

Book Reviews

William M. Schweitzer, ed. *Jonathan Edwards for the Church: The Ministry and the Means of Grace*. Watchmead, Welwyn Garden City, UK: Evangelical Press, 2015. pp. 312. \$19.99.

With every passing year, publishers present us with a fresh torrent of books dedicated to Jonathan Edwards's life and thought. Most of these works fall into one of two categories. Some are scholarly monographs or collections of essays that are often expensive. Others are popularly written works intended for the lay audiences, but these sorts of books are often marred by overly simplistic and pietistic interpretations, evidencing a lack of serious research. Relatively few works about Edwards bear the marks of serious scholarly acumen, yet are written primarily for lay audiences. This is one reason why *Jonathan Edwards for the Church* is such a needed book.

The volume compiles the proceedings of a conference of the same name that was convened in Durham, England in 2014. The contributors are all ordained ministers, mostly in Reformed ecclesial traditions, though a smattering of Anglicans and a Lutheran are also included. Unfortunately, no Baptists contributed to the book, despite significant Baptist interest in Edwards's thought both historically and today. Most of the contributors have previously published serious scholarship related to Edwards. In fact, several of the chapters are summaries of arguments previously advanced in monographs and scholarly articles, herein coupled with practical pastoral application. Each author is committed to using his scholarly gifts in service to the church.

Part one focuses on Edwards's ministry, though this section is erroneously titled "Means of Grace." Gerald McDermott, one of the two seasoned Edwards scholars among the contributors, offers eight lessons that contemporary pastors can learn from Edwards. Editor William Schweitzer discusses Edwards's view of pastoral ministry as a means of grace. Roy Mellor addresses Edwards's termination from his Northampton pastorate, focusing upon ways that Edwards models pastoral integrity in the midst of controversy. Jeffrey Waddington examines Edwards's ministry as a pastor-apologist, especially known for his defenses of

revival and Reformed theology. Jon Payne revisits Edwards's missionary work to the Mahican Indians of western Massachusetts, arguing (contra some interpreters) that Edwards was strongly committed to missionary work both before and during his years in Stockbridge. John Murray offers a historical account of Edwards's interpretation among (mostly) evangelicals in the British Isles. This latter chapter reflects the book's British provenance.

Part two is dedicated to Edwards's views of the means of grace. Doug Sweeney, another veteran Edwards scholar, and pastor Stephen Nichols each dedicate their respective chapters to aspects of Edwards's bibliography. Each essay offers a more explicitly edifying account of some of the same material the authors cover in recent monographs on Edwards and Scripture. Nicholas Batzig examines Edwards's Christ-centered, spiritual interpretation of the Song of Solomon, arguing Edwards is a model for faithful theological interpretation that augments the grammatical-historical method prevalent among evangelicals. Michael Bräutigam focuses his chapter on a key theme in Edwardsean thought: the excellency of the Triune God as communicated in his acts of creation and redemption. In an appendix, William Maclead wraps up the volume with a revival sermon that echoes Edwardsean themes about spiritual awakening.

Scholars will not find much, if anything in *Jonathan Edwards for the Church* that advances Edwards Studies. However, rather than being a shortcoming, this characteristic is in keeping with the purpose of the book. As Schweitzer notes in his introduction, the primary audience is ministers and the book "is intended to inform and to prompt change in the contemporary church" (18). This book is not directed to scholars, though believing historians, theologians, and philosophers will find much to appreciate, even if as reminders rather than fresh insights.

Though not a groundbreaking work in Edwardsean scholarship, this volume excels in three areas. First, several of the chapters distill some key themes in current Edwards scholarship and applies it overtly to pastoral ministry. Second, for pastors who are interested in Jonathan Edwards and wish to dip into scholarship that goes deeper than the widely available popular works, this book can provide an entryway into further studies. Finally, this book demonstrates how the reverent study and application of church history and biography can contribute to spiritual formation and pastoral theology.

Above all, Jonathan Edwards was a pastor-theologian. With the revived interest in the pastor-theologian model among English-speaking evangelicals,

Jonathan Edwards for the Church makes two helpful contributions. It shows how Edwards himself was a model for how to combine robust theological convictions, a devoted piety, and a commitment to practical pastoral ministry. Also, many of the chapters demonstrates how to engage in thoughtful pastoral scholarship as these Reformed and Anglican ministers use their academic training to promote theological and methodological renewal among contemporary evangelicals. There will be a follow-up conference on the theme Jonathan Edwards and the Church in Durham in 2018. One hopes that the fruit of that meeting will include another volume similar to this one.

Nathan A. Finn
 Union University
 Jackson, TN

Robert D. Holmstedt and John Screnock. *Esther: A Handbook on the Hebrew Text*. Baylor Handbook on the Hebrew Bible. Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2015, 295 pp., \$39.95 paper.

Those who study the Bible have no trouble finding a commentary that examines the theology, historical setting, etc. of any given book of the Old Testament. While many commentaries investigate the Hebrew text on some level, the number of commentaries that are solely devoted to the analysis of the biblical Hebrew text are few. Robert Holmstedt and John Screnock seek to fill a void in biblical Hebrew studies with their grammatical commentary on the Hebrew text of Esther (1).

In their commentary on Esther, Holmstedt and Screnock employ a linguistic framework that is primarily based on Holmstedt's linguistic research (2; see also page 3 of Holmstedt's commentary on Ruth in the same series). In addition, the authors also avail themselves of the linguistic works of John A. Cook—especially his work on the biblical Hebrew verbal system—and Cynthia Miller-Naudé. References to the standard grammars of Gesenius-Kautzsch-Cowley, Joüon-Muraoka, and Waltke-O'Connor are primarily limited to issues of morphology, comparative Semitic issues, and usages of prepositions and particles. Furthermore, the authors also make references to commentaries on Esther—commentaries by Frederic Bush, Lewis Bayles Paton and C. F. Keil, for example—when matters of historical background,

meanings of words, or other such matters are pertinent to their argument.

Holmstedt and Screnock begin their commentary with a chapter outlining the “background and terminology necessary for understanding” their particular linguistic framework used to analyze biblical Hebrew grammar (1). First they define the basic component of syntax: the ‘constituent.’ Constituents may combine with other constituents to create larger units, such as ‘noun phrases,’ or ‘adjective phrases’ (2). The authors forgo traditional grammatical categories like ‘accusative’ or ‘genitive,’ etc., replacing them with ‘complement’ and ‘adjunct’ (3). A ‘complement’ is a constituent that is required by the head of that particular phrase; the phrase would be “semantically incomplete” without its complement (3). In more traditional terminology, some verbs require a direct object; according to the authors, the required direct object is a ‘complement’ (3). An ‘adjunct,’ on the other hand, is a constituent that is not required, and provides information—manner, time, location, instrument—about its phrasal head (3). For example, an adverbial phrase is an ‘adjunct.’ Holmstedt and Screnock then discuss verbal ‘valency’: “the number of arguments the verb requires in order to be semantically ‘complete’” (4). They then move onto verbal semantics. Holmstedt and Screnock adopt Cook’s description of the biblical Hebrew verbal system (5). According to Cook, the biblical Hebrew verbal system is “aspect-prominent”; the *qatal* is ‘perfective’—“the temporal unfolding of a situation as an undifferentiated whole”—and the *yiqtol* is ‘imperfective’—“the temporal unfolding of a situation as in progress” (5). The participle in Cook’s system is an “adjective that encodes an activity or event rather than a quality” and it has a progressive aspect, indicating “durative, habitual, and gnomic statements” (5-6).

Holmstedt’s and Screnock’s description of their grammatical system continues with a discussion on word order. The authors maintain that basic word order in biblical Hebrew is Subject-Verb. The verb is often “raised” above the subject by various ‘triggers’: negation; particles like אֵם, כִּי, אֲשֶׁר; jussives; cohortatives; “Topic or Focus-fronting of a nonsubject constituent” (7). The discussion on verbal semantics leads into the explanation of ‘pragmatics’: the movement of a constituent out of its “default position” to communicate ‘Topic’ or ‘Focus’ information (8). ‘Topic’ indicates a change in what “the following assertions are ‘about,’” or to set a scene; ‘Focus’ often sets something from the context over and against related items, often indicating a contrast (9). A change in word order from Subject-Verb to Verb-Subject is often due

to Focus or Topic information. Holmstedt and Srenock conclude their first chapter with a discussion on subordinate clauses, numeral syntax in Esther, and dating the book of Esther according to linguistic data. In regards to dating Esther, Holmstedt and Srenock primarily interact with Ronald Bergey's 1983 dissertation on the language of Esther and recent "discussions of Hebrew diachrony" by scholars such as Cynthia Miller-Naudé and Ziony Zevit (17).

In the remaining 225 pages, Holmstedt and Srenock cover all ten chapters of Esther, an amazing amount of material especially considering the small dimensions of the book (5 1/4 in. x 8 in.). The authors divide the commentary into four parts according to the plot of the narrative. Part I—"Esther Becomes Queen of Persia"—covers chapters 1-2, and is divided into two episodes: "Vashti's Downfall" (ch. 1); "Esther is Chosen as Queen" (ch. 2). Part II—"Haman and Mordechai in Conflict"—includes chapters 3-7, and is divided into five episodes: 'The Rise of Haman' (ch. 3); 'Mordecai's Response' (ch. 4); "Esther's Plan" (ch. 5:1-8); "Haman's Plan Implodes" (ch. 5:9-6:14); "The End of Haman" (ch. 7). Part III—"The Jews and the Peoples in Conflict"—consists of chapters 8 and 9, and is divided into three episodes: "A Plan to Save the Jews" (ch. 8); "The Jews Prevail" (ch. 9:1-19); "The Jews Victory Commemorated and Reprised" (ch. 9:20-32). Lastly, Part IV is the epilogue, including chapter 10 of Esther.

Holmstedt and Srenock begin each episode with their own translation of the text and a brief explanation of the plot in that particular passage; they then analyze the text verse-by-verse. With the start of a new verse the authors give the entire verse from the Masoretic Text, including the accent marks, and a brief synopsis of what the verse states. The authors then analyze the verse according to its various grammatical components. For example, they devote the first paragraph for Esther 1:1 to the first word of the verse: וַיְהִי. After the heading וַיְהִי, the authors give the parsing of the verb form, and the proceed to discuss the grammatical function of וַיְהִי in biblical Hebrew in general and specifically in Esther 1:1. Holmstedt and Srenock then move on to the prepositional phrase that follows וַיְהִי, adhering to the same pattern discussed above (35). Throughout the commentary the authors head each paragraph with the portion of the Hebrew verse in question, followed by any necessary parsings and a discussion of the grammatical issue at hand. Most lengthy grammatical discussions are located in the analysis of the first chapters of Esther. As the commentary progresses, and as Holmstedt and

Screnock revisit material already introduced, the grammatical discussions become shorter.

As noted previously, Holmstedt and Screnock include a few discussions on the meaning and origin of loan-words, such as תָּי in 1:13 (59), and words that are difficult to define, such as סִחְרָה in 1:6 (47). The authors also interact with other commentators on Esther regarding the analysis of certain clauses (e.g., 41, 44, 89, 127). The authors also defend their reading of the Hebrew text when other scholars or commentators argue for emending the text (e.g., 119-20, 160), and in instances of *ktiv qere* (e.g., 60-61, 117, 147).

Holmstedt and Screnock conclude their commentary with three appendices. The first appendix supplements the authors' discussion on the syntax of numerals and consists of a chart detailing all the occurrences of numerals in Esther. The second appendix is comprised of charts of 'features for diachronic analysis' in Esther—grammatical and lexical features that indicate Esther belongs to the "latter part of the postexilic literary spectrum"—adapted from Bergey's dissertation (265). Holmstedt and Screnock convey their analysis of Bergey's conclusions by graying out in the chart those features they argue are not sufficient to demonstrate change in the language. Those features that are not grayed out "exhibit more potential for statistically significant diachronic variation (265). The third appendix includes a very helpful glossary of linguistic terms.

Holmstedt's and Screnock's commentary is well-structured. Their division of Esther into parts and episodes keeps the flow of the narrative in the forefront of the reader's mind as the reader is immersed in Hebrew grammar. The authors' translation of the text is a welcomed feature of the commentary, giving the reader another avenue—in addition to the grammatical analysis—to see how Holmstedt and Screnock understand the Hebrew text. Furthermore, having each verse printed as it is found in the Masoretic Text allows the reader to reference each verse with greater ease.

The potential benefit of Holmstedt's and Screnock's commentary is greatly limited because it requires the reader to be familiar with the authors' particular linguistic framework (1). While the authors do introduce their linguistic framework in the first chapter, the introduction is brief, necessitating further study by the reader (2, 5, 13). Their analysis is full of terms that may be unfamiliar to readers not trained in linguistics: 'valency,' 'proclitic left edge phrase marker,' 'scalar adverb,' 'stacked appositives,' etc. While the glossary is a helpful tool, the need to constantly refer to it can be discouraging for the reader.

Holmstedt's and Srenock's analysis can result in sentences that are difficult to wade through. For example, the authors write, "Hiphil עבר ('to remove, take away') is also trivalent, with a null subject (contextually clear as המלך) a null pronominal complement, which is the null resumption for the relative head טבעתו, and PP complement, מהמן, including the locative source" (210). Elsewhere they write, "Whereas the $\bar{\iota}$ between the fronted constituents and the main clause in 2:8 is necessitated by the *wayyiqtol* form, here the $\bar{\iota}$ serves the simple processing function, to demarcate the front edge of the clause and so make the adjunct fronting clear" (103). While the authors' statements just quoted may be clear to readers familiar with Holmstedt's and Srenock's linguistic framework, the uninitiated reader may have need to take time to process statements such as these. Other instances in which the authors' wording is difficult to sort out is due to their use of abbreviations, such as: NP (noun phrase); VP (verb phrase); AdvP (adverbial phrase). The use of such abbreviations certainly help to cut down on the word count, and saves space on the page; however, the abbreviations certainly contribute to a slower reading pace.

Furthermore, some aspects of Holmstedt's and Srenock's linguistic framework are not convincing. For example, they contend that a particle pointed like the definite article on a participle may function as a relative marker (43, 187). In their analysis of הַבְּיָרָה בְּשׁוֹשַׁן הַנְּמֻצָּאִים לְכָל־הָעָם ("for all the people who were found in Susa, the citadel") in Esther 1:5, the authors contend that the particle הַ on the Niphal participle הַנְּמֻצָּאִים ("who were found")—traditionally understood as an attributive participle—marks an "ה relative clause" modifying הָעָם (the people) (34, 43; authors' translation). However, while biblical Hebrew has examples of a relative particle הַ, it is almost exclusively found on the perfect verb form. The participle in Esther 1:5 is best understood as an attributive participle.

In addition, Holmstedt's and Srenock's contention that the basic word order for Hebrew is Subject-Verb is unsatisfactory (7-10). The authors contend that any change in word order—for example, Verb-Subject—is due to a 'trigger' (see above). However, they maintain that some clauses exhibiting a Subject-Verb word order may itself *not* exhibit the basic word order; rather, it may exhibit the fronting of a Subject for Topic or Focus information (78). Holmstedt's and Srenock's analysis of word order unnecessarily complicates the distinction between verbal and nominal clauses in biblical Hebrew. Lastly,

there are a few issues with the Hebrew font (7, 47, 138, 185, 216) and English wording (54, 125, 143, 156, 164) that the reader should be made aware.

In conclusion, Holmstedt's and Screnock's *Esther* is hindered by the authors' linguistic framework. Aspects of their framework are not convincing and do not necessitate a change from conventional analysis. Readers not familiar with the authors' framework may have a difficult time with this commentary.

Richard McDonald
Adjunct Professor of OT
The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary

Perspectives on Israel and the Church: 4 Views. Edited by Chad O. Brand.
Nashville, TN: B&H Academic, 2015, vii + 317 pp., \$29.99 paper.

The topic of the relationship between Israel and the church is not just important for ecclesiology and eschatology. Resolving this question requires an exercise in biblical theology leading to systematic formulation and reveals how one understands the biblical storyline and the covenants. Chad Brand, former professor of theology and current pastor, put together a team of contributors to capture the spectrum of opinion on this crucial debate. The late Robert Reymond presented the traditional covenantal view or Reformed perspective which emerged from Ulrich Zwingli, John Calvin, and many others. Advocating a traditional or sometimes called "revised" dispensational position is Robert Thomas, New Testament emeritus professor of Master's Seminary. The progressive dispensational position, which views the church as participating in the promises and covenants to Israel but not fulfilling the same in place of ethnic Israel, was articulated by the late Robert Saucy. Rounding out the views is the progressive covenantalism position argued by Chad Brand and Tom Pratt Jr. This last view shares aspects of the covenant and dispensational approaches with emphasis on Jesus as the fulfillment of Old Testament (OT) expectations. For the purposes of this review, I will seek to highlight the strengths and weaknesses of each perspective.

Reymond presents the relationship between Israel and the church as being one of essential unity: "the church of Jesus Christ ... *not* ethnic Israel, is the present-day expression of the one people of God whose roots go back to

Abraham” (40). In presenting his perspective, Reymond provides a helpful overview of the Westminster Confession of Faith, particularly in describing the covenant of grace and the unity of the God’s elect people through all ages (21-22). Perhaps Reymond is at his best when he demonstrates that the promised land is a typological pattern of the new heavens and earth (41-49, 60). Although using unfortunate terminology of the promise being “spiritualized” (44), Reymond rightly connects the promised land back to the garden of Eden and traverses important New Testament (NT) texts which confirm the antitypical fulfillment of the land.

On the other hand, Reymond’s essay is hampered by some glaring weaknesses. He spends an inordinate and unnecessary amount of ink on the question of the salvation of OT saints in dispensationalism (23-33). While two ways of salvation may be more evident in classical dispensationalism, it would have been more profitable if Reymond would have engaged the modern mainstream evangelical dispensational views. Secondly, Brand and Pratt (83-84) rightly respond to Reymond’s assertions regarding the connection between circumcision and baptism (27-28). Reymond presents the land promise as typological in the Abrahamic covenant, but he misses the typological aspect of circumcision and how the new covenant anticipates a faithful and regenerate Abrahamic offspring.

The next position presented in the book is the traditional dispensational approach offered by Robert Thomas. For Thomas, the NT does not cancel the promises to Israel and as such, they await fulfillment to ethnic, national Israel during the millennial period and even into the eternal state (135). Also, key aspects of the Abrahamic, Davidic, and new covenant still await fulfillment for national Israel in the future. Thomas’ essay is by far the weakest viewpoint of the book. Probably the most glaring problem is that Thomas does not have an inaugurated eschatology (e.g., 99), that is, Thomas misses how the kingdom is already present and has broken into this present evil age even as the consummation of the kingdom is not yet. Although popularized by George Eldon Ladd, inaugurated eschatology is presented throughout the gospels and the epistles. Both Reymond and Saucy highlight this problem in Thomas’ kingdom theology (140-42, 144-46, 149).

Secondly, Thomas’ hermeneutic is problematic. Although a traditional grammatical-historical hermeneutic is helpful as all interpreters should read the text literally, there is also the canonical horizon that reminds us

of progressive revelation as later OT texts build upon earlier texts, and the NT authors further develop in light of the revelation of Jesus Christ. For Thomas, historical-grammatical principles must be followed even though the NT writers did not always follow these principles (219). But as readers of the Scripture, should we not follow the NT writers' hermeneutic? Thomas' understanding of this issue breeds not a little of do as I say (we must follow the NT writer's authoritative writings), but not as I do (the apostles can go beyond a grammatical-historical interpretation of the OT only because they have such authority). Lastly, the research during the past few decades that has been poured into the topic of the NT use and of the OT with respect to citations, allusions, and echoes strongly suggest that Thomas' claim that the Abrahamic, Davidic, and new covenant await future fulfillment to be incorrect. The Abrahamic promises come to fruition through the "true seed," Jesus (Gal 3:16), and Jesus is currently reigning as the Davidic king (e.g. Matt 1:1; Acts 13:22-23) as he has fully established the new covenant in his blood (Luke 22:20; Heb 8-10).

The third perspective, written by Robert Saucy, is a progressive dispensational view. Saucy is to be commended for incorporating inaugurated eschatology and for recognizing the fuller meaning of earlier texts in consideration of the whole canon. Further, it was beneficial to observe how Saucy related his view to other areas of systematic theology such as politics and church practice (202-208). Saucy argues that the church is the new eschatological humanity that comprises of Jews and Gentiles as the prophesied messianic salvation is now being initially fulfilled (156, 181-88). Nevertheless, since partial fulfillment does not negate the original promises, and with the church never equated with Israel, the nation of Israel awaits the return of Christ when full restoration will occur with Israel in the promised land resulting in the "salvation of Israel bringing even greater blessing to the world than that occurring presently through the church's evangelization" (201).

Saucy covers a significant amount of Scripture and argues his position well, but his view is unconvincing. Saucy redefines typology to that of mere analogy in considering Israel as a type (161). But if the traditional understanding of typology is accepted such that a type is divinely designed to prefigure a future antitype, then Israel is not a type because Scripture does not explicitly identify Israel as such. But Scripture does identify Israel as a type in the traditional sense through the "sonship" and "seed" themes whereby Jesus

fulfills Israel's identity and role in ushering in the prophesied new exodus and the Abrahamic promises (Matthew 2-4; Gal 3:16). Another dilemma is Saucy's argument that the church is not depicted as the eschatological Israel. Even if Saucy is correct that the church is never called "Israel" (193-97), there are a host of images and descriptions of OT Israel that are applied to the church. More importantly, however, why would the NT authors equate the church – those with faith in union with Jesus Christ, those who share in the faith of Abraham, possessing the Holy Spirit—with OT Israel, a nationalistic entity that throughout history is marked by disobedience and rebellion? The church is the renewed, eschatological Israel, for the church is comprised of those who are spiritually reborn in Christ. As the new covenant people of God, these are the ones who inherit the promises since their covenant head, Christ, is the true Israel and faithful Son. In this sense, the NT authors can easily apply descriptions, labels, and titles of Israel to the church, but in a heightened and spiritual sense.

The final view is the progressive covenantal view defended by Chad Brand and Tom Pratt Jr. A thorough description of what they mean by "progressive covenantal" is not provided, though in the introduction they associate their position with Ladd, new covenant theology, and with Peter Gentry and Stephen Wellum's *Kingdom through Covenant*, published in 2012. They do present their view as sharing some aspects of dispensationalism and covenant theology (15). Nevertheless, their position is amorphous and the appeal to Ladd is diminished by the fact that covenantalists and dispensationalists also incorporate inaugurated eschatology, Ladd's key insight. Strangely, with this book being published in 2015, Brand and Pratt's chapter did not interact with *Kingdom through Covenant* (see 12 n. 54) and so their view is developed independently of Gentry and Wellum's definitive work. Two significant differences from the progressive covenantalism perspective offered by Gentry and Wellum include the lack of focused attention to the outworking of and relationships between the covenants and second, the role and importance of typology is completely absent.

Brand and Pratt's view is the one this reviewer finds the most convincing. Nevertheless, there were several problems which indicate that this is not the best presentation of progressive covenantalism. First, without sustained treatment of the covenants (particularly the Abrahamic covenant) and their relationship to Christ and the church, the covenant and dispensational

paradigms were largely left unchallenged. Second, while the relationship between Israel and Jesus is present (vine imagery, 242), much more discussion of how Jesus fulfills Israel's identity and role would have helped establish Jesus as the "true Israel" with the church as the eschatological Israel through faith union in Israel's messiah. More emphasis on the theme of sonship/seed (which was briefly mentioned, 238) and how Jesus fulfills restoration prophecies made to Israel needed to be developed especially given the importance of such OT prophecies for dispensationalists. Third, the last section which merely surveys the rapture and offers some rationale for a historic premillennial view (268-79) offered very little to the discussion overall. The truth is that one can be in the progressive covenantalism camp and comfortably be historic premillennial or amillennial.

Perspectives on Israel and the Church offers much for students of the Bible to think through. The doing of biblical theology leading to proper systematic formulations is no easy task. While this multi-view work presents helpful interaction on the relationship between Israel and the church, more studies are required to address this important area of ecclesiology and eschatology.

Brent E. Parker

Assistant Editor, *The Southern Baptist Journal of Theology*

Ph.D. Candidate in Systematic Theology

The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary

Baptism and Cognition in Romans 6–8: Paul's Ethic beyond 'Indicative' and 'Imperative'. By Samuli Siikavirta. WUNT 2.407. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2015. 214 pp., \$78.95 Paperback.

For over a century, the study of Pauline ethics has stayed on the international scholarly agenda, with many of today's foremost biblical scholars showcasing some of their best and most heated dialogues concerning it. Within these discussions, scholars have focused on the interaction between what Paul commands in one verse (often termed the "imperative") and what he speaks of as an already existing state of reality (often termed the "indicative") in another. Take Gal. 3:27 and Rom. 13:14.

Now comes Samuli Siikavirta. He argues in this slender volume, a slightly revised version of his PhD dissertation, that the popular terminology used to

conceptualize the relationship between Pauline theology and ethics (i.e., the indicative-imperative schema) is misleading, inadequate, and inappropriate.

How did this problematic description, as the author calls it, get started? Blame Paul Wernle. In 1897, Wernle used the terms “indicative” and “imperative” to describe the two modes of Pauline language, which threw out the Lutheran idea of being simultaneously a sinner and righteous.

The chief question for Siikavirta is: can the core relationship between Paul’s theology and ethics be most clearly reached in Rom 6–8 by analyzing the substance of Paul’s theological-ethical argument about the relationship between Paul’s baptismal teaching and his cognitive reminders arising from it. He writes that, “[F]ocusing on Paul’s teaching about being in Christ through baptism and his emphatically cognitive instruction ‘in the elements of Christian living that follow from baptism’ gives us a clearer and more text-based picture of the relationship than what is attainable through the vague and potentially misleading indicative-imperative terminology” (3). Siikavirta immediately acknowledges that his proposal does not mean that Paul teaches freedom from moral obligation. He simply declares that such cognitive renewal of such a concrete and identity-defining event should also lead believers to the correct use of the body.

Siikavirta spends an early chapter of the book surveying the solutions that have been offered thus far by other scholars, such as Bultmann, Schnackenburg, Barclay, and Schnelle. The author does not find their solutions ultimately satisfying, even though he identifies some positive aspects that can be gleaned from most of them. Instead, the author contends that there is ample warrant for abandoning the old terminology and focusing on the content and substance of Rom 6–8, where, according to Siikavirta, Paul’s theological and moral teaching interacts most clearly. This important nuance, he says, can help us understand Paul’s complex and concrete language better than the other proposals. “In doing so,” he writes, “the divide that has often been forced between Paul’s theology and ethics disappears” (177).

The primary issue, then, is not the descriptors themselves but the fact that we are left with the impression that the strengthening of the Christian identity by way of reminder regarding God’s salvific act in Christ through baptism is of secondary importance. Adding to the problem, or at least the potential confusion, is that nowadays grammatical debates about verbal aspect abound. Yet the author only spends about three pages discussing it,

and never incorporates some of the leading voices in the discussion. There is, alas, no dialogue with (or even mention of) Buist Fanning, Constantine Campbell, Rodney Decker, or Francis Pang. The study would have benefited from their voices too.

In any case, examples of Paul's cognitive vocabulary abound in Siikavirta's analysis. To cite a few: γινώσκω, οἶδα, συνίημι, φρόνημα, νοῦς, and λογίζομαι. Such examples are even more obvious once they are explained (which the author does well), but it is also at this point that intuitions often lead us to overemphasize design, direction, and trajectory. Nevertheless, Siikavirta argues that the baptismal state in Christ and its behavior-shaping cognition in Rom 6–8 is the most central theme in the most central text for the topic of Paul's theological teaching and his ethical instruction. "This represents my distinctive," he states, "and (as I would hope) more nuanced approach in this study" (173).

My minor quibbles should not deter readers from this volume. My advice would be to read it. Siikavirta is a lucid writer and indeed, when talking about baptism and cognition, a rather eloquent one. In fact, I will let him have the last word by quoting a portion of his final paragraph: "Overall, then, it needs to be seen that the relationship between Paul's theology and ethics goes well beyond the relatively recent and question-begging terminology of 'indicative' and 'imperative' . . . [Rather, we must] focus on baptism, and the understanding of baptism, in as concrete a way as Paul himself does" (178).

Brian J. Wright

Ph.D. Candidate in NT and Christian Origins (ABD)

Ridley College, Melbourne, Australia

The God of This Age: Satan in the Churches and Letters of the Apostle Paul. By Derek R. Brown. WUNT 2.409. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2015. 243 pp., \$105.00 Paperback.

It might be reasonable to assume, while reading about evil powers and figures in the Pauline letters, that Paul does not have a particular understanding of Satan. The references are all too few, and Paul does not offer a theological explanation when referring to Satan; suggesting that Satan is not important for Pauline theology. But the author of this volume proposes a different

conclusion. He cogently argues that “Paul fundamentally characterizes Satan in his letters as the apocalyptic adversary who opposes his apostolic labor” (198).

I confess that until reading this work, I had not fully considered the possibility that, in contrast to when Paul mentions evil powers and figures generically and without concrete referents, whenever Paul mentions Satan he does so with respect to Satan’s specific actions against either himself or his churches. Take 2 Corinthians 4, where Satan appears as an adversary of Paul and his apostolic ministry, not just as a generic opponent of all God’s people. The intriguing question that forms the main thesis of this study—how and why does the Apostle Paul refer to the figure of Satan in his letters—addresses this very notion.

In order to answer this question, the author makes clear that he is only examining ten verses (i.e., Rom 16:20; 1 Cor 5:5; 7:5; 2 Cor 2:11; 4:4; 6:15; 11:14; 12:7; 1 Thess 2:18; 3:5) from the so-called “undisputed” Pauline letters (i.e., Romans, 1 and 2 Corinthians, Galatians, Philippians, 1 Thessalonians, and Philemon). Consequently, he is not attempting to present a Pauline theology of Satan. Of the 10 passages in these letters, the author tells us that all but three explicitly use the Greek term *σατανᾶς* to refer to Satan. Of the rest, Satan is called “Beliar,” “the god of this age,” and “the tempter.”

With the scope of study in mind (Chapter 1), the author spends the next three chapters surveying what he considers to be the most relevant background information for understanding Paul’s references to Satan, such as the literary descriptions of Satan in the Hebrew Bible and Second Temple Jewish writings. The author makes the case, among other things, that Satan had become a prominent figure within Jewish writings and theology coterminous with Paul’s religious milieu, and that Satan almost always functions as an opponent of God’s chosen people (not an enemy of all humanity). He highlights the fact that Satan is depicted as an active opponent, who plotted against key Jewish figures, like Moses, Job, and David, at crucial points within Israel’s history, such as the exodus. The author further explains Satan’s role within Paul’s theology by providing a detailed review of Paul’s apocalyptic thought. He maintains, “Paul, according to his apocalyptic theology, perceives his apostolic labor as having apocalyptic significance since it is opposed by the great apocalyptic adversary Satan *and* because the gospel which he announced was, at its core, a proclamation of the defeat of all apocalyptic powers” (71).

Before concluding (Chapter 7), the author spends two chapters utilizing his findings from Chapters 2-4 to better evaluate Paul's references to Satan in the verses mentioned above. The author's points about Paul's depiction of Satan's responsibility for thwarting some of Paul's efforts, like returning to his church in Thessalonica (1 Thess 2:18), Satan's ultimate eschatological defeat (Rom 16:20), and Satan's schemes against Paul's apostolic labor and the Corinthian congregation as a whole, are all true and important. Moreover, the author does a good job suggesting a few rhetorical reasons why Paul references Satan in his letters: to name Satan's activity where it had gone undetected, to inform his readers of Satan's past opposition to his ministry, and to warn his churches of Satan's constant schemes to take advantage of them for his own evil purposes. Taken together, the author explains, "Paul's depiction of Satan is far more subtle and deeply rooted in his apostleship than NT scholarship typically suggests" (197).

Overall, this well-researched study—which includes an excellent orientation to the topic—provides more than just a helpful corrective to the common perception that Paul speaks of Satan only in a generic sense, without concrete referents. It is also a timely reminder of the Apostle Paul's pivotal role in spreading the gospel at a crucial point in salvation history and his call to establish and nurture communities of faith based on the gospel. As the author concludes, "[A]lthough Paul's notion of Satan is derived from his christologically-modified apocalyptic theology, his portrayal of Satan in his letters to his churches is thoroughly contingent upon his self-understanding as an apostle and church-planter as well as his actual experiences of Satan's opposition to his ministry. This may help account for why Paul mentions Satan within the combative Corinthian correspondence with relative frequency but rarely does so in a more cordial letter such as Philippians. In other words, Paul apparently speaks or warns of Satan's activity in his letters when he has already discerned Satan's work among his respective churches" (200).

"The God of this Age" is a grand addition to New Testament studies. Every theological library should own a copy.

Brian J. Wright

Ph.D. Candidate in NT and Christian Origins (ABD)

Ridley College, Melbourne, Australia

Composite Citations in Antiquity: Jewish, Graeco-Roman, and Early Christian Uses. Edited by Sean A. Adams and Seth M. Ehorn. LNTS 525. New York: T&T Clark, 2016. 242 pp., \$120.00 Hardback.

Citation techniques existed in antiquity. This fact is confirmed by Jewish, Christian, and Greco-Roman sources. Just a sampling of such evidence makes clear that there was a broad spectrum of citation practices. Over the years “ancient citation techniques” have been investigated and have stayed on the international scholarly agenda.

“Composite Citations in Antiquity” has not had quite the same ring or academic attention. Only a few short studies have explored them in any detail. It is, nevertheless, the title of this new volume, which specifically examines composite citations (i.e., two or more passages from the same or different authors fused together and conveyed as though they are only one) from nearly a dozen ancient authors writing roughly between 350 BCE to 150 CE, such as Plato, Plutarch, Philo, Pliny, and Justin Martyr.

The subject is certainly worthwhile. Composite citations, as one of the authors in this offering argues early on, were probably a broadly accepted literary practice, even taught in schools. “From the discussion of school texts and scholia,” he concludes, “we can see that there was a sustained tradition of intricate reading practices that form associations among passages of Homer” (34).

Much of the book is taken up with rich and thoughtful analysis of composite citations. Many conclusions are common sense: “We thus see that the correct understanding of Philo’s citations requires an appreciation of the distinction between the presentation of a modern text (with such devices as quotation marks and ellipsis points, as well as of course accents, breathings, punctuation, and word division) and the form of Philo’s original writings” (91). As obvious as such summary statements may seem, though, they bear repeating because they are so routinely ignored.

Among the more surprising conclusions, Martin Albl’s study on the so-called *testimonia* hypothesis and composite citations demonstrates that there is a close connection between the *testimonia* genre and the literary technique of composite quotations. A broader implication is also discernable. Even if the common assumption is correct that orality dominated the earliest proclamation, that does not mean it was always the case. The use of notes,

excerpts, compilations, and incipient testimonia were already happening in early Christian communities, with some use of rolls of the Jewish Scriptures and written gospels likely as well.

This volume ends with a chapter—Composite Citations: Retrospect and Prospect—written by Christopher Stanley, who published a well-known monograph almost 25 years ago on the apostle Paul’s use of explicit quotations from the Jewish Scriptures in relation to the mechanics of the citation process. He highlights eight important implications from this study, such as the fact that composite citations were an established literary technique in antiquity, and offers eight categories of questions that the forthcoming, second volume ought to address, like sources, purposes, and audiences.

The authors of this volume accomplish at least two rare feats: they opened up new areas of inquiry on a neglected topic, and they have made them academically rigorous. Moreover, even though the authors do not directly attempt to address any NT examples of composite citations, as they clearly state upfront, they do anticipate this volume serving as a type of methodological base for future studies on composite citations within the NT. I can already confirm that their forward looking expectation is being met in at least one study: Brent Belford’s forthcoming PhD dissertation, “Paul as Theologian, Exegete, and Writer: What Paul’s Use of Composite Citations Reveals about His Jewish, Christian, and Greek Perspectives.”

Anyone planning to enter the fray on ancient citation practices would be advised to keep this book handy. Other readers will come away from this volume persuaded that there is significant value in studying the literary practices of ancient Greek, Jewish, and Roman authors. But the harder questions of how composite citations are deployed in the NT remain.

Brian J. Wright

Ph.D. Candidate in NT and Christian Origins (ABD)

Ridley College, Melbourne, Australia