame' (in Hebrew *bm 'wr wpsξ*) is translated as: 'in (or: to) the feast of the Passover' (probably reading the Hebrew as *bm'wd psξ*), and possibly evidence of a belief of the grand return at the Passover feast.

Chapter 7, Extrabiblical Jewish writings of the Second Tempe period, is the longest (52 pages out of 183 of text) and probably the most important section of the book. It examines the Similitudes of Enoch (*1 Enoch* 37-71) and the titles 'Righteous One', 'Messiah', 'Elect One', 'Son of Man'; various Qumran texts having to do with developing Jewish messianism, including some problematic ones; a critical examination of each of the many texts, and with abundant footnotes. This is followed by discussion of two books on Qumran and New Testament messianism, namely Michael O. Wise, *The First Messiah: Investigating the Savior before Jesus* and Israel Knohl, *The Messiah before Jesus: The Suffering Servant of the Dead Sea Scrolls.* This is followed by examination of the relevant texts of *The Psalms of Solomon, The Sibylline Oracles, 4 Ezra, Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* and writings of Philo.

Chapter 8 is on the use of Messiah in the New Testament, with stress that the Greek term *christos* retains its messianic associations. He believes the same is true of Josephus Flavius ('James brother of Jesus who was called *christos* – the Messiah' and Tacitus ('the inspirer of the name [Christians] was *Christus*…'). Whatever of Josephus (who uses both the terms Jesus and *Christos*) it would appear that for Tacitus *Christus* was merely a personal name, without any messianic connotations, as it was for Pliny the Younger (111 A.D.) in his letter to Trajan: Christians meet on a 'fixed day before dawn and sing … a hymn to Christ as to (a) god'. Chapter 9 examines the use of Messiah in the Mishnah, Targums, and other Rabbinic writings. In his initial discussion on the use of the Targums, in a footnote he mentions the present reviewer's dissertation on the topic, *The New Testament and the Palestinian Targum to the Pentateuch* (1966), reviewed by himself in 1968, and here with a caveat as to what is said in the dissertation about the Targum's dating and the failure to realize that there are multiple Palestinian Targums, not just one. This caveat could have been in place in 1968, but much water has passed under targumic bridges since then. A number of the targumic texts examined here were already treated in their Old Testament setting without messianic reference. With regard to Genesis 3:15 he says that the only New Testament allusions to the text are generic in Luke 10:19 and Rev 12:14-17. There may be a reference to it, or influence from the targumic rendering, in Romans 16:12: 'The God of peace will shortly crush Satan under your feet', to be compared with one possible rendering of the targumic text (Gen 3:15) in which the children of the woman are promised a crushing of the serpent in the days of King Messiah.

The work has a brief conclusion in which the Messiah of the New Testament is compared with the corresponding messianic beliefs in Judaism. There are indexes of ancient writings, of authors and of subjects. The author has succeeded admirably in the aim he set himself, with his competent analysis of texts and abundant footnote, evidencing a very wide reading and acquaintance with modern literature on the wide variety of topics. It will serve specialists in the field, researchers, students, and the general interested reader in the subject for decades to come.

Milltown Institute, Dublin, Ireland — Martin McNamara

James, Brother of Jesus, and the Jerusalem Church: A Radical Exploration of Christian Origins. By Alan Saxby. Pp. xxiii, 318, Eugene, OR, Wipf & Stock, 2015, $35.76.

Saxby employs acute scholarship to tease out differences, contradictions, and *aporiae* between the account of early Christianity in Luke's *Acts* and Paul's letters, as well as the fragmentary asides available to us from other sources, to argue powerfully that there were a number of 'proto-Christian' reform groups operating in Jerusalem in the 30s CE who had been inspired by John the Baptist's preaching in their programs to usher in the *eschaton*, and with it God's definitive intervention to drive out the occupying Roman *imperium* and restore the Kingdom of Israel. This arrival could be hastened and reinforced by repentance and a more complete or rigorous adherence to the 'Law', as well as by a supererogatory conversion to go *beyond* the Law in one's deeds of compassion and charity (called *Zekhut* in Hebrew, and similar to Jesus's new 'decalogue' of the beatitudes). These groups knew nothing of Jesus who, although he too had been baptized by John, was pursuing a wandering (non-baptismal) ministry in Galilee. These groups are therefore called 'proto-Christian' only in the sense that they would later (after the defeat of the Jews in the war of 66-70 CE) and the collapse of the nationalistic hopes) be absorbed into the increasingly gentile Christian 'Way'. Already at the conclusion of Matthew's gospel, Jesus commands his disciples to preach the good news 'to the ends of the earth', thus enveloping the whole world, rather than working for the restoration of the Kingdom of David. We thus have a battle between two 'rival' *eschatons* - one nationalistic and confined to the borders of Israel, to restore 'purity' to the Land and to the people of God's special favour, and the other dropping the ethnic and nationalistic associations in favour of an expansion to all peoples of the planet.

James, the brother of Jesus who was considerably older (likely by Joseph's first wife), had moved with some of the other brothers and Mary to Jerusalem during Jesus's Galilean ministry. News of the death and resurrection of Jesus was taken as a 'friendly amendment', rather than the center of their own 'gospel', showing that God's definitive *eschaton* for the Jewish people had indeed begun, and James became the head of the Jerusalem Christian Church (not Peter, who began an itinerant ministry as James' 'lieutenant' – as we see him in *Acts* visiting Antioch). The Jerusalem Church – and Paul, who was 'instructed' by James during his first visit (but warily, because Paul had earlier persecuted this same Christian community) – preached only the events 'in Jerusalem' – that Jesus had been killed by Yahweh's enemies and raised from the dead – a sign that the new and 'last age' had finally begun. The Jerusalem Church knew and cared little about what Jesus had done in Galilee.

Luke, who is writing around the year 100 CE for a largely gentile Church, and is embarrassed by the origin of the Christian Way in a Jewish nationalistic rebellion which ended in disaster with the destruction and dispersal of the Jerusalem Church – 'airbrushes' James and non-Galilean members among the followers of Jesus who were faithful after the Resurrection out of his picture, moving Peter to the center, and showing a non-interrupted, continuous linear development extending from the Galilean ministry, through its climax or 'fulfilment' in Jerusalem, to Jesus's final command at his Ascension to evangelize to the ends of the earth. But James had been an authoritative and towering *eminence gris* in the Jerusalem movement. The latter had been fortified, but not begun, by his 'prodigal' younger brother during his relatively brief three-year ministry, but his bizarre final week in Jerusalem could be absorbed and exploited for the benefit of the Jerusalem Church's long-standing program for the restoration of Israel. Had James survived his assassination by the Saducean high priest who was threatened by this 'pharisaic' social troublemaker, Christianity would look very different today. Paul was torn between the highly political 'Jewish' form of Christianity he encountered in Jerusalem, and the 'freedom' he felt from the 'Law' that Jesus had accomplished through the more complete 'sacrifice' of his suffering, death, and Resurrection. But he also knew and cared little about the Jesus of Galilee.

Heythrop College Patrick Madigan

Simon Peter in Scripture and Memory: The New Testament Apostle in the Early Church. By Markus Bockmuehl, Pp. xvi, 223, Baker Academic, Grand Rapids, MI, 2012, $26.00.

This book, beautifully constructed, argued with clarity and elegantly written, is a model of its kind, a more accessible, but no less learned, successor to the author's 'The Remembered Peter' of 2010. What Bockmuehl seeks to do is to trace Peter's 'footprints in memory, making the point that it is always 'somebody's Peter', rather than an objective figure who can be scientifically recovered, but that a portrait can be

drawn of the character who, after Jesus, is most often mentioned in the New Testament, and particularly in the gospels, though with different lines in all four gospels. Peter is also the only disciple addressed by name in all four gospels. Bockmuehl makes some shrewd methodological points on the usefulness of attending to the 'historical aftermath' of NT figures, and sharply, if paradoxically, observes that 'contemporary observers are often poor witnesses to the history of their own times' (p.10). The point is, he argues, that by paying attention to the text (and Markus Bockmuehl is an admirably attentive reader of the NT and patristic texts that he covers, not to mention his grasp of the archaeology of Rome and Palestine), it is possible to elucidate the 'shape' of Peter's memory. Bockmuehl has some interesting ideas on Peter's name; he suggests that although he was called 'Simeon bar Yona', he retained the Greek nickname of 'Peter' or 'Rock' from his early days in Bethsaida, and that it was Jesus who gave him the Aramaic nickname of 'Kephas'. Peter started life in what archaeology reveals to have been a Greek-speaking and largely non-Jewish town, from which also his brother Andrew and Philip (the only two disciples with Greek names) emerge. Early traditions, and the gospel evidence, suggest that he had moved to Capernaum by the time that he encountered Jesus, possibly in order to marry into Jewish culture. He functions in the gospels as a spokesman, and also as one who takes the lead in asking questions; but (especially in Matthew) he embodies both faith and doubt. In Acts he disappears rather abruptly, as scholars have frequently noted, after Acts 15; and 1 Peter has frustratingly little in the way of personal or biographical allusions. However when he turns to examine the living memory of Peter in the East, with Ignatius, Justin Martyr and Serapion, Bockmuehl produces a convincing 'shape of the Petrine ministry' (the author has a gift for telling phrases of that sort), with a mastery of the relevant texts. Bockmuehl, it is noticeable, never makes claims that are not possible on the basis of the evidence as it is; indeed if anything he is rather cautious, which makes his conclusions all the more compelling. The tendency is for Peter to 'get it right on the second attempt', he argues, 'a sympathetically fallible man of resolve, eager to demonstrate commitment, but slow to grasp the spiritual point at issue' (p.66). Peter's identity in Matthew, he argues, has a very Jewish flavour, even though he is just a very ordinary Galilean, and rather unexpected as the foundation-rock for the assembly (Bockmuehl is cautious in his assessment of the question of whether this implies that Peter had any successors). Interestingly the author finds that Matthew is closer to Peter and his world than Mark, and that the first evangelist sees Peter as 'positioned at the centre of the Jesus tradition, as an eye-witness and transmitter of the oral history that became the story of Jesus'. Paul, likewise, clearly understands Peter as a defining figure in the Jerusalem church. Both the Eastern and the Western tradition (and Bockmuehl examines both with characteristic care) link Peter to Rome rather than to the East (other than the house in Capernaum); and several Roman memories, including at that of at least one non-Christian (Phlegon of Tralles), suggest that he died in Rome under Nero. The gospel of Mark may well have been written in Rome, but with a good deal of Palestinian influence on language and content. Peter is prominent here, and, as in John, when he is introduced the assumption is that the reader already knows him. Peter in the second gospel has, the reader observes, privileged access to private episodes in Jesus' life and ministry, and there are occasional glimpses (e.g. Mark 14:54) of the vivid recollection of an eyewitness, and Bockmuehl concludes that 'Mark is merely the earliest and most influential account in a whole tradition of Peter as the chief witness to the memory of Jesus'. There are two final chapters in this book, which are on no account to be missed, on Peter's 'conversion', which Luke 22:31-32 places in the future, between, presumably, Good Friday and Easter Sunday (with a fascinating treatment of the importance of the rooster in Petrine iconography), and on Peter's background and place of origin. This book ought to be widely read and discussed; it will set several cats among the exegetical pigeons.

Campion Hall Nicholas King

Paul and the Vocation of Israel: How Paul's Jewish Identity Informs his Apostolic Ministry, with Special Reference to Romans (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft vol 205). By Lionel J. Windsor. Pp. xii, 305, De Gruyter, Berlin/Boston, 2014, $154.00.

Lifting the Veil: 2 Corinthians 3.7-18 in the Light of Jewish Homiletic and Commentary Traditions (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft vol 210). By Michael Cover. Pp. xv, 345, De Gruyter, Berlin/Boston, 2015, $107.00.

Windsor's monograph explores one aspect of Paul's Jewishness, namely Paul's understanding of his own vocation in relation to Israel's vocation to the world. Israel's vocation comes from being the recipient of God's revelation. This can be understood as 'election' but receiving divine revelation comes with responsibilities for bringing the world to glorify God. The common understanding was that Israel fulfilled its vocation by keeping the Law of Moses and acting as a model of what it is to glorify God. For Paul, in the early part of

his life, this meant zealously protecting the synagogue from heretical threats within the community as well as lawless threats from outside. Paul then underwent a conversion and came to understand his own vocation and that of Israel in a different way. This could have meant rejecting Israel's vocation as being antithetical to the new vocation of the church – in effect moving from one religion to another so that Paul was no longer religiously Jewish, a view hardly defended any more. Or it could mean that Israel's time was now up and its sense of vocation was no longer relevant to the world within the fuller vocation of (what was to become) Christianity. However, Windsor's argument is that Paul's vocation to the gentiles was his way of being Jewish. In no sense did Paul give up being Jewish, though he came to understand in a new way what it was to have a Jewish vocation. We are dealing here with the question of how Paul understood himself as a Jew after his 'conversion'.

Paul certainly agrees that Israel had and continues to have a vocation related to the Law but he now understands that vocation in the light of the gospel of Christ. This leads him to see the Law in a new way. The mainstream view was to see a life structured by the Law as offering a model to the world that could demonstrate God's wisdom and power, which might bring gentiles to God. But Paul believed that Israel had failed in such a vocation by failing (some of them) to keep the Law, leading gentiles to blaspheme God. The purpose of the Law, then, was to convict the world – Jewish and gentile – of sin. The Jewish vocation, according to Paul, is now to preach the gospel of faith in Christ as the only way to deal effectively with sin. Paul's mission to the gentile world was his way of being authentically Jewish.

The focus of Windsor's exegesis is Romans. He looks at Paul's language about Jewish identity and the Jewishness of Paul's own sense of vocation in the introduction to Romans (1.1-15) and at the conclusion of his argument (15.14-33). Romans 2.17-29 is a crucial passage for contesting and refining the distinct nature of Jewish identity and Jewish vocation. This passage, Windsor maintains, is about identity and vocation and not about soteriology: whether Jews and/or gentiles are saved. He divides it into three sections: vv.17-20 describe the mainstream view of the Jewish vocation as expressed by a 'synagogue-based Law-teacher'; 21-27 deconstructs this using two arguments, namely (i) Law-breaking by some (not necessarily all) Jews has led to the failure of the vocation to bring glory to God (21-24), and (ii) using the figure of a Law-adhering gentile to expose the contradictions of the traditional view (25-27); and finally Paul reconstructs a fresh sense of Jewish identity in vv.28-29.

Again the author divides chs.9-11 into three, though these chapters are as much about Paul himself as about Israel. In ch.9 Paul identifies himself as a Jew but expresses his sorrow that so few Jews share his understanding of their proper vocation. Ch.10 presents two competing senses of vocation based on antithetical senses of identity related to antithetical understandings of the Law of Moses and Israel's role in God's eschatological purposes. However, in ch.11 Paul pulls the two senses of vocation together to gives Israel's failure a place in his own new vocation to preach Christ to the world. Windsor thinks that Paul places himself as a successor to Isaiah's 'servant', though Windsor thinks this by translating *doulos* as 'servant' and excluding any social or political sense of what it might be to be a slave in the Roman Empire. This is certainly a study to be consulted by anyone exploring Paul's relationship to the synagogue.

The second monograph for ZNTW by Michael Cover explores the literary background to 2 Corinthians 3.7-18, which contains exegesis of Exodus 34 where Moses comes down from the mountain with the second set of commandments written on stone tablets and with his face veiled having met with God and picked up the divine radiance. This passage is found in a broader context of 3.1-4.6 (and beyond), which is surely Paul's most anti-Judaic passage, and how one understands it is important for understanding how Paul related to Jewish synagogue religion after his conversion.

The first question is whether 3.7-18 belongs in this place as it begins so abruptly or whether it has been edited in inappropriately at this point in what is almost certainly a composite letter. However, it does not end abruptly as the verses that follow proceed quite smoothly. The author has compared 3.7-18 first with other, as it were, midrashic passages in Paul: Gal 4.21-5.1; Rom 4.3-25; 1 Cor 10.1-13. He finds the 2 Cor passage similar in its sequential exegesis but without an introductory formula. He then explores what he calls secondary-level exegesis in samples of Hellentistic literature: Philo's commentaries on the Pentateuch; Plato's *Meno*; and Qumran's *11QMelchizedek*. Then he looks at exegesis in homilies and Gospels: Hebrews 3-4; Acts 2; Luke 4.16-30 and John 6.31-58. And finally Ps-Philo and Seneca. What Cover has found is that the structure of Paul's exegesis fits a wider pattern found in other Hellenistic commentaries, particularly in Philo, and from that point of view it fits quite satisfactorily into its context in 2 Corinthians – it has not been edited in inappropriately. Such a comparative study indicates some of the elements that made up Paul's education in Hellenistic Judaism.

Cover's approach is resolutely historical and at this point he says that his primary aim has been 'to illuminate the rhetorical function of Paul's epistolary exegesis'. At the end he pushes a bit further by considering the role of Moses. In contrast with Philo,

who comments on the more popular Ex 33, Paul sees Moses as an anti-hero who brings a law written in stone that represents a covenant whose glory is fading; and as a hero and paradigm of Christians who can now look God in the face (2 Cor 4.1-6). But that is as close as you get in this book to any theology and, while the book is packed with heavy research and detailed argument, the author has not moved us on very much further in understanding what Paul was telling his Corinthian readers.

Harrogate, UK Geoffrey Turner

The Father Who Redeems and the Son Who Obeys: Consideration of Paul's Teaching in Romans. By Svetlana Khobnya. Pp. xvii, 196, James Clarke, Cambridge, 2014, $26.00.

Christ Died for Our Sins: Representation and Substitution in Romans and Their Jewish Martyrological Background. By Jarvis J. Williams. Pp. xxiii, 221, James Clarke, Cambridge, 2015, pb £17.75.

Another exposition of Romans, this one using as its focus what Paul thinks of the role played by God the Father. It very much reflects the mood and content of what is being newly written about Paul these days. The brief section on methodology affirms the importance of intertextuality and the OT (Richard Hays), a narrative approach to the letter and what is assumed by it historically (N T Wright), the worldview that Paul draws on (Wright again), and the heuristic approach of Philip Alexander where later information is used to explore the meaning of the earlier letter.

As a theme that the author says has not been much used to help make sense of Romans, Svetlana Khobnya surveys the theme of the fatherhood of God first in the OT and shows that there is more of it, particularly in the later writings, than we are normally led to believe. The key to understanding Romans in this context is the centrality of God's faithfulness despite Israel's lack of fidelity. This leads Khobnya to emphasize the meaning of *pistis* not so much as believing doctrine but as faithfulness/fidelity. And *dikaiosunē* is more to do with God's righteousness than what has been traditionally talked about as justification. Faith in the first place is seen as being virtually synonymous with obedience as in Rom 1.5 and 16.26. So the faith of Christ means first his obedience to his Father and then his faithfulness in seeing his mission through, and so realising the faithfulness of the Father towards Israel. Israel is, in principle, redeemed, but as God's original purpose was for Israel, God's elect people, to take God to the gentile world, Christ's mission – begun in obedience to the Father and continued faithfully – is now to bring in the gentile world together with a redeemed Israel. The author explores Paul's account of the role of Adam and Abraham in all this.

As you would expect, Khobnya, following Hays, takes the expression *pistis Christou* to be a subjective genitive that means 'the faithfulness of Christ', not 'faith in Christ', but she has been seduced by Douglas Campbell's implausible opinion that Romans 1.18-3.20 is not Paul's voice but that of a fictitious Jewish Christian teacher whom Paul is opposing in the rest of the letter.

So far so familiar for those who have been reading recent books on Paul, but this book is none the worse for that. It is a perspicacious account of the meaning of Paul's letter that I find very congenial. It has an interestingly fresh slant on the letter even if it does not contain anything radically new. It has the virtue of having lots of references to Paul's own writing and the quality of the English is excellent for someone whose first language is Russian (a convert to evangelical Christianity). The book is also resolutely theological in its approach to Paul.

In Khobnya's exposition of Paul's pattern of redemption, Christ dies as a *hilastērion*, the sacrifice of a perfect Jewish martyr, which links us to the work of Jarvis Williams, who explores the influence of Jewish martyrological [unfortunately misspelt on the cover – did no one spot it?] traditions on Paul's understanding of the death of Jesus Christ in Romans. These traditions of the vicarious death of Jewish martyrs are to be found in 2 & 4 Maccabees and LXX Daniel 3.1-90. He has been working on this theme for some years and had formerly assumed a use of these traditions in all Paul's letters that refer to Christ's death, to the exclusion of other traditions that might make sense of that same death. As a result of subsequent debate, Williams has adopted a more modest position whereby he accepts that Paul might have used other OT traditions and here he gives only an account of brief texts in Romans. This is, then, quite a narrowly focused monograph and readers will also need be able to read Greek and Hebrew.

Did Paul know 2 & 4 Maccabees and Daniel or did he just share a common way of thinking about the death of Jewish martyrs? We cannot be certain, though Williams assumes the former. However, he accepts that these traditions have absorbed ideas from earlier OT texts, namely cultic passages about sacrifice in Leviticus and about God's servant in Isaiah 53. Indeed according to Romans 3.25 Christ died as a *hilastērion* – the word used in the martyr tradition in 4 Macc 7.22 with its verbal form being

used in LXX Leviticus, but not used in LXX Is 53.10 – an atoning sacrifice.

A parallel theme in the book is whether Christ died as a representative of or a substitute for sinners, that is non-Torah observant Jews and, in the case of Romans, gentiles as well. The distinction is that a representative is one of the group he represents – which means that an animal in the OT can hardly represent the people whose sins are atoned, and most Christians would think that Jesus does not in this context *represent* sinners as such – while in substitution the martyr/sacrifice *takes the place of* those whose sins are atoned. As in football the substitute comes on and the one replaced goes off the field of play. This theme of Christ's death as representation or substitution is much discussed by evangelicals, though I am not sure that it is distinction worth spending much time on.

After a chapter on previous research in this area, Williams devotes two chapters to exploring representation and substitution in the Hebrew cult and Isaiah 53, and then in Second Temple martyrologies. Then, before a general conclusion, there are three chapters that look at texts in Romans – in reality they are very short texts as they are in Maccabees. Williams' thesis, in brief, is that Jewish martyrologies have influenced 3.21-4.25 where we find Jesus's death as a substitution; 5.6-11, 8.1-4, and 8.31-34 again as substitution; and 5.12-6.23 as representation. So we find both ideas in Paul, the one complementing the other. Williams certainly thinks that the distinction is significant with substitution being the more important idea because it is in these passages that Paul identifies the specific benefits of salvation that have been accomplished by Jesus's death (justification, reconciliation, deliverance from God's wrath) and are offered to Jewish and gentile sinners to be appropriated by faith.

Harrogate, UK Geoffrey Turner

Mark and Paul: Comparative Essays Part II, For and Against Pauline Influence on Mark (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft vol 199). Edited by Eve-Marie Becker, Troels Engberg-Pedersen and Mogens Müller. Pp. viii, 330, De Gruyter, Berlin/Boston, 2014, $92.33.

The research project that has produced the papers that are collected here has its roots in the work of the nineteenth-century Tübingen School. F. C. Baur came up with the unlikely theory that Mark's Gospel was a fusion of both Petrine and Pauline traditions and had been written in the second-century CE, with Mark being a first step towards a final Johannine synthesis. But in 1857 Gustav Volkmar suggested that Mark was a Pauline Gospel, in which Paul's concepts had been allegorised in narrative form. Volkmar had a few supporters (Jülicher, Wrede) but a monograph by Martin Werner in 1923 seemed to have put a stop to his influence. However, there has been a mini-revival of the idea that Mark might have been influenced by Paul (it cannot have been the other way about) or that they at least shared common traditions or influences. This move has been led by Joel Marcus and has led to a more general opening up of the question with conferences of members of the New Testament Departments of the Universities of Aarhus and Copenhagen and the publication of two volumes: the first (BZNW 198), an "overview of the historical, literary and theological track that might have led from Paul to Mark"; and this, the second (BZNW 199) that covers the issues and arguments.

It is in three sections, the first of which is 'Histories and Contexts'. Anne Vig Skoven gives a full account of Volkmar's argument and Werner's reaction to it. Skoven suggests that despite what she sees as the weakness of Werner's position, we should not so much try to prove that Mark is in effect Paul's Gospel as see how Paul might help us to understand some difficult passages in Mark. Joel Marcus then identifies items on which Paul and Mark seem to converge: *euangelion*, faith, etc., and especially the cross. Gerd Theissen explores at length the concept of "gospel" in Mark and argues that he has developed an understanding begun by Paul. He then develops some ideas about the location of Paul and Mark and others in early Christianity that stretches the evidence perhaps beyond its limits. Heike Omerzu outlines the history of research in this area; Eve-Marie Becker locates our apostles within their literary culture; and Mogens Müller says that behind both are congregations, whom Paul and Mark were each addressing and influencing. For both of them their chief concern was what constitutes the Christian life and how to live it. Each is about the 'paraenetic implications of the Jesus story', one in letters and the other in narrative form.

The second section is 'Texts and Interpretations'. The textual connections are here quite limited: Oda Wischmeyer comparing the introductory verses of Romans and Mark; traces of Paul in the high Christology of Mark 2.27-28 by Jan Dochhorn; Kasper Bro Larsen considering whether Mark 7.1-23 on unclean foods is a Pauline Halakah (it isn't); and Troels Engberg-Pedersen giving his all to finding parallels with Paul on Christian identity in Mark 8.34-9.1.

We edge towards theology proper in the third section on 'Topics and Persepctives'. Ole Davidsen is modest in his approach and finds no clear evidence of a direct influence between Paul and Mark in an Adam/son of man Christology, but only a suggestion, through mutual correspondence, of a pre-Pauline myth that they both understood. Jesper Tang Nielsen, on the other hand, thinks that Mark's understanding of the cross builds directly on how Paul made sense of the earliest interpretations of the death of Jesus. Finn Damgaard has an intriguing approach to Mark's unfavourable portrait of Peter. He thinks Mark has adopted Paul's autobiographical style of 'reversal' (portraying himself badly) to present a modest and even critical picture of a man he actually admired and thought important.

The most interesting paper in this collection is by Gitte Buch-Hansen and is a complex analysis of Paul and Mark's Christologies in the light of Paul's use of pneuma, which in turn is given a Stoic reading influenced by Engberg-Pedersen. While Paul's Christology leads to the incorporation of baptised gentiles into Judaism (and seems to imply that for Paul what we call Christianity is only for the benefit of gentiles), Luke's Christology implies that Christians are separated from Judaism, while Mark occupies a middle ground, following Paul but mapping out his own position. A challenging, controversial but not necessarily convincing paper.

After this for the most part objective review, it should be said that this collection has more than a hint of clutching at straws to keep a funded research project going. There is little cohesion among the papers beyond looking at Paul and Mark together, and even less agreement about whether there are any direct influences. The obvious conclusion is that they shared some common ideas but that is hardly surprizing as they were two of only a small pool of literate, intellectual Christians, whose writings are separated by not much more than a decade. What limited and conflicting conclusions are reached in separate papers here are not of great consequence to NT studies. The editors' rhetoric refer to this as a "crucial" and "indispensable" issue, so that the thinness of the conclusions reached so far show that further work is demanded. But perhaps there is not that much to be developed in the first place.

Harrogate, UK Geoffrey Turner

The Gospel According to Mark: A Commentary (CBNT Series 2004). By Camille Focant; translated by Leslie Robert Keylock. Pp. xvi, 740, Eugene, OR, Pickwick, 2012, $67.77.

This excellent commentary follows a sensible narrative-critical approach; that is to say that 'Matthew' is the 'implied author', 'the image of the author as it is revealed in the work through his writing choices, and the display of a narrative strategy', rather than the historical person responsible for the text. Each pericope is given a competent literal (or 'working')translation, with a consideration of text-critical questions in footnotes, and a good bibliography in several languages, followed by an 'Interpretation', intended to be more accessible, and Notes, which are more specialist. The Introduction admirably captures the strangeness of Mark's gospel, and shows a good grasp of recent literature (even in English) on the Second Gospel. He makes a perceptive point on the genre of Mark: 'If we call it a biography, we must immediately specify that it is the biography of a man believed to be king, and acting beyond his execution and death'. Focant sensibly avoids reaching definite conclusions on introductory questions such as the date and place of Mark, its structure and sources, and its addressees, and the theological issues that Mark might have been facing, although as far as one can judge he inclines to the more conventional answers. It is in keeping with his overall aim that he stresses that the main source of illumination in the narrative is the plot (the actions narrated, and the links between them), and occasional light from the narrator or from a Bath Qol, which, with the Scripture citation with which the gospel begins, 'means that the course described in what follows originates in a word that goes beyond it', and this captures exactly what Mark is up to. Focant shows the skill with which Mark reveals the protagonist's character from the very beginning, and how the narrative is inserted between two baptisms (1:10; 10:38) for the first part, and between two 'tearings' (1:9-11; 15:38 and perhaps also 14:63) for the story as a whole. Jesus is only correctly understood as Son for Mark, if that also includes his passion and death; and the reader is a privileged witness to all this. Focant is excellent on the titles of Jesus, but pays careful attention to the world of the story, concentrating that rather than on history. This is a very scholarly work, and the author makes some outstandingly perceptive linguistic observations; but it is very readable, and, importantly, the author is evidently entirely at home in the text. A good test for a commentary is this: have I gained any

insights from this work that I would not have thought of unaided? And such insights come by the bucketful in this work. Not that all scholars would agree with all Focant's conclusions; but that is not the point. His comments on any given pericope are always worth attention, and he is interesting and persuasive on the 'cursing' of the fig-tree, which, he argues, is not really a cursing at all, but a prophetic gesture indicating the uselessness of the Temple. Focant is probably correct in his general line of argument, that the 'Jerusalem' section of the gospel is better seen as its 'Temple' section. This is a commentary heartily to be recommended, especially for those who always meant to get round to a narrative-critical approach to Mark, but have never yet quite managed. The translation is very competent for the most part, but seemed to lose its sureness of touch at about chapter 11.

St Mary's University, Twickenham Nicholas King

Mark (New Cambridge Bible Commentary). By Darrell Bock. Pp. xiv, 424, Cambridge University Press, 2015, $36.99.

This is an unusual commentary, in that right from his very solid introduction the author concentrates on the different lines of approach that has been taken in the commentaries of the 20th and (so far) 21st centuries. This offers a useful reminder of how very differently competent scholars can treat the same material; it follows from this that any sentence that contains the phrase 'it is now an assured truth of biblical studies…' will be rapidly falsified. Despite, for example, all the rigorous investigative work of recent decades, the identification of the author of the second gospel as 'John Mark', and of its setting as Rome in the years before the First Jewish War, have never gone away. In his introduction, Bock offers us a very helpful survey of previous studies and commentaries, which reminds us of how many different fashions there have been in Marcan scholarship down the years; and that is a useful, and at times chastening, discipline for one who would read Mark intelligently. The author points to the recent strengthening of the case for Papias' alleged views on Mark (whatever Eusebius of Caesarea may have thought of him), and for Peter as a possible source for this gospel (not to mention as the author, in some sense, of 1 Peter). There will be colleagues who will shift restlessly at the reappearance of these views, but they are not soon likely to disappear. Mark is, Bock argues, a very Jewish gospel, despite what is sometimes rather casually asserted; and it is not at all evident, as is sometimes too strongly asserted, that he knows nothing of Palestinian geography. The Jesus of this gospel is, Bock rightly opines, one who 'thinks and acts out of the breadth of Jewish expression'. That is something that cannot be said too often. Another sensible observation is Bock's underlining what Papias says about Mark not being unduly bothered by questions of chronology, from which it follows that it may be a step too far to allege that the second gospel has no notion of any more than a one-year ministry for Jesus (and in any event the three years ordinarily assigned to the Fourth Gospel depends upon the three Passover references, which may have a theological rather than an historical bent). Mark 14:12-16 fairly clearly demands that Jesus has previously visited Jerusalem. Bock also offers some useful reflections on Wrede's 'Messianic Mystery', which he prefers to classify as Jesus' 'messianic ambiguity', with Mark introducing the notion of suffering into the understanding of Jesus as Messiah, so that the ambiguity reflects the care with which Jesus handled the title, as he recasts that dangerous category. The early Church would not have invented so perilous a claim unless there had been in some sense or other an anticipation of it in the course of Jesus' ministry. For the genre of Mark, Bock reverts to the category of bios, and makes a good case for it: the life, in acts and sayings, of a hero who is worthy of emulation; but he also makes the important point that Mark is clearly influenced by OT historiography, so that God as agent is key to the events narrated (Mark's frequent use of the *passivum divinum* is good evidence in this direction). All in all, then, this is a sensible commentary, showing a good grasp of the first century Palestinian and Jewish Greek background, and Bock is perceptive on the 'mood' of Mark's narrative. Bock is admirably attentive to the text, and offers a useful bibliography in several languages (though there are some irksome mistakes in Greek and French that should have been dealt with in the copy-editing). This is a useful commentary and can be put safely in students' hands.

St Mary's University, Twickenham Nicholas King

The Original Ending of Mark: A New Case for the Authenticity of Mark 16:9-20. By Nicholas P. Lunn, Pp. xii, 378, Cambridge, James Clarke, 2015, $45.00.

It is always salutary (if alarming) to have a fresh look at apparently unshakable certainties in NT scholarship, and here is just such a thing, a very striking review of the evidence on which is grounded the broad consensus that Mark 16:9-20 (hereinafter the 'long ending', or LE) is regarded as a later addition, cobbled together from the other gospels. The author has apparently been stimulated to review the arguments by contemporary scepticism that denies the Resurrection, on the basis of the ending of the second gospel at 16:8; and if that is the case, he is quite correct, for it is clear that Mark believes in the Resurrection; and with some gusto Lunn argues that 'an interpretation presupposing 16:8 as the actual conclusion are based on an "uncertain foundation"', which, since the 19th Century, has been asserted rather than argued for. The author proceeds entirely sensibly through the external evidence, the biblical mss and the patristic references, and argues that the weight of the material falls on the side of a textual dislocation a century and a half later; what will surprise many people is that he argues that the two mss that lack the LE, namely Sinaiticus and Vaticanus, are misleadingly described as 'the earliest mss'. For both numerically and in terms of their diversity, the manuscript support (including the versions) for LE is very considerable, including the fact that these two impressive mss are 4th Century, and there is much earlier patristic evidence for LE. Lunn makes a good point when he argues that the scribes of both mss show signs of knowing that there was a longer version, Vaticanus by leaving an unaccustomed blank page, and Sinaiticus by way of ornamentation and a horizontal and a vertical line. The fact is that there is no evidence against LE prior to the 4th Century. Lunn then goes on to challenge the apparently secure consensus on the linguistic evidence, formed on the basis of vocabulary and style; and he is bold enough to construct an argument in favour of Marcan authorship of verses 9-20, on the grounds that the arguments based on the concentration of unusual language are not as strong as we had supposed. (Scholars may blench, of course, at what the implications of this insight for that other apparently unshakable consensus, on the non-Pauline authorship of the 'Deutero-Paulines' and the Pastorals). Lunn has assembled a remarkable range of comparative material, and demonstrates a sharp eye for parallels in not only the second evangelist, but also in the OT, and by the end, the *feeling* that LE is rather different turns out not to be supported by the *facts*. For this reader at all events, the linguistic evidence made the head spin more than somewhat, but it is powerfully marshalled, and seems on the face of it very impressive. One point on which Lunn may well be right is Mark's use of *inclusio*, and he detects one of these between 1:1-20 and the LE, arguing on the basis of a five-fold relationship and five verbal linkages between the two, as well as Mark's fondness (frequently remarked on by scholars) for three-step progressions, which he applies also to the LE. These do not obtain if the gospel ends at 16:8. When he comes to examining Mark's microstructure and macrostructure, Lunn puts together a powerful case that demands at the very least a detailed response, and not an instant rejection (the response for which some in the guild may be tempted to reach). Chapter 7 is perhaps the weightiest part of the book, on the Marcan themes that he detects in the LE, and the purposeful structuring that the author finds from 11:1 to 16:20. Among the Marcan themes for which Lunn argues in the LE is that of Exodus, where he makes a very strong case indeed, and concludes that there is 'an essential unity between the last twelve verses and the rest of the gospel'. What then about the dependence on the other gospels that over the years has been found in LE and the other three gospels? Lunn shows a profound knowledge of Mark and constructs an impressive argument that the dependence goes the other way round, and argues, somewhat unexpectedly, that the Petrine passages in Acts are dependent on LE. At this point I found myself wondering how convinced colleagues will find themselves by this or by the undeniably interesting notions of 'selectivity' and 'telescoping' and 'implicit events' in biblical narrative; and I have to say that in teaching Mark, it has been my experience that ending the gospel at 16:8 does actually 'work'; but it will be interesting to see how other NT scholars assess this interesting book. If the LE was lost, then the question arises, was that accidental or deliberate? Was it (as I have been accustomed to argue in lectures) 'the rat hypothesis' or 'Egyptian Gnosticism or Hellenistic dualist anthropology' that cause the excision of LE? It will be interesting to see how the debate goes; but scholars will do their craft no service if they simply ignore this extraordinary work.

St Mary's University, Twickenham Nicholas King

What was Mark for Matthew? (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament. 2. reihe 344). By J. Andrew Doole. Pp. xvi, 221, Tubingen, Mohr Siebeck, 2013, $105.00.

This book is a compelling read, with never a wasted page as the author worries away, terrier-like, at the text of Matthew and of Mark. Nothing is redundant as the argument builds up, and each section advances his case a step further. Doole's argument is that Mark was a source-text for Matthew, which he reuses and retouches precisely because he approves of it; so Doole speaks, in a way that no one else in this reviewer's knowledge ever does, of 'the proximity and loyalty of Matthew to Mark'. So he is not of the view that Matthew is a 'Q-Christian'; 'Mark's gospel was Matthew's gospel', he claims; it was his primary source, 'almost wholly reproduced, rarely neglected, constantly improved and constantly followed'. Q on the other hand is no more than a sayings-source, although Doole is perfectly happy with the possibility of some 'Q-Mark overlap', in a way that other theorists of the Synoptic problem simply are not. Q is (unlike Mark) a 'source, which Matthew exploits but does not emulate'. 'M', on the other hand, that is to say the special material found only in Matthew, and which is neither Mark nor Q, is too varied to be a single source, and was probably originally oral rather than written material. What Matthew successfully manages is to integrate Mark and Q, a key development in early Christian literature. Matthew does this primarily, Doole argues, in chapters 3-11, which is where most of Q is found, but without ever abandoning Mark's basic structure; Matthew uses Q, not because he is a 'Q-Christian', but because he 'revels in the teaching of Jesus'. Mark, therefore, is the 'base-camp' for Matthew's project, the mountaineering metaphor a helpful one in this context, raising the question of what a gospel is, and how evangelists go about composing their text. Doole is certain that what we have in Matthew is by way of additions (Infancy Narratives and Resurrection stories and discourses), omissions (possibly because occasionally Matthew felt dissatisfied on theological or other grounds), and amendments (replacing Mark's unusual vocabulary and adding connections). Perhaps the most interesting section of the book, though the reader should be warned that it can be demanding, is where Doole works through parallel texts in Mark and Matthew; it is an immensely instructive exercise. In Mark 2:23-3:6// Matthew 12:1-14, for example he concludes that Matthew does not, despite the firm judgement of many scholars, after all disagree with Mark's attitude to disciples or purity laws, at this point where he has just started to follow him most faithfully. For Doole, Mark is a 'conventional scribe', who uses Mark precisely as the background of his narrative, adding material where appropriate, reordering and reworking where necessary, but always returning to the primary source where he left off. The argument is underscored by telling examples from other ancient authors. So Josephus, Paul, and the author of the Temple Scroll reveal that Matthew does very much what they did: working on just one scroll at a time, using his memory of the other scroll, which is not open before him, and giving a comprehensive overview by integrating the different materials. This seems to me a really original insight, as is Doole's suggestion that while Mark is written to be heard, Matthew (the 'catechists' handbook') is written to be read; Doole makes the useful point that Judaism and Christianity have more interest in producing written documents than does Greco-Roman religion. Obviously both Matthew and Luke rewrite Mark, which means that they regard his gospel as an authoritative account of Jesus' life and death, but also means that they do not regard his text as set in stone. What counts here is continuity. Doole's book is going to have to be taken very seriously indeed by anyone who in future proposes to write about the relationship of the synoptic gospels, especially the first and second of that ilk. We may end with the following incisive summary: 'Matthew is the heir of Mark, who draws on Q. . .and he provides a direct development of Mark's story of Jesus. He is interested in Mark as more than simply a vessel for the continuance of independent teachings; he desires an edition of Mark which reflects a complete and appropriate account of the ministry and teachings of Jesus for the growing Christian church at the end of the first century' (p. 196).

St Mary's University, Twickenham Nicholas King

Enoch and the Gospel of Matthew. By Amy E. Richter. Pp. vii, 234, Eugene, OR, Pickwick, 2012, $22.59.

The importance of the Enochic material during the 2nd Temple Period, and their consequent relevance for interpreting the New Testament corpus, receives ever-increasing attention in the scholarship. Enoch gives an alternative explanation for the origin of evil from the disobedience of Adam and Eve

recorded in Genesis. Instead evil is traced back to a fall of angels, or 'watchers', who were attracted to earthly women, descended from their divine station to have children by them, and taught them heavenly lore which it was not proper for them to know concerning astrology, metallurgy, and pharmacology. The offspring of their sexual union was a race of giants who afflicted the human race through their violence and voracious appetites, and the illicit arts passed on to the women taught beautification and seduction; metallurgy spread the art of war, and astrology led to idolatry and demon worship. By holding this 'Enochic template' against the canonical gospels, especially the gospel of Matthew, one becomes aware of how much of the evangelist's kerygmatic strategy in announcing a 'good news' consists in reactivating and playing upon a knowledge of this Enochic material among his audience, specifically of presenting Jesus, not as a 'second Adam' or the long-awaited fulfilment of Old Testament prophecies, but rather as a 'second Enoch', or the eschatological figure who completes the reversal of this transgression by the angelic watchers and the repair of the consequences of their illicit generation and esoteric pedagogy that the scribe Enoch began. Richter confines her study to the first two chapters of Matthew's gospel, while also sketching how themes introduced there are developed in the later account of Jesus' adult activity and ministry.

There is indeed a 'recapitulation' motif according to which Jesus is presented as repeating, but in a correct, generous, and beneficent way, the specific acts of the watchers, so as to reverse the effect of the first transgression of the boundary between heaven and earth, this time bringing blessings, health, social stability, and correct worship. In this consists his 'salvation' for the people. Jesus is the result of a heavenly-earthly union, but this time consummated in a non-sexual manner, and for God's purposes, not following the lust of the progenitors. The Magi who come to worship the 'new king of the Jews' are masters of the arts of astrology and the various uses of gold, frankincense and myrrh, but now deployed to honour the true God and not a demon. Jesus engages in a 'pedagogy', but this time for all, and to bring peace rather than sow discord through the use of spells, charms, amulets, or war. He casts out demons and heals the sick, playing the role of a 'correct watcher' who repeats the descent of his predecessors but this time using it to bring humans blessings rather than woes, through the proper use of these new skills and powers. Richter extends and deepens our awareness of the rhetorical sophistication by which the evangelist weaves artfully his message of a powerful – but not unprecedented – new event of relevance for the whole human race.

Heythrop College Patrick Madigan

Mothers on the Margin? The Significance of the Women in Matthew's Genealogy. By E. Anne Clements. Pp. 296, Eugene, Pickwick, 2014, $36.00.

Alert readers have always speculated about the four (or really five) women who feature, oddly and unusually, in the genealogy with which Matthew's gospel opens. This book, a doctoral thesis from Spurgeon's College, employs narrative-critical methodology (in an interesting and original way), to construct an argument to the effect that, so far from the unthinking and trivial assumption that the women are all there because all four of them are 'sexually scandalous', there is in fact a gynocentric counter-narrative in Matthew, one that runs all the way through the gospel. This version goes rather deeper than the feminist 'hermeneutics of suspicion', and argues that the challenge to patriarchy is already in the biblical narrative, in a way that we thought impossible a few years ago. Clements argues that Matthew's inclusion of these four women 'invites the reader to consider what relationship might exist between the stories of these women and the story of Jesus as told by Matthew'. She suggests that there are three areas where the women's stories interlink in Matthew's project: first, the inclusion of Gentiles in the People of God, second the place and priority of the marginalised in the people of God, and, finally, the role and place of women in the Kingdom of Heaven that has been inaugurated by the Messiah. The genealogy, she observes, aptly enough, is annotated, and expresses the precision of God's plan. In the second of the two sections of the genealogy, Matthew omits no less than four generations and six monarchs, which makes it all the more striking that he troubles to include five women. And it is no good our muttering that 'they were all sinners', for there are a great many less wholesome sinners among the men, and Clements makes the suggestion, obvious once you think about it, that each of the women has a different reason to be included by Matthew. Tamar is a model of righteousness (the only other person so described in Genesis is Abraham), and Matthew includes her for three reasons: the theme of the reversal of expectations, her

status as doubly marginalised (structurally and culturally) and the importance of women in God's purposes. (And it is no good our asking, 'Is this really Matthew she is talking about?'). Rahab challenges Israel about boundaries; here Clements offers an ingenious re-reading of what is in essence a spy-story with sex, resolved when Rahab makes her confession of faith, so powerful that it is paralleled only by Moses (Dt 4:39) and Solomon (1 Kings 8:23); for Matthew, Rahab is the ultimate outsider, but the first in the book of Joshua to show the great virtue of *hesed*, which gets a great deal of mileage in this book. Ruth, the Moabitess, is likewise an outsider, but she too models *hesed*. So what, you ask, of Bathsheba; but as Clements points out she is not named by Matthew, but identified as 'she of Uriah', which draws attention to the appalling start of the story, and to David's sinful treatment of both Bathsheba and Uriah. In this context it is worth noticing that the first section of Matthew's genealogy ends with 'David the King', whereas the second starts with 'the father of Solomon by the wife of Uriah', so drawing attention to the abuse of power and status. What then of Mary? She is linked with the brave young mother of Isaiah 7:14, as her life, like Tamar's, hangs in the balance. Mary does nothing at all, except that, like Tamar, she waits for the man's verdict; Matthew hardly characterises her at all, which is an invitation to us to read into her silence. Like Bathsheba, she is marginalised because the father of her child is not her husband; so the mother of the son of David and the mother of the *final* son of David, are closely linked. All the women, in their different ways, point ahead to the Messiah, but they also share Mary's marginalisation; and all ultimately find a place on the inside. All four (five, in effect) women are on the margins, in their different ways, but they are women whom God honours, along with the structurally marginalised of Israel, such as the (triply) marginalised Canaanite woman of chapter 15, or Pilate's wife, who forms an interesting gender-pairing with the centurion, that other significant Gentile. Matthew, that most Jewish of evangelists, is able to hold conflicting viewpoints in interesting tension; so Mrs Pilate, for example, is a counterpoint to Mrs Herod.

So the women of the genealogy, Clements argues, are an indication that patriarchy will be subverted by the coming of the Messiah, and Jesus' interaction with women has precisely the same effect. This is a most interesting book; it is long past time that we were given a good look at these five women, and saw more to them than their being either foreign or sexually aberrant. At times the book is a bit repetitious, and occasionally it could have done with some copy-editing; but it is certainly worth reading, and should start a deeper conversation.

There are, it has to be said, some irritating mistakes in Greek and Hebrew, which should be edited out in any further edition: *ra*' is twice misspelt on p. 50, *tsedeq* on p. 58, fn 62 on p. 181, in fn 84. There is a very odd Greek mistake on p. 189, and two more on p. 211.

That having been said, however, this book offers us a good deal of original and stimulating insight, and should be given an attentive hearing.

St Mary's University, Twickenham Nicholas King

Peter: False Disciple and Apostate according to Saint Matthew. By Robert H. Gundry. Pp. xx, 119, Grand Rapids/Cambridge, Eerdmans, 2015, £12.99/$20.00.

Gundry has specialized in the Synoptics, moving from Mark to Matthew (whom he sees as writing in Antioch early, around 60 CE, considerably before and influencing Luke. This is a follow-up to his view of Matthew's community as a 'mixed church' of 'true and false disciples', the latter (tares in the harvest) being revealed by the persecution his community is undergoing. His gospel is thus intended for 'internal consumption', and is 'occasional' in the sense that it might never have been written except for the crisis provoked by this new and unexpected attack (from fellow Christians) that requires a serious revision of Mark's portrait of Jesus and his commissioning. The work is thus primarily a catechesis for aspirants or members, to inform them of what they are to expect, rather than an instrument for external evangelization; his congregation would have taken it in through having it read to them in long segments, perhaps even the entire gospel, in contrast to the short pericopes into which it was later divided for liturgical appropriation. Such a presentation allowed his audience to pick up on his altered depiction of Peter, which is largely lost on contemporary readers. The persecution accounts for the unusually severe re-working of Peter Matthew works on Mark's earlier portrait, by additions and omissions as well as through much uniquely Matthean material, whereby he proposes the astounding conclusion that Peter, like Judas Iscariot, was in fact a 'false disciple' who apostatized during persecution, thus incurring the 'wrath' Matthew's Jesus promises to all those who do not live up to his 'higher standard' of righteousness. The tears Peter sheds as he leaves the

high priest's precincts after his triple denial are *not* the tears of repentance, but rather of despair, like those of Judas, as he now knows he has definitively closed himself off from the kingdom of heaven. His audience, benefiting from longer exposures to the text, would have picked this up, reversed their estimate of Peter, and taken the warning that the same fate could await them. Peter was the seed that falls on 'rock' (*petrus*) that first springs up vibrantly but wilts under the sun's heat. According to Gundry, Luke and John were provoked to write yet further 'gospels' in part to rehabilitate Peter back to Mark's original presentation, to show him repenting and being restored to the central position he came to occupy subsequently in the Church's tradition.

Gundry does not dilate on the nature of the persecution his community is experiencing. It is known there were disturbances in Antioch between Jews and Gentiles during this period, in which the (mixed) Christian experiment was probably caught up. More deeply Gundry hints that Matthew supported Paul in his confrontation with Peter – specifically regarding the latter's 'hypocrisy' in observing kosher while eating with the mixed group of 'fellow Christians'. James, the 'brother of the Lord', was the head of the Jerusalem community of Christ-followers; it is known that, in spite of the 'agreement' he struck with Paul (sometime between 48-50), his community followed the full Jewish Law so as not to arouse the authorities, and later attempted to impose these constraints on Paul's foundations, which James may have viewed as 'rogue communities' whose reputation for apostasy brought danger to his own fledging group. The Jerusalem community may have been complicit in Paul's arrest after the disturbance in the Temple, viewing Paul as an irritant and headstrong 'unguided missile'. Matthew supported Paul, but was experiencing 'judaizing' pressures from Jerusalem, and he may have come to view Peter as caving in and backsliding into Judaism, despite his earlier flexibility and assurances. James the brother of the Lord does not appear in Mark's gospel, but Peter does. Thus the portrait changes.

Heythrop College Patrick Madigan

Luke: Storyteller, Interpreteter, Evangelist. By Mikela C. Parsons. Pp. xxii, 230, Peabody, MS, Hendrickson, 2007, £10.99.

In his foreword Parsons begins by stating what this book is *not*. The book is not a commentary on the Lukan writings; it does not attempt to provide a sequential, passage-by-passage interpretation of the text. Nor is this book a monograph proper; that is to say, the book does not argue a sustained thesis from beginning to end about some particular Lukan these(s) or purpose(s). The book is not an introduction to Luke-Acts, either, nor is it focused on the history of Lukan research. Rather, it represents a series of forays into the Lukan terrain from three different angles – Luke as storyteller, Luke as interpreter, and Luke as evangelist. A brief explanation of what each of these terms represents is given.

In the first chapter, under title, 'The Life of a Legend: The Making of Luke' briefly treats of the traditions relating to 'Luke', one that he was a physician (citing among others the *Golden Legend* of Jacobus de Varogine; thus also in index; read Voragine), ending with his stated aim in the book, namely to attempt to explore the Third Gospel and Acts in terms of Luke's abilities as a storyteller in the context of ancient rhetoric, as an interpreter of pagan, Jewish, and Christian radiations, and as an evangelist whose stories of the elder brother (Luke 15) and Cornelius (Acts 10-11) serve as paradigms for the inclusion of Jews and Gentiles into the people of God. His approach proper is treated in detail in the next lengthy chapter (with 78 endnotes): 'Luke and the Progymnasmata: A preliminary investigation into the preliminary exercises', with a section on Luke and the rhetorical tradition. He notes that if, as some studies of the speeches of Acts do show that Luke was more than competent in the handbook tradition, then it would be fair to conclude that he would have cut his rhetorical teeth on the *progymnasmata* tradition. Using a citation he notes that the *progymnasmata* were handbooks that outlined preliminary exercises designed to introduce students who had completed basic grammar and literary studies to the fundamentals of rhetoric that they would then put to use in composing speeches and prose. While four of these *progymnasmata* from the first to the fifth centuries C.E. have survived, Parsons' arguments about Luke's knowledge of the rhetorical devices preserved in the *progymnasmata* are drawn principally from the *progymnasmata* of Aelius Theon of Alexandria (*ca*. A.D. 50-100), the only textbook roughly contemporary to Luke. He is not suggesting any kind of literary dependence between Luke and Theon, but assumes that most (if not all) of what Theon says about these rhetorical exercises

was not unique to Theon. Parsons goes on in part one (Luke the Storyteller) to treat of Luke 1:1-4 (Luke's prologue) and ancient rhetoric. Then in part two, 'Luke as Interpreter', in three chapters (4-6) he treats of 'Interpreting traditions': Pagan traditions: Friendship and physiognomy (in Luke and Acts); Jewish traditions: Jerusalem and the Suffering Servant; Christian traditions: Parables and Paul (Luke as interpreter of parables; hearing Luke's story of Paul in the contexts of the *Corpus Paulinum*; Pauline rhetoric in Acts; Paul the Apostle). Part 3 (chapter 7) is on 'Luke the Evangelist', and treats of reconstituting the people of God: The examples of Peter, Cornelius and others.

The work serves its aim well. There is a good bibliography (of 22 pages), an index of modern authors and another of ancient sources (biblical and otherwise).

Milltown Institute, Dublin, Ireland — Martin McNamara

Hearing the Silence: Jesus on the Edge and God in the Gap – Luke 4 in Narrative Perspective. By Bruce W. Longenecker. Pp. xiv, 138. Cascade, Eugene, OR, 2012, $19.00.

Exegesis is by definition a matter of making sense of what is in a text; Bruce Longenecker here tries to make sense of what is – famously – not in a text. The example is Luke 4.30. After Luke's account of the temptations, Jesus returned to Galilee where he gained notice by teaching in the synagogues. He entered the synagogue in Nazareth and commented on a text from Isaiah, which he applied to himself and enraged the congregation of his own town to the extent that they took him out to throw him headlong over a cliff. 'But passing through the midst of them he went away.' Longenecker asks, as others have before him, what is missing from the narrative that would explain this unlikely escape.

The author first turns to several novels about the life of Christ to see how they have elaborated this under-narrated passage by adding background information or new characters, techniques that Luke himself resorted to in his use of his sources. Unfortunately Longenecker's novelists have not produced anything very plausible or authentically Lucan. They introduce either the 'athletic dodge' in which Jesus skips away because of his familiarity with the terrain; or he becomes the 'magical mystery man' who literally charms himself out of the situation; or he has local sympathisers who spirit him away from trouble. Best of all is the 'rewritten ending' that leaves Luke behind and that can include barricades, rescuing women and children, and even escape on horseback – this in *The Memoirs of Jesus Christ*, purportedly written in recollection by the escapee himself when Jesus was an old man hiding in a monastery.

Longenecker prefers to pick up clues from Luke himself. Lk 4.16-30 is the first incident in the ministry of Jesus and Longenecker sees this passage as the first part of an *inclusio* that bookends the ministry of Jesus with the death and resurrection at the other end. In each case Jesus escapes the clutches of death through divine intervention. Longenecker finds a Lucan pattern of divine interventions in Acts that enable miraculous escapes, usually from prison. So Jesus' escape in Lk 4.30 should be understood as the result of divine action rather than human cause and effect. Of course, such an escape at the beginning is a theological necessity because Jesus still has to preach the coming of the kingdom of God throughout Galilee and complete the vision of Isaiah 61 in the synagogue reading at 4.18. And, moreoever, prophets are destined to die in Jerusalem.

Then the interpretation is pushed one stage further to link the temptations of 4.1-13 with 4.16-30 through Ps 91 that the devil quotes at Jesus: 'If you are the son of God. . .'. The passing mention of angels ministering to him in Mark and Matthew may hint at Ps 91, but Luke quotes it and more fully: 'throw yourself down' and the angels will 'bear you up'. Longenecker says the psalm contains a christological prophecy, misapplied by the devil, but fulfilled in 4.30. Jesus' escape from the crowd is a 'divinely-initiated angelic guarding of Jesus'. (Though on grounds of good style we could do without expressions such as 'narratological fulfillment'.) Is this what Luke intended to embed into his text or is it just a fanciful and playful construction of a later so-called Lucan christology? There is no mention of angels in 4.30; only the reader can put them there. One unsettling, and perhaps unintended, effect of Longenecker's redactional reconstruction of Luke's christology is to undermine the reader's confidence in the historical reliability of the third Gospel. If Luke can so easily weave his theology into the structure of his Gospel, how far can we trust the text to tell us what actually happened? Has Luke invented the crowd's reaction so that Psalm 91 can be fulfilled? And has he furthermore invented the incident in the synagogue to make use of Isaiah 61?

Harrogate, UK — Geoffrey Turner

The Question of John the Baptist and Jesus' Indictment of the Religious Leaders: A Critical Analysis of Luke 7:18-35. By Roberto Martínez. Pp. xiii, 231, Cambridge, James Clarke, 2012, £20.00/$40.00.

In an expansion of his doctoral dissertation, Martínez avails himself of a narrative-critical hermeneutic which presumes but advances beyond historic-critical and redaction-critical approaches to consider the periscope as a unit where Luke's superior skills as a composer come to the fore in his treatment of the contentious and sensitive topic of the relationship between John the Baptist and Jesus. This periscope is not chosen at random, but is arguably the key to unlocking the whole of Luke's two-volume work. Arguing that this is 'one of the most important passages in the Synoptic tradition' (p. 168), Martínez holds that the verses which treat the hinge or pivotal nature of John as between two eras, 'are crucial for appreciating how Luke incorporates [the traditions about John] into a section where the main literary concern is to outline the identity of Jesus and the diverse set of responses that his ministry evokes. As part of a dynamic movement that begins in the infancy narratives and continues through the Galilean ministry section and beyond, the response to God's initiative of salvation in the ministries of John and Jesus finds its first and more explicit formulation in 7:29-30. Through these verses, Luke reveals his theological perspective about how the plan of God may suffer apparent setbacks and still triumph.' (p. 173)

Starting from the age-old conundrum about why John in prison would send two disciples to ask Jesus whether he is 'the one who is to come, or are we to wait for another?' after he had previously (according to John's gospel) identified Jesus as the 'Lamb of God', Martínez uncovers a growing puzzlement and tension in Luke's artistic development concerning the identity of Jesus among the individuals and groups with whom he comes into contact, a tension that is meant eventually to infect and agitate the reader as well. As 'a prophet and more than a prophet', John is the greatest and most perceptive individual from the previous era; his evident acceptance of Jesus' deeds and invocation of the signs of the eschatological age according to Isaiah is meant to be the decisive insight that settles the matter, much as Peter's confession in ch. 9 does for the apostles. At the same time the enthymic structure that for Luke characterizes Jesus' rhetorical style – where the conclusion of an argument is deliberately omitted or suppressed after the premises have been carefully built up – adds pressure on the reader to place himself or herself *within* the story, and after initial uncertainty and natural hesitation, to come themselves to supply the missing conclusion and take their place among those who see Jesus correctly. This is a shameless or masterful exploitation – depending on your point of view – of 'reader-response' manipulation in the service of Luke's christological propaganda! If the historical John had contact with the Essene community, so that the messiah he was expecting was a fiery figure of divine wrath and eschatological judgment, Luke tempers this towards jubilation at Jesus' revelation of God's compassion towards the needy, the poor, the broken and the excluded, and his determination to address the deepest needs of our time.

Heythrop College Patrick Madigan

Luke's Jesus in the Roman Empire and the Emperor in the Gospel of Luke. By Pyung-See Seo. Pp. xiv, 194, Cambridge, James Clarke, 2015, $26.00.

This book is different in a number of ways. For one thing, the author takes a good look at Luke's interest in secular history and the inextricable relationship that operates in the ancient world, but is neglected in contemporary society, between religion and politics. For another, he looks at the importance in Luke of stories related to taxes, through the lens of Roman culture and imperial theology. For a third, he uses, refreshingly, a range of critical methods, rather than just one, and succeeds in pointing to some important themes in Luke's gospel. Not the least of these is the vital question of what ancient religion, especially the imperial cult, was like in the world in which Luke's gospel is set. This leads to a further question of some importance, namely given that both Jesus (at least in the third gospel) and the Emperor are described as 'Saviour', how are they different, and in what respects are they similar? Pyung-See Seo demonstrates in his opening chapter, on the birth and trial of Jesus, that Luke has a clear interest in the kind of authority (using the familiar distinction between charismatic, traditional, and bureaucratic) of political and religious leaders. The birth of John the Baptist is used to stress Jesus' charismatic authority over against that of John (whose name is not mentioned in the account of the baptism); and while John's birth is set over against Herod, that of Jesus is set against the authority of Rome. Likewise Luke's account of the trial is, as is well enough known, very different from that of Mark and Matthew: the trial before Herod is sandwiched by two trials before Pilate; the trial before

the Sanhedrin is shorter than in Mark, and Luke emphasizes the extent to which the Jewish leaders are dependent on Pilate, whom Luke treats negatively. Luke is also more specific about the charges against Jesus, and Pilate declares Jesus innocent, even though Pilate is clearly responsible for Jesus' death in Luke. Jesus' authority is depicted as superior to that of all other figures: John the Baptist, Pilate, and Augustus. There follows a useful chapter on tax-collecting and the three important accounts in Luke (2:1-2; 20:19-26; 23:3), and the related question of paying tax to the Emperor. There are some sharp insights here, and some interesting arguments about the 'tribute to Caesar', in the context of a portrayal of Jesus as very much on the side of the poor. This chapter contains a helpful section on the tax-burden and on tax-collectors, who should properly be described as seen as 'tax-farmers', implying that they buy their commission ultimately from the Emperor. However it is also important to note that in Luke (who uses the term more often than any of the evangelists) they are regarded as outcasts, under several headings: they are employees of Roman imperial oppression, they deal with unclean goods, and they go in for exploitation and corruption (see 3:12-13). Augustus, Luke is suggesting, is a failure by comparison to Jesus, because he, whose power depended on the taxes, and who made various efforts to restore morality, never succeeded in reforming the tax-collectors, whereas Jesus did succeed, at least with Zacchaeus and Levi. Luke, Pyung-See Seo, argues in chapter 3, is profoundly critical of the Emperor and of the social structure of patron-client relations; it is Jesus, not Augustus, who is the true 'Euergetes', because he cares: 'I am among you as one who serves'. In chapter 4 there is a most interesting treatment of the word 'Saviour', with the significant subtitle: 'Victory, Peace, Salvation'. Augustus is 'victor', especially after the battle of Actium, and it is he (according to his own propaganda) who brings peace. So Luke presents Jesus, the argument goes, in contemporary imperial language, so that in the third gospel it is Jesus, not the emperor, who achieves victory over his enemies. Jesus' second temptation (4:5-8) is concerned with 'all the kingdoms/empires of the inhabited world', and Luke represents him as having authority over Rome and over Satan. Jesus rejects the use of force in pursuit of peace (the strange business of the swords at 22:35-38, 47-53 is important here). Luke makes far more use of the term 'Saviour' than to Mark or Matthew, and uses tax-collectors to stress the gulf between Jesus and Augustus. Augustus is not the real thing because he does not correct tax-collectors' wrong-doings, whereas Jesus does and therefore is 'the real thing'. Zechariah calls Jesus a 'great Saviour', a term which in LXX refers almost always to God, but is also part of imperial discourse. So religion and politics are (we have got used to this idea now) intertwined in the Empire, and Luke is not as favourable to Roman imperium as is sometimes supposed; Jesus is, quite simply, greater than the Emperor. The accusations at Jesus' trial are false, according to Luke, and Pilate's verdict simply wrong. Jesus is the genuine *euergetes*, who achieves victory and peace, which his rivals simply do not. This is therefore an interesting (if brief) book, and I commend it. The argument is not always clear, nor the quality of English invariably of the highest, but it is worth reading.

St Mary's University, Twickenham Nicholas King

The Roman Army and the Expansion of the Gospel: the Role of the Centurion in Luke-Acts. By Alexander Kyrychenko. Pp. x, 228, Berlin/Boston, Walter de Gruyter, 2014, $83.09.

In this expansion of his doctoral dissertation Kyrychenko draws our attention to both the prominence and the positive view of the occupational Roman army in Luke-Acts, against a sea of negative views from both the Greco-Roman literature (part of the moral degradation of society theme from the introduction of great wealth as booty through conquest, leading to rapaciousness, laxity, and indiscipline as rival generals were forced to 'buy' the soldiers' loyalty during the civil wars) and the post-Pompeian Jewish literature - except for Josephus who goes to the other extreme and in a sense prepares a foil against which Luke constructs his own picture: the soldiers are efficient but just, and the (Flavian) emperor is God's anointed, the Lord of the World who brings reconciliation, unity and peace to all, Jew and Gentile alike. A centurion is present at every key point in Luke-Acts and responds in a generous, beneficent, exemplary and occasionally heroic manner to the 'gospel of repentance and salvation' being preached by Jesus, Paul, and Peter, culminating in Cornelius in the Roman regional capital of Caesarea, gateway to the empire, who functions as the prototype of Gentile submission and conversion in confessing Jesus, not the emperor, as 'Lord of the World' - and as a symbolic anticipation of the conversion of the Roman world itself. The scholarship is complete and the writing concise and powerful in this definitive treatment of the subject.

Heythrop College Patrick Madigan

Perfect Martyr: the Stoning of Stephen and the Construction of Christian Identity. By Shelly Matthews. Pp. ix, 226, Oxford University Press, 2012, $28.95.

Matthews gives us an extremely powerful and provocative reading of the Stephen periscope in *Acts* that is ultimately persuasive in its grand lines if disputable in several of its fine points. Scholars have underlined the martyr accounts as central for Christian identity formation in the first few centuries of the common era, and as regards the crucifixion of Jesus and the martyrdom of Stephen that is modelled upon it, as central for establishing a separate Christian identity from that of the Jews who declined to accept Jesus as their 'messiah' or to align themselves with the new 'Way' and who, in the presentations of the evangelists and specifically Luke, were seriously implicated in putting both Jesus and Stephen to death.

Iconic to the ministry of Jesus is the exhortation towards enemy-love and a refusal of retaliation; highly distinctive of him in contrast to earlier Jewish martyrs is the prayer from the cross that those who have persecuted him be forgiven. Matthews waves the historical question of whether there was an actual 'Stephen' (which means 'crown') who became the first, and prototypical, Christian martyr as uninteresting and unanswerable, and redirects attention to the multiple symbolic, psychological, political, and ideological roles this figure carries out, as a 'performance artist' acting out both a view of the history of divine-Jewish relations and an ethic that distinguishes Christians from Jews (for a non-Jewish, Gentile audience in the second century C.E.), and how this aligns Christianity with the aims and ambitions of the Roman Empire over against the 'Jews' viewed *en bloque* as permanently in the grip of riotous and rebellious impulses. Luke also plays with the Paul-versus-the-Jerusalem-'pillars' tension: puzzlingly, there is no account of Paul's death in the *Acts*, and Matthews suggests that the martyrdom of Stephen, which triggers Paul's conversion and launches his ministry, may also be intended as a thinly-disguised portrait of Paul's similarly bold and outspoken preaching before the Jews, and that the more timid and judaizing Jerusalem apostles may have been complicit in his arrest and execution, as a way of getting rid of a nuisance and risk to their own survival.

Matthews also brings our attention to the 'reverse psychology' that can be operative in 'praying' that those who persecute you be forgiven. By not resisting but accepting their unjust blows, foregoing retaliation and even eschatological justice, one *seems* to be occupying a humble, subservient, or lower position, conceding the superior spot to the 'victors'; however, by distinguishing oneself as one able to utter this uniquely non-aggressive, self-sacrificing, and almost super-humanly or excessively unselfish wish, one in effect *elevates* oneself psychologically and spiritually *above* the insensitive and irrational brutes who are attacking you, gives them (and the world) a demonstration of something of which they are incapable, and reverses the apparent power relations. By trying a different and reverse strategy, one gains the ultimate 'victory'. As Nietzsche and Freud would agree, martyrdom provides its own consolations, as 'secondary gains'. Matthews has advanced the conversation on Stephen, and there will be no avoiding her in the future.

Heythrop College Patrick Madigan

The Gospel of John and Christian Origins. By John Ashton. Pp. xii, 228, Fortress Press, Minneapolis, 2014, $33.58.

This is a remarkable book, offered with John Ashton's accustomed clarity of expression and sharpness of insight. It aims to answer the (difficult) question of how a practising Jew could claim that the Jewish Messiah has come in a way that (in effect) meant the abandonment of Judaism. Ashton offers three basic propositions: that the gospels are not to be thought of simply as lives of Christ; that the Fourth Gospel went through at least two editions; and that the gospel was composed by a member of a community for his fellow-members of the same community. At the heart of the matter is the tension found in the gospel (and in the Johannine community) between Moses and Jesus, between synagogue and church. Ashton argues that the evangelist is 'deliberately repudiating traditional Judaism'. He is also of the view that the Prologue, as it stands, is at the end, not the beginning of the process of the gospel's evolution; at the start (perhaps represented by 'there was a man sent from God whose name was John') the author and his community still regarded themselves as disciples of Moses. For Ashton the gospel is a 'proclamatory narrative', intended to affirm or confirm the faith of Christian believers in the Risen Lord'; even if the story is about Jesus' life before the

Resurrection, the early Christians had rapidly realised that Jesus could only be truly recognised after that had happened. The gospel is therefore about the present moment, and in the final chapter Ashton answers in this manner the question of why the Synoptic and Johannine portraits of Jesus are so different: '. . .his constant awareness, which he shared with the members of his community, that they were living in the presence of the glorified one'. The evangelist, that is to say, is a theologian, working out a coherent Christology, so that he is able to say 'we beheld', understanding the *doxa* as the manifestation of the Godhead, 'the *experience* of the glorious Christ, constantly present to him and to all his community'. And here lies the clue to understanding John Ashton's approach to the fourth Gospel. He is absolutely captivated by the gospel; it would not be putting it too strongly to say that he is in love with it; and with his quite remarkable gift for seeing connections, between art, for example, or the plays of Shakespeare, and what is going on in the New Testament, he paints an illuminating picture, that makes at least this reader aware of how little I know about John's gospel. The confidence with which John Ashton writes, not to mention his assured command of the history and literature of our period, makes one hesitant about contesting any of his verdicts, even if he does sometimes (as he does in this volume) change his mind. This book is also a good read, and characteristically sharp in his assessment of those positions with which he disagrees (Richard Bauckham, for example, on the destination of the gospel); and his readiness to adopt new positions gives Ashton's writing immense freshness. There is a most stimulating chapter on the Essenes, who share with the evangelist the sense of a special revelation that sets them apart; the Torah, that is to say, is not God's final word. There are some especially helpful Excursus here, on in particular on 'The Changing Gospel', on the virtue of the diachronic approach, although Ashton does not, if I have him right, exclude the possibility of a synchronic reading; and another (Excursus IV) which argues that John 1:4 refers not to creation but to 'the divine plan'. He has a truly enviable gift for handling ideas and seeing how they fit together. The big question underlying all this is that of who Jesus is, and Ashton's answer is that Jesus is the embodiment of God's revelation, 'He was the manifestation'. That insight is the source of the life for which we read the Fourth Gospel, and the reason why this latest book by John Ashton should be widely read.

School of Theology and Ministry, Boston College — Nicholas King

Signs of Salvation: The Theme of Creation in John's Gospel. By Anthony M. Moore. Pp. 218, Cambridge, James Clarke, 2013, £25.00/$50.00.

Years ago E. C. Hoskyns and R. H. Lightfoot proposed that when Mary Magdalen 'mistakes' the Risen Jesus for the 'keeper of the garden' in which Jesus had been buried in John's post-resurrection appearance, John intends the discerning and reflective reader to realize that she is not mistaken at all; Jesus *is* the gardener, and the mysterious 'garden' is the same as the mythological 'Garden of Eden' in *Genesis* that Jesus, as the Logos present with the Father from all eternity through whom the world was created, as John's *Prologue* tells us, was himself God the creator, who planted the garden in the first place. Later Raymond Brown threw doubt on the arguments in favour of such intentional symbolism, arguing that if John had intended his readers to discern such an allusion, he would have used stronger vocabulary connections. In 1990 Nicolas Wyatt responded to Brown, arguing emphatically that John does intend his audience to understand the resurrection of Jesus as in some sense the restoration of Paradise, the reconciliation of God and humanity, and that the institution of the eucharist with the piercing of Christ's side on the cross allows humanity once again to participate intimately in the life and work of God, so that the cross *is* Paradise. Here, in this expansion of his doctoral dissertation, Moore goes beyond Wyatt's argument, supplying the vocabulary connections Brown missed through 'creation markers' in the Signs discourse in John, and arguing specifically that the seven signs (and the High Priestly discourse) are meant to correspond to the seven 'days' of creation in *Genesis*, so that Jesus, as the incarnate Logos, recapitulates as saviour what he has done before as creator, restoring the world as the Garden of Eden that man had darkened through sin. The theme of the 'work' that Jesus 'sees the Father doing' and that he is doing himself, is thus salvation as a repetition and restoration of creation, or a 're-creation'; this is the deepest theme in the gospel, deeper than and presupposed by Jesus as the new 'Temple' or 'presence of God' to his

people in this post-70 CE era, for it explains the otherwise puzzling choice and arrangement of 'signs' which is John's primary way of arguing for Christ's identity, the nature of his 'work', and what his followers are called to share in in the 'eighth sign', the first day of the 'new week' or 'new creation', the 'breakfast on the beach' when he again gives us dominion over the world and commissions us to extend and carry on his work of restoring the 'Garden'.

Heythrop College Patrick Madigan

King of the Jews: Temple Theology in John's Gospel. By Margaret Barker. Pp. ix, 638, SPCK, London, 2014, $80.00.

Margaret Barker never ceases to amaze, with her prodigious erudition, in several languages, and with the range of her ideas, and her invitation to look at familiar texts in entirely new ways. Here, in this immensely lengthy book, she is looking at John's Gospel, to see how it might be read in the light of the Temple Theology that she has outlined with such ingenuity over the years. Her suggestion is that the Johannine community were not Jewish, but were Temple-rooted Hebrews in Palestine, who became the Church; they sound, it is true, a pretty odd lot, but that is not impossible for the community that produced this remarkable gospel. The evangelist, it turns out, is John the Elder, to whom Jesus revealed the visions that Jesus had had in the Temple, to restore the pre-Deuteronomistic theology of the Temple. This ancient Temple theology is, she argues, a secret and unrecorded tradition that surfaces at various points, in Qumran, Ignatius of Antioch, the Gospels of Thomas and of Philip, and in the writings of Clement of Alexandria, Justin Martyr and Dionysius the Areopagite. John and James, it turns out, are high priests who wore the *petalon*; and John is presenting God's original revelation, before the Moses-and-Exodus tradition took over. One decidedly interesting suggestion in this book concerns the notoriously controversial use of 'the Jews', a phrase that is used, nearly always in a pejorative sense, no less than 68 times in the Fourth Gospel, as opposed to single-figure uses in the Synoptics. Barker suggests that we are to understand this group, to whom the evangelist is bitterly opposed, as those who focus on the 2nd Temple, attacked by 3rd Isaiah, and classed as an 'apostate generation' in 1 Enoch; and there seems to be evidence that Josephus uses the phrase in that sense. Those who, by contrast, reject the 2nd Temple attribute the laws and customs, not to Moses, but to Enoch, Noah and Abraham. So 'the Jews' is to be understood as the Johnny-come-lately group who followed Moses, and who come late into the Hebrew scriptures. Their teaching does not appear in the earliest psalms, but 647 times in Exodus to Deuteronomy; and the suggestion is that Moses grew in significance in the 2nd Temple period, after the demise of the monarchy. It must be said that Barker asks important questions, about some of the most notoriously obscure portions of the Hebrew scriptures, such as what context to offer, which layer of the text to read, and which vowels to add to an originally consonantal text. One important plank of her argument is that 'the Son' is a 'Second God', who appears in all sorts of unexpected texts (there is an ingenious and erudite reconstruction of the notoriously difficult Ps 110:3, which concludes that 'the Davidic king was the visible presence of the Lord...the King of the Jews, the original Davidic priest-king of the first Temple'). Certainly this book is a good example of the extraordinary richness which a profound knowledge of Hebrew can bring to reading the biblical text. The aim is to demonstrate that this Temple Theology resurfaces in the Gospel of John, and that Jesus was the anointed Davidic priest-king of Ps 89, whose task was to replace the Spring Passover and the Moses traditions with the older ways of the first Temple and the autumn festivals of Day of Atonement and Sukkoth, when 'the Jews' (Moses people) 'have lost touch with their own roots'. The elder John, it turns out, is the unnamed disciple who was called with Andrew, and, more fancifully perhaps, all four gospels identify Jesus as Melchisedek; and the Fourth Gospel achieves this feat at Cana. The Jesus who cleanses the Temple is the High Priest (hence the whip); he opts to die at Passover, replacing the Moses-festival with the older Sukkoth. One thing that commends this book is Barker's insistence on the richness of Jesus' religious experience, and the absolute indispensability of taking the Old Testament seriously. It is a compelling read, and you find yourself wondering if it could possibly be true. Just occasionally the method of arguing leaves one rubbing one's eyes, as assertions are made that appear ungrounded in the text of the gospel, and moderated with 'could well have been derived... this could be...This story decodes itself [well,

does it?]. . .this is not reading too much into the text [is it not?]' There is an easy assumption, which many NT scholars would bridle at, that the Paul of Acts is identical with the author of Ephesians, for example, and likewise, of course the author of the fourth gospel with the author of Revelation. Assertions are made which, if true, are very striking, but for which it is not always easy to see, from sentence to sentence, how the argument works (for example that Revelation and the Gospel of John are both translated from the Hebrew). And annoyingly, there are mistakes in the Greek, for example at pp. 196, 247, 415, 453, 456), and an odd mistranslation of the Hebrew Jehoshaphat, all of which reinforces a general impression that her grasp of current NT scholarship is on the scanty side. One also feels that she does not give sufficient weight to the biblical narrative as narrative; too often one has the impression that it is just a platform for demonstrating erudition. But there is much that is fascinating in this book, including a reference to the earliest prayer to Mary, from Egypt in the 3rd Century, and an interesting suggestion of possible tension between Paul and John. This book is not boring, and you are encouraged to read it, not without a grain of salt.

Boston College Nicholas King

Love in the Gospel of John. By Francis J. Moloney SDB. Pp. xvi, 249, Baker Academic, 2013, $35.00.

Love (in the Gospel of John as elsewhere) is not about words but about actions. It is Moloney's view that the love of God in the Fourth Gospel has become the love of Jesus, while the Synoptic commandment to love the neighbour has turned into the rather more 'sectarian' love of one another. Francis Moloney has spent his life on John, and we listen with attention to this digest of his learning on this most mysterious of gospels. His basic point is that for John's Gospel, God's act of love henceforth only happens in and through the Son, who models that love. However the important point to grasp is that 'the Fourth Gospel is *ultimately* about God, not about Jesus'. He points, wisely, to the function of 4:34 and 17:4 as a 'literary frame' to the gospel, linking the section that he calls 'Cana to Cana' to the final prayer. The half-comprehending disciples, bent on seeing Jesus as fulfilling Jewish hopes put titles on him like Rabbi, Messiah, Son of God and King of Israel, for (unlike us) they have not read the Prologue, and have slowly to discover that it is God who sent Jesus. This work is written from a narrative-critical angle, and has much to teach us. Jesus' task, according to this gospel, is to 'perfect' the 'work' of his Father, and so glorify God. In support of this, Moloney argues, unexpectedly, but with some conviction, that *doxa* in the LXX does not, as is often assumed, refer to human glory, but to the 'visible, caring and saving presence of God in the human story'. The question then becomes 'what kind of God?' And the answer is that it is a God who 'makes known' (*apokaluptei*, though we should notice that the verb itself is rare in the Fourth Gospel, only appearing at 12:38), and a God who 'sends'. An important element in narrative criticism, as Moloney argues, is that of prolepsis, the anticipated future event, whose anticipation creates a tension in the reader, so that throughout the gospel of John we are waiting for the resolution of themes such as 'lifting up', 'hour', 'gathering', 'glory of God and glorification of the Son'. These themes come back 'within dense literary and theological contexts where the language of love is also exquisitely appropriated'. In illustration of this important point, Moloney offers a very careful analysis of the use of the 'hour' in John's Gospel, either pointing forward to a time yet to come or announcing that it has arrived; and he argues that there is a profound link between the cross and love in the Fourth Gospel, which has been too often neglected. Another example of the profitable use of this method of exegesis comes with the Last Supper discourse, where the theme of love dominates the whole story, as it is acted out (in the washing of the feet), spoken of (notably in chapter 15), and prayed for (in the final chapter. There are of course many views about the structure of this discourse, but this one is persuasively argued. Moloney points to the profound links between chapters 13 and 17, and argues that the whole passage is about making God known: 'Jesus makes God known in the perfect love that he has for his fragile disciples'. He is equally perceptive on the Johannine Passion Narrative, and 'it is finished/made perfect', where he points to the 'careful and impressive elimination of description of insult and excruciating suffering from the passion tradition', where Jesus is the master of the situation, so that a theology of the fragile church delicately emerges. Jesus is presented as king on the cross; there is no cry of dereliction, no request that he should come down from the cross, no questioning of his trust in God, no apocalyptic signs, no recognition of the great wrong that has been done. Then, but only at the end, the Church moves into action. 'From that

hour' demands an eventual resolution, and a community of love is formed, out of the darkness (Joseph of Arimathea and Nicodemus). The disciples are uniformly puzzled, and it is God who does everything; just three 'foundational characters' bridge the gap between the story of Jesus and the subsequent generations of disciples, namely the Beloved Disciple, who shares love with Jesus, but does not know the Scripture, Mary Magdalene who does not believe in Resurrection, but comes to address Jesus as 'Rabbouni', and Thomas who makes conditions, but whose proclamation 'my Lord and my God' is the Christological climax of the narrative. A penultimate chapter brings the Johannine epistles into the story; it seems that the practice of love in the Johannine community turns out to have been problematic, and Moloney comments that 'A community based on love and faith alone…is inevitably destined to run into internal difficulty'. Finally the author offers a moving Epilogue in which he suggests the new way for Christians to understand the Cross, as unconditional self-surrender in love. This is a book to be read carefully and inwardly digested; the scholarship is impeccable, but Moloney also thinks that the text should make a difference to the way we live. One final point to praise is that the footnotes (which in this volume are printed where footnotes should be, at the bottom of the page) are always worth looking at, often containing quite weighty additions to the main argument.

Campion Hall, Oxford Nicholas King

John's Gospel and Intimations of Apocalyptic. Edited by Catrin H. Williams and Christopher Rowland. Pp. xvi, 328, Bloomsbury, T & T Clark, 2013, $34.95.

This Festschrift is a worthy tribute to the eminent Johannine scholar, John Ashton, who once graced the lecture-rooms of Heythrop College, and who in those very lecture-rooms was on two memorable occasions roundly applauded at the end of lectures on the Fourth Gospel. In particular it centres on his penetrating insights into the apocalyptic nature of this gospel, that it is 'an apocalypse in reverse, upside down, inside out'. That is not to say, of course, that every one of the contributors to this volume agrees with John Ashton in every respect (you would not expect such a thing in scholarly dialogue), but it is a testimony to his magisterial authority, and to the unfailing freshness and flexibility of his thinking, allied to his prodigious learning. The first essay is by Ashton himself, pursuing a line that he had not developed in his important work, *Understanding the Fourth Gospel*, namely the influence on the Gospel of contemporary Jewish apocalyptic thinking ('a story about the past that was nevertheless represented as a prophecy about the future'). He makes the attractive suggestion that the gospel's author may have read Daniel and 1 Enoch, possibly at Qumran, in a way that gave him a new understanding of Jesus' death and words ('Enoch's *chutzpah* emboldening John'). Not that the definition of 'apocalypse' as applied to this text is easy, as Benjamin Reynolds points out in his contribution: the gospel both is and is not an apocalypse. Then comes a splendid essay by the incomparable Ian Boxall on the relationship of the Book of Revelation to the Fourth Gospel, bringing some sanity to this difficult and at times bewildering question. He argues for at least some connection between the two texts, at least at certain points, and some link in terms of what actually happened in terms of Jewish and early Christian visionary experience. Interestingly, Boxall suggests that the author of the Apocalypse may have come quite early in the tradition. Jörg Frey makes a connection between the two documents by way of the use of the idea of the Shekinah, with a very careful account of the OT background. Frey also offers a helpful understanding of the Prologue to the gospel as 'reading-instructions'. Catrin Williams makes powerful use of her expertise in apocalyptic and other Jewish material, and argues (against John Ashton) that the Greek word *anangellō* in this context means 'disclosure' rather than 'interpretation'. Her co-editor, Christopher Rowland, shows his great gift for linking ideas with one another, and combines this with his grasp of Blake's astonishing genius to support Ashton's understanding of 'intimations of apocalyptic in the Gospel of John', and indeed argues that Blake was there before John Ashton on 'apocalypse in reverse'. There is a breathtakingly imaginative essay by Robert Hall, who argues that the readers of the gospel have to be open to 'revelatory experience', ready for unveiling, and the importance of 'hearing and re-hearing'. Hall draws on older traditions and argues that in the Fourth Gospel 'the reader takes the place of the apocalyptic hero; the Paraclete takes the place of the interpreting angel; the Fourth Gospel takes the place of the vision', and offers some ingenious re-readings of well-known Johannine riddles, such as those in 1:18 and 17:21, as he speaks of the 'shifting fullness of meaning'. Robin Griffiths-Jones touches into an important modern trend in arguing that John's Gospel is a document to be performed on several occasions. This is a powerful and moving article,

with important reflections on both the evangelist's techniques and the transformation in the reader's self-understanding. There is not space here to review all the essays, but they will all repay attention. The point is that Ashton has pioneered a new way of reading this remarkable gospel, and we must thank the editors of this distinguished collection for presenting it so clearly.

Campion Hall, Oxford Nicholas King

I, II, & III John: A Commentary (New Testament Library). By Judith M. Lieu. Pp. xx, 300, Louisville/London, Westminster John Knox Press, 2008, $38.49.

Judith M. Lieu is Lady Margaret's Professor of Divinity at the University of Cambridge. Among her many writings on New Testament and Jewish Christian topics two are on the Johannine Epistles, namely *The Theology of the Johannine Epistles*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991; *The Second and Third Epistles of John: History and Background,* Edinburgh: T.&T. Clark, 1986. She has also written essays on these letters. After a bibliography of 20 pages (Commentaries; Monographs and important articles), this work gives a fine introduction of 32 pages to all three epistles, followed by detailed exegesis of the entire text of all three letters, with brief introduction to the second and third. In the preface she reminds us that she has written in the conviction that the Letters can and should be understood free from the shadow of the Fourth Gospel. The introduction is systematically laid out, in numbers sections, beginning with the questions: The First, Second, and Third Letters of John?, anonymous Letters attributed in tradition to John. For her, in interpreting the letters it will be important to take this anonymity seriously and to examine how it contributes to the way in which the letters seek to achieve their purpose; for the interpreter to supply specific details of authorship or of audience would be to ignore the conscious strategy implicit in these writings themselves. She goes on to treat of question of 'Letters'. The wide use of the letter form in antiquity has provoked attempts to distinguish different categories, for example, between 'real' letters and those that consciously use the format for other literary purposes, adding in a footnote that older scholarship sometimes used 'epistles' for the more artificial category. We have detailed consideration of the setting of the letters (author and audience, lengthy examination of 'situation'), the structure (argument and style), background (Johannine tradition) and thought of the letters, and on the reception and text of the letters and their importance in recent study. The commentary goes through the text of the three letters chapter by chapter and verse by verse, and in keeping with the introduction is detailed and informative on the various issues involved. There is an index of ancient authors, biblical and others, and an index of subjects

Milltown Institute, Dublin, Ireland Martin McNamara

Patmos in the Reception History of the Apocalypse (Oxford Theology and Religion Monographs). By Ian Boxall. Pp. xiii, 273, Oxford University Press, 2013, $125.00.

Here is an outstanding addition to your library, a model for what a reception-history approach to a text can produce, in this instance on the interpretation of Patmos in Revelation 1:9. Modern scholarship has largely neglected the cultural impact of Patmos, rather oddly, as Boxall points out, given that Revelation is one of the very few NT documents that actually tells us where it was written. What this book seeks to do is to chart the different understandings of 'Patmos' given by interpreters of Revelation; then he raises the wider question about the implications of reception-history for the study of Revelation and of the NT more widely, encouraging exegetes to acknowledge a wide range of possible meanings of the biblical texts and their 'multivalency'. Boxall offers an impressive range of readings of the text of 1:9 (which turns out to be far more ambiguous than you might have supposed: Patmos might be figurative, for example, and the Greek preposition *dia* has several possibilities); and Patmos might even have something to do with the Temple. There are no easy answers here, more a 'rich interpretative potential'. That is the burden of the first chapter, which engages the reader from the very beginning; then chapters 2-7 move to a chronological-genealogical catalogue of how Patmos is treated in the reception-history of Revelation, starting with a lively treatment of the patristic tradition of the 2nd to 5th centuries, which tends to regard Patmos as either a place of exile because of persecution or a place of revelation. As one watches the investigation proceed, the reader

cannot help reflecting what freedom comes with not having to reconstruct what actually happened, only how the story was told in subsequent centuries; and it turns out that the story is actually quite complex: 'more about the circumstances of Revelation's earliest interpreters than about John's historical situation'. This same two-fold pattern reappears in the treatment of the Medieval Latin fathers (the 6th to the 10th centuries); then comes the all-important expansion of interest, especially stimulated by Joachim of Fiore, and the tendency to 'actualise' the text for the present day. Boxall is particularly interesting in his account of the 'genealogy' of various interpretations. This period produced some very creative and sophisticated exegesis, in which "Patmos functions for many as a lens through which the contemporary call to contemplation may be viewed, emphasising heavenly mysteries in order to draw analogies between Patmos and the interpreter's own life of prayer" (p. 103). Then, and entirely appropriately, Boxall looks at the very different Eastern tradition, which was very different, and even a bit suspicious of Revelation's canonical status; however the East did produce a most interesting 'novella', the *Prochorus Acts*, narrated with energy and originality. Boxall notes in this context 'the capacity of the text to generate non-literal readings' (it is important to recognise that reception-history does not tell us about the text, so much as its effect), such as the typology between Sinai and Patmos. There is a most interesting chapter covering developments from the 16th to the 20th centuries, and Boxall is very properly sharp about the failure of commentators writing after 1900 to look at the ancient exegetical traditions; this reader was fascinated by the range of erudition, with seriously scholarly commentary on the work from Isaac Newton, from a Cambridge Professor of Mathematics and from Gregory Martin. The most compelling chapter of this book is its final one (which is a heart-warming contrast to the relentless grinding tedium of so many doctoral theses); Boxall stresses the importance of imagination in exegesis (even in the historical-critical method), and gives a most attractive account of the exegetical possibilities of painting ('visual exegesis' – the image is seen as 'a bearer of exegetical experience'). There is a particularly absorbing treatment of Bosch's 'St John on Patmos', which will tell you things that you had not noticed but make eminent sense once you see them in the painting. The great advantage of visual exegesis is that it holds together what commentators tend to regard as mutually exclusive, and also invites immediate participation in the exegesis by both artist and viewer. The fact is that reception-history offers a very rich range of hermeneutical possibilities, deal with real, and not hypothetical, audiences, and a reminder that all our readings of texts are historically conditioned. At the end, Boxall offers six possibilities, neglected by contemporary commentators, but explored by learned readers before 1900, including the rich link of meditations about the link between what John saw on Patmos, and what the Beloved Disciple saw when leading on the Lord's breast at the Last Supper. He also lists a range of hermeneutical strategies in the literature, all deftly illustrated from the *Prochorus Acts*, which offers some legitimate interpretative moves that can be justified in terms of the Apocalypse's own implicit strategies: fiction, we should never forget, can tell the truth. Towards the end of this book the reader inevitably starts to wonder where NT exegesis can possibly go from here; it is not that we must abandon the historical-critical method (Boxall is quite clear about what it still offers us), more that we need to go wider and deeper, and to apply imagination to our exegetical endeavours. In addition biblical scholars need a certain quality of engagement and participation: NT interpretation is not simply a matter of information, but also, Boxall argues, of transformation. What, finally, does 'Patmos' mean? The very ambiguities that this treatment has surfaced allow for many profitable re-reading of the text. This is a very important book.

Campion Hall, Oxford Nicholas King

Andrew of Caesarea's Commentary on the Apocalypse. Translated by Eugenia Scarvelis Constantinou. Pp. xiv, 270, Washington, DC, The Catholic University of American Press, £34.50/$39.95.

Guiding to a Blessed End: Andrew of Caesarea and His Apocalypse Commentary in the Ancient Church. By Eugenia Scarvelis Constantinou. Pp. xv, 350, Washington, DC, The Catholic University of American, Press, £62.95/$69.95.

I must confess I avoided reading the Revelation to John (or the Apocalypse) for years. As a child, I found myself in an ecclesial environment where every prophetic detail was believed to be literal and known with nothing short of certainty. As a college student, I then found myself in an environment where every detail was perceived to be historically allegorical and known with nothing short of

the same sense of certainty. Staring at what I perceived to be the only possible options, options respectively manufactured by Protestant fundamentalism and liberalism, I decided to functionally end my reading of the Bible with Jude.

Fortunately, the Church Fathers and scholars such as the University of San Diego's Eugenia Scarvelis Constantinou labored to provide the Church with paths beyond such self-imposed certainty. The good news of the Apocalypse is God is undoubtedly guiding the Church to a blessed end and calls the Church in the meantime to be just that, the Church. Constantinou's translation of *Andrew of Caesarea's Commentary on the Apocalypse*, as well as her own *Guiding to a Blessed End: Andrew of Caesarea and His Apocalypse Commentary in the Ancient Church*, make for imperfect yet significant reflections on the final words of the Biblical canon.

While a doctoral student at Université Laval, Constantinou began her study of *Andrew of Caesarea's Commentary on the Apocalypse*. Although her dissertation appears to have provided the background for her 2013 *Guiding to a Blessed End*, her translation of the *Commentary* was published two-years earlier. Any reader seeking to fully appreciate *Guiding to a Blessed End*, arguably needs to first read the *Commentary* in full. That latter work includes a robust introduction added by Constantinou. However, reading Constantinou's translation in full also sets the reader up well for the significance of the details to come in *Guiding to a Blessed End*.

The reasons why Constantinou believes Andrew's *Commentary on the Apocalypse* is worthy of such significant exploration have to do with this book's significance to the Orthodox Church past and the universal Church present. For example, Constantinou notes the Apocalypse was adopted into the Biblical canon much later in the East than in the West. Andrew, the Archbishop of Caesarea, likely produced his commentary in the early-600s at the request of Makarios or Sergius I, the Patriarch of Constantinople, and partly in response to the growing popularity of a Miaphysite commentary produced by Oikoumenios. The positive reception granted to Andrew's *Commentary* helped the Apocalypse find its rightful place in the Orthodox canon.

Constantinou thus notes 'Andrew's superior skill and exegetical training produced a commentary that quickly eclipsed the work of Oikoumenios to become predominant and the standard patristic commentary for the East, including the Greek, Slavic, Armenian, and Georgian Churches' (p. ix). Andrew's *Commentary* and Constantinou's explorations of it allow a new generation of Christians to understand '[r]egardless of the times in which we live, the end of the world will come for each of us soon enough, but God who loves humankind is always present and does everything possible for our salvation' (p. 318).

In order to explore further the significance of Andrew's *Commentary*, Constantinou's *Guiding to a Blessed End* is arranged topically into sixteen chapters followed by a brief conclusion. These chapters not only draw upon the latest of historical research but also from the theological wisdom Andrew drew upon in writing his commentary. Constantinou thus dedicates a considerable portion of her work to not only identifying the historical context in which Oikoumenios and Andrew's commentaries emerged but also to their considerable theological differences. For example, chapter six, following up on many of these introductory details, identifies why 'the Oikoumenian commentary must have been viewed as unacceptable or unsuitable' (p. 86). Constantinou thus goes into considerable detail as to the methodological and theological missteps made by Oikoumenios and thus also the reasons why Andrew's effort was so widely embraced.

While the remaining chapters are more distinctively focused on Andrew's considerable methodological and theological contributions to the study of the Apocalypse, comparative references to Oikoumenios continue to form an immediate backdrop. For example, in chapter thirteen Constantinou discusses Andrew's eschatology. In doing so, she walks her audience through Andrew's identification of certain figures and/or forces. As a result, she makes arguments such as the fact that 'Andrew is very consistent with his identification of "the dragon" with the devil, also known as "Satan"' (p. 244). Constantinou then notes that 'Oikoumenios, on the other hand, becomes hopelessly confused with the various evil personas' (p. 245).

For readers like me who are often mired in the modernist sensibilities of Protestant fundamentalism and/or liberalism, Constantinou's translation of Andrew's *Commentary* and her own exploration of Andrew's work proves to be of considerable theological value. However, that value could arguably be greater absent the consistent references to Oikoumenios and his work. In one sense, Constantinou runs the risk of setting Oikoumenios as a straw man well beyond the notably heretical qualities of his work. For example, please look again at the quote at the end of the previous paragraph. Oikoumenios is not only 'confused' but 'hopelessly confused.' In other comparable passages, Constantinou refuses to simply allow the facts of her case to stand on their own but modifies

them in ways to garner the sympathies of her audience.

In another sense, running the risk of setting Oikoumenios up as a straw man creates an apologetic quality for Andrew's work that perhaps he himself may have not desired. For example, one of the striking features of Constantinou's translation of Andrew's *Commentary* is his acceptance of imperfect versus perfect knowledge. Given our finite nature, Andrew believes we only have access to imperfect knowledge this side of eternity. Such a distinction does not mean we lack the needed revelatory resources. However, one is also struck by how often phrases such as 'we think' (p. 138) or terms such as 'or' (p. 139) work their way into Andrew's *Commentary*. While he may lack perfect knowledge, the wisdom of the Apocalypse is more than sufficient to nurture his faith. The manner in which Constantinou sets up Andrew's efforts in contrast to the efforts made by Oikoumenios runs the risk of obfuscating this critical quality of Andrew's work.

Regardless of these possible imperfections, Constantinou's translation of Andrew of Caesarea's Commentary on the Apocalypse along with her own *Guiding to a Blessed End: Andrew of Caesarea and His Apocalypse Commentary in the Ancient Church* are worthy of considerable attention. They make valuable contributions to our ability to read and understand one of the most challenging books of the Bible. In addition, they compel us to once again turn to the wisdom of the ancients as a means to escape the perils of our own age. Failure to do so could possibly leave us mired in misguided readings of Scripture or, perhaps even worse, readings that simply end with the book of Jude.

Taylor University, USA Todd C. Ream

James Through the Centuries. By David B. Gowler. Pp. xx, 340, Oxford, Wiley Blackwell, 2014, $112.95.

It is no longer possible airily to dismiss, as some in the New Testament guild have done, the reception-historical approach to exegesis as 'biblical studies on holiday'; here is a commendable example of the method, directed to the somewhat neglected Letter of James. Gowler regards this Letter as in some ways a direct heir of Jesus, though an uncomfortable one in that he concentrates on those elements of the teaching of Jesus that we should rather not hear. Gowler brings out well James' subversive hostility to the rich. What he does is not to tell us, didactically, 'this is what it originally meant'. Instead, he gives the 'ancient literary context', followed by a selection of interpretations, ancient, medieval, early modern and modern; sometimes this makes the book a bit light on exegesis, as the author rushes on to lay later interpretative traditions before us, but for the most part the mixture works well enough. This book is a telling instance of what reception-history can do, in this case, for example, pointing out scholars' tendency to 'domesticate' the rather sharp social teaching of the letter.

Gowler offers an illuminating sketch of the history of the reception of James of Jerusalem/James the Just/James the Less/James the brother of the Lord. This document was slow in getting accepted in the Western Church, when James inserted it in the Vulgate; in the East Origen was the first to cite the Letter as Scripture. As is well known, Luther, at least at one stage, dismissed it as 'an epistle of straw', because of what he took to be unsound views on justification by faith; but in fact, as Gowler shows, Luther writes a great deal about James, and by no means all of it is negative; the reason he attacks the Epistle is simply that his (mainly Catholic) opponents make so much use of it.

There is an impressive range of thinkers who have responded to James, not only Luther but also Calvin, for example; and Gowler offers a very moving account of the use made of James by the runaway slave Frederick Douglass in the United States in the 19th Century. Gowler also gives telling assessments of visual representation of the Letter, in iconography, in El Greco (who gives us a self-portrait), and, in the 19th Century with Tissot, who has James the Less closely resembling Jesus; and Gowler is very perceptive indeed in his account of Blake's engravings of Job. He also makes thoughtful use of hymns as part of the reception-historical method. So it is an interesting and intelligent book; it is also a bit frustrating, since there is not sufficient space to treat the different commentators, who are in any case necessarily presented somewhat selectively, at any depth. Also for reasons of space (presumably) Gowler does not print a text of the letter, and the reader is strongly recommended to have the Greek open before them. This book is very different from any other commentary, and for that reason alone, perhaps, to be warmly welcomed.

St Mary's University, Twickenham Nicholas King

Who Chose the Gospels? Probing the Great Gospel Conspiracy. By C. E. Hill. Pp. xi, 295, Oxford University Press, 2010, £8.99.

It has not been fashionable in scholarly circles recently to defend the orthodox thesis that the four canonical gospels were recognised earlier than the Constantinian settlement in the fourth Century of our era; here now is a book that takes that daring leap, and does it with some panache, but also with exemplary scholarly rigour, and in mercifully accessible prose. Hill's view is that the decision for Matthew, Mark, Luke and John, as against other possible gospels was not just a matter of victory going to those with the biggest armies or the highest number of converts (a common claim in contemporary popular literature on the subject). Contrary to what is often alleged, the 'Gospel of Thomas' does not appear to have had much standing among Christians of the early period, to judge by the number of manuscripts in which it is preserved. Statistics about 'non-canonical' gospels are, as Hill points out, surprisingly elusive for the 2nd and 3rd centuries; and they turn out to be even more in favour of the canonical gospels when you set papyrus rolls against codices. For the Christian invention of the codex is very properly used by Hill as evidence of greater respect for the documents that are bound in it; all four of the canonical gospels could be comfortably bound together in codices, for their better preservation and for the demands of public use, especially in 'pulpit editions'. Contrary to what is often maintained, Hill argues that Irenaeus in the 2nd century clearly already accepts the four canonical gospels; and he even pushes the evidence back to Justin, making a case for Justin having known all four, possibly in codex form. Nor does it stop there, in this enjoyable and often amusing tome: even the admittedly apocryphal 'Epistle of the Apostles', responding to the challenge of the 'Apocryphon of James', offers evidence for the existence of the four gospels in the era of the Apostolic Fathers. Hill also gently approaches the possibility that according to Papias it may have been the aged apostle John who was decisive in the Church's acceptance of all four gospels. For there is an oddity about the number 'four', as Hill points out; why should there not be just one, as Justin's pupil Tatian urged? If you have four, then there are difficulties, such as our old friend the Synoptic Problem, and the apparent disagreements on various points between the four. And yet the number 'four' seems to have been quite uncontroversial in the early days. Hill concludes that 'at least by the second half of the second century churches throughout the empire had recognised the same four gospels…back to the time of the earliest common ancestors: in this case, the apostles of Jesus' (p. 233), and he makes the sensible point that the canonical four, unlike some of their rivals, are embedded in 1st century Palestinian Judaism. The book ends with a useful glossary and some hazarded dates of the earliest existing manuscripts. Will this book command universal assent? It may not, for it challenges some cherished and entrenched scholarly positions; but it should be widely read. And not the least of its merits is that the case is not only rigorously argued but expressed with an even good-temper which many of its opponents will do well to imitate.

Campion Hall, University of Oxford Nicholas King

Born of a Virgin? Reconceiving Jesus in the Bible, Tradition and Theology. By Andrew T. Lincoln. Pp. xii, 322, London, SPCK, 2013, $22.72.

Lincoln crowns his career with a work that combines exegetical and pastoral concerns, addressing the question specifically: is it still helpful to confess our conviction in the Incarnation of the Second Person of the Trinity in Jesus Christ, who is also the long-awaited Messiah who fulfils the promises made to the Jewish people, through the doctrine of the Virgin Birth? Most readers are probably ready to see this doctrine, grounded scripturally in the infancy narratives of Matthew and Luke (which were probably added last), as reflecting a faith spawned by Jesus' resurrection retrojected into his entire life and ministry so that he was truly 'God with us', up to and including his birth, which they are willing to concede was written to conform with Jewish scriptural motifs and expectations as well as Hellenistic pagan conventions, according to which the birth of a great individual was composed as a kind of 'overture' to his life as a whole, in which his principal accomplishments would be proleptically anticipated. Most readers do not feel this as an objectionable or insurmountable tension, as the gospels themselves are not consistent on Jesus' paternity, identifying him both as 'Son of God' while also of the 'house of David' through Joseph who was of Davidic descent. For Protestant Christians committed to *sola scriptura* and the inerrancy of the Bible, however, this becomes a major concern, especially in the wake of

modern critical scholarship which raises ever more difficulties in taking much of the Bible literally.

Lincoln patiently reviews all the advances of critical scholarship, but takes certain Catholic scholars who have written on this topic, such as Raymond Brown and Joseph Fitzmeyer, to task for bowing too quickly and completely to the apparently sceptical conclusions which these latter seem to require. His hero is Schleiermacher, who addressed courageously and head-on the changes wrought on popular Western thinking by the Enlightenment but who insisted on deciding on the Virgin Birth from a faith stance within the living tradition of the Church. He saves Jesus' distinction from other human beings through a continuous and heightened 'God-consciousness' that other humans who become disciples may obtain as well; this strikes him as a better solution than one based on 'natures' and 'persons' in the creedal formulations, because these terms have changed meaning in the modern period. Lincoln also finds a solution that allows Christians to maintain what became the traditional doctrine of the Virgin Birth if they choose to do so, while finding it not necessary to save a full doctrine of the Incarnation.

You will not find a better review of developments on this topic through the centuries than this book.

Heythrop College Patrick Madigan

Union with Christ in the New Testament. By Grant Macaskill. Pp. 353, Oxford University Press, 2013, $106.32.

This book is not one for the faint-hearted, for it is heavy reading; at times it throws so many ideas at the reader that it is hard to see how they fit together; their links are either left unexplained or allusively sketched. At times the conclusions are asserted rather than argued for, in a way that may leave some readers struggling. Its thesis, however, is the interesting one that, in the New Testament, there is a generally cohesive understanding of the ideas of union with Christ, and of the union of God and humanity. The understanding of this union, both in the New Testament and in historical theology, is covenantal and representative, and it asserts that the story of Jesus is also the story of his people, often with the help of Temple imagery. Macaskill takes historical-critical method very seriously indeed, and is very attentive not only to Scripture (which he sees as a matter of more than merely getting methodology right), but also to theology; although in this context it must be said that he finds some modern theological approaches too reserved about the divine-human union in Jesus. Macaskill wants to insist on the 'ontology of the Incarnation', against over-specialised contemporary studies in both New Testament and systematic theology. You cannot fault his desire for wider collaboration between these disciplines; the difficulty is that the book tends in consequence to go in for frustratingly brief assessments of (for example) 20th Century scholars. The chapter on *theosis* in the patristic tradition and in modern orthodox theology offers some helpful signposts through a far from clear field; it is followed by a chapter on 'participation' in Luther and other Reformed theologians, emphasising links to the medieval tradition as well as to certain modern developments. This chapter produced some rather surprising reflections on the mode of Christ's real presence in the sacraments in the very different thinking of Luther and Calvin. Macaskill casts his net wide, however, for there is also a perceptive chapter on apocalyptic and mystical Judaism, including a commendable treatment of the evidence from Qumran, and makes excellent use of the pioneering work of Christopher Rowland (stressing that apocalyptic does not always entail eschatology). This chapter introduces the reader to the importance of 'covenant' notions for the corporate dimension of biblical and Jewish theology, an idea that will be important for the argument in the whole of the rest of the book. This is followed by a helpful treatment of the 'Adam traditions', and in particularly Paul's 'Adam Christology'; Macaskill argues that Paul makes his own highly original contribution to the reading of Genesis 1-3; the basic notion, he suggests, is that the glory that was lost in Adam is restored in Christ, to the glorification of believers (which is probably what you were thinking anyway). A chapter follows this on 'Temple Christology', which is perhaps the most original and compelling part of the book, linking the set of ideas around 'Messiah', 'Temple' and 'Church' with creation language. This chapter contains a very perceptive reading of the Fourth Gospel and of the Letter to the Hebrews, in terms of access, and speaks of 'a thoroughgoing access to the divine presence in the heavenly Temple that is grounded in the ontology and history of the Incarnate Son'. There is discussion, too, of the 'participatory' dimensions of the sacraments (here only baptism and Eucharist) in Christian tradition, and to their 'covenant' character. This is a very attentive reading, which enables Macaskill to argue that these sacraments can be traced back to the earliest strata of the New Testament. The picture is then filled out by a look at other participatory themes in the Pauline corpus

(I may be missing something here, but it was hard to see why this chapter was separated from the previous one in which the Adam traditions were examined); this enables the author once more to emphasise the 'covenantal shape' of participation language, and the importance of the Holy Spirit, and the link to Paul's 'new creation' language. Then there is a final chapter that gallops through the remainder of the New Testament, and the conclusions, briefly laid out. This book is in general very thought-provoking, and encourages us, as good books should, to read familiar texts with fresh eyes. Whether the conclusions will in the end be found to carry widespread conviction is another matter, and perhaps not ultimately significant: the process is the thing.

St Mary's University, Twickenham Nicholas King

The Story of Original Sin. By John E. Toews. Pp. xii, 132, Cambridge, James Clarke, 2013, £17.50/$35.00.

This is a devastating and decisive - indeed terminal - condemnation of the Augustinian doctrine of 'original sin' as scripturally unsupported, late in developing, and unfaithful to the Christian tradition. Augustine created an 'ontological' model of sin acquired through Adam's disobedience and passed on, through sexual reproduction, to all members of the human race in all three aspects of responsibility, guilt, and inability not to sin, such that, except for a select minority saved by God's grace imputed through Christ's sufferings and merits, all humans are naturally and justly doomed to eternal torments. Toews does an exemplary job at tracing the actual historical development of reflection on *Genesis* 3 by Jews and Christians, showing thereby how much of a deviation and distortion of the tradition Augustine's theory constitutes. This doctrine may have been handy for 'scaring' barbarian tribes in the West, and children in later Christian families, into religion, but it represents an inadequate basis for mature Christian existence - which it indeed serves to block - and a skewed view of the 'good news' Christianity intends to announce as regards the liberation and return-to-wholeness made possible by God through his messiah Jesus. While it is accurate in capturing the ubiquity of sin in our world as a kind of permanent tendency or context of our existence, this was unacceptably simplified and severely exaggerated, is now past its 'use by' date - if it ever was justified - and urgently needs to be replaced by something less rhetorically terroristic and more adequate to Christianity's message and tradition. It was the exception and not the rule, made possible by a misreading of Paul and a misunderstanding of a codicil in the Nicene creed, that *became* the rule in the West. This will make our task more difficult but necessary, as this 'shorthand', while frightening people into religion, too often repelled them later or rendered impossible rather than facilitating the transition to a higher stage of development. We need more 'carrot' and less 'stick' in leading people towards the unavoidable – and painful – acknowledgement of sin involved in Christian conversion.

Genesis 3 was composed late, during the Babylonian Exile, when most of the Jewish scriptures received their final form, and is largely a reflection on the meaning to be attributed to this all-too-frequent experience for the Jews. Exile – being kicked out of the 'Garden' – is a punishment for sin, and the heart of the doctrine is not the particular sin, but the first consequence of sin: being excluded from God's presence. Adam and Eve could no longer 'walk with God' in the Garden. Other immediate consequences were a loss of control over the appetites (Adam and Eve feel a need to cover themselves before they see God again) and our tendency towards evasion, denial, and towards blaming others for our own having gone astray. The loss of God's presence is crucial and the heart of the doctrine, for this privilege is what makes human life worthwhile, or the event that serves as the goal for both historical and personal existence, without which life begins to make no sense. This loss automatically fixes the goal of history – to restore this privilege.

The early Greek-speaking Church concluded that through Adam's sin mankind had lost the image, but not the likeness of God given at creation. He still has free will, and is not hopelessly condemned to failure before the demons who are constantly tempting him. Adam and Eve were more immature children then fully developed adults, and there is no hereditary transmission of Adam's sin; the social and cultural consequences of Adam's sin, though serious and pervasive, arise through example, imitation, habit and custom, not through an irresistible or invincible ontology. If St. John's gospel was more influential for Greek Christianity, St. Paul was for the West. Augustine relied on Ambrosiaster's mis-translation of Paul in *Romans* 5:12 to extract his ontological view. The Nicene creed contains the statement: 'We confess one baptism for the forgiveness of sins', but the intent of the phrase 'one baptism' was to disallow the

possibility of *rebaptism*, and the phrase 'remission of sins' was composed with a view towards the actual sins of *adult* candidates, *not* with regard to infants and children. Toews speculates that Augustine's harsh anthropology may have been due to the 'harsh North- African sun', and ironically – or tragically – it *is* closer to the severe self-estimate internalized in the Muslim scriptures rather than reflecting the wider 'catholic' or Christian tradition.

Heythrop College Patrick Madigan

Hell's Destruction: An Exploration of Christ's Descent to the Dead. By Catherine Ella Laufer. Pp. x, 230, Ashgate, 2013, £55.00.

This is a good moment to have another look at the meaning of 'he descended to the dead' in the creeds. Towards the end of the 20th century, in the light of two world wars, and, above all, the Holocaust, which left 19th century optimism shattered, theologians have once more started to reflect upon it. Catherine Laufer makes the important point that there has been no serious attempt to collate the various possible interpretations of the 'descensus'; she identifies six of them, falling into three categories: heretical (that is to say the view that the doctrine is simply false and should not be in the Creed), then those which link it to Christ's humiliation and those which make it part of his exaltation. The final two chapters of this book, where she works out a solution to the various problems, are where she is at her best, on the approach of 20th Century theology, principally von Balthasar and Moltmann. The problem for many readers may be the getting there, for she has cast her net very wide indeed, and the grasp of the material is uneven, needing rather tighter organisation. In particular the first chapter will pose problems. Very sensibly, she starts with the scriptural data and the treatment of the doctrine by Justin and Origen; but those who know something about Scripture will find it difficult to get through this part, since it has simply not been copy-edited. Quite reasonably, she prints out the relevant Hebrew and Greek texts, but there are some horrible errors here; every single Hebrew text is printed back-to-front, for example, and occasionally with the wrong consonants, and there are almost always alarming mistakes in the Greek, as well as in Latin, German and even English. And there is a very odd suggestion about the origin of 'Gehenna' (p. 10), and poor old Gregory Nazianzen has his name differently misspelt each time he appears. Things get better later on, and she makes the admirable point that the English 'mystery plays are primarily a form of reflection'. There is a treatment of the approach to the 'descensus' by Luther and Calvin, though it was not always easy for the reader to grasp what was going on. However, the basic plan was a good one, to set treatments of the 'descensus' into their contemporary context; and her account of how the Enlightenment affected our understanding of Hell was undeniably interesting. She has done well to point to the importance of this topic; but this book is perhaps not the last word on it.

Campion Hall, Oxford Nicholas King

The Character of Christian Scripture: The Significance of a Two-Testament Bible (Studies in Theological Interpretation). By Christopher R. Seitz. Pp. 218, Grand Rapids, Baker Academic, 2011, $23.00.

In this volume, Seitz sets out a strong account for the hermeneutical implications of the classic Christian affirmation that both the Old *and* New Testaments function together as Scripture. Much like his mentor, Brevard Childs, Seitz's command of the issues at stake and the literature that must be dealt with is immense, and his ability to move from the particularities of patristic exegesis to the latest discussions of 'canonical shaping' in the Book of the Twelve to German scholarship on the book of Hebrews makes the book a demanding but rewarding read.

The book proceeds in two parts: (1) an introduction and extensive, programmatic first chapter (pp. 27-92) and (2) a series of six, similar length excursus-style chapters following up particular themes laid out previously (pp. 93-210). By the end of the book, one wonders if the order should have been reversed to allow the uninitiated reader time to wade into the issues through particular figures and texts before coming to the deep-end of Seitz's condensed and summarized arguments. Nevertheless, by the end, the central positions of the book emerge with strength and promise.

The key affirmations of the book may be summarized as follows: (1) The Christian Bible is a

two-testament witness, in which both the Old and the New speak with distinct voices but always in relationship to one another. (2) The authoritative witness of the Old Testament is *part of* its 'literal sense' and *cannot be limited* to its use in the New. It speaks about God, 'precisely in its pre-Christian form' both (a) *within* the NT (by direct quotation and through its *'per se* voice', i.e. the guiding assumptions the OT inherent in the NT text) and (b) *independent* of it (e.g. ch. 3, where Psalm 8 is discussed both in Hebrews from its own OT position). (3) Each of the testaments speak of God and God in Christ from their own historical place, which necessitates a critical distance and appraisal *en route* to understanding the Word of God articulated therein. This role for historical-critical methodology is often applied (and over-applied) to the OT, but Childs' position, 'We are not apostles and prophets', functions to provide critical distance from the *NT* text as well, i.e. the NT is not the *final* word, it is one testament of the Word. Finally, (4) the NT does not fundamentally *progress* from the OT, thus indicating a continuing revelation ultimately made known post-Scripturally in the church's own time (e.g. ch. 6, the 'crisis in the American Episcopal Church (TEC)'). Instead the NT is the *fulfillment* of the OT, such that the movement is 'from OT to New, [but] *then reverses direction*' (p. 58). Seitz sees each of these affirmations as the undeniable consequences of the *nature* of the Christian Bible, whose final form is as two-testament witness under the rule of faith, which affirms the God of the OT as God in Christ.

In all of this, Seitz is consciously arguing for (and in some places extending) the 'canonical approach' as originally conceived by Childs. The weakness of the book is that his tone can be unnecessarily defensive and polemical, muddying his argument. For example, his ongoing argument with Francis Watson seems to miss the point of Watson's own project (i.e. to set *Paul* as *a* reader of the OT; contrast Seitz, p. 153, '*Watson's* reading of the OT is flawed…', emphasis added). Also, the first (long) chapter is set as a defense against *nine* misconceptions about the canonical approach. In the end, one comes away with a long list of don't's when it comes to how to rightly interpret the Bible, rather than a clear list of do's. One wishes there was one more volume to come, in which Seitz would keep his relatively clear style of language and keep the main points he is trying to make, but make them all positively rather than negatively.

Overall, the book is one I will happily hand out to others, especially in situations where NT and OT scholars are looking to work together in a canonical approach to the whole Christian Bible. Even where ensuing debate may disagree with Seitz or one another, this contribution will certainly set the conversation around the right questions, an invaluable aid, to be sure.

Durham University Jonathan D. Parker

The Jewish Gospels: The Story of the Jewish Christ. By Daniel Boyarin. Pp. xxii, 200, NY, The New Press, 2012, $21.95.

This is a wonderfully iconoclastic book, humbly, generously tearing up the received view on the historical relationship between Christianity and Judaism and specifically the myth of the 'parting of the ways' which did not take place until the great councils of the 4th century. The book is chock-full of revisions of views still held by a majority of scholars; Boyarin is not afraid to take on not one, but two religious establishments, and undermine the self-defining and self-justifying rhetoric of each. 'Judaism' and indeed 'religion' are modern inventions; Christianity saw itself, and was accepted by others, as one of a variety of species of Judaism that co-existed peacefully for centuries in Palestine and the diaspora until the late 4th century. Jesus was a traditional Jew keeping the conservative dietary regulations of the Torah against the new-fangled overly-refined and often hypocritical 'traditions of the elders' developed in Babylon during the Exile and brought back to Jerusalem by the Pharisees. Jesus definitely kept kosher, went to the Temple, and Christianity was a species of Judaism; the requirement placed on gentiles who wished to join the Jesus movement by the 'Council of Jerusalem' in *Acts* are the same as those enjoined on resident aliens who sojourn with Israel in the Old Testament (p. 23) Boyarin's thesis is that it was the religious and civil authorities who gradually imposed rules and insisted that people choose between being a Christian and a Jew; the people themselves saw no need to choose and maintained dual, mixed, or blurred identities for centuries.

Boyarin makes it seem that the divisions arose because the authorities were 'uptight and anally retentive', psychologically prissy and socially uncomfortable with messy ambiguity, impatient power-seekers insisting on simplistic and distorting administrative distinctions. Still, there were theoretical issues involved. Paul thunders that we are

saved either through the Law or by faith in Jesus as the Christ; the one invalidates or supersedes the other, and we cannot have it both ways. (Still a Christian may keep the Jewish dietary laws so as not to offend a 'weaker' brother, and Paul has Timothy, born Jewish but uncircumcised, circumcised, and would have had his own children circumcised as a token of honor to the priority of the Jewish people). The eye-opening parts are the second and fourth chapters: in the former Boyarin shows how monotheism in Judaism had not excluded, but rather developed or evolved naturally into a dualism involving a 'son' or 'deputy' to the 'Ancient of Days' as a way to mediate and overcome the aloofness that accompanied the extreme transcendence of the One. He thereby launches a lethal attack on humanists who present Jesus as a moral reformer elevated into a god after his death through contact with Greek categories. Proto-Trinitarian tendencies were fully developed within Judaism before Jesus was even born; Jesus had a 'high Christology' and all of his titles already waiting for him, and fully embraced them. The fourth chapter shows further that before the first century of the common era it was common coin in the Midrash that the messiah would have to suffer.

In the wake of the destruction of the Temple, it was the proto-rabbinic Pharisees who clamped down on the 'two-throne' theme common in 2nd-Temple apocalypses and eventually inserted the curses on the 'minim' and the 'Notzrim' in synagogue services to exclude Jews who accepted Jesus as the messiah – an indication that the pastoral or sociological problem was widespread, and that remarkably late. The authorities won, the people lost, and we have been paying the price ever since.

Heythrop College Patrick Madigan

Institutionalization of Authority and the Naming of Jesus. By Yolanda Dreyer. Pp. xiii, 161, Eugene, OR, Pickwick, 2012, $22.00.

Dreyer displays a comprehensive knowledge of the development of the accounts about Jesus, from the oral groupings of his wisdom and prophetic sayings, their recessions in up to three versions of the written 'Q' document, and the expansion of these into narrative and biographical accounts by Mark, Matthew, and Luke. Jesus himself may have been perceived as a scribe (only scribes in provincial villages had authority), and it was scribes who became followers of Jesus who found themselves challenged by scribes loyal to the Rabbinical, Temple, and Roman establishment on what grounds anyone should take this artisan's son from Nazareth seriously, on what grounds he even had the right to speak (i.e., Jesus is depicted as cast out from the synagogue in Capernaum). Dreyer sees Jesus as spreading a subversive counter-wisdom that posed an alternative 'kingdom of God' based on equality and concern for the poor, which directly challenged the traditional ruler/savior model of the Judeo-Hellenistic world. He was a charismatic figure who attracted followers by the boldness and authority with which he decried the injustice of the increasingly high taxes that led to land dispossession and the breakup of families among the peasantry. He eschewed the 'divine' titles that were common in Jewish messianic and apocalyptic literature and as part of the Hellenistic emperor cult, and in Dreyer's view never envisaged anything for his followers beyond a continuation of his own itinerant, non-hierarchical charismatic ministry proclaiming his alternative vision of a 'new Israel'.

It was the scribes who wrote up accounts of his life and teaching who found themselves in conflict situations with scribes loyal to 'formative Rabbinical Judaism' in the post-70 era who were forced to attribute titles such as 'messiah', 'son of God', and 'son of man' to Jesus, as a way to shore up and ground their *own* claims to authority as Christianity inevitably became institutionalized as a resident civic entity and rival to the forming synagogue; most of the gospel stories about controversy and challenges between Jesus and the scribes and Pharisees are transcripts of disputes between these two later groups of scribes projected back into the ministry of Jesus; these accounts bestow a 'title' on him that gives him power to carry off the victory. A 'little tradition' of an unassuming prophet murdered for defending the poor and marginalized thus gradually became infiltrated with the triumphant, exalted, and victorious epithets from the 'great tradition' of the traditional Judeo-hellenistic savior-kings, and Jesus is elevated into a divine being, something he never intended.

Dreyer is persuasive on the macroscopic, sociological level, but what is totally absent from her treatment is the transformation, conversion, or *metanoia* Jesus called for on an *individual* level, from rich and poor alike. Once one realizes that, this is like reading an account of *Moby Dick* which leaves out the whale.

Heythrop College Patrick Madigan

The Jewish Jesus: How Judaism and Christianity Shaped Each Other. By Peter Schäfer. Pp. xvii, 349, Princeton, NJ, Princeton University Press, 2012, $35.00/$24.95.

Schäfer builds on the work of Israel Jacob Yuval, in the sense that while Christianity was seen as absorbing, interacting with, and reacting against currents within the 2nd-Temple Judaism from which it emerged, Rabbinic Judaism was imagined to have sprung spontaneously, whole and entire like Athena from the head of Zeus, from the desperate attempts to salvage and consolidate what remained of its tradition after defeat by the Romans, the destruction of Jerusalem and loss of the Temple in 70 CE, largely independently of developments in its struggling 'sister religion', Christianity. We now know that this was not the case but that on the contrary, Rabbinic Judaism was aware of and reacting to developments within Christianity at every stage of its development; it was as fluid, plastic, and malleable in its infancy, with as diverse and even contradictory elements within it. In fact, it was developments in what was going on *outside* it, and specifically within Christianity, that propelled it to take the specific form it eventually adopted, and which account for the shape it has today. None of the latter was foreordained, for what we recognize as 'Christianity' today announced itself initially also as a 'new' Judaism or 'post-Temple' Israel; no one could say at the outset which of these struggling rivals would survive, nor what shape they might eventually describe. They reacted to and defined themselves over time as a function of positions the other was embracing; each in its current form is unintelligible apart from the other. Today in a reverse direction, as each tradition discovers aspects of its history which later were denied, spurned, or suppressed (because of a dangerous similarity with its hostile 'Other') – but which, once known, call to be openly acknowledged and at least partially rehabilitated– this process goes on.

Schäfer startles us by revealing that a strict monotheism, that would deny a plurality of persons within the godhead – even a 'Father-and-Son' relationship – was not definitory of pre-Rabbinic Judaism – in fact, just the opposite. The very aloofness or transcendence that attended the announcement of a single deity responsible for the entire universe led early to speculation about a 'mediator', a viceroy or deputy who would be the instrument of divine providence, especially when in the history of Israel involving loss of the monarchy and of the 1st Temple the need for a 'deliverer' was felt, if devotion to this single deity was to be maintained. This 'messiah' was inevitably and serially described as a 'second' Adam, Moses, and David, as well as one of the archangels like Michael or Metatron – or a 'scribe' like Enoch who is elevated, granted a tour of the heavens where he is able to read the tablets on which all of history (and notably the destruction of Israel's oppressors) is written, and he is transformed into at least a semi-divinity and granted his own 'throne' beside that of the 'Ancient' One. Such speculation was so common and widespread as to constitute almost Jewish 'orthodoxy' before the Rabbis railed against such a position that was too close to Christianity (and which Christianity simply grew into and put on like a suit of clothes, rather than creating from whole cloth. It did not have to originate any of the titles it applied to Jesus, but simply announced that the long-awaited 'messiah', 'Son of Man', and 'Son of God' had finally arrived.) Freed from the oppression of the Roman empire and the soon-dominant Christianity, these speculations remained unsuppressed and surprisingly flourishing in Babylonian Judaism.

The heart of the book is the fourth chapter where Schäfer demonstrates how the Rabbis, to defend God's independence against the angels who 'advise' him, on the basis of strict justice or human merit, *not* to go ahead with the creation of man, in effect render God an arbitrary or irrational power. Traditionally in Jewish reflection, God is prompted by two opposing tendencies to mercy and to justice. Now he becomes schizophrenic, or suffers from a bi-polar disorder; he is out of control, a loose cannon, an unguided missile. Against 'rational' external advice, God is depicted by the rabbis as 'lurching' towards an insistent, almost retaliatory compassion, announcing he will create a race of humans he knows will sin, simply because he is God and has the power to do so – which means that the 'messiah' projected must not simply repel Israel's enemies but must suffer to atone for humanity's sins – that he was known, pre-existed, and was loved most of all by God before the creation of the world – all this in Rabbinic Judaism 'in spite of' Christianity.

Heythrop College Patrick Madigan

Treasure Hidden in a Field: Early Christian Reception of the Gospel of Matthew. By David W. Jorgensen. Pp. xvi, 321, 2016, Berlin/Boston, Walter de Gruyter, $110.98.

It is quite clear that *Wirkungsgeschichte*, the history of the reception of the Bible, is not going to go away, for early reception of a text has the clear and demonstrable possibility of letting us know

what readers closer than we to an author thought that author might have meant. Here is a book that offers many interesting possibilities; Jorgensen looks at 2nd and 3rd Century interpretation of the First Gospel, which in those years was highly regarded as an authoritative source. This was particularly the case among both the Valentinians and their Catholic opponents. Matthew was part of their common inheritance in a situation where there were, in Jorgensen's phrase, 'multiple orthodoxies', revealing both the unity of the early Christian movement and its diversity. Valentinians made great use of Matthew, the Fourth Gospel and Paul; and the writings on which Irenaeus (their great opponent) comments seem to be meditations on these texts. It is indeed possible that the Valentinians were the first to regard Matthew as canonical (they do not appear, however, to have used Mark or Paul). In the 2nd Century, Matthew was generally the most popular gospel, and remained so until the 4th Century. This may simply have been because Mark and Luke were not thought to be 'apostolic' (Tertullian thought that Luke was 'twice removed' form the Lord's words). Jorgensen wisely cautions us against applying the label of 'Valentinian' to the Nag Hammadi texts, and that of Gnostics to the Valentinians. For they understood themselves simply as Christians, and make use of Paul, Matthew and the Gospel of John, because, in their terminology, there was 'spiritual seed' there. The term 'Valentinian' nevertheless remains a useful term; Jorgensen argues that before there was such a thing as a NT canon, 'Valentinians regarded Matthew as 'scripture' and that they were therefore a part of its 'scripturalisation'. This book offers some interesting fresh insights, for example that 'biblical studies' and 'reception history' each includes the other as a sub-set of itself. Valentinianism, rather than being an 'unorthodox' reading of Matthew, shares its reception-history of Matthew with other contemporary Christians. Valentinians, followed by other patristic readers, treat the parables of the Sower and of the Wheat and the Tares as being about problematic diversity; and indeed Valentinians sometimes offer a more conservative reading of the text. But Irenaeus does not like them, and sometimes uses alarmingly strong language against them (he might be surprised to be told that he was influenced by them, which is demonstrably the case). As is well known, Elaine Pagels suggests that the problem is one of exegetical teaching communicated through initiation rituals; and this in turn led to the existence of distinct groups in the ekklesia. Irenaeus (and I have to confess to some sympathy with him on this) saw this as dangerous for fragile Christian communities whose need was above all for stability and cohesion in the face of increasingly frequent local persecutions. Irenaeus turns the problem into a story of legitimate exegesis, and draws (quite brilliantly according to Jorgensen) on secular rhetorical techniques of exegesis and hermeneutics in late antiquity. According to Frances Young, Irenaeus is 'the first Christian systematic theologian', and he puts a great deal of weight on 'the canon of truth', insisting on the apostolic faith as that which safeguards the validity of any theological hypothesis. Irenaeus attacks the Valentinians on the basis of their hermeneutical method, even though it looks very much like his own. And yet, as Jorgensen points out, Irenaeus' attitude to the Asian church on the quattuordeciman controversy is much more pragmatic; for his real aim is to avoid dissension: there are for him acceptable and unacceptable degrees of diversity. According to Jorgensen, Irenaeus had had rhetorical training which marked him out in a world where reading skills were quite limited, and this was of great importance: 'being able to cite from memory a *bon mot*, to copy a short text, to jot down a phrase, and to reads words from documents of the central government posed in large clear letters were not small accomplishments' (p. 48), and Irenaeus must have got to the top of the pyramid of the *scientia bene dicendi*. When Irenaeus argues that the treasure hidden in the field is actually Christ, then he is using the technique of *inventio,* the discovery of arguments; and Jorgensen thinks that this observation marks a new departure in Irenaean studies, and that the Valentinians were there before Irenaeus in attentiveness to the Greek text, for example in offering a soteriological rather than paraenetic reading of the Last Supper discourse. The difficulty was that the Church expanded enormously in the 2nd Century and so it was faced with the challenges of diversity of doctrine and practice; and it has to be admitted that the exegetical models of Valentinians look remarkably similar to those of the 'orthodox'. Jorgensen is determined to get rid of the boundaries that we have drawn between the 'orthodox' and the 'heretical'; he claims that these boundaries were in fact 'retrospective'. (This is an attractive, even seductive possibility; it remains to be seen whether it will fly). The book concludes with some very helpful observations on the history of the canon, and on the distinction between 'canon' and 'scripture'. If Marcion was the first to have a 'canon', then Irenaeus was the first to 'canonise' Mathew Mark and John, and to hold a four-fold canon of the gospels. Certainly Jorgensen has carried his point that Valentinian exegesis is very important in the reception-history of Matthew.

Heythrop College Nicholas King

Migrating Tales: The Talmud's Narratives and their Historical Context. By Richard Kalmin. Pp. xxii, 282, Oakland, CA, the University of California Press, 2014, $44.95.

This is Kalmin's sixth book, concentrating for the most part on Jewish Babylonia, including the prize-winning *Jewish Babylonia between Persian and Roman Palestine* (2006). Here he supports the recent revolution in rabbinic studies in showing how both the Palestinian and Babylonian Talmuds did not develop in autonomous isolation but rather were responsive to developments outside Jewish circles. Here in particular he argues that the Babylonian Tamud, or Bavli, incorporated much non-Jewish material from the eastern provinces of the Roman empire, much of it of Christian origin. These 'migrating tales' thus flowed from west to east; the Bavli displays a remarkably non-polemical attitude towards Christianity, but does typically add to or alter these tales, directing them towards its own specific concerns. The reason for this direction of 'migration' (since the Babylonian community was older than the Palestinian, had the more ancient textual traditions, and had not suffered in the loss of Jerusalem and the Temple or the two later revolts) was perhaps occasioned by the Persian military conquests deep into Roman territory and the subsequent resettlement of Jewish, Christian, and pagan populations into Mesopotamia, eastern Syria, and western Persia, which opened up new vectors of transmission and influence.

Kalmin gives us close readings of several rich rabbinic stories and, by noticing the 'layering' of original core and subsequent additions through 'language switching' between Hebrew and Aramaic, teases out what the particular concerns of these rabbis were. He starts off in provocative fashion by treating the legend that the prophet Isaiah was executed by Manasseh by being sawed in half; a gruesome painting of this bloody scene graces the front cover. What is striking about many of these stories is that the rabbis did not reply defensively to criticisms of themselves (or of the earlier Pharisees) but surprisingly take the lead in retailing their foibles and shortcomings, in particular their 'occupational hazard' of pomposity and one-ups-manship in demonstrating a deeper knowledge of Torah (and of the danger of hypocrisy for the earlier Pharisees). Often their treatment of received stories involves a reversal of the expected evaluation of key characters. For example, surprisingly the rabbis 'accepted' a Christian Hebrew tale that reflected the view that God had rejected the Israelites and had compassion for a prophet they had murdered ('Zechariah and the Bubbling Blood'); however, the rabbis added an Aramaic phrase that transformed it into a story about God's enduring *compassion* for the Israelites, and a meditation on the problems involved in the effectuation of that compassion in a world without prophets. Elsewhere the rabbis crafted an encounter between Solomon and the 'demon' Ashmedai so as to criticize Solomon and to elevate and re-cast Ashmedai as a 'rabbinized Jewish holy man'. This serves their main agenda of establishing their own credibility and superiority to other contenders for religious authority and social dominance among Babylonian Jews. Kalmin explains: 'The aspirations of Babylonian rabbis to dominate the local Jewish community motivated them to appropriate and transform literature from the Roman East (1) by portraying Solomon as a magician who fails because he is deficient in rabbinic learning, and (2) by portraying Asmedai, king of the demons, as a rabbinized holy man. The Babylonian rabbinic authors of the story, competing with holy men and magicians for dominance in Jewish society, make no mention of Solomon's most important sins according to the Bible because of the particular messages they wish to convey. They use the figure of Solomon to teach their rabbinic audience that only rabbis, through their understanding of Scripture and rabbinic traditions and their appreciation of the human and the spirit worlds, are able to rid the king's palace and the human body of demonic possession, and to enable human beings to live their lives free of the crippling fear of demons. The story is critical of Solomon for being a magician, for being ignorant of Torah and knowledgeable only about the behaviour of demons, and for lusting for power over the spirit world and not being content to rule the earth.' (pp. 96-97). In other words, the rabbis were not yet secure in their authority in Babylon, and are using their Talmud to bring this about.

Heythrop College Patrick Madigan

Soundings in the Religion of Jesus: Perspectives and Methods in Jewish and Christian Scholarship. Edited by Bruce Chilton, Anthony Le Donne, Jacob Neusner, pp. xix, 268, Minneapolis, Fortress Press, 2012, $12.26.

This is not a comfortable book, and nor should it be. It is a collection of essays (uneven in quality, as all such collections tend to be) on the impact on Jewish-Christian relations of the undoubted, though too little celebrated, fact that Jesus was a Jew, not a Christian. It makes uncomfortable reading for Christians, mainly because it is clear-eyed about the fact that Christian anti-Semitism made the Holocaust possible. The contributors to this volume assume that Jewish-Christian dialogue is a good thing, but many of them quite rightly stress how difficult

a matter it is, if only because we cannot, whether we are Jews or Christians, leave our prejudices at the door; what we have to do is recognise them, and that can make us shift uneasily in our seats. The book comes in four parts: the first looks at the NT Jesus, and the various 'boundaries' that may be said to be constructed around him; the second looks at early Jewish and Greek perspectives on Jesus; the third (and the discomfort is at its greatest here, perhaps) considers Jesus research, especially in Germany, before and after National Socialism. In the fourth part there are responses from established authors, James Dunn (a magisterial piece of work, this, very sharp on anything that does not meet his high standards of scholarship), from the Christian side, and Amy-Jill Levine, from the Jewish side, (although in fairness, since she makes some excellent points about the fluidity of meaning of key terms such as 'Jewish', 'Christian' and 'dialogue' in a post-modern world, I should perhaps write 'Jewish' there). Lastly we are given an overall response from two of the editors, Christian and Jew, Bruce Chilton and Jacob Neusner. There is not space here to review all the articles in detail; Leonard Greenspoon is in some ways the most challenging, on how to translate anti-Semitisms, and what difference it makes when some of the principal characters of the New Testament are referred to in what sounds like Gentile names: Jesus, Mary, Joseph, Peter, Paul – and the only prominent character to retain his Jewish-sounding name is, of course, Judas. Joel Lohr offers a very stimulating reflection on what he regards as a very Jewish parable, that of the 'Sheep and Goats' in Matthew 25, seen as a parable about 'good Gentiles' who get a favourable judgement without realising what they have done; Matthew, he argues, is a Jew, writing for a Jewish community against another Jewish community. Anne Lapidus Lerner is very stern about Jesus' shocking response to the Syro-Phoenician woman (or Canaanitess if you are reading Matthew). Donald Senior writes with real authority on Matthew's more Jewish Jesus, but admits the problem for Jewish-Christian dialogue of the first evangelist's high Christology: Matthew is both very Jewish, and hostile to certain Jewish leaders, and his group is caught between loyalties. He offers a very attractive suggestion about the likely origins of Matthew's gospel, and make the point that Matthew offers a more plausible Jesus than Mark, in some ways, his gospel providing a good picture of first century Judaism in its Palestinian background. And, importantly, Senior cites the Pontifical Biblical Commission's neglected document on our debt to Judaism. Anthony Le Donne, another of the editors, makes two important points: that there were critical attempts at the Historical Jesus before Reimarus (Schweitzer started there for reasons of his own), and that, for all the undeniable centuries of bloody Christian persecution of the Jews, there have been outstanding examples of friendship across the boundaries. Le Donne asks some very challenging questions. Dagmar Winter offers some illuminating suggestions about why Protestants wanted to separate Jesus from 'Judaism' (she finds four reasons operative); like many of the contributors, she warns against the dangers of projecting Reform criticisms of Catholicism onto the relationship between the Jesus movement and its parent Judaism. In the final contribution before the responses, Gerd Theissen (born in Germany in 1943) writes, chillingly, from his experience of the intellectual background of Jesus research before and during and after the time of National Socialism in Germany. It is an appalling story, which one can hardly bear to read; but Theissen offers some important methodological considerations for locating Jesus properly within Judaism. If it is permitted to be churlish, however, this excellent article is not well served by its translator. The concluding reflections are an important part of this book, and should not be omitted, for what they say about the pain of Jewish-Christian dialogue, and its importance. There is here much welcome, if far from comfortable, frankness about some of our apparently unbridgeable differences; but the dialogue must go on, and it is perhaps significant and appropriate that the last words of the entire book are '. . .into an era of mutual understanding'.

St Mary's University, Twickenham Nicholas King

Jesus and Muhammad: Parallel Tracks, Parallel Lives. By F. E. Peters. Pp. xv, 214, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2011, $24.95.

The central problem for historians of early Islam – the person of Muhammad, the accounts of his deeds, the formation of the Qur'an – may be summed up in a single question: 'What to do about Wansborough?' The latter had insisted on seeing the production of the Qur'an not as divine revelation or as the authentically remembered recitation of verses by Muhammad, Arabian messenger of God, but as a series of social processes which could be established through comparison with source-critical study of the Old and New Testaments and their historical accretion of varying types of exegesis and commentary. Wansborough's innovation in treating the Qur'an in the same fashion as the Judaeo-Christian scriptures caused consternation when published (and no little degree of ad hominem attacks), and continues to divide scholars. Peters has previous written about early Islamic history in which the origin of the Qur'an in Muhammad's revelations is unquestioned – indeed, unquestionable; here, in

his attempt to draw parallels between Jesus and Muhammad, we may discern an attempt to lay hands on the same biblical criticism that Wansborough had first used to open a new way of understanding and conceptualising the Qur'an. In Peters' hands, however, modern biblical criticism is used to minimize the historical credibility of the gospels; but the traditional Islamic picture is left untouched, and thus the figures of Jesus and Muhammad appear, as the title proclaims, 'parallel'. Much emphasis is laid on the existence of *Q* as a written source for the Gospels: its function as a conveyor of Jesus' *logia* (the narrative features of *Q* as reconstructed are glossed over) allows a parallel to be drawn with the Qur'an as a collection of Muhammad's sayings. More interestingly, the development of Islam is presented as being within what Muhammad would have wished; the development of Christianity, however, is not. Thus the Last Supper gets short shrift, and Matthew 16:18 is translated, 'You are Peter, and upon this Rock . . . I will build my assembly (*ekklesia*)' (the subsequent Gates of Hell are omitted), and glossed: 'that Jesus appointed [Peter] to head a "churc" or any other kind of institution he was founding, is contradicted by all the other evidence of Jesus' intentions and the earliest history of his followers' (pp. 87–88). There is neither footnote nor specific justification for what must be a moot point; this is but a characteristic example of Peters' smoothing over of difficulties. Subsequent pressures within the unauthorised 'Church' explain depictions of Jesus that stray from Peter's pared-down 'original': the picture is fragmentary, but at least historicised. In contrast, Qur'an and hadith are integrated into a seamless whole. And so we might say that Wansborough's use of biblical criticism to illuminate the fragmentary nature of the Qur'an has come full circle: the hypothesis of *Q* is asserted as fact in order to leave the Qur'an entire and in place.

University of Manchester Anthony Lappin

Origen and Scripture: The Contours of the Exegetical Life (Oxford Early Christian Studies). By Peter W. Martens. Pp. xii, 280, Oxford University Press, 2012, $40.00.

For years, the investigation of Origen's epic achievement in Christian biblical interpretation was largely polarized between studies like R.P.C. Hanson's *Allegory and Event* (1959), a highly critical, sometimes caustic allegation of exotic and spiritualizing exegesis, and Henri de Lubac's *Histoire et Esprit* (1950; ET 2007), a much more sympathetic account that tried to resonate with Origen's view of scriptural revelation as bridging the realms of material 'history' and transcendent 'spirit.' A newer generation of scholarship, however, has pursued other avenues of inquiry between and beyond these approaches, such as David Dawson's *Christian Figural Reading and the Fashioning of Identity* (2001), which looks to redescribe the relation between literal and figurative meaning in Origen. Martens's book is a new contribution to the still fertile field of patristic hermeneutics, providing a fresh angle of approach that focuses on the person and existential horizon of the interpreter as crucial factors in Origen's interpretation of the Bible. As the subtitle of Martens's monograph suggests, real insight into Scripture depends, for Origen, on the 'exegetical life' of the interpreter, the sustained teleological process of forming good interpretive (and moral and spiritual) habits and commitments.

Martens works to paint a profile of the 'ideal' interpreter—an ideal to which Origen himself aspired. Indeed, Origen's self-investment in the enterprise of biblical interpretation has everything to do with the heuristic character of his exegesis. He himself *is* the 'bride,' the soul eluded by the Bridegroom, Christ the Logos, in the drama played out in the Song of Songs, and Martens has rightly recognized how the Song functions for Origen not only as an allegory of divine-human love but as a classic image of the exegetical dance itself (p. 165). As Henri Crouzel emphasized, Origen was a 'research theologian' devoted to leaving no stone unturned in the quest to excavate the concealed treasures of scriptural revelation. Origen's exegetical work was a relentless journey, as Martens conveys in his own study (pp. 212-16).

Martens's profile of Origen's ideal interpreter begins by analyzing the rigorous scholarly formation imperative to the exegetical enterprise, including a serious propaedeutic in philosophy, a rigorous text criticism, and disciplined integration of Greco-Roman literary criticism (pp. 25-87). On the last point, Martens, distancing himself from some earlier scholarship, convincingly argues that allegorical interpretation, rather than being just a flight of imaginative fancy, fell under the rule of *philological* analysis of the sacred texts as well as under the apostolic sanction of Paul himself (Gal. 4:24ff). Martens successfully counters Hanson's dismissal of Origen's allegory as merely a diversion from the 'real' work of interpretation.

As Martens further shows, the scientific dimension of exegesis was wholly insinuated with the religious and ascetical quest of the interpreter. A deep spiritual anthropology, further framed within Origen's broader cosmology, underlies his hermeneutics (pp. 94-106). Distraction or negligence was

the primal sin of all spiritual beings in their preexistent state, and in the present context of investigating scriptural revelation the exegete had to fight these at every turn. Interpretation aspired to wisdom and contemplation, helped by the fact that the Spirit designed Scripture precisely to elevate embodied minds above the disordered world. The exegete followed in the way of the apostles since, in their intimacy with the incarnate Logos, they too had to be elevated by the Logos to perceive the gospel.

Though rigorous in scholarship, Origen's ideal interpreter was no sequestered intellectual. As Origen's own career testifies, interpretation invariably had a public and ecclesial face, and the keen interpreter was determinative in combatting heterodox readings and vindicating the church's rule of faith. He had to expose and uproot those readings, showing how erroneous Gnostic interpretations were ill-informed by pagan philosophy, narrow, simplistically literal, and deficient in accounting for the wholeness of revelation. Marten's treatment of Origen's engagement with Jewish exegesis (pp. 133-60) is compelling, demonstrating that his accusation of Jewish 'literalism' was no transparent allegation of superficiality. How could it be, when Origen himself used many Jewish interpretations, endorsed the value of a literal sense, and knew traditions of sophisticated rabbinic allegorical interpretation? Most such accusations of literalism were specifically targeted (e.g. regarding ceremonial laws), and more often than not Origen was assailing Jewish failures to discern the underlying *intent* of the biblical text. Exegesis of the 'suffering servant' in Isaiah was an exemplary case. The rabbis' claim that the servant was the Jewish nation was ironically a failure to read the text *literally* enough. If the servant had been led to death 'because of the iniquities *of my people*' (Isa 53:8), how could the servant and his people be the same?

In my judgment, a true highlight of Martens's study is his final chapter, 'Horizons: The Beginning and End of the Drama of Salvation' (pp. 227-42) in which he substantiates his claim that Origen's ideal interpreter is consciously located and grounded within, not outside, the economy (*οἰκονομία*) or 'drama' of salvation history, such as it began in a state of prelapsarian unity and perfection. In this case, 'ideal scriptural interpreters sought to reverse their original fall in an attempt to reprise, however fleetingly, their original state, the contemplation of God' (p. 233). Indeed, Origen's interpretation aspired to bridge the incorporeal and corporeal worlds, to heal and restore alienated souls precisely in the rehabilitative context of embodied life, and to guide all toward the future world, 'a schoolroom where minds found increasing enlightenment' (pp. 236-7).

One might quibble with some very minor points in the book. In his discussion of Christ as the center and salvific content of Scripture in Origen, Martens relegates a key explanation of the precise nature of this christocentricity to a footnote (p. 217, n. 105), perhaps an oversight in reshaping the book from a dissertation into a monograph. I would have hoped to hear a bit more from Martens on the provocative work of David Dawson on Origen and 'figural' reading, which is briefly mentioned in another footnote (p. 4, n. 10). Such small things do nothing, however, to compromise what is a brilliant piece of research that is conversant with the massive secondary literature on Origen and yet offers new insights and elucidations.

Emmanuel Christian Seminary, Johnson City, Tennessee — Paul M. Blowers

Alexander to Constantine: Archaeology of the Land of the Bible. By Eric M. Meyers and Mark A. Chaney. Pp. xv, 363. New Haven/London, Yale University Press, 2012, $27.50.

After a chapter on the Persian period and the transition to Hellenism, the authors of this immensely useful book provide an account of the advent of Hellenism under the Greek kingdoms, and then of the Hasmoneans. The story of the extensive introduction of Roman architecture by Herod the Great leads to a discussion of Kirbet Qumran and the Dead Sea Scrolls, and through the Great Revolt to the Bar Kokhba Rebellion. Next there is a chapter each on the emergence of Christianity, early Judaism and the rise of the synagogue, and the archaeology of paganism in Palestine during those times. (I was surprised to find sheer paganism so well represented in Palestine during the Roman period (246).) After a general discussion of the growth of Greco-Roman culture in Palestine, and the special case of Sepphoris, a final chapter takes us beyond Constantine and the Roman period. The authors are specialists respectively in early Judaism and the New Testament; and both have extensive experience as field archaeologists.

In fact the book does not begin with Alexander, but rather with Nehemiah. The latter, though evidently less capable than the renowned Macedonian conqueror of forming part of a catchpenny title, is one of my favourite Old Testament characters (of a priest who had become son-in-law to a notorious

political troublemaker, he says, 'I chased him from my presence' [Nehemiah 13.28]). Recent studies indicate that both the size and population of the Persian province of Yehud, and of the city of Jerusalem within it, were much smaller than was previously thought. 'The older view adhered to by many scholars held that Jerusalem had approximately 15,000 inhabitants after the return from Exile, whereas from the late 1990s that figure had dropped by one estimate to as low as circa 750 in the time of Nehemiah' (1). It is also curious that Greek pottery, and other signs of Hellenic culture, are so abundant just at the time when the wars between Greece and Persia were at their height. It did not take long for local potters to imitate Attic ware, though they could never rival its quality.

Jesus taught and healed in small towns and villages, which suggests that he deliberately avoided major urban centres. Among the towns mentioned in the gospels, there are just two possible candidates for synagogue-building at that time, and only one that is certain (210). It seems probable that the earliest synagogues were used for community functions as well as for strictly religious purposes (216). The first Christians typically assembled in private houses (195-6), though some evidently worshipped in synagogues - the notorious Birkat ha-Minim may have been directed against such people. The authors properly advise caution in identifying too readily sites to be associated with Jesus and his immediate followers. There is *some* evidence for supposing a house at Capernaum to have belonged to St. Peter, though it was later subject to extensive alterations; and the site could merely be where early Christian generations wrongly thought that Peter lived (191-4). I was glad to learn that the identifications by St. Helena, the mother of the emperor Constantine, of the sites of Jesus' death and burial, while debatable, are not without merit in the light of modern archaeology (181).

It is also good to read that people of the time of the late Roman Empire, and Jews in particular, could get away with thumbing their noses at tyrannical edicts from on high; a Christian imperial ban against the building of synagogues seems not in the least to have affected the number being built. More surprising to me was the extent of cultural accommodation of Jews with paganism; in a fourth-century synagogue at Hammath Tiberias, the large mosaic floor includes a panel, at the centre of which there is depicted Helios the sun-god and his chariot. 'Jews gathering in this synagogue to worship were clearly not troubled by figural representation, even of a mythological figure like Helios' (288).

Judaism saw a remarkable spate of literary activity in Byzantine times. The Jerusalem Talmud, together with the Babylonian Talmud which emerged about a century later, proved of fundamental significance in the evolution of Rabbinic Judaism. The Christian texts, while not so foundational for the Christian tradition at large, had some importance nonetheless; the great Church historian Eusebius, whose career was on the cusp of the Roman and Byzantine periods, served as bishop of Caesarea Maritima, and his work shows that he had contacts with contemporary Jewish scholars (291).

I confess that I usually, as a matter of convenience, deface books in the course of reviewing them; but I could not bring myself to do so in the case of this one, abundantly and sumptuously illustrated as it is - a bibliophile's delight.

Calgary, Canada Hugo Meynell

Ancient Apologetic Exegesis: Introducing and Recovering Theophilus's World. By Stuart E. Parsons. Pp. xvi, 238, Eugene, OR, Pickwick, 2015, $31.00.

This book accompanies a revolution in contemporary exegesis of early Christian (and Jewish) apologetic texts, specifically in the way they use scripture. Modern scholars, plentifully supplied with printed versions of biblical texts in various languages and translations, and solicitous to get the wording of a citation exactly right, have tended to project their practices back upon exegetes of the turn of the common era and early Christian centuries. Baffled by the 'loose' way St. Paul, for example, uses scripture – running quotations from different Jewish books together, usually linked by a common word, with no thought to announce the splicing and compounding he is performing, we have been unable to appreciate how the scriptures functioned and were used in a largely illiterate society. We have purchased our own extensive libraries of scriptural texts at the expense of losing our ability to quote large sections of texts verbatim; paradoxically, religious believers in largely illiterate societies routinely memorized key chunks of their holy books, especially those that had deeply impressed them. They judged exegetes and responded powerfully to preachers, not as a function of how accurately they could retrieve an individual citation, but by how skilfully they could marshal these powerful passages and weave together allusions from far-flung sources, through key words and literary echoes, typically culminating in a crescendo of indirect or non-explicit references that mutually reinforced one another to propel their polemical or apologetic point. What makes

us shake our head in incomprehension would have made them break out in applause at the skilful mastery of scripture put on display by this creative process.

The apostolic generation were Jewish followers of Christ who routinely used the Jewish scriptures this way to explain and defend their belief. The first generation of Gentile leaders did not have this command of the Hebrew corpus; they frequently had recourse to collections of proof-texts or quoted from others when using scripture. By the third generation, however, starting in the late second century when Theophilus was patriarch of Antioch, gentile leaders had attained the same mastery of the scriptural corpus as the first generation of Jewish-Christians. To interpret properly what they are doing we must throw out our tendency to 'project Protestantism' back into the early church, where everyone would bring their own bible to the service and would follow personally every reference the minister makes. The relevant model is rather the contemporary judicial rhetoric where a skilful attorney had to line up his string of reliable witnesses, and impugn the reliability of his opponent's witnesses. Everyone knew the Bible already; you were judged on how well you used it! Further, the one work we have from Theophilus, his apology to the gentile pagan Autolycus, is a specimen of 'protreptic', that deliberately withholds the more 'advanced' doctrines of Christology and Soteriology, which would have been too much for Autolycus to take in or accept at the time, in the interests of making a 'first step' to awaken Autolycus to the important but less specifically Christian issues of resurrection and judgment, and to move him to abandon his unreliable 'witnesses' of pagan poets and philosophers in favour of the Hebrew prophets and Moses. St. Paul used this same technique when addressing the philosophers at Athens – as did Jesus when responding to the rich young man who asked him what he must do to be saved.

Heythrop College Patrick Madigan

Hermeneutics, Intertextuality and the Contemporary Meaning of Scripture. Edited by Ross Cole and Paul Petersen. Pp. viii, 308, Avondale Academic Press, 2014, $31.95.

Drawing together articles from a 2003 Seventh-day Adventist Biblical Conference at Avondale College in Australia, the editors present a broad variety of essays on the relationship between modern hermeneutics and a faith filled, inter-textual approach to Scripture in the Seventh-day Adventist tradition. The volume presents both academic and popular articles that attempt to explain how contemporary Seventh-day Adventists can study Scripture in a way that nourishes their faith while also incorporating the legitimate findings of modern studies.

Five different sections make up the volume. The first section, 'Intertextuality: Foundations and Principles,' includes two essays that seek to lay the groundwork for the rest of the volume. The essays by H Ross Cole (3-15) and Ray Roennfeldt (17-25) address the delicate balance which must be observed in studying Scripture as a whole but without losing the historical nature of individual texts or getting lost in postmodern subjectivism. The section seems primarily geared toward encouraging more conservative Christians to be open to historical studies. It argues that while Scripture should be studied as a whole, one must also examine a text's literary genre and historical setting, affirming that God can speak through an ancient text for our benefit today.

The second section of the volume presents essays on the relationship between the Old and New Testaments. Jon Paulien examines intertexutality by looking at the book of Revelation and discussing a current a debate over its use of the Old Testament (29-49). Richard Davidson addresses certain passages in the Gospel of Matthew, often cited as examples of Matthew misquoting the Old Testament, to argue that Matthew's use is faithful to the text's original context and meaning (51-65). David Thiele looks at Paul's reference to Moses in 2 Cor 3 and states that Paul's use of the Old Testament is best characterized as 'top down,' or, as shedding the light of Christ back into Old Testament realities (67-78).

In part three, entitled 'Bringing Our Text to the Text,' Roennfeld, Matupit Darius, and Grenville Kent present essays that examine presuppositions and other factors which influence ones reading of Scripture. Roennfeldt begins by encouraging readers to examine their own biases when approaching scripture and discusses how one's background can impact one's hermeneutic (81-88). Darius examines the use of Scripture in cross cultural settings and notes that while communication technology has led to an increasingly global world, Christian evangelists still need to learn native cultures in order to more effectively communicate the Gospel (89-94). The third essay then deals with postmodern hermeneutics, explaining that while one must avoid the rampant subjectivism that imposes one's views on Scripture, there are certain elements of postmodern thought that can aid Christians in their dialogue with others.

The fourth part of the volume is dedicated entirely to the writing and hermeneutic of Ellen G. White. With essays from Arthur Patrick (117-140), Robert McIver (141-152), Barry Oliver (153-170),

Jon Paulien (171-196), and Graeme Bradford (197-224), this section discusses the influential and controversial figure's role in the history of Seventh Day Adventist Church and bible studies. Finally, the last section of the volume ideals with other studies related to Seventh-day Adventist hermeneutics. It includes an essay by Jeff Crocombe on the legacy of William Miller 227-238), an examination of Satan present in Scripture by Andrew Skeggs (239-294), an analysis of historicism in the 21st century by Donna Worley (255-274), and a study on the Fatherhood of God by Graeme Bradford (275-291).

The work is a valuable resource for those interested in the biblical hermeneutics of the Seventh-day Adventists tradition. In particular, those interested in the thought of Ellen White will surely want to read the essays on her as they are particularly thorough. However, despite its praise of historical studies, and its attempt to walk middle path between a faith-filled approach and a historically conscious one, the attempt rings a little hollow due to a deficient philosophic discussion of human and divine causality, especially in regard to the inspiration of Scripture. Furthermore, in its discussion of post-modernism and the subjectivism that often accompanies it, the work does not discuss the obvious implications which it has for principle of *sola scriptura* or the primacy of private interpretation. And while the participants were not Catholic, one would have hoped for at least a brief discussion of the early Church's role in forming the canon and the intertextual nature of Scripture. These were largely absent and therefore lessen the appeal of the work to those outside the Seventh-day Adventist tradition.

Ave Maria University Luke Murray

New Testament Theology and its Quest for Relevance: Ancient Texts and Modern Readers. By Thomas R. Hatina. Pp. 277, London, T & T Clark, 2013, $29.95.

There is a question in the air these days about how you establish what is and is not 'relevant' in the New Testament. In this book, Hatina argues that in default of an answer to this question the 'future of Protestantism is at stake'. It is perhaps a particular kind of Protestantism that he has in mind, since he articulates his project as attempting to formulate a NT theology in mainstream culture within the dialogue between faiths, in the light of the 1960's crisis of authority. You may wish to observe that his wishes are far from modest, but the target, to see what religious texts are up to, is a worthy one. The book has three parts. The first looks at New Testament Theology in theory, the second examines it in practice, while in the final section, he considers the question of New Testament theology in a pluralist age. The real question, always, is the hermeneutical one: how can you possibly understand the NT? But, all too often, potential readers wobble uneasily between that and the historical question of the original meaning of the text. Hatina distinguishes between the 'foundationalist' approach, which would be a study of that theology which is found in or limited to the NT, and the 'dialectic' approach, 'a study of that theology which is based on or rooted in the NT'. Both have their difficulties, of course, but Hatina prefers the latter, whose goal is 'relevance'. Strikingly, he is prepared to argue that 'all good Protestants must first be good Catholics' (p. 20), because of the 'prior commitment to early ecclesiastical decisions' that reading the NT entails. Hatina is very thoughtful and his argument is interesting, though it is not always easy to pin down precisely what he is saying. He is certainly right to point to a 'past of competing voices', as he argues that foundationalists are not sufficiently aware of the limitations of language, especially language that is religious or mythical. The fact that the NT consists of twenty-seven books poses, he argues, a problem for Protestantism; the historical-critical method justified emancipation from ecclesial control of the scriptures, but then came the problem that the Reformed tradition, freed from such structures, turned out to be fissiparous. The NT is not conscious of itself as 'Scripture' or as a 'canon', and we do not really know what the key passage of 2 Timothy 3:16 really means. So there is no such thing as a pure 'NT theology'. At the end, after some very sensible analysis of the historical-critical method (which has, he argues, nine aspects, some of them problematic), he outlines five contemporary ways of structuring NT theology: first there are two 'bottom-up' approaches, the chronological, and the 'author-by-author'. Then there are three that are 'top-down': salvation-historical, dogmatic, and existential. Each of these has its own set of difficulties, and at times the book has the feel of a treatise on the impossibility of any NT theology at all. At the end he produces an impressively strong case for a dogmatic approach to NT theology that is far from currently fashionable. The third part of the book, on a NT theology for today, is perhaps the most interesting, looking at inchoate religion, 'an understanding of religion prior to the act of theologising', in the context of the surprising

contemporary popularity of religion after the events of September 11th 2001. In the end, Hatina argues for a 'dialectical' rather than a 'foundationalist' approach, if NT theology is to be culturally relevant and engaging. It is an unending process, and always (here's the rub) linked to the self-understanding of the exegete, a process in which readers shape texts, and texts shape readers. 'We live in a world where the text can no longer be divorced from the interpreter'. His argument is that our culture has a neurotic obsession with instantaneous results, whereas '[i]f we are to take theology seriously, the process from faith to theology takes years, lifetimes, and even centuries to develop'. It is in keeping with this important insight that Hatina offers a generous Protestant view of Catholic and Orthodox approaches to the question. There are too many misprints in the text, and the argument is not always clear, but Hatina is dealing thoughtfully and respectfully with a question of immense contemporary importance.

St Mary's University, Twickenham Nicholas King

Hermeneutics and the Church: In Dialogue with Augustine. By James A. Andrews. Pp. xv, 303, University of Notre Dame Press, Notre Dame, Indiana, 2012, pb $35.00, & E-book, $24.50.

There is a story about a civil servant in France who gave a plan to his government minister. The minister replied that he was sure it would work in practice 'but does it work in theory?' he asked. We are all familiar with the peculiarly French way of relating theory to practice and James Andrews deals with just that issue but in a very different context: that of theological hermeneutics. The issue here is whether interpreting a text should be preceded by a general philosophical theory that should control in some measure the interpretation, or whether hermeneutical theory describes an interpretation after the event. If you think that reading is not a simple or innocent activity, you will take the first *a priori* approach, as Andrews calls it, and first analyse your experience and practice of reading. This has been the dominant approach since Schleiermacher. But if you think reading a text is simple and innocent, then you will just want to get on with it and describe *a posteriori* what you have done. The *a priori* approach assumes that misunderstanding is common and needs to be checked; while the *a posteriori* approach judges that correct understanding is the norm. Andrews goes for the second of these and in doing so identifies with Augustine's way of interpreting scripture in *De Doctrina Christiana*. There are two reasons for suggesting that this is Augustine's approach: first that Augustine is not in this work interested in understanding in general but just in understanding texts and specifically scriptural texts; and second that Augustine does not think that misunderstanding is the norm because he is entering into an already established tradition of interpreting the Bible that is to be trusted, in a particular community: the church. This results in a theological hermeneutics that is decidedly confessional as we shall see.

Although Books 1-3 of *De Doctrina Christiana* were written early in Augustine's Christian life and Book 4 only towards the end, Andrews treats it as a unified work that required a later completion to finish it. While the work has been characterised in a number of ways – a biblical hermeneutics, a handbook for preachers, a rhetorical handbook, a formulation of a new Christian culture – the author, who thinks it is all of these, follows Edmund Hill in seeing it in the first place as a guide for preachers. Book 4 is of a piece with the rest and advises preachers on how to deliver what has been interpreted by the first three books. It is primarily a book for the educated in the church, the clergy, and the purpose is not to please the audience with Ciceronian rhetoric but to instruct them about the meaning of the content of the Bible. Understanding the Bible is not something only to be enjoyed for its own sake (*frui*) but it must also be put into practice (*uti*) by changing the lives of the readers and the hearers of the sermon. For this reason Andrews thinks that the sermon is the paradigm of a theological hermeneutic. That is where it all leads. And this is because *De Doctrina Christiana* encompasses a twofold rule of interpretation: the *regula fidei* which tells the reader/hearer what is to be believed (God), and the *regula dilectionis* which helps one understand how God is to be loved. This last rule is twofold because the purpose of scripture is to learn how to love God and one's neighbour.

James Andrews is not a slavish disciple of Augustine. He sets up a dialogue between this voice from the past and two modern theologians, first with Werner Jeanrond who represents the *a priori* school that thinks interpretation must be protected by a prior general theory (Anthony Thiselton would have been another possibility), and later with Stephen Fowl who is closer to Augustine with a modern *a posteriori* approach. Here Andrews follows Augustine and Fowl in subordinating theory to practice. A necessary part of this practice is prayer. The author has a neat summary of Augustine's *a posteriori* hermeneutics:

> It exists in the worshipping church, where the practice of piety takes center stage, where two rules structure the reading, the *regula fidei* and the *regula dilectionis*, one focusing on the true faith, the other on correct living. His hermeneutics has a balanced view of the human and the divine; both operate together; neither supersedes the other. (p.158)

This is a confessional style of interpretation that takes place in a prescribed community and as such it has little or nothing to offer a general philosophical hermeneutic. But if it were not so characterised, Andrews would say that the theory has missed the point, which is to change peoples' lives through directing love towards others and (in Christian terms) leading to salvation. This approach makes theological hermeneutics a world of its own and not an expression of a more general philosophical discipline. This leads to a concluding chapter, which sets out a number of general statements that characterise a theological hermeneutics, though it is not a conclusion that summarises what has gone before and that will allow you to skip the preceding discussion.

Harrogate, UK Geoffrey Turner

The Bible in Politics: How to Read the Bible Politically. By Richard Bauckham. Pp. xxi, 166, Louisville, KY, Westminster John Knox Press, 2010, 2nd ed., $25.00.

In his introduction to the second edition of *The Bible in Politics*, Richard Bauckham is at pains to make two points very clear: (1) if the Bible is to be understood, the whole of it must be read and understood as a whole, and (2) a political analysis of the Bible is not rendered meaningless in this age of globalization. Perhaps recalling one reviewer's criticism of the first edition for failing to deal extensively with liberation theology, Bauckham concludes this new introduction by briefly addressing an issue of present importance, namely eco-theology. He argues both that we must consider ourselves principally as creatures among other creatures, all of value to God, and that, if we do this, it will be easier for us to discard consumerism.

In his original introduction, Bauckham explains that he wishes to teach his readers how to learn from the Bible about politics, rather than to learn from him about politics in the Bible, although he admits that a certain amount of the latter will occur incidentally. He begins Chapter One by reiterating that the two Testaments do not stand in political contradiction. Context changes for many reasons in many ways, and our negligence in being aware of context allows us to twist the Bible to mean whatever we will it to. This is a needed injunction

Bauckham also insists that our own contemporary context should not be neglected, something he notes he should have stressed in the first edition more than he did. Nonetheless, he affirms that true political—or are they moral?—principles exist at a deeper level than can be touched by changing contexts. Fundamental political principles are unchanging and cannot be limited arbitrarily, e.g., to relations among Christians or to the wholly private sphere.

Still in the first chapter, Bauckham explains that all meanings of any particular biblical passage must be 'intelligibly continuous' with the core meaning of the text as it was understood prior to it becoming part of the biblical canon. A text's canonical context, however, must be acknowledged as the authoritative one, even though we can now see that some parts of the Bible relativize or correct others. Bauckham concludes this all-important introduction with a warning about the ease with which one's own prejudices can be read into the Bible, with an exhortation for all Christians to work together to properly contextualize the Scriptures via in-depth studies of their original historical contexts, and with an admonition to interpreters not to rely wholly and merely on correctly applied hermeneutical principles.

Having explained how the Bible may be interpreted properly in a political manner, Bauckham uses his next eight chapters to give us the results of his application of his method to passages from both Testaments that deal with eight subjects: the holiness of God's people (Leviticus 19), the proper conduct of rulers (Proverbs 31:1-9), God and the oppressed (Psalms 10 and 126), theocratic and secular taxation (Mark 12:13-17 and Matthew 17:24-27), the wickedness and fall of Rome (Revelation 18), freedom and slavery (various), the persecution and survival of the Jewish nation (Esther), and violence and widespread destruction (Genesis). He hopes that reading these exegetical examples will assist the reader in applying his method. Each of these essentially self-contained chapters is strong enough to stand alone (as an earlier version of chapter nine in fact did), although by reason of their political theme and single hermeneutic approach they are not unrelated. Bauckham concludes with a final chapter

that consists of a detailed analysis of the radical politics of Jesus Christ and the political significance of his crucifixion. Taken as a whole, *The Bible in Politics* provides an interesting and genuinely useful introduction to–or perhaps a diverse series of windows into–Bauckham's own thoughtful exegesis.

St. Francis Xavier University, Canada Paul Niesiobedzki

In God's Shadow: Politics in the Hebrew Bible. By Michael Walzer. Pp. xxi, 232, London/New Haven, Yale University Press, 2012, £20.00.

Walzer professes a neutrality between the different political regimes outlined in the Bible, but it gradually becomes apparent that he has a favourite, in the defence of which he delivers a devastating criticism of the theocratic priority of the dominant authors and final priestly editors of our 'book of books'. In this his twenty-eighth book, he turns upside-down or delivers an 'anti-Bible', teasing out the neglected or positively discouraged option of doing the hard, human, 'political' work of deliberation, negotiation, debate, compromise, taking what we can live with if not all we wanted, raising the level of our situation or relationship with an enemy a notch rather than going for 'all or nothing', which all too often the absolutist stance of the prophets and priests, speaking for an absolute and uncompromising God who had done them the quintessential honour of 'choosing' them, led the latter to adopt. He thereby offers us an 'anti-history' of Israel, one that deliberately reverses the evaluation of particular eras or regimes that the Biblical authors and editors impose to justify their fulminations and recommendations. These authors thereby sent Israel and much of the West in the wrong direction for hundreds, even thousands, of years, a misdirection which comes down to us today whenever Jews or Christians disparage their current Temple-less condition, feeling inferior to and sustaining themselves with the dream of a restored royal messianic kingdom of David. This constitutes an adulteration and misuse by the prophets of their spiritual capital, of their great gift and contribution to world historical development: the message that God does not want our sacrifices and burnt offerings, but rather moral reflection, self-appropriation and transformation, leading to a concern for the poor, the marginal and oppressed, and working for reconciliation with enemies. This deeper thrust was perverted - kidnapped, held hostage, and hijacked for almost the entire Biblical period by its absolutist encasement in this authoritative book, only gradually freeing itself when all other options had been tried and the bitter consequences tasted, with the serendipitous, unplanned, and unintended rise of the Pharisees, and latter the rabbis, who in practice foreswore royalist and messianic dreams as a luxury they could no longer afford, and really not part of God's plan in any event. Finally attention could be given to what is neglected, indeed almost completely omitted, from the 'official' Biblical account; as Henry Kissinger put it, 'realism is ultimately more compassionate than romanticism'. These later leaders worked to devise a law for this 'in-between time' that is invisible in the Bible, but that looks likely to fill all of history, with the wrathful 'day of the Lord' deferred or delayed permanently to a post-historical moment.

Walzer's bugaboo is the 'high' theory of monarchy, which in practice, if the prophets were to be followed, would lead to passivity and quietism by the King (and thus the people) who foreswear all human attempts to resolve their problems, relying exclusively on the Lord to deliver them as He had miraculously at the Red Sea against the Egyptians. The ideal period, ironically enough, becomes the disparaged period of the Judges when 'each man did what he thought best', when there was a 'theocratic' regime where God ruled directly in each person's heart, where all the people were called to be holy, to be priests and prophets, and to take full responsibility for their actions (or lack thereof). The request for a king to Samuel was a mistake, which was in practice finally reversed when the Jewish exiles found they were better off in Babylon, where they had developed the 'synagogue' and substituted study and discussion of the 'law' for sacrifice in their now Temple-less condition – and admitted that they were better off as Jews with the whole monarchist-priestly superstructure removed. The synagogue as an institution did not die when they returned to Israel, although the Temple was then rebuilt. Judaism had been permanently changed; there would be no going back.

Heythrop College Patrick Madigan

The Bible and Literature. By Alison M. Jack. Pp. ix, 179, London: SCM Press, 2012, npg.

I found this book absorbing from start to finish, though its arguments did not always convince me. If anyone thought contemporary literary criticism as a whole was a futile exercise, especially as applied to understanding the Bible, I would strongly recommend it.

If the Bible is the 'word of God', and one not unreasonably assumes (following Aquinas) that God can neither deceive not be deceived, then does it not follow that a man once lived for nine-hundred and sixty-nine years (*Genesis* 5:27); and that a Hebrew prophet was not only regurgitated alive by a fish that had swallowed him, but - still more implausibly from a strictly historical point of view - preached successfully to the people of Niniveh (*Jonah* 2.10; 3.5)? At the other extreme, the Old-Testament scholar Alan Lowe once suggested to me that the Bible was the Word of God so far as it had not yet been proven to be false. It does seem integral to Christianity that the Bible is in some sense the Word of God. But in what sense? Can one honestly assert the proposition only at the cost of eviscerating it of meaning? I assume, conventionally enough, that we cannot take the fundamentalist way out, if we are fully-educated modern persons. And perhaps it is helpful to observe that, whatever the historical status of *Jonah*, most people with experience of life have suffered metaphorically through storms at sea, and done time in the belly of the fish.

Following chapters on the bible in literature, and on reading the bible as literature, we find creation singled out as a recurring theme. After a discussion of the methods and limits of 'intertextuality', and two chapters on narrative criticism and the role of the reader, the question of feminist readings is broached. Just before the 'Conclusion', and after an account of 'midrash' as rewriting, we are introduced to another recurring theme, apocalypse. I am less than enamoured of the jargon of contemporary literary criticism. I cannot understand, for instance, how anyone with any sensitivity to the English language could put up with the linguistic barbarism of the term 'narratology.'

Frank Kermode is rightly commended for having done pioneering work on the way the Gospel of *John* 'works on' the reader - prescinding from the questions which have often preoccupied scholars, about the audience for which the author composed his gospel, the community in and for which he wrote, and how accurately he recounts the words and deeds of the historical Jesus (26-30). But Robert Kysar is surely taking this approach too far, and flying in the face of both sanity and common sense, when he writes: '(I)t is sheer pretense to suppose that any of us can examine the evidence for the past and come up with an objective, unbiased, and true picture of what took place' (31). We have excellent reason for saying that Queen Victoria was really married to a man called Albert, and that neither Julius Caesar nor Abraham Lincoln died natural deaths. One is relieved to read that such a deeply sceptical approach as Kysar's has not generally recommended itself.

I think the author's exegesis of Hawthorne's 'Young Goodman Brown' to be both insightful and convincing; less so her treatment of *1 John* (of which J. A. T. Robinson remarked that it might as well have been written backwards). Occasionally, it seems to me, the author's formidable critical apparatus is employed arbitrarily, or to somewhat trivial effect (64-5). From *1 John* we are to learn the lesson that, '(i)ndeed, what should be questioned are the claims of those who deny their potentially reality-changing actions' (69) - a small mouse to come out of the labour of the preceding discussion. What are signs to one school of divergent sources, are signs to another of literary strategy. (Surely we find both at the end of *Job*, where the author appends the end of the folktale, which recounts the restoration of Job's fortunes, to brilliantly cynical effect; the reader no more believes the author than she believes the happy ending of *Oliver Twist*.) One of the many treasures of the book is a very searching investigation of the parable of the prodigal son (82-5, 164-73). What will happen to the family dynamics after the conclusion of the story (I am ashamed to say I'd never thought of that!)?

What is legitimate interpretation, what over-interpretation, and why? The author is constantly pushing one up against this question. In her generally illuminating discussion of *Jane Eyre*, I found Mr. Brocklehurst's connection with a certain perverse kind if evangelical piety just if rather obvious, Helen Burns's association with the Oxford Movement somewhat forced (86). In spite of the title of one of the chapters, I do not see why there should be any limits to 'intertextuality'. An 'intertextual' juxtaposition of *Mein Kampf* and *The Flopsy Bunnies*, though it might lack something of what Matthew Arnold would call 'high seriousness', could be entertaining and even instructive.

It astonishes me that there is no mention of the work of Northrop Frye, who has written both extensively and brilliantly on this subject of the bible and literature. To my mind, Frye shows better than anyone else how the Bible as a whole affects our literary and religious consciousness; and he

does so by envisaging it as having something analogous to a literary unity - like a great play by Shakespeare, or some of Dickens's later novels. Frye has convinced me that the best way of approaching whatever 'inspiration' the Bible may have is along these lines.

Calgary, Canada Hugo Meynell

Resurrection. A Guide for the Perplexed. By Lidija Novakovic. Pp. x, 214, London/NY, Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2016, £16.99.

Novakovic traces her study of the subject through her own undergrad and doctoral studies, referring to her introduction to Jewish literature of the Second Temple period, 'instrumental for the understanding of the emergence of the belief in resurrection' (ix), and fascinating to read.

In 2012 Bloomsbury T&T Clark published her major work *Raised from the Dead According to Scripture: The Role of Israel's Scripture in the Early Christian Interpretations of Jesus' Resurrection*, and it is on account of this publication in the Jewish and Christian Texts in Contexts and Related Studies Series that the present book was commissioned.

Novakovic begins with the issue, generally agreed upon by Jews in the Second Temple period, that the resurrection would be 'a corporate event at the end of time' (3). In her opening chapter, then, she looks in addition to Ezekiel 37:1-14, Hosea 6:1-3, Isaiah 26:19 and Daniel 12:1-3, at 1 Enoch 1-36, 85-90, 91-105 and 37-71, Jubilees, Second Maccabees, Qumran literature (in particular, 4Q521), Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, Psalms of Solomon, Josephus, pseudo-Philo, 4 Ezra, 2 Baruch, the Sibylline Oracles and pseudo-Phocylides; a wealth of material which arises in the Maccabean period 'as a response to the suffering of the pious Jews who were punished ... because of their obedience to the Torah' (42) that goes some way to explain the variety of ideas present in the earliest Christian texts.

The next three chapters are devoted to the New Testament evidence for the resurrection of Jesus. Chapter 2 explores the non-narrative traditions, especially in 1 Corinthians 15, concentrating on the Pauline formulaic statements that include a reference to the third day. Novakovic concludes, 'The confession that Jesus was raised on the third day ... is not a chronological but theological statement' (73-74). Chapter 3 looks at the narratives about the discovery of the empty tomb and Novakovic asserts that the story of the empty tomb 'functions as a prequel to the stories of Jesus' post-resurrection appearances' (100). Chapter 4 ponders the narratives about the appearances of the risen Jesus, concluding that the empty tomb and appearances developed independently and it was only later, 'probably for apologetic purposes, i.e. to demonstrate that Jesus was bodily raised from the dead' (125), that these two traditions were conjoined. In these three chapters Novakovic is at pains to explain, by considering the religio-historical context, why the evangelists sought to establish the continuity between the crucified and the risen Jesus.

The fifth and sixth chapters address two of the most controversial questions in the whole debate: the historicity of the resurrection and the implications of Jesus' resurrection for Christian theology. Novakovic concludes that the resurrection is the object of theological rather than historical enquiry, that it can be regarded as a religio-historical *novum*, that Jesus' resurrection was regarded as the start of the general resurrection from the dead, and that this functions 'as a metaphor for the newness of life' (184).

Resurrection certainly enables a better understanding of the exegetical, historical and theological issues relating to the resurrection. In particular, when considered against its first-century background, the newness of the Christian proclamation is well brought out. There is a wide ranging Bibliography and a much needed Index of literary references. The whole, with its series of summaries and conclusions, assists the gradual construction of Novakovic's argument and is clearly and accessibly written.

Dorset Luke Penkett

Transformations in Biblical Literary Traditions: Incarnation, Narrative, and Ethics. Essays in Honor of David Lyle Jeffrey. Edited by D.H. Williams and Phillip J. Donnelly. Pp. vii, 348, Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 2014, $70.00.

This *festschrift* for David Lyle Jeffrey contains twelve major contributions as well as an appreciative opening introduction, a more personal reminiscence on Jeffrey's links with Chinese scholarship, a full bibliography of the honouree's publications, and an index. It is handsomely produced

by UNDP, and will be a valuable addition to scholarly libraries.

The sheer breadth of the honouree's contributions, however, militates against stalwart editorial attempts to harness the essays into some sort of thematic coherence. The contrasting titles and subtitles of the volume also point to this difficulty. It is not that there are not essays about incarnation, narrative and ethics; but after reading the book I would not have thought of trying to capture it with those three words. The main title is closer to the focus, in conscious debt to Jeffrey's own remarkable work as a scholar of literary reception and interaction with biblical scholarship. But the essays burst the banks of such concerns, and are only loosely grouped into two parts: (1) on 'European Biblical Cultures: Interventions in Traditions', of seven essays; and (2) on 'Dissemination of Biblical Traditions: West and East', consisting of the remaining five.

Having said that, if one is willing to see the breadth and diversity as a bonus then this is a truly engaging and fascinating collection, possibly most helpfully understood as forays into 'Christian humanism' of the sort defined in Ralph Wood's contribution on de Lubac and Chesterton. In line with the *nouvelle theologie*, this emphasis is on the ever-already-present grace of God in all human endeavour, intellectual and otherwise. Thus Jeffrey's interests are pursued as angles on a graced world where scripture and other texts might mutually illuminate each other. Most of the contributions do not put it in these terms, but they might have done.

One or two highlights are worth noting. Phillip Donnelly draws intriguing links between forms of Latin pedagogy and general trends in the humanities. A 16th century shift towards emphasising translation, rather than immersion in the Latin world of the text, presages approaches to life and literature (and in due course the Bible) that emphasise present-day utility rather than imaginative reconceptualisation. Although Donnelly does not draw all this out, it links well with much recent thinking on scripture and its function. John Fleming offers a lengthy reading of reactions to Hume and the nature of scepticism, in a piece entitled 'Did Napoleon Exist?'. This is almost three articles rolled into one, including readings of eighteenth century sceptics and some remarkable rebuttals, attuned to the question of whether one could reasonably conclude anything at all if one adopted the line taken towards some biblical accounts – including, in a couple of strange cases related at length here – whether Napoleon existed. Mark Noll offers a reflection on the Bible in the USA and Canada where he wonders if the real difference is not in the cultures or their reception of the biblical text, but in their status as nations with the power to enforce their ways of reading on others.

Other studies explore specific texts (*Paradise Lost*, some receptions of Ovid, the Inklings' fiction) or specific settings for the reception of texts (in German Romanticism, or post-apartheid South Africa, or China). The complex interplay of scriptural text and literary reception and refraction is held by Jeffrey to be dependent on *not* reading the Bible as literature (*contra*, for example Northrop Frye), but on seeing it as the revealed word of God that sets literary reaction in motion. A brief contribution by one of his collaborators, Gregory Maillet, expounds this key point.

So all in all: a worthwhile book that is difficult to classify, even if it is open to a range of construals about what the core subject matter is. It is a worthy tribute to a scholar whose work is similarly wide-ranging and probing.

Richard S. Briggs

St John's College,
Durham University

A Man of Many Parts. Essays in Honour of John Bowker on the Occasion of his Eightieth Birthday. Edited by Eugene E. Lemcio. Pp. xiv, 235, Cambridge, James Clarke, 2015, $25.82.

This is possibly the most diverse *Festschrift* I have ever read. Editor Lemcio tries to make a virtue out of that by saying that the honoree, John Bowker, has one of the most diverse academic careers imaginable: ranging over biblical studies including emphases in Aramaic, to the fields of science and faith on the one hand, and comparative religion on another. He even writes poetry and children's books.

This collection duly ranges over all these areas, and along the way picks up some interesting if somewhat *recherché* pieces. Rowan Williams writes a genuinely appreciate overview as introduction, insisting that the whole trajectory of his career fits a certain kind of learned Anglican pattern of following links through various cultural forms of the defence of the faith. Essays are then grouped into five sections. 'Biblical Studies' includes an obscure tracing of the history of the teaching of Syriac at Cambridge until its lamented disappearance in the 21st century. An intriguing essay on the Old Greek recension of Daniel explores Daniel and his friends as instantiations of the suffering one

'like a son of man' in Daniel 7. Whether this piece will get the reading it deserves in this context may be debatable. Under 'Theology' Richard Bauckham ponders the Christocentric boundaries that permit robust Christian faith, while Sarah Coakley reflects on Catholic disputes over the female priest. Other sections explore neurobiology or other faiths. A closing section on 'Culture' includes an account of Bowker's career as a broadcaster, and some poetry from a some-time collaborator.

Well, all this is engaging, and may be a worthy tribute to the honoree. I doubt that it adds up to a *book* in quite the way one usually imagines a book, as a collection with some general link to a reasonably well-defined area of enquiry. One comes away persuaded that Bowker's interests were very broad, and that it is possible to reflect that in a collection of contributions. What is the imagined readership for a book that ranges over the history of Syriac teaching and the need for a new research programme in neurobiology, along with semi-comic poems, and the progress of Islamic thought? Or to put it another way, if there is a market for this, how might one imagine a book for which there is not a market? I confess to being slightly bemused.

St John's College, Richard S. Briggs
Durham University