

Book Reviews

Pistis and the Righteous One: A Study of Romans 1:17 against the Background of Scripture and Second Temple Jewish Literature. By Desta Heliso. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament, 2nd Series 235. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007, 292 pp., \$110.00 paper.

This recent dissertation was completed at the London School of Theology under the direction of Max Turner, with significant input from faculty at King's College London, especially Douglas Campbell. The author now serves as dean of the Ethiopian Graduate School of Theology in Addis Ababa.

The appearance of this study marks the continuing development of African theological scholarship and the encouraging progress that is taking place in theological education in the developing world. It is therefore to be applauded. Moreover, despite his focus on current discussion, it is no small topic which the author engages here, but one which goes to the center of the Christian faith and upon which rest centuries of theological tradition and debate. For this reason too, the author is to be commended. The study itself, it must be said, leaves much to be desired. Its weaknesses to a large extent reflect myopic tendencies of recent scholarship. Perhaps the author will yet find his way past these problems. At least one may hope so.

As the title suggests, Heliso attempts to establish a so-called

"christological reading" of Rom 1:17, particularly in respect to Paul's citation of Hab 2:4, namely, that the Righteous One who lives by faith is none other than Christ. Yet even in the conclusion of his work, Heliso hesitates, arguing merely that "the christological reading should be afforded more weight . . . than has been the case thus far" (254). Perhaps he is reluctant to let go of his favored reading, but recognizes that the evidence in favor of it is lacking. Perhaps he wants to find a *via media* (as he says in another context, 252), but cannot quite articulate it. Perhaps he cannot make up his mind. Whatever the case may be, such reserve is not warranted here. Exegesis entails being led by the text to *judgments* about the text, judgments that will be controversial so long as the Word causes offense.

Heliso develops his case (such as it is) for the "christological reading" in a series of exegetical decisions, in which he demonstrates a good understanding of recent debate. We may briefly follow his chain of argument. The actual citation of LXX Hab 2:4b comes first in line. Does it refer to a messianic figure? It may well be that LXX Hab 2:3-4a (the preceding context) reflects an anticipation of a messianic or eschatological figure. But Heliso overlooks the shift in topic marked by the particle *de* and the fresh introduction of the named subject in LXX Hab 2:4b. There are *two* figures in the text, the one who announces the divine word and promise (LXX Hab 2:2-4a) and the

one who hears it (LXX Hab 2:4b), as (for example) the Qumran *peshar* recognizes in its distinction between the Teacher of Righteousness and his followers. If anything, LXX Hab 2:2-4a intimates the role of the apostle, not that of the Messiah. Heliso likewise fails to consider the context of Habakkuk, which is characterized by the conflict between the righteous and the wicked (Hab 1:4, 13). The language recollects the contentions of the psalms in new form. There it is the "godly"—often appealing to their "righteousness"—who are attacked and oppressed by the "wicked." Habakkuk speaks instead of the "righteous one" who is called to wait for the divine promise of salvation. The new language may well recall the figure of Abraham (Gen 15:6; cf. Isa 51:1-8). Quite understandably, Heliso wants to retain some validity for the variant reading "*my righteousness one* (shall live by faith)" in LXX Hab 2:4. But this transposition most likely is due to the influence of Heb 10:38 on the transmission of the text, just as the reading in which the first-person pronoun is omitted is due to the influence of Rom 1:17.

Does Paul cite it in reference to Christ? Heliso points to Paul's reference to "God's power" and "God's righteousness" in Rom 1:16-17 as potential references to Christ. No one would deny that Christ's person and work are theologically implicit to Paul's understanding of these expressions. The question remains, however, whether Paul refers directly

to Christ in this context, and more particularly, if he refers to Christ in his obedience and faithfulness to God. As with much of current discussion, Heliso's attention is focussed narrowly on words and phrases. He thus overlooks that aside from the theologically significant exception of Rom 5:15-19, it is consistently *God*, not Christ, who is the actor in Romans. That is also the case in Rom 3:21-26, where Paul unpacks Rom 1:16-17. Why not simply listen to the immediate context of Rom 1:16 which speaks of the *gospel* as God's power because God's righteousness is revealed in it? The text is about Christ, yet not as the faithful human being, but as the One crucified, *risen and now proclaimed*. As Heliso notes, Paul does not refer to Christ as "the righteous one," not even in Rom 5:19. References to "the righteous one" in the Parables of Enoch and elsewhere in the NT do not help Heliso's cause. Hebrews 10:38 may seem more promising, but it can hardly be the case that the One who comes (Heb 10:37) and the righteous one who waits (Heb 10:38) are one and the same Messiah—as Heliso seems to wish to say (see 153, cf. 246).

Nor do other elements of Rom 1:17 come to the aid of the "christological" reading. Is it really the case, as Heliso argues, that God's righteousness (understood as saving power) cannot be revealed by means of faith? Is it really "absurd" to speak of "human faith" as the means by which God's power and righteousness are revealed? (36). What then of apostolic preaching? What if "faith" is *God's work* in the human being (Rom 10:17)?

What if Paul has apostolic preaching in view in his reference to "faith" in Rom 1:17 (see Rom 1:11-12)? The proclamation of the gospel, after all, is Paul's topic (Rom 1:15)!

This reading of Rom 1:17 as a reference to the faithful Christ obviously is bound up with the interpretation of the expression "faith of Christ." While we cannot here pursue Heliso's discussion of the relevant texts and arguments, his concluding statement deserves comment. He opines that Rom 1:17 could provide the framework for "the idea of *God's act of salvation through Christ's faithfulness-to-death*" (254). His formulation, typical of those who want to read "faith of Christ" as a subjective genitive, conceals a significant problem. To speak of "Christ's faithfulness" is to speak of Christ as a *human being* who offers representative obedience to God. But how could it be that the saving work of God takes place through the faithfulness of a human being? The view comes precipitously close to Nestorianism. Nor does it correspond to the letter to the Hebrews, where Christ is not merely a faithful high priest, but also the Son who is God: were he merely a human high priest, he would offer no benefit. Even when representatives of the "subjectivist" reading take care to speak of salvation in terms of our participation in Christ's faithfulness (thus avoiding the danger of making Christ a mere example), the question remains as to what precisely the object and content of faith then becomes. As Karl Friedrich Ulrichs has observed, the event of the cross here is relativized in favor of Jesus'

obedience. Jesus in the end threatens to become dispensable. Once I possess and act in his faithfulness, I no longer need him. One might wish for more careful theological reflection on the implications of this new reading, not only from Heliso, but from all representatives of this approach.

As Heliso realizes, the traditional (or "anthropological") reading of the text is not limited to Luther and Protestant theology. The understanding that Rom 1:17 speaks of the justification of the fallen human being by faith in Christ has deep and wide roots in Christian interpretation, even if nature and place of "faith" has been debated since the Reformation. To read the verse otherwise as Heliso and others would like to do is to read it differently from most of the Christian tradition. With reference to Luther himself it should be said that the common view (which Heliso repeats) that Luther's reformational discovery rested simply in his fresh reading of the "righteousness of God" as that righteousness which makes us righteous is misleading. This understanding of justification was still alive within the Augustinian tradition—and appears within the Tridentine decrees. Here we may follow Oswald Bayer, who has shown the fundamental breakthrough lies in Luther's new understanding of "promise," as the word of God that performs what it says. Only as this understanding of "promise" determines Luther's understanding of justification does the latter take on reformational form. With respect to Heliso's thesis, the interpretive question that Luther's reading raises is

not small. It makes some difference whether one finds in Rom 1:17 the effective word of God or a faithful human being.

Mark A. Seifrid

Christusglaube: Studien zum Syntagma pistis Christou und zum paulinischen Verständnis von Glaube und Rechtfertigung. By Karl Friedrich Ulrichs. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament, 2nd Series 227. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007, 311 pp., \$120.00 paper.

Ulrichs's dissertation, completed under the supervision of Michael Bachmann (Universität Siegen), makes a welcome contribution to the seemingly unending debate over the usage and meaning of the Pauline expression, "faith of Christ." The author engages the recent debate—which largely has taken place in the theological scene in North America and the UK—thoroughly, carefully and competently. Above all else, the work displays a considerable concentration on lexical and grammatical details and is studded with useful and significant exegetical and theological judgments. Even if many of these insights are not entirely new, they deserve to be restated and underscored in the debate.

Ulrichs begins with a lengthy introduction in which he discusses the significance of the genitive, the noun *pistis*, and the christological "titles" that are then attributed to it as *nomina recta*. He likewise addresses the relation of the noun (*pistis*) and the verb (*pisteuō*), and favors Moisés Sil-

va's appeal to (Martin Joos's) principle of "maximal redundancy"—allowing it perhaps even more strength than it deserves. The introductory chapter also includes an exploration of the theological dimensions of the debate and (finally) provides an all-too-brief *Wirkungsgeschichte* of the expression.

Four exegetical chapters follow, in which Ulrichs treats the passages of the core Pauline letters in which the seven occurrences of the "faith of Christ/Jesus" appear—that is, seven plus one. Ulrichs appeals that the usage appearing in 1 Thess 1:3 should be included among the other instances of the expression. Yet, despite the legitimacy of Ulrichs appeal that this text should be considered, the distance of the noun "faith" from the genitive "of the Lord," the orientation of "love" in the letter toward others (and not God), and the usual usage of the genitive following "hope" to express its content (or object) make it altogether likely the genitive "of the Lord" is related only to "hope," the last member of the triad.

The work concludes with an exceedingly brief theological assessment of the debate. Ulrichs then provides a summary in English of the essential points of his work.

One of the most significant of these points is the observation that recent discussion in large measure suffers from a form which is "a bit naïve philologically" (10, 21, 253). To set the reading of *pistis Christou* in terms of an objective genitive over against the reading of it in terms of a subjective genitive without further

reflection is premature. The genitive case has broad valence, which includes, of course, the expression of author, source, or quality. Ulrichs recognizes that these categories (and perhaps others) must be taken into account in assessing this contested expression, and rightly appeals for their consideration its interpretation (see especially 19-23). One wonders a bit why he did not make this insight more fruitful within his own work, in which he mostly prefers the objective genitive.

Some of Ulrichs finest points appear in his exegetical and theological summaries. He rightly recognizes that both sides of the current debate, or at least significant representatives of both sides, read the text in such a way that salvation remains *sola gratia*—and that despite criticism from the opposing side. Likewise both sides assign fundamental significance to christology *and* faith in their construals of Pauline christology. The true question in the debate is *how* "Christ" and "faith" are to be understood (251-52). The question of the meaning of "faith," or more properly, the Greek term *pistis* stands clearly in the center of the storm. Does Paul in the critical passages speak of "faith" or "faithfulness," or perhaps, as is now often argued, "faithful faith," so that he has in view Jesus' faith(fulness) toward God? Ulrichs rightly picks up on and calls into question Richard Hays's attempt to thereby link faith with ethics (252). He likewise rejects the attempt to link Paul's reference to the obedience of Jesus Christ (Rom 5:19) to his faith (210-18). Even when it insists

that Jesus is not a mere example, but that believers somehow participate in his faith(fulness), the scheme suffers from the danger of a “christological deficit.” Once we possess this faith(fulness), mediated and given to us by Jesus, he becomes dispensable (250). To put the matter differently: for Paul faith is always related to God’s word of promise and to the gospel. Within *this* theological framework (Hebrews is another question), Jesus does not (and indeed, cannot) appear as a generic representative of human believing or faithfulness. The same applies to the obedience of which Paul speaks in Rom 5:19. Jesus does not simply do what all human beings should have done. He acts as the one, new Adam—and in identification with God himself (Rom 5:15)—for the justification of all humanity (56).

Here we arrive at questions concerning Paul’s christology, as Ulrichs recognizes and nicely brings out at various points. Is it the cross *itself* (that is to say, God’s work), which is of significance for Paul, or *only* the (human) relationship to God which is manifest in it (6)? In reference to Rom 3:21-26, Ulrichs rightly asks, “Is Jesus’ cross here an example for “faith” or is it the atoning event? . . . Is it Jesus’ motivation to suffer death on the cross that is the salvifically relevant event, or is it the death of Jesus Christ *hyper hēmōn*?” (193). Even though one must protest that Jesus’ purpose is in fact highly relevant to Paul—particularly as an act of love and grace (Rom 5:15)—in a certain sense Ulrichs’s point stands. Paul clearly has in view Jesus’ saving

death, not his faith(fulness) *per se*, not even when it extends to a willingness to die. In a similar way, Ulrichs rightly takes up the important criticism that the “subjectivist” focus on Jesus’ faithfulness leaves no room for the saving significance of his resurrection (250-51)—a rather embarrassing gap! Underlying these problems is a nearly Nestorian christological deficit: the *solus Christus* becomes a *solus Jesus*. Ulrichs raises this issue in his own way in relation to Rom 3:22. How is it possible to understand “the faith of Jesus Christ” as a manifestation of God’s righteousness when Jesus otherwise (in the “subjectivist” reading) is regarded as *purus homo* (168-69)? One might add: Does Paul conceive of Jesus—to whom he gives the title *kyrios* in the face of the usage of the LXX—acting *simply* as a human being? How can it be that the grace of God is nothing other than the gift and grace of the human Christ (Rom 5:15)? The christological deficit bears soteriological implications, as Ulrichs recognizes. How is it that Jesus’ faith is the basis of our emancipation from sin? Is “sin” here understood with Paul as a death-dealing power, or simply as a moral weakness? (64).

Ulrichs by no means paints all those who adopt a subjective genitive reading in one context or another with one black brush. His comments are consistently nuanced and careful. The stronger remarks that I have taken up generally take the form of questions directed to programmatic representatives of the subjective-genitive reading.

As the title indicates, Ulrichs’s dissertation is essentially a series of stud-

ies from which he does not develop a synthesis, or at least, not one that corresponds to the depth and scope of his work. One might have wished for more. A fuller history-of-research, taking into account earlier debates in the wake of Haußleiter’s work might have proven fruitful.

Materially, Ulrichs might have considered more fully the significance of the massive shift in usage of the term *pistis* from “faithfulness” in contemporary literature to “faith” (as both act and content) in the New Testament. As Ulrichs notes, “faith” for Paul is not an appellative: there is only one right and true faith with specific content, the gospel of Christ incarnate, crucified and risen, in whom we meet God savingly. The apostle generally presupposes that his addressees share that understanding, even when it is contested. If it is so that the object and content of “faith” is already implicit in the term itself, then, perhaps, the genitive modifier “of Christ” signals something more than the mere object of faith. “Maximal redundancy” has its limits, else we would say nothing new. Given the title of his work, *Christusglaube*, Ulrichs might well have taken further than he did his own recognition that the genitive may signify author, source, quality, or content. Nevertheless, he is to be thanked for a useful and at many points thoughtful work.

Mark A. Seifrid

William Carey: Missionary and Baptist. By Keith Farrer. Kew, Victoria, Australia: Carey Baptist Grammar

School, 2005, viii + 156 pp.

Books on William Carey (1761-1834) are legion and rarely does one display a significant amount of new ground. This does not mean that new material is not there for the discovery. Rather, most biographers are quite content to traverse the same old ground, with maybe a short venture from the pathway of the traditional story. For instance, apart from Timothy George's biography of Carey, no one as of yet has really dealt with the theological footing and ground upon which Carey stood for his entire ministry, namely Edwardsean Calvinism.

But this new biography of Carey by Keith Farrer, an Australian scientist with an M.A. in history as well, does traverse new ground, although in this case it is Carey's work as a botanist and scientist. Failure to know anything about this side of Carey or to appreciate it has been common from the very moment Carey died. John Dyer, who was the first full-time secretary of the Baptist Missionary Society (BMS) and who wrote a small memoir of Carey shortly after his death, could declare that from 1815 till his death in 1834, "few incidents occurred in the life of Dr. Carey of a nature requiring notice in a brief memoir" (61)! Farrer easily shows how short-sighted is this comment:

Serampore College was built and the steam engine and the continuous papermaking machine bought and installed (both at the personal expense of the missionaries), the Agricultural Society was founded, new periodicals were introduced and books published to say

nothing of Carey's significant contributions to botany and the expansion of the missionary enterprise (61).

Essentially, the second half of the book (67-125) deals with this work of Carey as a gardener, then botanist, and finally, as one who wisely used the technology of his day to alleviate the condition of many of the Indian people in Bengal, where he was laboring for the gospel. Chapters 6 and 7, which deal with the transition of Carey from gardener to botanist, helpfully clear up many myths about Carey as a gardener and reveal the depth of his work in botany. The importance of Carey's gardens and botanical work to the missionary's life can be seen when it is recognized that the gardens which Carey created at Serampore were so extensive it took fifty gardeners to look after them (83). But while botany and more generally the biological sciences were Carey's first love when it came to things scientific, Farrer also notes that he had an interest in other areas of science and technology, especially geology (107).

The importance that Carey placed in knowing science can be discerned from some remarks he made to his one-time acquaintance William Staughton (1770-1829), the first president of Columbian College, later known as George Washington University. Carey's trusted co-worker William Ward (1769-1823) had spent three months in America raising funds for Serampore College, which Carey and his colleagues had established as a place of theological education and training in the liberal

arts. Ten thousand dollars had been raised. Ward had left the money in the hands of American trustees, with the interest to be sent regularly to Serampore. But Staughton, who had been involved in the founding of the Baptist Missionary Society that had sent Carey to India, informed Carey that none of the interest would be forthcoming until Carey gave assurance that the money would be used *only* for theological training, and not for the teaching of science. Carey's reply was blunt and forthright: "I must confess," he wrote, "I have never heard of anything more illiberal. Pray can youth be trained up for the Christian ministry without science? Do you in America train youth for it without any knowledge of science?" Farrer rightly comments, "The question is still relevant." (110; also see 45).

In the first half of the book (7-65), Farrer traverses familiar ground as he tells Carey's story, from his birth in Paulerspury to his death in Serampore. It is a great story, though there are some mistakes in Farrer's telling of it. It simply is not true to say that although "Carey was a Particular, i.e. Calvinist, Baptist, and maintained some Calvinist views into later life, his whole approach to mission was Arminian" (18). Here is where we need that theological study of Carey! Then, the founding of the Baptist Missionary Society was a logical outflow of Carey's evangelical Calvinism, not something at odds with it as Ferrar maintains (21). In fact, it was Carey's Calvinism—the solid conviction that the entirety of the world is the Lord's—that sup-

plied the underpinning of Carey's commitment to botany and science, as well as his zeal in mission. While these mistakes are not negligible, they should not deter a wide reading of this new study of Carey that is beautifully produced and reveals Carey as something of a nineteenth-century Renaissance man who reveled in the revelation of God both in his Holy Word and in every nook and cranny of creation.

Michael A. G. Haykin

The Faithful Preacher: Recapturing the Vision of Three Pioneering African-American Pastors. By Thabiti M. Anyabwile. Wheaton: Crossway, 2007, 191 pp., \$15.99.

This book made me realize that, like far too many church historians trained in the West in the past thirty to forty years, I am woefully ignorant of the spiritual experience of African-American pastors and congregants. Rightly does John Piper state in his foreword to this volume by the senior pastor of First Baptist Church, Grand Cayman Islands, that it “mines the unknown riches of the African-American experience” (9). Now, I had heard of one of the figures treated in this book, the Edwardsean Lemuel Haynes (1753-1833), but the other two men—Daniel Payne (1811-1893) and Francis Grimké (1850-1937)—were completely unknown to me. And what I knew about Haynes could have been told in less than a minute!

When he was ordained in 1785, Haynes was the first African-Amer-

ican ordained by a religious body in the United States. Deeply influenced by Edwardsean Calvinism, his ministry involved not only pastoral care but also a defense of Calvinistic truth. His longest pastorate was located in Rutland, Vermont, where he labored from 1788 till 1818, when he was dismissed from his charge, probably because of racial prejudice.

Daniel Payne labored in the African Methodist Episcopal Church (AME) for most of his life, becoming a bishop in this denomination in 1852. In detailing Payne's career, Anyabwile focuses on his vision of a learned ministry. Grimké was the son of a slave-owner, Henry Grimké, and of one of his slaves, Nancy Weston. After Henry Grimké's death, and in an attempt to avoid further enslavement to Grimké's eldest son, who was a half-brother of Francis, Francis enlisted in the Confederate Army. After the Civil War, Francis Grimké was able to do further study in Massachusetts and eventually get admitted to Princeton Seminary, where he studied under that Calvinistic titan of a theologian, Charles Hodge. Most of his ministry after graduating in 1878 was in a Presbyterian Church in Washington, D.C.

What makes this volume especially useful is that Anyabwile combines his narrative discussion of the lives of these three pastors with three or four primary sources from each of their writings. Thus, for example, there is Haynes's first published sermon, *The Character and Work of a Spiritual Described* (1792), where Haynes outlines how the pastor must guard the flock from theological

error. Payne's *The Christian Ministry: Its Moral and Intellectual Character* (1859) is an excellent overview of the moral and intellectual armament with which every pastor needs to be equipped. A couple of pieces from the pen of Grimké grapple with the issue of racism, still very germane to our day.

This work is ideal as a source-book to be included in any study of American Christianity. But it is also good for the souls of those called to be pastors and leaders in the church of the living God. Here, for instance, is a deeply challenging statement from the Methodist Bishop Payne:

[I]t is not the omnipotence of God that constitutes His glory—it is His immaculate holiness. And such must be the fact in the moral character of the Christian minister—not his talents ... not his learning ... but his holiness (95).

Michael A. G. Haykin

The UBS Greek New Testament: A Reader's Edition. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2007, 704 pp., \$69.95.

No doubt the biggest obstacle to reading the Greek NT with proficiency is acquiring an adequate vocabulary. After taking an elementary-level Greek class, most students will have learned the meanings of words that occur fifty times or more in the Greek NT. With the completion of an intermediate-level course, many will know words that occur in the range of twenty to thirty times or more. But what then? There are certainly many good tools available for building

one's Greek vocabulary further. Yet reading the text cannot await mastery of all NT vocabulary. At some point, a student must simply jump in and begin reading. The obvious problem, though, is that reading the text is seriously slowed when one is continually looking up unfamiliar words in a lexicon.

This is where *The UBS Greek New Testament: A Reader's Edition* comes in. It employs the text of the UBS⁴ GNT, used by most beginning Greek students. As the subtitle indicates, it is *A Reader's Edition*. Its goal is to enable students to acquire the skill of reading the Greek text without undue dependence on other tools. The student who has a first-year level Greek vocabulary is provided, at the bottom of each page, with glosses for words that occur thirty times or less. As one comes across these words in the text, they are numerically marked to facilitate finding the corresponding number and definition at the bottom. As a result, students spend less time searching a lexicon and more time in the text—and are, thus, enabled to read larger sections more quickly.

Other features of the running dictionary at the bottom of each page include the following: (1) The definitions for each word are chosen according to the context. Thus, the reader is given a concise meaning that fits the context, rather than a list of possible meanings from which to choose. (2) If significant differences of opinion exist regarding a given word, alternate definitions are provided. (3) On occasion, one is given the meaning of an idiomatic phrase or word combination—if it is hard to deter-

mine this by merely combining the individual meanings of the words. For example the definition given for *hyperbole* in Rom 7:13 is “outstanding quality.” However, since it appears in this verse with the preposition *kata*, the idiomatic rendering “beyond measure” for this combination is also provided. (4) Irregular forms of words are identified and defined. So, even though the common verb *echō* (“I have”) occurs more than thirty times, its irregular aorist subjunctive form (*schōmen*) found in 1 John 2:28 is defined. (5) All defined verbs, participles, and infinitives are parsed.

In addition to the running dictionary, the *Reader's Edition* contains an appendix that provides translations of all words occurring more than thirty times in the Greek NT. The maps from the UBS GNT are included as well, and the burgundy hard cover resembles the UBS GNT; although, the size is larger (approx. 6 x 9).

Unfortunately, the price is steep (list price: \$69.95)—especially when compared to a similar product, *A Reader's Greek New Testament* by Zondervan (2nd ed., 2007), which is more affordable (list price: \$34.99). However, I prefer the UBS *Reader's Edition* for the following reasons: (1) The Zondervan *Reader's GNT* (2nd ed.) is based on the Greek text that underlies the TNIV (Today's New International Version), while the UBS *Reader's Edition* contains the standard critical text of the UBS⁴ and the NA²⁷, used by most students and scholars. (2) The layout of the running dictionary in the UBS *Reader's Edition* is much more user-friendly, appearing in two numbered columns. The

definitions in the Zondervan *Reader's GNT* appear in a paragraph and are, in my opinion, more difficult to find. (3) The appendix in the UBS edition with definitions of words occurring thirty times or more is more extensive than the similar glossary found in the Zondervan edition. (4) The UBS *Reader's Edition* includes parsing information for defined verbs, participles, and infinitives.

This last point is also a potential weakness. Students who consistently rely on the running dictionary to do their parsing for them will weaken their abilities. Another danger is that a student may become too dependent on the running dictionary and spend little time becoming familiar with and learning from the standard Greek-English lexicon, BDAG. Neither of these concerns, though, prevents me from commending this resource. The *Reader's Edition* of the UBS GNT is an extremely useful tool that will benefit those wanting to become more proficient readers of the Greek NT.

Christopher W. Cowan

The Apostolic Fathers: Greek Texts and English Translations. 3rd ed. Edited and translated by Michael W. Holmes. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2007, 832 pp., \$42.99.

Most students of the Bible have, at some point in their studies, become familiar with the “Apostolic Fathers,” a collection of post-apostolic writings that date from the late first- to mid-second century. In New Testament surveys, Bible students learn

of bishops like Polycarp, a disciple of the Apostle John and faithful martyr, and Papias, who provides early testimony regarding authorship of the Gospels. They read of Ignatius and Clement of Rome and their quotations from and allusions to the New Testament. They hear of fascinating early writings such as *The Didache* that testifies to early Christian morality and practice. But how many students, ministers, and scholars have actually read any of these significant works for themselves?

This critical edition of *The Apostolic Fathers* serves not only as a valuable and useful primary source tool for one's library, but also offers readers an opportunity to become familiar with the earliest post-biblical Christian documents. As indicated by the subtitle, both the Greek (or Latin) texts and English translations are included on facing pages. This handsomely bound volume includes 1 Clement, 2 Clement, the seven letters of Ignatius, *The Letter of Polycarp to the Philippians*, *The Martyrdom of Polycarp*, *The Didache*, *The Epistle of Barnabas*, *The Shepherd of Hermas*, *The Epistle of Diognetus*, the Fragment of Quadratus, and the Fragments of Papias.

In this 3rd edition whose roots date back to the 1891 work of noted New Testament scholar J. B. Lightfoot and his colleague J. R. Harmer, Michael W. Holmes (also responsible for the 2nd ed.) provides a thoroughly revised English translation (based on the 3rd edition of Holmes's *The Apostolic Fathers in English* [Baker, 2006]), an expanded and revised critical apparatus, and a few revisions to the Greek texts. Improvements also include

modifications in format, design, and typography to enhance presentation and ease of use. Each writing includes an introduction, addressing issues of authorship, occasion, date, text, etc., as necessary. Also included are bibliographies of classic and recent treatments of each document. Holmes has expanded the introductions with updated information on textual witnesses and problems, and he has extended the bibliographies. The size is compact (5.25 x 7.5), the Greek and English fonts are very readable, and the English translations include subheadings indicating section content. The indices are broken down according to subject, modern authors, and ancient sources (biblical and non-canonical). Also included with the indices is a "thematic analysis" which lists the section headings used within the English translation of each document and their corresponding page numbers.

This is an excellent resource that serves as a window into the early development of Christianity. It should appeal to a wide variety of readers: those doing patristic or New Testament research, those wanting to improve their ability to read Koine Greek, and those who simply desire to read for themselves these important writings.

Christopher W. Cowan

The Art of Reading Scripture. Edited by Ellen F. Davis and Richard B. Hays. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003. xx + 334 pp. \$32.00 paper.

This book consists of essays pre-

sented to the Scripture Project at the Center of Theological Inquiry in Princeton, New Jersey. The consultation produced a set of affirmations that, after the introduction, open the volume. These "Nine Theses on the Interpretation of Scripture," unfortunately, fail to address the most pressing questions of our day. The choice not to use terms such as *infallible*, *inerrant*, or *totally true and trustworthy* in any of these nine theses locates the project on the theological map, and thus the door is open for the question posed after thesis 2, "does God speak through *all* the texts of Scripture?" (2, emphasis original).

No decisive conclusion was reached by the Scripture project on the pressing issues of the day. For instance, thesis 7 reads, "The saints of the church provide guidance in how to interpret and perform Scripture" (4). Below this statement is a paragraph "For ongoing discussion" that asks, "How much of a gap can be endured between one's right interpretation of Scripture and one's failure in performance (e.g., churches that practice racial exclusion or unjust divisions between rich and poor)? How do we understand what goes wrong when the Bible is used as an instrument of oppression and division?" These are important questions, but it seems that they could be applied to more relevant cultural issues. I know of no Christian church that openly advocates racism and oppression of the poor. Some churches may commit these sins, but they probably agree that the Bible condemns these things and desire to change. It would seem more pressing

to address ecclesiastical advocates of positions that are expressly forbidden by Scripture. I have in mind such topics as same-sex “marriage,” the church’s relationship to practicing homosexuals (to say nothing of their ordination), and the disputed question of whether women can serve as pastors, elders, or bishops.

Seemingly in spite of the direction of the project, the book does have its bright spots. The essays by Richard Bauckham, David C. Steinmetz, R. W. L. Moberly, Gary A. Anderson, and Richard B. Hays are both stimulating and in step with historic Christianity. Hays’s essay is a brilliant presentation of how to read the Bible in light of the resurrection of Jesus, which provides a legitimate method for reading the whole Bible Christologically. Bauckham’s essay explores the Bible’s “metanarrative,” the over-arching story that binds up the variety in the Scriptures in beautiful unity. Steinmetz points out that once we have “read the end of the story,” we not only cannot, we should not try to re-read it as though we do not know the end. Moberly’s first essay devastates negative interpretations of Genesis 22, and his second explores truth and the necessity of faith for interpreting the Bible from John 7:14–18. Anderson’s essay shows the typological relationship between Joseph and Jesus. There is much to ponder in these essays.

Aside from these fine essays, the general tenor of the project provides more evidence that the conservative resurgence in the SBC was necessary. A wide range of scholars representing mainline Protestantism and the

Roman Catholic Church (but none from the SBC) gathered to address the question, “Is the Bible authoritative for the faith and practice of the church? If so, in what way?” (xiv). In *The Art of Reading Scripture*, different answers are given by the various authors. Thankfully, for those of us in the SBC, our confessional stance settles such questions. This does not mean we do not wrestle with difficulties, but it does give us healthy starting points. The problem that remains for us in the SBC is that while we confess the Bible’s authority, we too often set it aside when the time comes to do ministry, revealing our lack of confidence in the sufficiency of Scripture. Paul followed the statement, “All Scripture is inspired by God,” with the words, “and profitable” (2 Tim 3:16, emphasis added). Let us bear witness not only to the authority of Scripture but also to its usefulness—in our pulpits and in our practices.

James M. Hamilton Jr.

Southwestern Baptist

Theological Seminary, Houston

Ancient Texts for New Testament Studies: A Guide to the Background Literature. By Craig A. Evans. Peabody: Hendrickson, 2005. xxxvi + 539 pp., \$34.95.

Craig Evans of the Acadia Divinity College in Wolfville, Nova Scotia, presents a survey of the ancient texts that are relevant for New Testament study. While he primarily has students in mind, the volume will also be of help to scholars (if only for the

bibliography which points them to the most recent English scholarly editions and secondary literature!). It is an augmented version of Evans’ earlier volume *Non-Canonical Writings and New Testament Interpretation*.

Evans notes that “there are many teachers of biblical literature who are not sure exactly what makes up this literature, how it is relevant, and how it is to be accessed. The purpose of this book is to arrange these diverse literatures into a comprehensible and manageable format” (xi). After a detailed table of contents and list of abbreviations, Evans writes in the introduction,

[I]f one is to do competent NT exegesis, one must know something of these writings and of their relevance for the NT. Some of these writings are vital for understanding the NT, some much less so. But all are referred to by the major scholars. Thus, intelligent reading of the best of NT scholarship requires familiarity with these writings ... if for no other reason (1).

He then sets out with a brief overview of these writings (1-3) and describes their value for determining the meaning of words and syntax, for the meaning of concepts, for history and historical, social, and religious context, exegetical context, hermeneutical context (how Scripture could be interpreted, applied, and adapted), and the canonical context (what was regarded as Scripture and why?, 3-6). He further outlines the method to be used when reference is made to these texts (6f, general bibliography on 7f).

The following chapters survey

the OT Apocrypha, the OT Pseudepigrapha, the Dead Sea Scrolls, versions of the Old Testament, Philo and Josephus, the Targums, Rabbinic literature (including summaries of Talmudic literature, Tannaic Midrashic literature, Amoraic Midrashic literature, later midrashim and even medieval), and the NT Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha (a section that is relatively short in view of the attention that these writings receive in recent academic and popular literature for better or worse!).

Further chapters deal with early Church Fathers (the Apostolic Fathers and authors up to the fourth century), Gnostic Writings (Coptic Gnostic library and Mandaean materials), and "Other Texts," which provides a survey of Greco-Roman authors and of the passages in Greco-Roman authors on Jesus and Early Christianity as well as the *Corpus Hermeticum* and various Samaritan writings. It closes with references to papyri, inscriptions, coins, and ostraca.

In each chapter Evans starts with a list of the works under discussion, a brief introduction, exact titles, and summaries of the works in various detail. For each work, bibliography including editions of the text and critical studies is included. The chapters close with a survey of the major themes addressed by them and general bibliography.

This broad survey is followed by seven examples of New Testament exegesis drawing on such texts for interpretation, including Jesus' Nazareth sermon (Luke 4:16-30), the Parable of the Talents (Matt 25:14-30), the Parable of the Wicked Vineyard

Tenants (Mark 12:1-11), "I said 'You are gods'" (John 10:33), "The Word is near you" (Rom 10:5-10), Ascending and Descending with a Shout (1Thess 4:16), and Paul and the first Adam (1Cor 15:45-47).

Several appendices round off the volume starting with a chart of the canons of scripture that include the Apocrypha; a detailed ("not comprehensive, it is illustrative only," 342) list of quotations, allusions, and parallels to the New Testament; a list of the parallels between NT gospels and a selected number of pseudepigraphical gospels; as well as a list of the parables of Jesus and those by the rabbis (close parallels and resemblances in theme, style, or detail). This is followed by a brief comparison of Jesus and the miracles of (other) Jewish holy men. A further chart lists Messianic claimants of the first and second centuries covering biblical and historical precedents, Messianic kings, priests, prophets, and later Messianic claimants. The volume closes with detailed indexes of modern authors, of ancient writings and writers, and of ancient sources.

Evans has provided an up to date useful guide to a wealth of literature and the maze it creates. His focus is clearly on Jesus and the Jewish *Ancient Texts for New Testament Studies* (cf., e.g., a statement like "The literatures surveyed in this book help us understand how biblical literature was interpreted and what role it played in the life of the Jewish and Christian communities of faith," 5). The section on Greco-Roman literature is comparatively

short. Would Greco-Roman authors not have deserved at least a chapter of their own, rather than simply being classed as "Other Writings" and be mentioned in the introduction simply as follows: "A few of the most relevant pagan authors will be included" (3)? Evans starts his comments on the exegetical value of ancient texts with an immediate limitation: "Of major importance is the fact that the noncanonical writings quite often shed light on the interpretation of the OT passages quoted or alluded to in the NT" (5). Is there not also exegetical value in other ancient texts? However, in the list of "Quotations, allusions and parallels to the New Testament" a good number of non-Jewish sources are included (easy to be traced through the index of ancient sources).

A mere page on the use of such texts for NT interpretation (5f.) is short in a volume of this length. The preceding pages on the value of these texts (3-6) indicate what kind of insights they might provide ("How is NT exegesis facilitated by studying these writings?", 3), yet without developing methodological steps. What Evans provides directly on their use refers exclusively to the use of the OT in the NT. He writes,

In order to understand a given passage one must reconstruct as much as possible the world of thought in which the NT writer lived. Since the NT frequently quotes the OT (hundreds of times) or alludes to it (thousands of times) and everywhere presupposes its language, concepts, and theology, exegesis should be particularly sensitive to its presence and careful to reconstruct the exegetical-

theological context of which a given OT quotation or allusion may have been part (6).

This statement is as correct as it is one-sided. What of the historical, religious, literary, and cultural developments in the intertestamental period? NT authors also quote and may allude to *non-Jewish* sources. Not all their readers shared the authors' world of thought. Evans moves on to provide seven steps for this quest. The concluding sentence is Evans's only advice for using the texts discussed in this volume for NT exegesis: "Although the above steps have been applied to passages where the OT is present, either explicitly or implicitly, most of these steps are relevant for exegesis of any passage, for it is indeed a rare passage that alludes to or parallels no other" (6). Some guidance on methodology may be gleaned from the examples, though Evans's aim is "to show how the noncanonical writings at times significantly contribute to the exegetical task" (329), rather than to provide guidelines for students.

The developing methodological debate over intertextuality and its implications for interpreting individual texts is not sufficiently addressed. This is surprising in view of the emphasis Evans puts on the function of the OT in the NT. Despite these criticisms, Evans succeeds in providing "a tool designed to encourage students to make better use of the various primary literatures that are cognate to the writings of the Bible" (xi). A similar source book for the history of interpretation of the Bible beyond the early church would be

much welcome.

Christoph Stenschke
Missionshaus Bibelschule
Wiedenest and Department of
New Testament
University of South Africa