SOUTHEASTERN THEOLOGICAL REVIEW

VOL. 8, NO. 1, SPRING 2017

Southeastern Theological Review
Is published biannually for the faculty of Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary.

"Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary seeks to glorify the Lord Jesus Christ by equipping students to serve the church and fulfill the Great Commission."

"The mission of Southeastern Theological Review is to equip the Church to serve the Lord Jesus Christ and fulfill the Great Commission through rigorous scholarly engagement in the disciplines of mission, biblical studies, theology, philosophical theology, historical theology, and practical theology."

Southeastern Theological Review is produced biannually (Spring and Fall) and may be themed or un-themed. *Southeastern Theological Review* aims to serve the Church and help her think rigorously so that it may serve the Lord Christ faithfully.

Unsolicited article submissions to the journal are welcomed and should be directed to the editor. All submitted articles to *Southeastern Theological Review* are evaluated by double-blind peer review. All articles that are submitted to *STR* should present original work in their field. Manuscripts should conform to the *SBL Handbook of Style* (2nd edition).

This periodical is indexed in the ATLA Religion Database® (ATLA RDB®), a product of the American Theological Library Association, 300 S. Wacker Dr., Suite 2100, Chicago, IL 60606, USA. Email: atla@atla.com, www: http://www.atla.com.

This periodical is also indexed with Old Testament Abstracts®, The Catholic University of America, Washington, DC 20064, USA. Email: cua-ota@cua.edu.

For more information visit: **www.southeasternreview.com**

Direct correspondence to: **Attn: Editor, *STR***
Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary
PO BOX 1889, Wake Forest, NC 27588-1889

ISSN 2156-9401

CONTENTS

ARTICLES

BOOK REVIEWS

STR 8.1 (Spring 2017): 1–2

Introduction

Benjamin L. Merkle
STR Editor

This volume of *STR* brings several changes to the journal. First, we have redesigned the front cover to be more in line with what would be expected from something associated with Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary. Second, we have moved the issues from Summer and Winter to Spring and Fall. Because we are a seminary (and college), it makes sense to produce issues consistent with our annual semester cycle. Issues will typically be posted on our website March 21 (Spring issue) and September 21 (Fall issue). Third, we have redesigned and relaunched our website (www.southeasternreview.com). All individual essays and entire volumes can now be downloaded for free. Consequently, we are no longer printing hard copies of the journal. Please subscribe to the journal on our website if you wish to receive an email reminder when a new issue is posted.

The Spring issue of *STR* is typically un-themed. In this issue we have two New Testament essays, one Old Testament essay, and one essay that is cross-disciplinary. In the first essay, Charles L. Quarles, professor of New Testament and Biblical Theology at Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary, addresses the citation of Hos 11:1 in Matt 2:15. He argues that Matthew correctly interprets the Hosea passage ("Out of Egypt I called my son") as a reference to Israel's exodus out of Egypt led by Moses which then anticipated a future, eschatological exodus led by the Messiah.

The second essay is by Murray Vasser, a PhD student at Asbury Theological Seminary. Vasser's essay, "Sell Your Possessions: Luke 12:33 and the Greco-Roman Utopian Ideal," won first place in the 2016 SEBTS Intersect Project PhD Symposium Competition sponsored by the Kern Family Foundation. The Symposium featured paper presentations from ten PhD students from around the world on issues related to the intersection of faith, work, and economics. In his essay, Vasser seeks to answer the tension between Jesus' command to "sell your possessions" and the fact that many Christians in the early church retained significant possessions. By using the insights of redaction criticism and the work of Abraham J. Malherbe, Vasser concludes that Jesus' command to "sell your possessions" should be understood as a command to relinquish all superfluous possessions and embrace equality.

In the third essay, "The Curse of Cain Reconsidered," Todd Borger, associate professor of Old Testament and Hebrew at Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary, takes on the traditional interpretation of Cain's curse which is typically rendered "You are cursed from the ground." Dr. Borger demonstrates that the context and grammar of the passage favor the translation "You are cursed more than the ground." He then considers the implications of this interpretation.

The final essay in this issue, "Rescuing Adam: Three Approaches to Affirming a Historical Adam," is by Kenneth D. Keathley, senior professor of Theology and director of the L. Russ Bush Center for Faith and Culture at Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary. Dr. Keathley provides an extremely helpful survey of three positions (concordist, semi-concordist, and non-concordist) related to the historicity of Adam and demonstrates why this is an important issue for evangelicals.

STR 8.1 (Spring 2017): 3–19

"Out of Egypt I Called My Son": Intertextuality and Metalepsis in Matthew 2:15

Charles L. Quarles
Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary

Matthew rightly interpreted Hos 11:1 as a reference to the historic exodus that anticipated an eschatological exodus led by the Messiah. Matthew was attentive to the fact that Hosea repeatedly used the image of the Egyptian bondage to portray Israel's Assyrian exile and thus utilized the image of the exodus to portray Israel's restoration (Hos 2:14–15; 8:13; 9:6; 11:5). Like his Jewish contemporaries, Matthew recognized that the Messiah would fulfill the prophecy regarding the coming of a prophet like Moses (Deut 18:15–19) and thus would lead God's people on the promised new exodus from this continuing exile. Matthew quoted Hos 11:1 because he saw Jesus' return from Egypt as signaling the beginning of this new exodus.

Key Words: Hosea 11:1; Matthew 2:15; new Exodus; new Moses; NT use of the OT

Martin Pickup referred to Matt 2:15 as the passage "that many Bible believers regard as the most troubling case" of the NT use of the OT.[1] The text is such an important test case for hermeneutical theories that one recent book on hermeneutics required each contributor to offer an interpretation of Matt 2:7–15 and explain this specific verse.[2]

Four major views of Matthew's use of Hosea exist. Each of these has multiple variations and scholars often combine multiple approaches. The *atomistic interpretation* view claims that Matthew was attracted to the text simply because it mentioned the departure of a divine son from Egypt. Matthew either misunderstood or was completely disinterested in the original sense of the text. Although some scholars see Matthew's atomistic interpretation as faulty, others argue that Matthew's approach was legitimate for the period since it was consistent with midrashic interpretation.[3]

[1] Martin Pickup, "New Testament Interpretation of the Old Testament: The Theological Rationale of Midrashic Exegesis," *JETS* 51 (2008): 371.

[2] Stanley Porter and Beth Stovell, eds., *Biblical Hermeneutics: Five Views* (Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2012).

[3] See Pickup, "New Testament Interpretation of the Old Testament," 374–

The *recapitulation of Israel* view sees Matthew's use of Hos 11:1 as prompted by the notion of the Messiah's corporate identification with Israel that results in him reliving major events in Israel's history.[4] Thus Matthew applied Hos 11:1 to the Messiah on the basis of an "Israel typology."[5]

The *Messianic prophecy* view (championed by Barnabas Lindars) suggests that Matthew identified the Messiah as the "son" of Hos 11:1 under the influence of a messianic interpretation of Num 24:7–9 suggested by the LXX.[6] Lindars suggested that Matthew interpreted Hos 11:1 against the background of the similar statement in Balaam's oracle and concluded that Hosea referred to the Messiah. Matthean scholars David Hill and Dale Allison and Old Testament scholar John Sailhamer have adopted, to one degree or another, the view suggested by Lindars.[7]

79. According to Sailhamer, Erasmus claimed that Julian the Apostate was the first to challenge the legitimacy of Matthew's interpretation of Hos 11:1 ("Hosea 11:1 and Matthew 2:15," *WTJ* 63 [2001]: 87). Erasmus was apparently referring to a fragment preserved in Jerome's Latin commentary on Hos 3:11 that ascribes to Julian the quote: "The words that were written concerning Israel [Hos 11:1] Matthew the Evangelist transferred to Christ [Matt 2:15], that he might mock the simplicity of those of the Gentiles who believed."

[4] Craig Blomberg ("Matthew," in *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament* [Grand Rapids: Baker, 2007], 8) argued that Matt 2:15 is "a classic example of pure typology." See also D. A. Carson, "Matthew," *in Matthew-Mark* (EBC 9; 2nd ed.; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2010), 118–20; C. H. Dodd, *According to the Scriptures: The Sub-structure of New Testament Theology* (London: Nisbet, 1953), 103; D. E. Garland, *Reading Matthew: A Literary and Theological Commentary* (Macon, GA: Smyth & Helwys, 2001), 29; J. Gibbs, *Matthew 1:1–11:1* (Concordia Commentary; St. Louis: Concordia, 2006), 139–43; L. Morris, *The Gospel According to Matthew* (PNTC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1992), 42–44; G. Osborne, *Matthew*, ZECNT (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2010), 99; T. Schreiner, *New Testament Theology: Magnifying God in Christ* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2008), 73. Although some of these commentators blend the Israel typology view with other approaches, Albright and Mann dismiss other alternatives, especially the new Moses view: ". . . Matthew's OT quotations see Jesus as living, in himself, through the spiritual experience of a whole people, and not as an individual who becomes another Moses" (W. F. Albright and C. S. Mann, *Matthew* [AB 26; Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1971], 18).

[5] John Nolland, *The Gospel of Matthew* (NIGTC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005), 123.

[6] B. Lindars, *New Testament Apologetic: The Doctrinal Significance of the Old Testament Quotations* (London: SCM Press, 1961), 216–19.

[7] D. Hill, *The Gospel of Matthew* (New Century Bible; London: Oliphants,

An often-neglected proposal is the *biblical-theological* interpretation defended most ably by Greg Beale. Beale persuasively argued that "Matthew is interpreting Hos 11:1 in the light of its relation to the entire chapter in which it is found and in the light of the entire book, and that his approach does, indeed, verge upon a grammatical-historical approach combined with a biblical-theological methodology."[8] Beale's argument included several essential elements. First, Hos 11:1–11 focused on Israel's future eschatological restoration that is described as a return from "Egypt." Hosea 11:1 referred to Israel's historic exodus. However, 11:10–11 referred to an eschatological exodus in which Israel would be delivered from exile and restored. Hosea intended to highlight the correspondence between the historic exodus and this eschatological exodus.[9] Second, Israel's deliverance from Egypt would be led by an individual king (Hos 3:5) who is identified in 1:10–11 as the "head" (ראֹשׁ) of the "sons of the living God." This introduces the concept of corporate headship. Furthermore, Hosea 11 alludes to Numbers 23 and 24 in which the Balaam oracles refer to both the exodus of Israel (23:24) and the exodus of Israel's king (24:9), thus applying corporate language to the individual. Beale further suggests that the description of Jesus as the "son of the living God" in Matt 16:16 may be an allusion to the description of Israel as the "sons of the living God" in Hos 1:10 "by which Jesus is seen as the individual kingly son leading the sons of Israel, whom he represents."[10] He added: "Such an identification of this individual son with the corporate sons is likely the reason that Matt 2:15 applies the corporate 'son' reference of Hos 11:1 to

1978), 85; W. D. Davies and Dale Allison, *Matthew* (3 vols.; ICC; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1988–1997), 1:262–63. Walt Kaiser characterized Lindars's view as an "ingenius suggestion" but one rendered doubtful by text-critical questions surrounding Num 24:7–8. See Walt Kaiser, *The Uses of the Old Testament in the New Testament* (Chicago: Moody, 1985), 47–53, esp. 51. Some early Christians believed that Matt 2:15 actually quoted Num 24:8 rather than Hos 11:1. An example is the scribe behind the marginal note in Codex Sinaiticus at 2:15 (ΕΝΑΡΙΘΜΟΙΣ). This view probably arose among readers who were more familiar with the LXX than with the Hebrew text. Eusebius of Caesarea interpreted Num 24:3–9 as a reference to the Messiah and his deliverance from Egypt (e.g., *Dem. ev.* 9.4). Although he preferred the view that Matt 2:15 alluded to Hos 11:1, he suggested that if one concluded that Hos 11:1 referred to Israel then Num 24:3–9 was the source of Matthew's quotation.

[8] G. K. Beale, "The Use of Hosea 11:1 in Matthew 2:15: One More Time," *JETS* 55 (2012): 697–715, esp. 700.

[9] Ibid., 703.

[10] Ibid., 709.

the individual Jesus."[11] Beale concluded: "Jesus' journey out of Egypt is identified as Israel's eschatological exodus out of Egypt to which Israel's first exodus out of Egypt pointed."[12]

The view that Matthew recognized Hosea was referring to an eschatological exodus of Israel has been argued by recent commentators such as Craig Keener and older commentators like Strack and Billerbeck.[13] Recent studies in intertextuality have bolstered this interpretation. Scholars such as Richard Hayes have argued that New Testament allusions or citations of the Old Testament involve metalepsis, "a literary technique of citing or echoing a small bit of a precursor text in such a way that the reader can grasp the significance of the echo only by recalling or recovering the original context from which the fragmentary echo came and then reading the two texts in dialogical juxtaposition."[14] In Matthew's metalepsis, he expects the reader to recall that Hosea's description of the historic exodus was the prelude to the promise of a second eschatological exodus. Other texts in Hosea demonstrate that this exodus would be led by a Davidic Messiah and prophet like Moses.

The rest of this essay will explore evidence supporting the "biblical-theological" interpretation.[15] First, the essay will argue that expectation of a second exodus is prominent in the Old Testament and it is not surprising that Matthew would be aware of this theme. The threat of a second Egyptian captivity and promise of a second exodus was part of the fabric of the Deuteronomic covenant. Later, the Old Testament prophets Hosea, Isaiah, Micah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and Zechariah further developed the new exodus motif.

Second, the essay will argue that Matthew's use of Hos 11:1 to refer to an eschatological exodus led by the Messiah suits well his historical and cultural context. Under the influence of the Law and the Prophets, the correspondence between Moses and the exodus on the one hand and the

[11] Ibid.

[12] Ibid., 710.

[13] Craig Keener, *A Commentary on Matthew* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999), 108–9; Hermann L. Strack and Paul Billerbeck, *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus* (vol. 1 of *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch* [München: Beck, 1922], 85).

[14] Richard Hayes, *Echoes of Scripture in the Gospels* (Waco: Baylor University Press, 2016), 11.

[15] This is not to say that the article will support Beale's interpretation in every detail. I arrived at my conclusions independently of Beale and discovered his research late in the process of my study. However, my view agrees with the broader contours of Beale's position.

Messiah and eschatological deliverance on the other hand became an important element of rabbinic eschatology. Furthermore, several features of the messianic movements described by Josephus and characteristics of the Jewish sect in Qumran show that the expectation of participating in an eschatological exodus led by a redeemer like Moses was a prominent trait of popular Judaism in the first century.

Third, the essay will argue that the biblical-theological interpretation fits Matthew's literary context exceptionally well. The understanding of the quotation of Hos 11:1 as part of the promise of the new Moses and eschatological exodus coheres with the emphases of Matthew 2 in which the stress is on Jesus' identity as the prophet like Moses rather than on his identity as the divine Son.

The Prominence of the New Exodus Theme in the Old Testament

The Torah Foretold a Second Exodus

The Pentateuch warned that, if Israel failed to keep the covenant, they would suffer the horrors of Egyptian bondage yet again. Deuteronomy 28:27 threatened, "The LORD will afflict you with the boils of Egypt, tumors, a festering rash, and scabies from which you cannot be cured."[16] Deuteronomy 28:60 warned, "He will afflict you again with all the diseases of Egypt, which you dreaded, and they will cling to you." Most significantly, Deut 28:68 which serves as the climax of the description of the curses for abandoning the covenant threatened, "The LORD will take you back in ships to Egypt by a route that I said you would never see again. There you will sell yourselves to your enemies as male and female slaves, but no one will buy you."[17]

The Pentateuch frequently warns that Israel's refusal to keep covenant with Yahweh will result in Israel's defeat, deportation, and subjugation (Deut 28:36–37, 48, 63–64). The climactic warning about a return to Egypt refers to this deportation and subjection by many different nations.

[16] Unless otherwise indicated, all Bible quotations are from the HCSB.

[17] D. J. Reimer, "Concerning Return to Egypt: Deuteronomy 17:16 and 26:68 Reconsidered," in *Studies in the Pentateuch* (ed. J. Emerton; VTSup 41; Leiden: Brill, 1990), 217–29. On the difficult phrase "in ships," see D. G. Schley, Jr., "Yahweh Will Cause You to Return to Egypt in Ships' (Deuteronomy 28:68)," *VT* 35 (1985): 369–72. The reference to a previous statement regarding never seeing the route to Exodus again likely points to Exod 14:13: "The Egyptians you see today, you will never see again." For a discussion of the new exodus theme in Deuteronomy similar to my treatment, see Eugene H. Merrill, *Deuteronomy* (NAC; Nashville: Holman Reference, 1994), 368–69 (see also 370, 372).

Thus "Egypt" may include the literal land of Egypt, but it is clearly not restricted to it. Egyptian bondage serves as an emblem for deportation, subjection, disease, and suffering that will result from divine judgment for breaking the covenant.

God promised that after this return to Egypt he would restore and bless his people again (Deut 30:1–4). Since the divine curse was expressed in terms of a return to Egypt and since the covenant renewal in Moab made repeated references to the exodus (Deut 29:2–5, 16, 25), the promised restoration of repentant Israel was naturally conceived of as a new exodus and conquest: "The Lord your God will bring you into the land your fathers possessed, and you will take possession of it. He will cause you to prosper and multiply you more than He did your fathers" (Deut 30:5).

Hosea Predicted a Second Exodus

The prophet Hosea (786–746) employed the Pentateuchal theme of a return to Egypt and eventual new exodus in his prophecy. Several lines of evidence support this claim.[18]

First, Hosea portrays Israel's future judgment for her sin as a return to Egypt. Hosea 8:13 says, "Now He will remember their guilt and punish their sins; they will return to Egypt." Hosea 9:6 adds, "For even if they flee from devastation, Egypt will gather them, and Memphis will bury them." This theme is especially prominent in chapter 11, the source of Matthew's quotation: "Will they not return to Egypt and will not Assyria rule over them because they refuse to repent?" (Hos 11:5, NIV).[19]

[18] For a summary of these and other important texts from the twelve minor prophets, see M. Shepherd, *The Twelve Prophets in the New Testament* (New York: Peter Lang, 2011), 22–24.

[19] The most natural sense of the Hebrew (**לֹא**) is as a simple negative. Thus the sentence bluntly denies that Israel will return to Egypt (ESV and CSB). The problem with this translation is the repeated insistence elsewhere in Hosea that Israel will indeed return to Egypt (11:11). Such a tension may be resolved in several ways. First, the denial in 11:5 may only indicate that Egypt is to be understood metaphorically rather than literally. Thus Egypt refers to captivity and slavery, which in Hosea's context would occur through deportation to Assyria (D. Garrett, *Hosea, Joel* [NAC; Nashville: B&H, 1997], 225–26). Second, the clause may be interrogative and introduce a polar question in which the negative **לֹא** implies a positive answer to the question (NIV: "Will they not return to Egypt?"). HALOT notes that **לֹא** sometimes functions as a substitute for **הֲלֹא**. See B. Waltke and M. O'Connor, *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax* (Winona Lake,

Second, Hos 2:14–15 foretells of a day when God will bring Israel "into the wilderness" and when Israel will "answer as in the days of her youth, as at the time when she came out of the land of Egypt" (ESV). The passage anticipates a time of restoration for Israel that will be reminiscent of the Exodus experience. Rabbinic interpretation saw the passage as a reference to the Messiah, who, like Moses, will lead his people in the wilderness (Ruth Rab. 2:14; Pesiq. Rab. 15:10). The rabbinic interpretation seems justified since Hos 3:4–5 connects this time of restoration with the reign of the Messiah.

Third, the immediate context of Hosea 11 also shows that 11:1 was part of a promise of a new Exodus. Although 11:1 describes the original exodus from Egypt (since 11:2 shows that this exodus was followed by Israel's idolatry), the following verses warn that Israel will be enslaved again in Egypt and Assyria but that God would deliver his people again, just as he had done through the exodus, by bringing about a return from exile. After the threat of a second "Egyptian bondage" in Assyria,[20] Hos 11:11 then promises an exodus from Egypt and a return from exile in Assyria: "They shall come trembling like birds from Egypt, and like doves from the land of Assyria, and I will return them to their homes, declares the Lord" (ESV).[21] Hosea 12:9 recalls the historic exodus ("I have been Yahweh your God ever since the land of Egypt") but promises a new

ID: Eisenbrauns, 1990), 684–85, esp. n. 48. Third, the לֹא may serve as a substitute for the emphatic particle הֲלוֹא resulting in the marginal reading in the ESV: "Surely they will return to Egypt."

[20] The translation in the NIV is probably superior to the ESV at this point. The ESV reads: "They shall not return to the land of Egypt, but Assyria shall be their king." However, this translation seems to contradict the promise of future deliverance from Egypt in 11:11. See the appendix to the Beale article for an argument against the ESV rendering. Duane Garrett summarizes the chapter well: "The first strophe, vv. 1–5, focuses on the exodus and ends with the warning that God will undo the exodus and send Israel to a new Egypt, Assyria, and into servitude to a new Pharaoh, the Assyrian king. The second strophe, vv. 6–12, concerns the possibility that Israel will become like the cities of the plain, that is, eternally annihilated. Yahweh recoils from this and promises a new exodus" (*Hosea, Joel*, 219).

[21] Blomberg also noted that although Hos 11:1 was "a reference to the exodus, pure and simple," the following verses portrayed Israel's future restoration as a reenactment of the exodus. Blomberg, under the influence of McCartney and Enns, rejects Sailhamer's view that Hosea contains a messianic reading of the exodus. See Blomberg, "Matthew," 7–8. For a defense of Sailhamer's messianic reading in response to McCartney and Enns, see Shepherd, *The Twelve Prophets in the New Testament*, 18–28.

sojourn in the wilderness such as accompanied the exodus ("I will make you live in tents again, as in the festival days"). Israel will not just live in huts for a brief time as a commemoration of the exodus during the feast of tabernacles. Instead, they would reenact the exodus by returning to the wilderness to live in tents.[22]

Fourth, the portrayal of Israel's restoration as a new exodus in Hosea 11 may have stirred Israel's hope for a new Moses as well. On the heels of this promise of a new Exodus, Hosea reminded his readers: "By a prophet the LORD brought Israel up from Egypt, and by a prophet he was guarded" (Hos 12:13, ESV). The portrayal of Moses as a prophet derives from the primary reference to Moses as a prophet in the Pentateuch, Deut 18:15–19 (cf. 34:10 which appears to allude to Num 12:6–8). The allusion to Deuteronomy 18 may imply that the new exodus will be accompanied by the appearance of a new deliverer as well, the prophet like Moses.[23] At the very least, Hosea associated the new exodus with the Messiah. Hosea 3:4–5 clearly indicated that Israel's renewal and restoration would occur when Israel sought the Lord their God and "David their king . . . in the last days."

Other OT Prophets Predicted a Second Exodus

The OT prophets understood the Pentateuchal threat of a new Egyptian bondage and the gracious promise of a new exodus and conquest. Like Hosea, they portrayed Israel's deportation and exile as a second Egyptian captivity and pictured Israel's return and restoration as a second exodus.

Isaiah (740–698 BC)

New exodus imagery appears in Isaiah in 4:5, 11:15–16, and is especially prominent in 40–55 (40:3–4; 43:16–21; 44:27; 48:20–21; 49:8–13; 50:2; 51:10–11; 52:4).[24] Although space will not permit an exploration of each of these references here, R. Watts summarized the data well:

> Exodus typology, of some significance in chapters 1–39, is central to this salvation theme [in 40–55]. Although other canonical writings appeal to the Exodus tradition, here it is elevated to its most

[22] J. Jeremias, "Μωυσῆς," *TDNT* 4.861–2.

[23] A final appeal to the exodus tradition appears in Hos 13:4–5.

[24] Note that Pesikta Rabbati 31:10 frequently quotes from the new exodus texts of Isaiah and argues that these promises will be fulfilled when the Messiah gathers Jewish exiles from all over the earth and reassembles them in the land of Israel.

> prominent status as a hermeneutic, and according to some commentators, shapes the heart of 40–55 even replacing the first Exodus as *the* saving event. The allusions cover the whole Exodus experience, and their appearance in the prologue, the end of the first section (48:20ff), and the epilogue (55:12f) stress its significance. . . . If Israel's founding moment was predicated on Yahweh's redemptive action in the Exodus from Egyptian bondage, then surely a second deliverance from exilic bondage, this time of Babylon, could scarcely be conceived of in other terms except those of the first Exodus?[25]

Micah (735–710 BC)

Several possible references to a new exodus appear in Micah. Micah warned that Israel would be forced into exile because of its sin (1:16). Yet Micah repeatedly promised a return from exile (2:12–13; 5:2–4). Micah 2:12 uses the imagery of God as Shepherd of his people and 2:13 describes Yahweh going before his people in their deliverance. Allen notes that the description of God as Shepherd is "a religious metaphor traditionally associated with the exodus" and that God going before his people echoes the "old motif" of God going before his people during the exodus in a pillar of cloud and of fire.[26] Micah 7:15 adds, "I will perform miracles for them as in the days of your exodus from the land of Egypt" (ESV). This verse constitutes an example of "exodus theology" that portrays Israel's restoration as a "kind of new exodus" akin to the exodus described in 6:4.[27]

Jeremiah (626–584 BC)

Jeremiah is steeped in references to the exodus tradition (2:6–7, 14, 18, 20, 36–37; 7:22, 25; 11:4, 7; 16:14; 31:32; 32:20; 34:13; 42:7–43:7; 44:12–14, 28). Of these texts, the clearest promise of a new exodus is Jer. 16:14–15:

> "However, take note! The days are coming"—the LORD's declaration—"when it will no longer be said, 'As the LORD lives who brought the Israelites from the land of Egypt,' but rather, 'As the

[25] See Rikki Watts, *Isaiah's New Exodus and Mark* (WUNT 88; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1997), 79–82 (emphasis original).

[26] Leslie C. Allen, *The Books of Joel, Obadiah, Jonah, and Micah* (NICOT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1976), 302–3.

[27] Ibid., 131. Micah 7:15 would become particularly important for the new Moses/new exodus themes in rabbinic eschatology. This text would be the basis for r. Akiba's claim that the messianic redemption of God's people would mirror the exodus events.

> LORD lives who brought the Israelites from the land of the north and from all the other lands where He had banished them.' For I will return them to their land that I gave to their ancestors."

A new exodus would overshadow the historic exodus as the pivotal event in the history of God's people.

Ezekiel (593–571 BC)

After referring to the historic exodus in Ezek 20:6–10, Ezek 20:32–44 uses the themes of the Egyptian bondage, exodus, and wilderness judgment to describe Israel's exile among the nations and coming restoration. Although Yahweh will judge Israel just as he judged their ancestors "in the wilderness of the land of Egypt," he would "bring them out of the land where they live as foreign residents." D. Block has argued that the passage promises a new exodus and that "the entire section is intentionally colored by the language of Exod. 6:6–8."[28]

Zechariah (520–514 BC)

Zechariah 2:5 likely compares the divine protection that the city will enjoy to the theophanies of the exodus, both the pillar of fire that led the Israelites and the glory that descended on the tabernacle (Exod 3:2; 13:21–22; 19:18; 40:34–35; Lev 9:23–24; Deut 4:24). Furthermore, the Hebrew expression "I myself will be" utilizes the same verbal form as Exod 3:14 and seems to echo intentionally that text. Hence Baldwin commented, "God is both dealing with potential enemies and protecting His people, in the same way and on the same covenant basis as He did at the Exodus."[29]

More importantly, Zech 10:10–12 employs exodus themes to describe the restoration of God's people. Statements such as "I will bring them back from the land of Egypt and gather them from Assyria" (v. 10), "Yahweh will pass through the sea of distress and strike the waves of the sea" (v. 11), "the scepter of Egypt will come to an end" (v. 11), and "they will march in his name" (v. 12) recall the overthrow of Pharaoh, the parting of the waters of the Red Sea, the historic exodus, and the conquest of Canaan.[30]

[28] Daniel Isaac Block, *The Book of Ezekiel* (NICOT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997), 650–51.

[29] J. Baldwin, *Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi* (TOTC; Downers Grove, IL: Inter-Varsity, 1972), 107.

[30] These features prompted G. Klein to comment: "Presumably, Egypt serves to remind the reader of the exodus since the Egyptian bondage represents one

Matthew's Historical and Cultural Context

Most scholars are convinced that Matthew was a Jewish Christian author writing to a predominantly Jewish Christian audience in the first century. The view that Matthew interpreted Hos 11:1 as a promise of a new exodus led by the Messiah and that Matthew's original readers would have understood this reference is supported by messianic expectations in rabbinic Judaism and in popular first-century Judaism described in Josephus and the Dead Sea Scrolls.

The Rabbis Expected a Second Exodus

Rabbinic literature portrays the Messiah as a second Moses and the deliverance that he brings as a second exodus. Rabbinic texts describe the correspondence between these persons and events and point to the cyclical nature of history as the basis for the correspondence.[31]

In Mekh. Exod. 12:42 (20a) r. Joshua claimed that the eschatological redemption would occur on the night of Passover since "In that night were they redeemed and in that night will they be redeemed in the future."[32] In Midrash Psalms 90:17, r. Akiba argued for a similar correspondence between the events of the exodus and the redemption brought by the Messiah by interpreting Ps 90:15 in light of Deut 8:3 as teaching that the Messianic era would last 40 years to match the 40 years of affliction in the wilderness.[33] Pesikta Rabbati 1:7 also recorded Akiba's interpretation but added that his "proof from Scripture" was Mic 7:15 which

of the most important eras of persecution in Israel's existence. Without doubt, however, the exodus from Egyptian slavery does symbolize the greatest expression of divine salvation for the nation during Israel's long history. Numerous prophetic passages view Egypt as a metaphor—rooted in deep historical experience—for the oppressive lands out of which the Lord would gather the nation in the messianic kingdom" (George L. Klein, *Zechariah* [NAC 21B; Nashville: B&H, 2007], 303).

[31] Davies and Allison note, "Finally, in ancient Jewish sources concerned with eschatological matters, the redemption from Egypt often serves as a type for the messianic redemption, and the prospect of another exodus is held forth: before the consummation, the pattern, exodus/return, will repeat itself" (*Matthew*, 1:263). They cite in support Isa 40:3–4; 42:14–55:13; Ezek 20:33–44; Hos 2:14–15; 1 Macc 2:29–30; 1QS 8:12–18; Matt 24:26; Acts 21:38; Rev 12:6, 14; Josephus *Ant.* 20.97; *Bell.* 2.259, 261; 7.438; and SB 1:85–88.

[32] Jacob Z. Lauterbach, *Mekhilta de-Rabbi Ishmael* (2nd ed.; Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 2004), 1:79.

[33] W. G. Braude, trans., *The Midrash on Psalms (Midrash Tehillim)* (ed. Leon Nemoy; 2 vols.; Yale Judaica Series 13; New Haven: Yale University Press, 1957),

explicitly compared the days of the exodus to the marvelous events of the Messianic era.[34]

Numerous rabbinic texts quote the aphorism, "Like the first redeemer, so the last redeemer," a statement which expressed the expectation that the Messiah as the prophet like Moses would reenact features of the ministry of Moses associated with the exodus. The aphorism appears in Pesikta Rabbati 15:10[35] and Ruth Rabbah 2:14 (in reference to appearance to Israel and then disappearance). The Messianic interpretation in Ruth Rabbah 2:14 ascribed to r. Jonah interprets Hos 2:16 and 12:10 as referring to the Messianic redemption in which Israel will return to the wilderness and live in tents as during the feast of tabernacles. The final argument supporting the claim that the Messiah would reenact the ministry of Moses involved an appeal to Eccl 1:9. Since "there is nothing new under the sun," history is cyclical. The exodus phase of history including features like the miraculous provision of manna will recur when Messiah comes. L. Rabinowitz noted that the citation from Eccl 1:9 indicated that "Whatever is destined to occur in the future Redemption occurred in the first."[36] Midrash Psalms 43 also highlighted similarities between the redemption from Egypt and the Messianic redemption. It pointed out that the first redemption had two redeemers, Moses and Aaron. Likewise, the eschatological redemption would have two redeemers, Elijah who was of the house of Aaron and the Messiah, the Isaianic servant.[37] Exodus Rabbah 3:12 also appealed to the cyclical nature of history affirmed by Eccl 1:9 ("that which has been is that which shall be") to argue that the latter redemption will be marked by a divine utterance similar to that which accompanied the exodus from Egypt by noting that Gen 46:4, Exod 3:12, and Mal 4:5 were all instances in which Yahweh spoke using אָנֹכִי.[38] The best-known and most frequently quoted comparison of Moses and the exodus with Messiah and his redemption is Qoheleth Rabbah 1:9. It expounds the statement "That which has been is that which shall be" by

2:97–98.

[34] William G. Braude, trans., *Pesikta Rabbati* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1968), 1:46–47. Braude acknowledged that most translated the question, "And how many are the days of the Messiah?" He based his translation on the insights of Yehuda Eben Shemuel (see n. 51).

[35] Braude, *Pesikta Rabbati*, 319.

[36] L. Rabinowitz, trans., *Ruth Rabbah*, *Midrash Rabbah* 8 (ed. H. Freeman and Maurice Simon; 3rd ed.; New York: Soncino Press, 1983), 65.

[37] Midrash Psalms 1:445.

[38] Exodus Rabbah 3:12. S. M. Lehrman, trans., *Exodus, Midrash Rabbah* (London: Soncino Press, 1951), 63.

quoting the familiar aphorism: "R. Berekiah said in the name of R. Isaac: As the first redeemer was, so shall the latter Redeemer be." It confirms this statement by showing similarities between descriptions of Moses in the Pentateuch and descriptions of the Messiah in the Psalms and Prophets. Like Moses, the Messiah would ride on a donkey, cause manna to descend from heaven, and cause water to rise from the earth (Exod 4:20 and Zech 9:9; Exod 16:4 and Ps 72:16; Num 21:16 and Joel 3:18 respectively).[39]

First-century Jewish and Christian Literature Displays Popular Expectation of a Second Exodus

Matthew 24:26 refers to some who would insist that Messiah had arrived by exclaiming, "Look, he's in the wilderness!" Numerous commentators have pointed out that such a claim is likely based on the expectation of a reenactment of the exodus that would occur in connection with the coming of the Messiah.[40] Acts 21:38 seems to confirm this understanding since it refers to an Egyptian who claimed to be the Messiah and led 4,000 sicarri into the wilderness.

Josephus describes several different messianic claimants who led their followers into the wilderness including the Egyptian (*Bell.* 2.261), Jonathan (*Bell.* 7:438), and Theudas (*Ant.* 20.97). Although one may suspect that the claimants did so in search of seclusion and safety rather than in conscious imitation of the exodus, other features of the accounts leave little doubt that the claimants associated the wilderness with the exodus. Theudas, for example, promised to part the waters of the Jordan (*Ant.* 20.97) in an effort to reenact the parting of the Red Sea associated with Moses and the parting of the Jordan associated with Joshua. Jonathan

[39] Qoheleth Rabbah 1:9.

[40] See Martin Hengel, *The Zealots: Investigations into the Jewish Freedom Movement in the Period from Herod I until 70 AD* (trans. David Smith; 2nd ed.; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1989), 229–33; Keener, *Matthew*, 582; Ulrich Luz, *Matthew* (trans. James Crouch; 3 vols.; Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2001–2007), 3:198–99. Davies and Allison note that the desert "was presumably a well-known haunt of messianic pretenders who sought to imitate the wilderness miracles of Moses" (*Matthew*, 3:353). Gerhard Kittle pointed out that Judaism often associated the wilderness with the Messianic age and added: "There thus arises the belief that the last and decisive age of salvation will begin in the ἔρημος, and that there the Messiah will appear. This belief led revolutionary Messianic movements to make for the ἔρημος (Ac. 21:38)" (Kittle, "ἔρημος," *TDNT* 2.658–59). This belief was viewed as the background of Matt 24:26 and Rev 12:6, 14.

likewise promised his followers that he would show them "signs and appearances" in the wilderness, likely a reference to the miracles and theophanies of the exodus.[41] Josephus portrays the flight into the wilderness as a consistent feature of Messianic movements.[42]

1QS 8:12–18 shows that the Qumran covenanters saw their retreat into the wilderness as a fulfillment of Isa 40:3–4. As shown earlier, this text marks the beginning of the section of Isaiah in which the new exodus is the primary theme. 4Q175 links the prophet like Moses prophecy and the oracle of Balaam regarding the scepter rising out of Israel. It appears that both texts were regarded as Messianic at Qumran. Thus the members of the community expected the Messiah to be a new Moses who would lead Israel into the wilderness and ultimately to the land of promise in a new exodus.

J. Jeremias wrote:

> This typology [new exodus/new Moses] does not arise first in Rabb. literature or in the time after Aquiba. There are references to show that it goes back to a period prior to the NT. If it is not mentioned in the OT apocrypha and pseudepigrapha, it finds attestation in the Damascus document, Josep. and the NT.[43]

The Literary Context of Matthew 2:15

Coherence with New Exodus/New Moses Motif in the Early Chapters of Matthew

This view of Matthew's use of Hos 11:1 suits the literary context of Matt 2:15 remarkably well. First, the structure and arrangement of the Matthean genealogy hints at the critical role of Jesus in bringing an end to Israel's exile. The significant turning points are the rule of David, the Bab-

[41] Rebecca Gray is more doubtful of the association of some of the sign prophets with Moses and the exodus. See her *Prophetic Figures in Late Second Temple Jewish Palestine: The Evidence from Josephus* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993), 112–44. However, even Gray acknowledges that "In the case of Theudas and the Egyptian, the influence of the exodus and conquest traditions is clear" (137) and "Theudas promised a new exodus, or perhaps a new conquest . . . ." (138).

[42] See Jos. *War* 2.13.4 §258–59; Kittle, "ἔρημος," *TDNT* 2.658–59; J. Jeremias, "Μωυσῆς," *TDNT* 4.861–62; Hengel, *Zealots*, 249–53, esp. 252–53. See also Horsley, Richard A. "Popular Prophetic Movements at the Time of Jesus: Their Principal Features and Social Origins," *JSNT* 26 (1986): 3–27, esp. 9; idem, "'Like One of the Prophets of Old': Two Types of Popular Prophets at the Time of Jesus," *CBQ* 47 (1985): 435–63, esp. 456.

[43] J. Jeremias, "Μωυσῆς," *TDNT* 4.861.

ylonian captivity, and the conception and birth of the Messiah. The structure implies that the Messiah will at last deliver God's people from their slavery and exile. This deliverance was generally conceived as a reenactment of the exodus.

Second, the birth narrative in Matthew clearly portrays Jesus as a new Moses. The circumstances of Jesus's infancy closely parallel those of Moses. Just as pharaoh murdered male Hebrew infants and just as Moses was providentially rescued from this slaughter, so Herod murdered the male infants of Bethlehem and Jesus was providentially rescued from this massacre. The striking parallels between the infancy narratives in Matthew and Exodus are heightened in the expansive retelling of the story of Moses in first-century Jewish tradition such as that preserved in Josephus (*Ant.* 2.9.2 §205). The portrayal of Jesus as a new Moses is not merely accomplished by correspondences in the story line. It is expressed even more definitively through verbal parallels that establish an indisputable connection between Jesus and Moses. The announcement of the angel to Joseph in Egypt ("those who sought the life of the child are now dead") is a clear allusion to Exod 4:19 in which Yahweh speaks from the burning bush to Moses and states "those who sought your life are now dead." These parallels do more than merely construct a typology in which Moses is the type and Jesus is the antitype. They portray Jesus as the fulfillment of the prophecy in Deuteronomy 18 that promised that God would send a prophet like Moses to Israel. Elsewhere the NT explicitly cites the Deuteronomy 18 prophecy and describes Jesus as the fulfillment (Acts 3:22; 7:37). Matthew does not. Nevertheless, the words of the Father at the transfiguration ("Listen to him") are a clear allusion to the Deuteronomy 18 prophecy which serves to confirm that the numerous parallels between Jesus and Moses are intended to highlight Jesus's identity as the prophet like Moses.

Coherence with Matthew's Use of Jeremiah 31:15

This interpretation coheres well with Matthew's use of Jer 31:15. Scholars often assume that Matthew interpreted the weeping of the mothers of the slain sons of Bethlehem as the fulfillment of this prophecy about Rachel weeping for her deceased children. Many interpreters insist that Matthew stripped this passage from its original context in Jeremiah and applied it without any sensitivity to his original meaning. However, Matthew was using this passage much like he used Hos 11:1. Jeremiah 31:15 was a description of the grief of the nation of Israel over the Babylonian exile. Rachael wept for her children who "were no more" because they were in exile in Babylon (Jeremiah 29).

Jeremiah specifies that this lamentation for the exiles arose from

Ramah, a town located about five miles north of Jerusalem and through which the exiles passed on their way to Babylon. Bethlehem was located about five miles south of Jerusalem on the same road along which the exiles traveled. Jewish traditions saw great importance in the fact that Rachel was buried in Bethlehem. Some later rabbis suggested that she was buried there near the road on which the exiles traveled so she could pray for the exiles as they passed by.

Matthew did not cite the passage because it was associated with Bethlehem. Instead, he cited the passage because it depicted Israel as in exile and awaiting deliverance. Matthew's brief quotation assumes his reader's familiarity with the promise of deliverance that immediately followed it:

> They shall come back from the land of the enemy. There is hope for your future, declares the LORD, and your children shall come back to their own country. (Jer 31:17)

Matthew recognized that Jeremiah himself saw this deliverance as both eschatological and messianic. The eschatological and messianic nature of the deliverance is abundantly clear in Jer 30:8–9:

> And it shall come to pass in that day, declares the LORD of hosts, that I will break his yoke from off your neck, and I will burst your bonds, and foreigners shall no more make a servant of him. But they shall serve the LORD their God and David their king, whom I will raise up for them.

The passage from Jeremiah that Matthew quotes also immediately precedes Jeremiah's promise of the new covenant (Jer 31:31–34), a covenant that Jesus initiated through his sacrificial death (Matt 26:28).

Matthew deemed it appropriate to cite this eschatological and messianic text in the context of the description of the slaughter of the male infants of Bethlehem because that event showed that God's people were still in exile in a sense. They were still under the thumb of a foreign oppressor and waiting for the Lord to raise up David their king to deliver them.

Conclusion

Matthew recognized that Hos 11:1 was a reference to the historic exodus. Matthew was attentive to the fact that Hosea repeatedly used new exodus imagery to depict deliverance from the Assyrian exile (2:14–15; 8:13; 9:6; 11:5). Hosea used the image of the Egyptian bondage to portray Israel's exile and thus utilized the image of the exodus to portray Israel's restoration. Matthew quoted Hos 11:1 because he saw Jesus' return from Egypt as marking the beginning of this new exodus.

Matthew rightly interpreted the reference to the historic exodus as anticipating an eschatological exodus, an exodus led by the prophet like Moses, the Davidic Messiah, Jesus Christ. Matthew did not likely regard the "son" in Hos 11:1 as an explicit and direct reference to the Messiah. He recognized that "son" was a reference to the covenant people. In Matthew's use of the text, "son" is a reference to the Messiah inclusively but not exclusively. Matthew knew that the Messiah will indeed participate in this exodus, but he is more than a mere participant. He is the leader of this exodus, the prophet like Moses who will redeem God's people much like the hero of old. Matthew assumes his readers' familiarity with Hos 12:13: "The LORD brought Israel from Egypt by a prophet, and Israel was tended by a prophet." The statement looks back to the primary reference to Moses as a prophet in the Pentateuch, Deut 18:15–19 (cf. 34:10 which appears to allude to Num 12:6–8). The allusion to Deuteronomy 18 implies that the new exodus will be accompanied by the appearance of a new deliverer as well, the prophet like Moses whom Matthew recognized as the Messiah.

These expectations are well-represented in the Old Testament prophets and in ancient Jewish literature (Jos.; *Pesiq. Rab.*; *Midr. Pss.*; *Mek. Exod.*; *Ruth Rab.*; *Exod. Rab.*; *Qoh. Rab.*). The theme of the new exodus also coheres well with Matthew's presentation of Jesus as the new Moses throughout Matthew 2 and his use of Jer 31:15, since this text in its original literary context is sandwiched between two promises of Israel's return from exile. The slaughter of the innocents shows that Israel is still in exile and awaiting deliverance.[44] Jesus' journey out of Egypt is the prelude to that coming deliverance, the initiation of the eschatological exodus. Consequently, Matthew's use of the Hosea quotation is fully appropriate and sensitive to the original historical and literary context of the passage.

---

[44] For an overlooked piece of evidence supporting the view that Israel remained in exile awaiting deliverance, see m. Yad 4:4. In a debate concerning permitting an Ammonite proselyte to enter the congregation, r. Joshua succeeded in convincing an entire house of midrash including r. Gamaliel that the population of Israel was so ethnically mixed that one could not confidently distinguish Israelites from Ammonites. His argument was based on the premise, apparently accepted by all involved in the discussion, that Israel remained in exile. For extensive discussions of the view that Israel remained in exile, see N. T. Wright, *The New Testament and the People of God* (Christian Origins and the Question of God 1; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992); and Craig A. Evans, "Jesus and the Continuing Exile of Israel," *Jesus and the Restoration of Israel: A Critical Assessment of N. T. Wright's Jesus and the Victory of God* (ed. Carey Newman; Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 1999), 77–100.

STR 8.1 (Spring 2017): 21–40

Sell Your Possessions: Luke 12:33 and the Greco-Roman Utopian Ideal

Murray Vasser
Asbury Theological Seminary

How can the command, "Sell your possessions and give alms" (Luke 12:33), be reconciled with the fact that many Christians in Luke-Acts maintain significant possessions? In the first section of this essay, I review the various answers to this question which scholars have proposed and argue that none of these answers is entirely satisfactory. In the second section, I draw upon the insights of redaction criticism to demonstrate that Luke has intentionally set Jesus' command in contrast with the parable of the rich fool, who hoards his superfluous possessions. In the third section, I draw upon the work of Abraham J. Malherbe, who demonstrated that Luke 12 develops a common Greco-Roman topos on the vice of greed. I argue that the extant literature bears witness to a prominent antithesis in first century thought between the vice of greed, expressed through hoarding, and the ideal of equality, expressed through sharing. In the fourth section, I demonstrate that Luke was influenced by this ideal of equality. I conclude that the command to sell possessions in Luke 12:33 should not be understood as a command to relinquish all possessions and embrace poverty, but rather as a command to relinquish all superfluous possessions and embrace equality.

Key Words: Acts, almsgiving, charity, equality, greed, Luke, money, poor, possessions, utopia.

In a chapter entitled, "In Search of a Christian," popular author and activist Shane Claiborne considers "what it would look like if we really decided to follow Jesus." He then describes his own personal quest to find someone who believed "Jesus meant the stuff he said." Claiborne's search eventually led him to India, where he encountered a man named Andy.

> [Andy] used to be a wealthy businessman in Germany, and then he said he read the gospel and it "messed everything up." He read the part where Jesus commands the disciples to sell everything they have and give it to the poor (Luke 12:33), and he actually did it. I had met some fundamentalists before, but only "selective fundamentalists," not folks who took things like that literally. He sold everything he owned and moved to Calcutta, where for over ten years he had spent his life with the poorest of the poor.

Claiborne concludes, "I had gone in search of Christianity. And I had found it. I had finally met a Christian."[1]

This provocative passage raises an important question. Does being a Christian really require one to "sell everything"? Must Christians part with their cell phones, their computers, their cars, their homes, and their businesses? Of course, such a reading of Luke 12:33 is incompatible with the notion that Christians "have a stewardship responsibility" to "[produce] more than they consume" and contribute to a "flourishing economy" which "lifts people out of poverty."[2] One must typically own something to engage in value creation and economic exchange. Nevertheless, the observation that absolute divestiture is counter-productive hardly solves the interpretive question. Jesus, after all, was crucified, and there is nothing prudent or practical about the lifestyle encapsulated in the command to pick up a cross and follow (Luke 14:27).[3]

However, the meaning of Luke 12:33 is not as obvious as Claiborne implies, for the reader encounters scores of people in Luke-Acts who respond positively to the message of Jesus and yet do not "sell everything."[4] This apparent discrepancy has sparked extensive scholarly investigation, but a satisfactory solution which preserves both the unity of Luke-Acts and the radical force of Jesus' command has not yet been offered. In this essay, I will suggest that the significance of the Greco-Roman utopian ideal has been overlooked in the interpretation of Luke 12:33. Building on the work of Abraham J. Malherbe, as well as the insights of redaction and literary criticism, I will seek to demonstrate that Luke 12:33 is not a command to relinquish all possessions, but rather a command to relinquish all superfluous possessions.[5]

A Brief Survey of Scholarship

There is widespread agreement that Luke 12:33 is directed to Jesus'

---

[1] Shane Claiborne, *The Irresistible Revolution: Living as an Ordinary Radical* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2006), 71–77.

[2] Economic Wisdom Project, "A Christian Vision for Flourishing Communities," 9 (http://oikonomianetwork.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/02/Economic-Wisdom-Project-10-2014-small.pdf).

[3] Unless otherwise noted, all Scripture quotations are from the RSV.

[4] See Luke 9:4; 10:5–7, 38; 19:8; 24:29–30; Acts 2:2, 44, 46; 4:32; 8:3; 9:39; 10:6; 11:29; 12:12; 16:15, 34; 17:5; 18:7; 20:7–8; 21:8, 16.

[5] Abraham J. Malherbe, "The Christianization of a *Topos* (Luke 12:13–34)," *NovT* 38.2 (1996): 123–35.

followers in general and cannot be restricted to the twelve or the seventy.[6] Walter E. Pilgrim, who understands Luke 12:33 as "a command to sell all," affirms that it is for "everyone who would call themselves followers or disciples of Jesus."[7] Nevertheless, Pilgrim argues that Luke understands this command as "a call limited to Jesus' time"; now that "Jesus himself is no longer present, a new form of discipleship is called for (cf. Luke 22:35–38)."[8] Therefore, while this command "functions with exemplary force for wealthy Christians in Luke's day," the third evangelist does not intend for his readers to actually implement it.[9] Instead, Luke presents Zacchaeus, who is allowed to retain some of his possessions, as the "paradigm par excellence for wealthy Christians in his community."[10]

However, as Thomas E. Schmidt observes, "If the argument . . . is universal, the inference from it can hardly be otherwise: when is the Rich Fool not a rich fool, or to whom among the little flock is it not the Father's good pleasure to give the kingdom?"[11] Nothing that Jesus affirms in Luke 12:22–32 changes after the ascension. The command of Luke 12:33 is not predicated on some temporal aspect of Jesus' earthly mission; it springs from the reality of God's provision for his people. Furthermore, even if Pilgrim is correct in his assertion that the requirements for discipleship changed radically after the ascension, the story of Zacchaeus is prior to the ascension. Pilgrim affirms that the command in Luke 12:33 was directed to "disciples in the broadest sense of the term"; why then did Jesus not require Zacchaeus to obey it?[12] Furthermore, if Jesus really demanded complete divestiture, why did he share the possessions of his friends (Luke 9:3–5; 10:5–7, 38–42; 24:29–30)? As Luke Timothy Johnson notes, throughout Luke hospitality "is a sign of acceptance and faith," and

[6] So Walter E. Pilgrim, *Good News to the Poor: Wealth and Poverty in Luke-Acts* (Minneapolis, MN: Augsburg, 1981), 98–99; Robert H. Stein, *Studying the Synoptic Gospels: Origin and Interpretation* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2001), 90–91; Thomas E. Schmidt, *Hostility to Wealth in the Synoptic Gospels* (Sheffield: JSOT, 1987), 135–36; Christopher M. Hays, *Luke's Wealth Ethics: A Study in Their Coherence and Character* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010), 3–4; Thomas E. Phillips, *Reading Issues of Wealth and Poverty in Luke-Acts* (Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellen, 2001), 16–18; Kyoung-Jin Kim, *Stewardship and Almsgiving in Luke's Theology* (Sheffield: Sheffield, 1998), 14–17.

[7] Pilgrim, *Good News to the Poor*, 94.

[8] Ibid., 123, 101.

[9] Ibid., 123.

[10] Ibid., 129.

[11] Schmidt, *Hostility to Wealth,* 36.

[12] Pilgrim, *Good News to the Poor*, 49.

yet it obviously requires one to possess "a house, or at least a room."[13]

Schmidt, like Pilgrim, argues that the historical Jesus did indeed demand absolute divestiture. However, instead of suggesting that Jesus only intended this command for his first followers, Schmidt contends that the church simply failed to implement Jesus' command. He speculates, "Deprived of the powerful and exemplary presence of Jesus himself, disciples were less and less likely to practice dispossession but no less likely to preserve and approve the teaching." Thus the behavior of the early Church, which Luke describes in Acts, differs "fundamentally in purpose and extent" from the teaching which Luke preserves in passages such as Luke 12:33.[14]

Once again, however, the story of Zacchaeus and the hospitality passages pose a problem for this view. Schmidt argues that, while Zacchaeus retains half of his wealth, he does so "not in order to possess it but in order to make restitution."[15] The same argument is made by Robert C. Tannehill, who notes that Zacchaeus says nothing "about keeping a portion for himself."[16] However, while it is reasonable to infer that Zacchaeus would not have remained wealthy after encountering Jesus, nothing in the tax collector's statement suggests that the restitution he offers will exhaust the remaining half of his fortune and leave him homeless. Furthermore, Schmidt does not explain how his view can be maintained in light of the hospitality passages in Luke.

James A. Metzger offers another suggestion for reconciling Luke 19:8 with complete divestiture. After noting that μου is placed between τὰ ἡμίσια and τῶν ὑπαρχόντων, Metzger suggests that the possessive pronoun modifies τὰ ἡμίσια instead of τῶν ὑπαρχόντων. Thus Zacchaeus is not offering to give half of his possessions, but rather all of his half of the possessions. The other half, Metzger suggests, belongs either to Zacchaeus' wife or his children or both.[17] This solution is ingenious but untenable. In Luke alone, the pronoun μου often occurs before the noun it modifies.[18] Furthermore, if Zacchaeus really gave away everything, why would Luke not say so? Why preserve the awkward statement, "my half

[13] Luke Timothy Johnson, *Sharing Possessions: Mandate and Symbol of Faith* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1981), 20.

[14] Schmidt, *Hostility to Wealth*, 165–66.

[15] Ibid., 159.

[16] Robert C. Tannehill, "The Story of Zacchaeus as Rhetoric: Luke 19:1–10," *Semeia* 64 (1993): 203. So also Hays, *Luke's Wealth Ethics*, 178.

[17] James A. Metzger, *Consumption and Wealth in Luke's Travel Narrative* (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 175–76.

[18] See 6:47; 7:44, 45; 10:29; 12:18; 14:23, 24, 26, 27, 33; 19:23.

of the possessions," particularly when Luke provides absolutely no explanation to help his readers understand? Metzger's harmonization is the sort of strained interpretation that emerges only among scholars pouring over the text; such a complex and non-intuitive reading would never have occurred to Luke's original audience.

Faced with the difficulty of reconciling the various passages on wealth, Raj Nadella goes beyond Schmidt to propose that discontinuity exists, not simply between Luke and Acts, but within Luke itself. In a monograph entitled, *Dialogue not Dogma: Many Voices in the Gospel of Luke*, Nadella argues that Luke includes "mutually exclusive" perspectives on wealth and declares "the futility" of any attempt "to arrive at a unitary understanding of Luke's views on the issue." According to Nadella, the third Gospel "refuses to let any one perspective dominate the dialogue"; it is "more interested in accommodating disparate perspectives and in subverting a unitary worldview" than in providing "a consistent set of instructions."[19] Barry Gordon also argues that discontinuity exists throughout Luke-Acts, but instead of portraying Luke as a postmodernist seeking to undermine a "unitary worldview," Gordon suggests that Luke is simply confused. Luke is unable to resolve the tensions which exist among his own biases against wealth, the Jesus traditions he has inherited, and the realities of the early church.[20]

Few scholars, however, are willing to accept such a fractured view of Luke-Acts, a work whose author evidently possessed considerable literary and theological acumen. Given the numerous passages which indicate that some disciples retained some possessions, many scholars conclude that Luke 12:33 does not require complete divestiture.[21] James R. Edwards suggests, "Luke does not understand Jesus' teaching literally."[22] Robert

[19] Raj Nadella, *Dialogue Not Dogma: Many Voices in the Gospel of Luke* (London: T&T Clark, 2011), 109–10.

[20] Barry Gordon, *The Economic Problem in Biblical and Patristic Thought* (Leiden: Brill, 1988), 67–70.

[21] So Johnson, *Sharing Possessions*, 18; Hays, *Luke's Wealth Ethics*, 129; Kim, *Stewardship and Almsgiving in Luke's Theology*, 24; Robert H. Stein, *Luke* (NAC 24; Nashville: Broadman, 1992), 52–54; François Bovon, *Luke 2: A Commentary on the Gospel of Luke 9:51–19:27* (ed. Helmut Koester; trans. Donald S. Deer; Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2013), 222; James R. Edwards, *The Gospel According to Luke* (PNTC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2015), 377.

[22] Edwards, *Luke*, 377.

H. Stein likewise argues that while Luke 12:33 is on the surface a command "to sell all one has," it is "overstatement" or "hyperbole."[23] However, when Jesus gives an almost identical command to the rich ruler in Luke 18:22, he means it quite literally. Furthermore, Luke states no less than four times that the earliest followers of Jesus literally sold property (Acts 2:45; 4:34–35, 37; 5:1–2). The reader of Luke-Acts is thus led to understand Luke 12:33 as literal.

Johnson, however, argues that while the command may be literal, it is not necessarily mandatory. After asserting that Luke presents the "plainly inconsistent" ideals of "wandering destitution, almsgiving, hospitality, and a community of goods," Johnson proposes that Luke is not attempting to mandate a particular mode of sharing for all Christians at all times.[24] Instead, the only mandate is that Christians must, "in some fashion, share."[25] Passages such as Luke 12:33 thus exemplify the ethic required of all disciples, but offer only one of the many ways this ethic may be realized. Sondra Ely Wheeler, citing Johnson, explains further that while Luke 12:33 is a command to sell "all," Jesus' commands have "more the character of counsels aimed at achieving an end than of laws requiring obedience."[26] However, even if Luke 12:33 is "counsel" instead of "law," should not the counsel of Christ be followed? Furthermore, the reader of Luke-Acts cannot help but suspect that by reducing the radical command, "Sell your possessions," to the ambiguous cliché, "Share with others," Johnson has somewhat domesticated Jesus.

A more promising interpretation is offered by Dennis J. Ireland. Based on the literary context, Ireland suggests, "The actions called for in v. 33 are to be understood as the opposite of the rich fool's actions."[27] The same point is made by Matthew S. Rindge, who states, "[The command in Luke 12:33] has an important literary function in that it represents a constructive alternative to the rich man's failure to act in the parable."[28]

[23] Stein, *Studying the Synoptic Gospels*, 97.

[24] Johnson, *Sharing Possessions*, 22–23.

[25] Ibid., 108.

[26] Sondra Ely Wheeler, *Wealth as Peril and Obligation: The New Testament on Possessions* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995), 70.

[27] Dennis J. Ireland, *Stewardship and the Kingdom of God: An Historical, Exegetical, and Contextual Study of the Parable of the Unjust Steward in Luke 16:1–13* (Leiden: Brill, 1992), 182.

[28] Matthew S. Rindge, *Jesus' Parable of the Rich Fool: Luke 12:13–34 among Ancient Conversations on Death and Possessions* (Atlanta: SBL, 2011), 190. Noland also observes that the command in Luke 12:33 is "in contrast to the rich man's strategy" (John Nolland, *Luke* [WBC 35; Dallas: Word, 1989], 694).

Thus Ireland concludes that the focus "is on charity in contrast to selfishness, not on total renunciation."[29] However, Ireland's interpretation remains somewhat ambiguous. While he indicates that Luke 12:33 does not require complete divestiture, he does not specify how much property, if any, disciples are required to sell. Furthermore, while Ireland has noted an important feature of the text, the contrast with the parable of the rich fool hardly proves that Luke 12:33 does not enjoin total renunciation. After all, total renunciation would certainly entail "the opposite of the rich fool's actions."

In conclusion, this survey has examined five distinct options for understanding the command to sell possessions in Luke 12:33: (1) the command is not *universal*—it only applies to some Christians; (2) the command is not *consistent*—it conflicts with other passages on wealth in Luke/Acts; (3) the command is not *literal*—it is to be understood as hyperbole; (4) the command is not *mandatory*—it only exemplifies the proper attitude towards wealth; (5) the command is not *absolute*—it does not entail complete divestiture. For the reasons discussed above, I find the first four options unsatisfactory. Furthermore, the fifth option requires additional specificity and support, which this essay seeks to provide.

The Literary Context of Luke 12:33

The connection Ireland observes between the command of Luke 12:33 and the parable of the rich fool provides a helpful starting point for our investigation. This connection was noted as early as Augustine, who aptly observed, "The bellies of the poor were much safer storerooms than [the rich fool's] barns" (Augustine, *Serm.* 36.7 [Hill]).[30] Furthermore, several features of the text indicate that Luke intends his readers to make this connection.

First, Luke has apparently composed 12:21 as a bridge to link the parable of the rich fool to the subsequent teachings of Jesus. Most commentators agree that this verse was not part of the original parable in Luke's source but is rather an "appropriate application" composed by Luke.[31]

[29] Ireland, *Stewardship and the Kingdom of God*, 182. Similar observations are made by Craig Blomberg, *Neither Poverty nor Riches: A Biblical Theology of Material Possessions* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999), 131–32.

[30] This passage was brought to my attention by Edwards, *Luke*, 372.

[31] Nolland, *Luke*, 684. So also Edwards, *Luke*, 372; Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke* (AB 28; Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1981), 971; Bovon, *Luke 2*, 204; Friedrich Wilhelm Horn, *Glaube Und Handeln in der Theologie des Lukas* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986), 64–65.

"The sense of the parable is complete without it," and "Jesus leaves most parables open-ended."[32] Furthermore, the somewhat ambiguous notion of being "rich towards God" (εἰς θεὸν πλουτῶν) appears for the first time in v. 21 and is not explained in the parable. As Joshua A. Noble observes, "There is broad agreement that Luke 12:33 spells out the thought of v. 21 more fully, indicating the concrete practice recommended is almsgiving."[33] In a recent essay, Noble argues persuasively on the basis of the extant occurrences of πλουτεῖν εἰς + acc that this phrase in Luke 2:21 "should be understood as describing a transfer of wealth to God."[34] The verb θησαυρίζω also occurs nowhere else in the gospels except in Matthew's version of the saying recorded in Luke 12:33 (Matt 6:19–20). In Matthew the verb occurs twice, and in Luke 12:33 the noun form appears (θησαυρός). Thus Luke 12:21 functions as a "vorwegnehmende Zusammenfassung" of the instruction in Luke 12:33.[35]

Nevertheless, I. Howard Marshall considers it "unlikely" that Luke composed 12:21 "as a transition to the next section" because "the thought of treasure in heaven is so far away (v. 33)."[36] However, such an objection fails to give enough credit to Luke's skill in crafting an "orderly account" (1:3). After noting that ancient writers often utilized rough drafts, Craig Keener observes, "The Gospels are . . . undoubtedly polished products of much effort, carefully arranged to communicate their points most adequately."[37] Note that in chapter 18, Luke inserts the parable of the Pharisee and the tax collector (Luke 18:9–14) before the stories of the children and the ruler, which he has taken from Mark. Thus the "principle of status transposition" expressed in Luke 18:14 provides a framework for reading the two pericopes that follow.[38] In Luke 18:15–17, children who are being dismissed become the standard for status in the kingdom of God, while in 18:18–25, a rich ruler who believes himself to be righteous fails to obtain salvation. Luke also appears to have sharpened this contrast by emphasizing the low status of the children and the high status of the man.

[32] Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 971; Edwards, *Luke*, 372.

[33] Joshua A. Noble, "'Rich Toward God': Making Sense of Luke 12:21," *CBQ* 78.2 (2016): 315.

[34] Ibid., 319.

[35] Horn, *Glaube Und Handeln in der Theologie des Lukas*, 65.

[36] I. Howard Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (NIGTC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978), 524.

[37] Craig S. Keener, *The Historical Jesus of the Gospels* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009), 74.

[38] Joel B. Green, *The Gospel of Luke* (NICNT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997), 653.

Thus Luke replaces Mark's παιδία ("children"; Mark 10:13) with βρέφη ("infants"; Luke 18:15) and specifies that the rich "man" (Mark 10:17) was a "ruler" (Luke 18:18). We have no reason, therefore, to doubt that Luke could have composed Luke 12:21 with the material of Luke 12:33 in mind.

In addition to the transition in Luke 12:21, Luke's redaction of the Q material in 12:33 appears to link Jesus' teachings on wealth back to his initial warning about greed in Luke 12:15. While Luke 12:22–32 and Matt 6:25–34 are quite similar, Luke 12:33–34 and Matt 6:19–21 differ significantly. Most scholars believe that Matthew's version reflects the original saying, which Luke has paraphrased with more freedom.[39] First, the vocabulary of Luke 12:33 is Lukan. Luke-Acts accounts for all four occurrences of βαλλάντιον in the NT, ten of the thirteen occurrences of ἐλεημοσύνη in the NT, and nine of the fourteen occurrences of ὑπάρχω for "possessions" in the NT.[40] Furthermore, Matthew's version preserves "plus de rythme et de parallélisme sémitique que celui de Luc," and is thus more likely original.[41] Finally, the command, "Sell your possessions [τῶν ὑπαρχόντων], and give alms," recalls the warning which opened this section on wealth: "Beware of all covetousness; for a man's life does not consist in the abundance of his possessions [τῶν ὑπαρχόντων]." Thus, in summary, Luke appears to have composed 12:21 and 12:33 in such a way as to connect the material in 12:13–21 with the material in 12:22–34.

Thomas D. Stegman offers an intriguing hypothesis which is worth considering here. Stegman argues that Luke structured 12:13–34 according to the template of a standard classroom exercise for developing a *chreia*. He suggests the passage contains all eight elements of the template:

[39] So Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 981; Bovon, *Luke 2*, 213; Léopold Sabourin, *L'Évangile de Luc: Introduction et commentaire* (Rome: Editrice Pontificia Università Gregoriana, 1985), 251; Horn, *Glaube Und Handeln in der Theologie des Lukas*, 67; Roman Garrison, *Redemptive Almsgiving in Early Christianity* (Sheffield: JSOT, 1993), 65.

[40] The word βαλλάντιον occurs in Luke 10:4; 12:33; 22:35, 36. The word ἐλεημοσύνη occurs in Matt 6:2, 3, 4; Luke 11:41; 12:33; Acts 3:2, 3, 10; 9:36; 10:2, 4, 31; 24:17. The word ὑπάρχω as "possessions" occurs in Matt 19:21; 24:47; 25:14; Luke 8:3; 11:21; 12:15, 33, 44; 14:33; 16:1; 19:8; Acts 4:32; 1 Cor 13:3; Heb 10:34.

[41] Sabourin, *L'Évangile de Luc*, 251. The same argument is made by François Bovon: "[Matthew] preserves the Semitic antithetical parallel of Q, while Luke adapts the text to his language and his theology" (*Luke 2*, 213). However, the "almost perfectly symmetrical parallelism of Matt 6:19–20" makes Stephen Johnson suspicious that Matthew, as well as Luke, has modified the original saying (Steven R. Johnson, *Seeking the Imperishable Treasure: Wealth, Wisdom, and a Jesus Saying* [Eugene, OR: Cascade, 2008], 36–37).

a note of praise ("teacher"; 12:13), the *chreia* (12:13–15a), the rationale (12:15b), a statement of the opposite or contrary (12:16–20), a statement from analogy (12:24–28), a statement from example (12:30a; 12:27), a statement by an authority (12:30b–32), and a closing exhortation (12:33).[42] If true, Stegman's hypothesis would further strengthen the argument that Luke intended 12:33 to be read in contrast to the behavior of the rich fool. However, the hypothesis is not entirely convincing. As Stegman acknowledges, Luke is not composing; he is assembling pre-existing traditions. Furthermore, while the progymnastic exercise produces a speech *about* the words of a teacher, Luke is actually writing in the voice of the teacher. Finally, while interesting, the parallels Stegman suggests seem somewhat stretched. In addition to the conflated "statement from example" and "statement by an authority," the "note of praise" and "rationale" proposed by Stegman are significantly shorter than any attested in Ronald Hock and Edward O'Neil's collection, which Stegman utilizes.[43] Stegman's argument would be greatly strengthened if one could find other occurrences in Luke of this same template, but I find none. Nevertheless, Stegman's observations serve to emphasize the thematic unity of Luke 12:13–34; regardless of whether or not Luke was following a fixed template, Luke 12:33–34 provides a fitting conclusion to the discourse.

In conclusion, the findings of redaction and literary criticism indicate that the command in Luke 12:33 is a paraphrase of Jesus' teaching which Luke has deliberately placed in contrast with the behavior of the rich fool. Nevertheless, we are still left with the question of how the command in Luke 12:33 is to be understood. In Luke 18:22, Jesus gives an almost identical command to the rich ruler. The wording is so similar that some scholars believe this command shaped Luke's paraphrase in 12:33.[44] While Luke 12:33 may be ambiguous, in Luke 18:22 Jesus clearly commands complete divestiture, and Luke emphasizes this point by altering the command from ὅσα ἔχεις πώλησον (Mark 10:21) to πάντα ὅσα ἔχεις πώλησον. Furthermore, the command to relinquish "all" occurs also in 14:33. Nevertheless, in Acts 2:44–47 and 4:32–37, Luke describes the disciples selling only a portion of their possessions and sharing the rest.[45] The question

[42] Thomas D. Stegman, "Reading Luke 12:13–34 as an Elaboration of a Chreia: How Hermogenes of Tarsus Sheds Light on Luke's Gospel," *NovT* 49.4 (2007): 328–52.

[43] Ronald F. Hock and Edward N. O'Neil, *The Chreia and Ancient Rhetoric: Classroom Exercises* (Atlanta: SBL, 2002).

[44] So Sabourin, *L'Évangile de Luc*, 213; Johnson, *Seeking the Imperishable Treasure*, 33.

[45] The following passages reveal that the Jerusalem disciples retained possessions: Acts 2:44, 46; 4:32; 8:3; 12:12.

under consideration in this essay can thus be framed as follows: should the command to sell possessions in Luke 12:33 be interpreted in light of the absolute divestiture commanded in Luke 18:22 or in light of the partial divestiture described in the early chapters of Acts? To answer this question, we turn now to the Greco-Roman context of Luke-Acts.

The Antithesis between Greed and Equality in Ancient Thought

In a 1996 essay entitled, "The Christianization of a *Topos*," Malherbe compares Luke 12:13–34 with the oration, "On Covetousness," by Dio Chrysostom. He concludes that the "entire text" of Luke 12:13–34, which opens with a warning against πλεονεξία (Luke 12:15), is "shot through with items" from the common Greco-Roman *topos* on the vice.[46] Along with other parallels, he demonstrates that the depiction of the rich fool in Luke matches "the typical self-centered, acquisitive covetous man given to gathering superfluities" discussed by the philosophers.[47] Mahlerbe's stated focus, however, is on the "personal dimension" of πλεονεξία, not the "social dimension." He briefly notes that Dio sketches "the antithesis between covetousness and equality," but Malherbe does not discuss how prevalent this antithesis was in ancient thought or how this antithesis might contribute to the interpretation of Luke 12:33.[48] In this essay, I will build on Malherbe's work by exploring this antithesis and its relevance to the command in Luke 12:33.

Note first that by πλεονεξία, Dio does not mean the desire of a poor person to gain equality with a rich person; for Dio, covetousness is the desire of one "to have more than his neighbor" (*Avar.* 20 [Cohoon; LCL]). Thus Dio laments, "Not one man refrains from [covetousness] or is willing to have equality of possessions with his neighbour." He then quotes an excerpt from the ancient poet Euripides: "At greed [πλεονεξία], the worst of deities, my son, Why graspest thou? . . . Thou art mad for her!—'tis best to venerate Equality" (6–9).[49] Like Dio, Philo also contrasts πλεονεξία and equality, presenting the words as near antonyms: "Our

[46] Malherbe, "The Christianization of a *Topos*," 124.

[47] Ibid., 132.

[48] Ibid., 125–26.

[49] The original text of Euripides reads "ambition" (φιλοτιμία) instead of "greed," but the context indicates that Dio's paraphrase is warranted. In the poem, Jocasta is urging her son Eteocles to give up his attempt to take away his brother's rightful portion. Immediately following the lines quoted by Dio, Jocasta notes that the daylight and the nighttime share the year equally without feeling "envy" (Euripides, *Phoenician Women* 531–48 [Kovacs, LCL]).

mind should change from ignorance and stupidity to education and wisdom, and from intemperance and dissoluteness to patience and moderation, and from fear and cowardice to courage and confidence, and from avarice [πλεονεξία] and injustice to justice and equality" (*QE* 1.4 [Marcus, LCL]).[50]

This antithesis between covetousness and equality is pervasive in Greco-Roman utopian thought. Seneca describes a time when "the bounties of nature lay open to all, for men's indiscriminate use, before avarice and luxury had broken the bonds which held mortals together, and they, abandoning their common existence, had separated and turned to plunder." All "was divided among unquarrelling friends. . . . Not yet had the miser, by hiding away what lay before him, begun to shut off his neighbor from even the necessities of life; each cared as much for his neighbor as himself." In the absence of greed, "armor lay unused," and hands were "unstained by human blood." This time of peace and abundance came to an end, however, when "luxury began to lust for what nature regarded as superfluous," and "avarice broke in upon a condition so happily ordained, and, by its eagerness to lay something away and to turn it to its own private use, made all things the property of others" (*Ep.* 90.19, 36–41 [Gummere, LCL]).[51]

The mythical era described by Seneca is referred to as the "golden age" and associated with the reign of the Roman god Saturn or the Greek equivalent Cronus. Ancient writers routinely described this age as a time of peace and plenty, in which humankind enjoyed the bounty of the good earth in simplicity and complete equality.[52] This golden age was also remembered every December in the immensely popular Saturnalia festival, which Plutarch identifies as the "greatest festival" of the Romans (Plutarch, *Quaest. rom.* 34 [Babbitt, LCL]).[53]

One of the most notable features of the Saturnalia was the temporary liberty permitted slaves to dine with their masters and speak their opinions

[50] See also Philo, *QE* 2.64; Plutarch, *Lyc.* 24; Diodorus Siculus, *Library of History* 9.12; Menander, *Mon.* 259.

[51] This passage was brought to my attention by Pieter W. van der Horst, "Hellenistic Parallels to the Acts of the Apostles 2:1–47," *JSNT* 25 (1985): 60.

[52] See Hesiod, *Works and Days* 109–26; Plato, *Pol.* 272; Aelian, *Letters* 17; Aratus, *Phaen.* 108–14; [Seneca], *Octavia* 391–406; Fronto, *Eulogy of Negligence* 3; Virgil, *Eclogues* 4.6; etc.

[53] As the celebration drew near, Seneca noted that all of Rome was "in a sweat" (*Ep.* 18.1 [Gummere, LCL]), and when the festivities began, Pliny the Younger was forced to retreat into another room to continue his work, for "the roof resounds with festive cries" (*Ep.* 17.24 [Radice, LCL]).

openly.[54] Pompeius Trogus explains that during Saturn's rule slavery did not exist. Instead, "everything was held in common, undivided, as if all men shared a single family estate." Thus during Saturnalia, slaves are permitted "to recline with their masters" at dinner, "all enjoying a position of equality" (Justinus, *Epitome* 43.1.3–4 [Yardley]).[55] Plutarch likewise notes that this custom was understood by some as "a reminder of the equality which characterized the famous Saturnian age, when there was neither slave nor master, but all were regarded as kinsmen and equals" (*Comp. Lyc. Num.* 1.5 [Perrin, LCL]).[56]

In a satirical dialogue between the god Cronus and Lucian, Cronus explains that, although Zeus normally rules, he "thought it best" for a few days every December to "take over the sovereignty again to remind mankind what life was like under me."[57] This, Cronus explains, is why Saturnalia is a time of rejoicing and merrymaking, and furthermore, why "everyone, slave and free man, is held as good as his neighbor" (*Sat.* 7 [Kilburn, LCL]). Lucian then complains that, despite the god's intentions, the festivities do not actually realize the fabled equality of Cronus' reign. He states, "[It is] most unreasonable for some of us to have too much wealth and live in luxury and not share what they have with those who are poorer than they while others are dying of hunger. . . . I hear the poets saying that things were not like that in old times." Lucian suggests that, instead of having a few days of silly frivolity, Cronus should abolish the current "inequality" and make "the good things accessible to everyone" (19). Specifically, Lucian suggests that Cronus should compel the rich to reach into "their bushels of gold" and "throw down a measure for us all" (21).

In addition to the annual celebration in December, certain institutions in the Roman economy stood as reminders of the golden age. In his *Roman Questions*, Plutarch offers the following explanation for why the Temple of Saturn was used as the public treasury: "When Saturn was king there was no greed [πλεονεξία] or injustice among men, but good faith and justice" (42 [Babbitt, LCL]). Macrobius offers a similar explanation:

[54] See Ausonius, *Eclogues* 23.15–16; Horace, *Sat.* 2.7.4–5; Dio Cassius, *Roman History* 60.19; Seneca, *Ep.* 47.10–16; Lucian, *Sat.* 5; Tertullian, *Idol.* 10.

[55] This passage was brought to my attention by van der Horst, "Hellenistic Parallels," 60.

[56] Macrobius also states that in the golden age of Saturn, "The distinction between slavery and freedom did not yet exist, as is made plain by the fact that slaves are allowed complete license during the Saturnalia" (*Saturnalia* 1.7.26 [Kaster, LCL]).

[57] This passage was brought to my attention by van der Horst, "Hellenistic Parallels," 60.

> The Romans wanted the temple of Saturn to be the treasury, because it is said that when he dwelt in Italy no theft was committed in his territory, or else because in his reign no one held private property . . . . Hence the money belonging in common to the people was placed in his temple, because under his rule all men had all things in common. (*Saturnalia* 1.8.3 [Kaster, LCL])

In the same passage cited above, Plutarch also explains that Saturn's rule was characterized by "abundant harvests"; thus the market-day, held every eight days, was "considered sacred to Saturn."

The golden age also featured prominently in political propaganda and critique. One poet extolled the justice, peace, and abundance of Nero's early reign by insisting, "The days of Saturn have returned" (*Einsiedeln Eclogues* 2.23–34 [Duff, LCL]).[58] On the other hand, Suetonius mentions a far less satisfied poet who, after lambasting Tiberius as a "cruel and merciless man," states, "You, O Caesar, have altered the golden ages of Saturn; for while you are alive, they will always be iron" (*Tib.* 59 [Rolfe, LCL]). Plutarch writes of the Athenian statesman Cimon, "He made his home in the city a general public residence for his fellow citizens, and on his estates in the country allowed even the stranger to take and use the choicest of the ripened fruits . . . Thus, in a certain fashion, he restored to human life the fabled communism [κοινωνίαν] of the age of Cronus" (*Cim.* 10 [Perrin, LCL]). Philo also references the golden age in evaluating the early reign of Caligula. While describing the equality and prosperity which characterized the time, Philo exclaims, "Indeed, the life under Saturn, pictured by the poets, no longer appeared to be a fabled story" (*Embassy* 2 [Colson, LCL]).

Philo's familiarity with the utopian ideal is evident throughout his works, particularly in his description of the Essenes.[59] Philo states that the kinship all people naturally share "has been put to confusion by the triumph of malignant covetousness [πλεονεξία], which has wrought estrangement instead of affinity and enmity instead of friendship." The Essenes, however, have been able to reclaim this kinship by ridding

[58] Another poet wrote, "Amid untroubled peace, the Golden Age springs to a second birth" (Calpurnius Siculus, *Eclogue* 1.42). Translators J. Wright Duff and Arnold M. Duff present evidence that both poems were composed in praise of Nero. *Minor Latin Poets Volume I* (LCL; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1934), 211, 319.

[59] Craig S. Keener, *Acts: An Exegetical Commentary* (4 vols.; Grand Rapids: Baker, 2012), 1:1027; David L. Mealand, "Community of Goods and Utopian Allusions in Acts II–IV," *JTS* (1977): 98–99. See also Philo, *Posterity* 1.116–19; *Moses* 1.313, 324.

themselves of all "inducements to covetousness [πλεονεξία]," for they "do not hoard gold and silver or acquire great slices of land" (*Good Person* 76–79 [Colson, LCL]). In fact, they do not "have any private property." Instead, "they put everything together into the public stock and enjoy the benefit of them all in common." As a result, while they live frugally without luxury, they have "food in abundance" (*Hypothetica* 11.4–11 [Colson, LCL]). In language far more reminiscent of Seneca's ninetieth epistle than the War Scroll (1QM), Philo states, "As for darts, javelins, daggers, or the helmet, breastplate or shield, you could not find a single manufacturer of them, nor, in general, any person making weapons or engines or plying any industry concerned with war" (*Good Person* 77–78). Josephus also, in describing the Essenes, emphasizes elements which are reminiscent of the golden age. He states that they owned no slaves, devoted themselves "solely to agricultural labor," and held their possessions in common (*Ant.* 18.5 [Feldman, LCL]).

In conclusion, the antithesis between greed and equality which Malherbe notes in Dio Chrysostom's discourse is a common theme in Greco-Roman utopian thought. Of course, discussions of the golden age do not always include this theme. For example, while in *Saturnalia* Lucian discusses the golden age as a time of sharing instead of hoarding (see above), in another reference to the golden age he simply mentions that crops grew of their own accord, without the need of manual labor.[60] Nevertheless, while Greco-Roman utopian thought certainly includes other elements, the antithesis between greed and equality remains an important component. We turn now to consider the extent to which Greco-Roman utopian conceptions influenced Luke.

Luke and the Golden Age

In Acts 2:44–47 and 4:32–37, Luke describes the community life of the first Christians, stating that they held their possessions in common. As Richard I. Pervo notes, "Similarities in theme and diction between [these passages] and Greco-Roman utopian thought are widely recognized."[61] Johnson also points to OT echoes in these passages and rightly cautions against the assumption that Luke "is simply portraying the Christian community as a philosophic school"; nevertheless, he still agrees that

[60] Lucian, *Rhet. praec.* 8.

[61] Richard I. Pervo, *Acts: A Commentary* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2009), 90. See also Martin Hengel, *Property and Riches in the Early Church: Aspects of a Social History of Early Christianity* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1974), 8–9; Mealand, "Community of Goods."

the Hellenistic utopian ideal influenced Luke's depiction.[62] Given the prominence of the golden age in Greco-Roman literature, when writers such as Philo, Josephus, and Luke "were commending the customs and practices of their religion to those for whom they wrote in Greek, it is only to be expected that they should portray members of a close knit Jewish sect as fulfilling some of the Greek Utopian ideals."[63]

Furthermore, in addition to the widely noted connections between the Greco-Roman utopian ideal and Luke's language of communal sharing, Acts 2:46 contains another echo of the golden age which has been overlooked. In this verse, Luke states that the Christians ate their meals together ἐν ἀγαλλιάσει καὶ ἀφελότητι καρδίας. The word ἀφελότης, which is quite rare, occurs nowhere else in the NT or LXX. Modern translations offer a wide range of interpretations including "generosity" (ESV, NRSV, NJB), "sincerity" (NASB, NIV), and "humbleness" (NET, HCSB). However, the standard reference works, including BDAG, *PGL*, LSJ, and MM, all agree that ἀφελότης means "simplicity," citing its usage in the extant Greek literature.[64] C. K. Barrett also notes that the Vulgate translates ἀφελότης with *simplicitas*.[65] To this we should add that the Syriac Peshitta renders ἀφελότης with the word ܫܦܝܪܘܬܐ, which also means "simplicity."[66]

Nevertheless, despite this unanimous evidence, commentators routinely point to the phrase ἐν ἁπλότητι καρδίας (Eph 6:5, Col 3:22) and allow the NT usage of the more common term ἁπλότης to dictate their interpretation of ἀφελότης (note especially Rom 12:8; 2 Cor 8:2; 9:11, 13).[67] Ernst Haenchen asserts that in Acts 2:46, "The more sonorous ἐν

[62] Luke Timothy Johnson, *The Literary Function of Possessions in Luke-Acts* (Missoula, MT: Scholars, 1977), 200; Johnson, *Sharing Possessions*, 119.

[63] Mealand, "Community of Goods," 98.

[64] W. Bauer, "ἀφελότης," BDAG 155; H. Liddell, R. Scott, and H. Jones, "ἀφελότης," LSJ 288; G. Lampe, "ἀφελότης," *PGL* 274; J. Moulton and Milligan, "ἀφελότης," MM 95–96.

[65] C. K. Barrett, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles* (ICC; (London: T&T Clark, 2004), 171.

[66] Michael Sokoloff, "ܫܦܝܪܘܬܐ," *A Syriac Lexicon: A Translation from the Latin, Correction, Expansion, and Update of C. Brockelmann's Lexicon Syriacum* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2009), 189.

[67] F. F. Bruce, *The Book of the Acts* (NICNT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1988), 74; David Peterson, *The Acts of the Apostles* (PNTC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009), 164; Hans Conzelmann, *Acts of the Apostles: A Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles* (trans. James Limburg, A. Thomas Kraabel, and Donald H. Juel; Hermeneia; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987), 24; Ernst Haenchen, *The Acts of the Apostles: A*

ἀφελότητι καρδίας stands for the more usual ἐν ἁπλότητι καρδίας. Elsewhere too, Luke preferred longer to shorter expressions, even when they were not fully synonymous with what was meant."[68] However, the notion that ἀφελότητι is "more sonorous" than ἁπλότητι is rather subjective, and Haenchen offers no evidence to support his claim that Luke prefers length to precision. In any case, we are simply not justified in adopting entirely unattested meanings of ἀφελότης on the basis of the usage of a different word by different authors in different contexts. The word ἀφελότης means "simplicity," and unless we have decisive contextual evidence that such a meaning is impossible in Acts 2:46, we must assume that Luke meant what he said. Moreover, the statement, "They ate their food with gladness and simplicity of heart" (NKJV), makes perfect sense in the context of Acts 2. As noted above, one of the most common elements in descriptions of the golden age is simplicity. Writers envision a time when humankind dwelt together in harmony, eschewing all luxury and enjoying the simple but abundant blessings of the good earth. Thus we have no need to invent arbitrary translations such as "generosity of heart" to make sense of Luke's language.

A final point must be made here. Since Luke draws upon the ideal of a bygone utopian age, Eckhard Plümacher asserts that he is using "ein erbauliches Schema der antiken Literatur" to describe the "unwiederholbaren Anfängen der Kirche." He suggests that Luke "schildert sozusagen das Saturnische Zeitalter der Kirche."[69] Likewise, Johnson states, "A Hellenistic reader would recognize in Luke's description the sort of 'foundation story' that was rather widespread in Hellenistic literature."[70] From this Johnson concludes, "Luke is making a statement about 'how things were in the primordial beginning' . . . Luke is not proposing this picture as a concrete example to be imitated."[71]

However, the fact that Luke echoes descriptions of a bygone utopian era does not mean that he considers the situation of Acts 2 and 4 to be "unwiederholbaren." As noted above, Philo echoes descriptions of the

Commentary (trans. Bernard Noble and Gerald Shinn; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1971), 192; Johnson, *The Acts of the Apostles, 59*.

[68] Haenchen, *Acts*, 192. The same suggestion is made in Conzelmann, *Acts*, 24.

[69] Eckhard Plümacher, *Lukas als hellenistischer Schriftsteller: Studien zur Apostelgeschichte* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1972), 18.

[70] Luke Timothy Johnson, *The Acts of the Apostles* (SP 5; Collegeville, MN: Liturgical, 1992), 62.

[71] Johnson, *Sharing Possessions*, 128–29.

golden age in his account of the Essenes, but he is obviously not providing a "foundation story." Moreover, the so-called "unwiederholbaren Anfängen" described by Luke evidently continued long after Pentecost. The *Didache*, an early compendium of basic Christian teaching for new converts, states, "You shall not turn away from someone in need, but shall share everything with your brother and not claim that anything is your own" (4.8 [Holmes]).[72] In an apology to pagans, Justin Martyr confesses, "We who valued above all things the acquisition of wealth and possessions, now bring what we have into a common stock, and communicate to every one in need."[73] Tertullian likewise claims, "We . . . have no hesitation about sharing property. All is common among us—except our wives" (*Apol.* 11–12 [Glover, LCL]). If such statements did not contain at least some truth, they would hardly make for effective apologies. Furthermore, Lucian, a quite hostile source, describes the Christians as follows: "Their first lawgiver persuaded them that they are all brothers of one another . . . Therefore they despise all things indiscriminately and consider them common property" (*Peregr.*13 [Harmon, LCL]).[74] Note also that in 2 Cor 8:13–15, Paul calls for "equality" among believers.

Johnson argues that many passages in Luke-Acts assume private property, and he is certainly correct. He is mistaken, however, to conclude from this fact that the behavior described in Acts 2 and 4 is not presented by Luke as the normative behavior of the church.[75] The early Christians simply saw no contradiction between the notion of private property and the confession that they held all things in common. Immediately before stating, "All is common among us," Tertullian describes the church's collection for the poor: "Every man once a month brings some modest coin—or whenever he wishes, and only if he does wish, and if he can; for nobody is compelled; it is a voluntary offering" (*Apol.* 5). Justin, after explaining that Christians "bring what we have into a common stock," explains the weekly collection for the poor as follows: "They who are well to do, and willing, give what each thinks fit."[76] The Didache, after forbidding converts to claim anything as "your own," prescribes giving an amount which "seems right to you" (13.8).

In summary, Luke is evidently familiar with the mythic golden age in which humankind shared their possessions equally instead of greedily

[72] Michael William Holmes, *The Apostolic Fathers: Greek Texts and English Translations* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2007), 246.

[73] Justin, *1 Apol.* 14 (ANF 1:167).

[74] The passages from Justin, Tertullian, and Lucian were brought to my attention by Keener, *Acts*, 1028.

[75] Johnson, *Sharing Possessions*, 129. See also ibid., 22.

[76] Justin, *1 Apol.* 67 (ANF 1:186).

hoarding them. Furthermore, Luke knows his readers are also familiar with the golden age and thus describes the behavior of the disciples in Acts with language which echoes this ideal.

Conclusion

This study attempted to answer the following question: should the command to sell possessions in Luke 12:33 be interpreted in light of the absolute divestiture commanded in Luke 18:22 or in light of the partial divestiture described in the early chapters of Acts? Our findings may be summarized as follows:

1. The extant literature bears witness to a prominent antithesis in first century thought between the vice of greed, expressed through hoarding possessions, and the ideal of equality, expressed through sharing possessions.

2. Luke's depiction of the church in Acts 2:44–47 and 4:32–37 was influenced by this ideal of equality. The life envisioned here is not a life of poverty, but a life of simplicity and sufficiency.

3. In Luke's paraphrase of the Q material in Luke 12:33, the same language used in Acts to describe the ideal of equality is deliberately set in contrast with material which exemplifies the vice of greed (Luke 12:15–21).

The command, "Sell your possessions," in Luke 12:33 should therefore be understood to prohibit hoarding, not mandate poverty.[77]

What then of Jesus' words in Luke 14:33 and 18:22? First, the fact that Luke explicitly specifies "all" in these passages makes the absence of "all" in Luke 12:33 rather striking.[78] Furthermore, the inclusion of "all" in Luke 14:33 and 18:22 is easily explained. Consider the context of Luke 14:33 where Jesus says, "Whoever of you does not renounce all that he has cannot be my disciple," only after saying, "If any one comes to me and does not hate his own father and mother and wife and children and brothers and sisters, yes, and even his own life, he cannot be my disciple" (Luke 14:26). Jesus' words are shocking, but the point is obvious: allegiance to

[77] Compare with Pss. Sol. 5:16 ("If a man has too much, he sins" [Atkinson, NETS]), and Tobit 4:16 ("Give all your surplus to charity"). Note also that 1 Enoch 97:8–10 provides a close parallel with Luke 12:16–21, though in 1 Enoch, the emphasis is on the unjust acquisition of wealth.

[78] So Hays, *Luke's Wealth Ethics*, 129; Ireland, *Stewardship and the Kingdom of God*, 182–83; David P. Seccombe, *Possessions and the Poor in Luke-Acts* (Linz, Austria: A. Fuchs, 1983), 153.

Jesus must trump everything else (see Matt 10:37). No sensible reader walks away from Luke-Acts thinking that Jesus literally requires her to hate her children. While all disciples must be *willing* to break with family for the sake of Jesus, not all are required to actually do so, for some have family members who also love Jesus. In the same way, while Luke 14:33 clearly requires all disciples to be willing to sell everything, there is no reason to conclude from this text that all disciples are actually called to sell everything. Just as the reader knows that Peter did not hate his mother-in-law (Luke 4:38), the reader also knows that Zacchaeus did not give everything away.

Secondly, consider the context of Luke 18:22. In this passage, the rich man, like Levi (Luke 5:27–28), is called to drop everything and follow Jesus full-time. This same call is simply not given to other characters in Luke, such as Zacchaeus. Ben Witherington argues, "For Luke, Jesus's specific teaching to the rich young ruler is broadened and applied to Jesus's followers in general. Accordingly, we must assume that Luke did not think that Jesus's advice to the rich young ruler was a special or exceptional case."[79] This is certainly correct, but Luke 12:33 shows us precisely how the command is "broadened and applied." The injunction which applies to all Christians is this: sell your superfluous possessions. For those like Zacchaeus who are called to be honest businesspersons, only some possessions may be superfluous. On the other hand, for those like Levi called to be itinerant evangelists, all possessions may be superfluous. Each reader of Luke-Acts who seeks to follow Christ must discern which of her own possessions are necessary for her calling and which are superfluous.

In summary, this study sought a satisfactory interpretation of Luke 12:33 which preserves both the unity of Luke-Acts and the radical force of Jesus' command. By attending to the Greco-Roman context of Luke-Acts, as well as the literary context of Luke 12:33, I have argued that the command, πωλήσατε τὰ ὑπάρχοντα ὑμῶν, should be read as a command to sell superfluous possessions. Thus Luke 12:33 is not inconsistent with other passages in Luke-Acts, for it does not forbid disciples to own property and conduct business. Furthermore, the command cannot be dismissed as hyperbole. According to Luke, Jesus really does forbid all who would follow him from retaining superfluous possessions. He really does command that such possessions be sold and the money given to the poor. Affluent Christians living in a world of poverty cannot ignore these words.

[79] Ben Witherington, *Jesus and Money: A Guide for Times of Financial Crisis* (Grand Rapids: Brazos, 2010), 94.

STR 8.1 (Spring 2017): 41–53

The Curse of Cain Reconsidered: A Study of the Translation of *min ha'adamah* in Genesis 4:11a

Todd Borger
Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary

Genesis 4:11a has traditionally been rendered into English with some variation of "You are cursed from the ground." E. A. Speiser's interpretation of the Hebrew word ארור *("cursed") to mean banishment has also had great influence on modern interpretation of this verse. A closer study of the grammar of the sentence and the larger context of Genesis 3 shows that a better translation of this verse is "You are cursed more than the ground." This translation shows not only the extension of the curse from the serpent to the land and now to Cain, but it also shows the amplification of the curse as Cain is specifically cursed more than the ground was cursed in Genesis 3.*

Key Words: Cain, curse, grammar, primeval history, translation

The story of Cain and Abel in Genesis is fraught with several unsolvable riddles. Hardly a verse goes by in the chapter without some textual, linguistic, or theological problem arising. Genesis 4:11 is no exception to the general tenor of the chapter. Many English translations are unified in rendering the first part of this verse *Cursed are you from the ground* or with variations and explications. That simple sentence, however, is rife with problems, and there are notable exceptions within the English translation traditions. This essay will look at several of the problems in the verse and focus on one particular translation issue—the rendering of the preposition מן in the expression מן האדמה (*min ha'adamah*).

This essay will look first at the variety of published English translation options. The purpose of that section is not to limit our discussion to the range of options chosen thus far. The section summarizing the various translation traditions is illustrative to show the range of possibilities. The following section will contain a brief survey of the history of interpretation of this verse, showing some of the interpretive options and opinions concerning this verse. Following that section will be an analysis of the syntactical options for translating מן האדמה. Finally, we will show how this phrase could be seen in relation to the larger context, both in the immediate context of Gen 4:10–11 and in the larger context of Genesis 3–4. The essay will conclude with the thesis that the best English translation of the phrase מן האדמה in Gen 4:11 is with the comparative *you are cursed more than the ground.*

English Translation Traditions

In comparing various English versions, we can detect several streams of tradition in translating this verse: (1) cursed from the earth; (2) cursed from the ground; (3) cursed upon the earth; (4) cursed and alienated from the ground; (5) [cursed and] banned from the ground; (6) cursed and driven from the ground; and (7) cursed more than the ground. These variations are grouped below.

Variation (1), cursed from the earth, appears in the Geneva/KJV/Web-ster traditions.

- Now therefore thou art cursed from the earth. (Geneva)
- And now *art* thou cursed from the earth. (KJV)
- So now you *are* cursed from the earth. (NKJV)
- And now [art] thou cursed from the earth. (Webster)

Variation (2), cursed from the ground, which only changes the translation of the noun *adamah* appears in the various Revised versions and in the 1917 JPS version.

- And now you are cursed from the ground. (NRS, RSV, NASB, ESV)
- Now you are cursed from the ground. (NAU)
- and now, cursed *art* thou from the ground. (YLT, JPS [1917], ASV, RV)
- You are now cursed from the ground. (CEB)
- And now be thou cursed from the ground. (LEE, Darby)
- Now, therefore, accursed, art thou,—from the ground. (ROT)

Variation (3) is unique, found only in the Douay-Rheims English translation. The preposition does not seem to be adequately dealt with in this version until one notes that the Douay-Rheims version was a translation not of the Hebrew Bible but of the Vulgate. Jerome translated the pertinent phrase *super terram,* which could be taken in a number of ways. The Douay-Rheims translators took the preposition *super* to mean *on* or *above*. It might be, however, that Jerome actually was using *super* in the sense of *beyond*, which would add weight to the translation proposed here—you are cursed beyond the earth, or you are cursed beyond what the earth was cursed.

- Cursed shalt thou be upon the earth. (Douay-Rheims, 1899)

- *Nunc igitur maledictus eris super terram.* (Vulgate)

Variation (4) is found in the various versions of the Holman Christian Standard Bible (HCSB), now simply the Christian Standard Bible (CSB). The original version of this tradition inserted an explanation "with alienation" using brackets to indicate that they have made explicit in the translation something that was implicit in the original Hebrew. In the 2009 edition the brackets were removed and commas were used to set off the explanation "alienated." While the commas in that version set the word "alienated" off as explanatory of the word "cursed," there is no indication that this word is not represented explicitly in the Hebrew text. The new 2017 Christian Standard Bible has removed the second comma from the 2009 translation, apparently removing the explanatory function of the word, and furthering the confusion about its relationship to the original text.

- So now you are cursed *with alienation* from the ground. (HCSB, 2004)
- So now you are cursed, alienated, from the ground. (HCSB, 2009)
- So now you are cursed, alienated from the ground. (CSB, 2017)

Variation (5) is interesting. In 1985 the Catholic Jerusalem Bible translated the passage "cursed and banned" from the ground, apparently following Speiser's Anchor Bible commentary on the matter of the meaning of *cursed*. In 1996, the New Living translators followed this lead but removed the explicative nature of *banned* and instead translated *arur* as "banished," leaving out "cursed" altogether. In 2011, the new Catholic version came out and followed the same line, translating *arur* simply as "banned." However, each of the New Living updates have gone the other way, translating the word as "cursed" and including the explicative "and banished."

- Now be accursed and driven from the ground. (Jerusalem Bible, 1966)
- Now be cursed and banned from the ground. (New Jerusalem Bible, 1985)
- Now you are banned from the ground. (New American Bible, 2011)
- You are hereby banished from the ground. (NLT, 1996)
- Now you are cursed and banished from the ground. (NLT, 2004)

Variation (6) includes all of the NIV editions—British, American, and Reader's—which have consistently used "cursed" with the explicative "and driven from."

- Now you are under a curse and driven from the ground. (NIV, 1984, 2011)
- So I am putting a curse on you. I am driving you from the ground. (NIrV, 1998)

Finally, variation (7) is seen in the 1985 JPS translation, which went a completely different way by translating the phrase "more cursed than the ground."

These variations show that there is slight variation in the understanding of the term אדמה, whether it is earth or ground. Since these terms can be, but are not always, synonymous in English, the difference is slight. There is greater variation over the meaning of ארור.[1] Rather, there is not so much disagreement over the meaning but rather over how much information is implicit in the Hebrew text which must then be made explicit in the English translation. One underlying problem with the phrase ארור מן is that the translation *be cursed from* is virtually meaningless in English.[2] Perhaps better, it could be said that apart from this particular context, the English phrase *be cursed from* is virtually gibberish. All of the translation streams except two take the preposition *min* in a fairly uniform manner. The Douay-Rheims translation and the 1985 JPS translation are the exceptions.

History of Interpretation

While most English translations have some variation of *cursed are you from the ground*, the situation was at one time more fluid. Johannes Bartholdy Glenthøj surveyed the interpretation of the Cain and Abel narratives in Syriac and Greek writers of the 4th to 6th centuries. He discovered these opinions about this text: the earth was the instrument of the curse;

[1] For general works on the concept of curse, see Hans Ulrich Steymans, "Blessing and Curse: Old Testament," in *Religion Past and Present* (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 2:126–28; George Scheper, "Cursing," in *Encyclopedia of Religion* (2nd ed.; Detroit: Thomson Gale, 2005), 3:2097–2108; Herbert Chanan Brichto, *The Problem of "Curse" in the Hebrew Bible* (Journal of Biblical Literature Monograph Series 13; Philadelphia: Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis, 1963); Douglas Stuart, "Curse," in *Anchor Bible Dictionary* (New York: Doubleday, 1992), 1:1218–19.

[2] It would make sense in English only in used temporally. For example, *He was cursed from his youth.*

the earth was hostile and an unceasing enemy; Cain was cursed away from the earth; the curse of the earth was related to both Adam and Cain.[3]

Medieval Jewish commentators took different views of the passage. Rashi, for example, understood the phrase in the comparative sense. He wrote, "Even more than it [the earth] was already cursed for its iniquity, and also with this it continued to sin."[4] Sellers, in a brief note to the American Oriental Society, agreed with that view, adding that Cain's words in 4:13 should be taken as hyperbole.[5]

Cassuto followed Ibn Ezra in interpreting the phrase as showing the origin of the curse: *you are cursed with a curse that is coming from the ground*. For Cassuto the deciding factor was the parallelism between this verse and the preceding verse in which Abel's blood is crying out "from the ground."[6]

In modern commentary, Speiser, in both a 1960 article and his Anchor Bible commentary on Genesis, takes the preposition in the separative sense, but does so by reexamining the meaning of the root ארר.[7] He is aided in this investigation by his student H. C. Brichto in his monograph on the meaning of curse in the Hebrew Bible.[8] Speiser understands the root ארר as a magical term which finds meaning in the biblical setting as a ban or banishment. The curse on the serpent in 3:14, then, is really a banishment from the rest of the animal kingdom. The curse on Cain in our passage is a banishment from working the land.[9] It is difficult to suggest motivation of a study, but Speiser seems to be motivated by the need to explain this one construction, ארור מן, and extending it out to the other uses of the verb, rather than locating the larger meaning and then bringing that meaning to this passage.

Keil offers two options for interpreting the prepositional phrase. He says it is difficult to choose between the separative and source meanings of the preposition. He concludes, however, that the association with the

[3] Johannes Bartholdy Glenthøj, *Cain and Abel in Syriac and Greek Writers (4th–6th centuries)* (Louvain: Peeters, 1997), 178.

[4] *Genesis, Volume One: Bereshith, Noach, Lech Lecha, Vayera: Translation of Text, Rashi, and Other Commentaries* (trans. A. J. Rosenberg; New York: Judaica Press, 1993), 69.

[5] Ovid R. Sellers, *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 50 (1930): 336.

[6] Umberto Cassuto, *A Commentary of the Book of Genesis* (Jerusalem: The Magnes Press, 1978), 219.

[7] E. A. Speiser, "An Angelic 'Curse': Exodus 14:20," *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 80 (1960): 198–200; idem, *Genesis: Introduction, Translation, and Notes* (AB; Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1964), 24.

[8] Brichto, *The Problem of "Curse" in the Hebrew Bible*, 77–117.

[9] Speiser, "An Angelic 'Curse'," 198; idem, *Genesis*, 24.

phrase "which has opened its mouth" lends itself to the understanding of the preposition as showing source. In other words, because the ground has taken in Abel's blood, it is now giving back to Cain a curse.[10]

Von Rad takes the preposition as showing agent or at least means, but his language seems to push more toward the land itself as the author of the curse. "The earth itself is to deny [Cain] the power of its blessing. . . . Therefore the soil denies him fruit."[11]

Mathews notes the connection between the curse of Cain and the curse of the serpent in Genesis 3, even going so far as to note the parallel construction of the curse. "Like father like 'seed,' both the serpent and Cain . . . receive the same retribution." Yet even with such strong wording, Mathews preserves the distinction between the comparative use of the preposition for the serpent and the separative use of the preposition for Cain.[12]

Fretheim interprets the preposition מן as showing means. The ground mediated the curse from God to Cain by no longer producing fruit in keeping with Cain's labors. The curse of Cain is thus an intensification of the earlier curse against the ground itself (3:17). The reader can see the intensification also in the themes of banishment, hiddenness from God, and the journey east.[13]

Wenham notes the parallels between the curse of the ground and the curse of Cain—"certainly there is an element of mirroring punishment in the curse pronounced on Cain"—yet he translates the prepositional phrase as separative, noting the comparative sense in a footnote.[14]

From this brief survey, it is evident that the uniformity of modern English translations in regard to the preposition מן was not always the case. The next section will explore other possibilities for understanding the preposition as found in various guides to Hebrew syntax.

[10] C. F. Keil, *Commentary on the Old Testament* (vol. 1, Pentateuch; Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1996 [Reprinted from Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1866–91]), 1:71

[11] Gerhard von Rad, *Genesis* (rev. ed.; OTL; Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1972), 106. Von Rad very much reflects Gunkel's earlier interpretation of Genesis as a book of legends. Hermann Gunkel, *Genesis* (trans. Mark E. Biddle; Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1997).

[12] Kenneth A. Mathews, *Genesis 1–11:26* (NAC 1A; Nashville: B&H, 1996), 275.

[13] Terence E. Fretheim, "The Book of Genesis," in *The New Interpreter's Bible* (vol. 1; Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1994), 374.

[14] Gordon J Wenham, *Genesis 1–15* (WBC 1; Waco: Word, 1987), 107.

Syntactical Options

Having surveyed past interpretations of the phrase מן האדמה, we will now turn our attention to the range of meaning available to us from our understanding of Hebrew grammar. The preposition מן has the basic idea of separation. Spatially, this meaning comes out as showing the direction from where something is coming. In a related way, it will indicate the origin of some person or thing. The idea of separation can be seen in temporal statements as well. The preposition can indicate the starting time from which some event takes place or is due to take place. Three related but more abstract uses are the partitive, privative, and comparative.

From these descriptions, we might create the following options for our understanding of Gen 4:11. The separative use of the preposition would give us "away from the ground." This phrase could be understood in two different ways. Statically, it could mean the place the curse is occurring. Dynamically, it would show the direction away from which the cursing is taking place. The former is possible but does not yield a meaningful sentence ("The place where you are being cursed is away from the ground." Then where is he? Up in the air?). The latter use requires a verb of movement, however. Cursing, normally understood, is not a verb of movement so it is unlikely to be separative without redefining the words.

Understood as showing source, our phrase would carry the meaning "you are being cursed, and the curse is coming up out of the ground." Related to this, we might say the ground is the agent of the curse—"you are being cursed by the ground." There is some history of this tradition, as seen in Ibn Ezra and Cassuto (source) and Gunkel and von Rad (agent). The preposition used as a partitive marker—"the curse is taken from the curse in the ground"—makes good sense from the larger context of Genesis 3–4 and is related to the meaning of source.

Similar to the use of source is that of means. This use would yield a similar meaning but would preserve the agency of God and restrict the ground to a mediatorial role. This use is made explicit in Barnwell and Kuhn's Translator's Notes for the book of Genesis prepared for Bible translators.[15]

Finally, the comparative use of the preposition must be considered.

[15] Katherine Barnwell and Hanni Kuhn, *Translator's Notes on Genesis 1:1–11:26* (Dallas: SIL International, 2007). These works are important for understanding the significance of explicit and implicit information in any text. While one may not agree with the decisions of the authors, these linguists and translators are often more sensitive to the presence of implicit information than the casual or even the academic reader.

This use makes the best sense of the grammar of the sentence. The structure of noun + adjective/passive participle + *min* + noun is the basic form of the comparative expression. There is no information left implicit and no terms need to be redefined.

When making decisions about grammar, we must remember that native speakers do not go through these processes. Or rather, the process of making syntactic decisions happens at a subconscious level. The use of one form over another, or the proper interpretation of a term that has several uses, does not need to happen cognitively. This can be seen in the language use of children who are able to make proper decisions and interpretations with no explicit external knowledge of the language system. On the other hand, a more comprehensive awareness of the language system allows one to make puns and other word jokes.

Also, it is a mistake to think that one use of a preposition is more or less "literal" than another use. When students are learning the uses of the preposition מן it is often tempting for them to think or say something like "'The Hebrew expression for 'David is greater than Saul' literally means 'David is great from Saul.'" Of course, this is nonsense. The second sentence—David is great from Saul—is ungrammatical and gibberish. The Hebrew sentence that we translate as "David is greater than Saul" cannot literally mean something that is ungrammatical. The important point here is that when we are deciding between various uses of the preposition, it is a mistake to suppose that one of the meanings is more "literal" than another one. The literal meaning, if we must use that term, is the meaning that the speaker intended.

Contextual Translation

In considering the use of the preposition in this sentence and the meaning of the sentence as a whole, it will be good to consider the larger context and in particular, the prior context. There are several layers of context from which to draw.

First, we have within verse 11 another use of the preposition *min*. The ground has opened its mouth to take the blood of Abel *from the hand of Cain*. This use of the preposition is clearly separative. The blood is coming *away from* or *out of* Cain's hand. It could be considered instrumental, but that seems unlikely. Keil followed this line of thinking in his commentary.[16]

A nearer context than this, however, is found at the end of the previous verse 10. The entire phrase מן האדמה is used there to indicate the source of the cry going out to God: "the sound of the blood of your

[16] Keil, *Commentary on the Old Testament*, 1:71.

brother crying out to me מן האדמה." This sentence leads directly into our passage "And now, you are cursed מן האדמה." The preposition is used to show the source or origin of the cry. It was coming from out of the ground. If we took this as parallel to our present passage, it would require the understanding that the curse was coming from out of the ground. Cassuto followed this opinion.[17]

Moving further away from our passage, we find the preposition used in 4:3, 4, 13, 14, and 16. None of these occurrences, however, have any grammatical relationship to the phrase under discussion here.

If we expand our context to include the word *cursed*, however, we find more interesting information. The phrase . . . מן . . . ארור occurs twice in the OT. Beside our context in 4:11 we find that the serpent was cursed מן כל הבהמה ובכל חית השדה in 3:14. The scarcity of this form is striking given two considerations. First, the root ארר occurs 63 times in the OT. The use of this root as a passive participle occurs 54 times. That we only find it in 2 of the 54 occurrences with the following preposition מן seems odd, or at least remarkable. But second, given that much of the usage of the curse formula in the OT is reserved for the blessings and curses in Numbers and Deuteronomy, and then given the dominant theme of cursing leading to expulsion from the land in Deuteronomy, if there were a typical formula with the meaning *you are cursed and removed from the land*, you would find it in Deuteronomy. But we don't. Since we don't find the passive participle used in this manner in the many formulaic uses of it, it would seem likely that we have a different understanding of its use in Genesis 3 and 4.

Two other passages in chapter 3 bear mention in regard to our passage in 4:11. First, we find cursing and the ground together in 3:17. We read that the land was cursed because of Adam's sin: ארורה האדמה בעבורך. It is remarkable that in Genesis 3, humanity is not cursed, or at worst, is cursed secondarily through the curse of the land. The curse that befalls the earth in 3:17 certainly links to the curse of Cain in 4:11. The result of the curse of the land was felt most importantly in the difficulty of Adam's future toil. The land would no longer easily yield its strength to Adam at his work. The produce would be difficult and only obtained through hard labor. Likewise, however we understand the curse of Cain in 4:11, it is clear that the result of that curse affected his ability to work the land and have it produce for him. In the same way, the curse of Cain affected his relationship with the land in similar, but more serious ways.

Second, the curse of the serpent in 3:14 must be compared to an earlier passage about the serpent. Genesis 3:1 reads והנחש היה ערום מכל חית

[17] Cassuto, *Genesis*, 219.

השדה ("The serpent was more crafty than all the wildlife"). So the curse in 3:14 takes on a special meaning in that context: ארור אתה . . . מכל חית השדה ("You are cursed more than all the wildlife"). The serpent changed from being *arum* to *arur*. In both of these verses, almost all English versions take these as comparative uses of the preposition.[18]

So we see the following progression in Genesis 3–4:

3:1 והנחש היה ערום מכל חית השדה
the serpent was crafty ***min*** all the wildlife.

3:14 ארור אתה מכל הבהמה ומכל חית השדה
You are cursed ***min*** all the cattle and ***min*** all the wildlife.

3:17 ארור האדמה בעבורך
The ground is cursed because of you.

4:11 ארור אתה מן האדמה
You are cursed ***min*** the ground.

These connections alone lead the reader to hear a repetition of a formula. It is more than a formula, however, because the reader is hearing the repetition of an idea or concept. The serpent changed from being the most clever to the most cursed. Then the reader learns that the ground has been cursed, but that in turn Cain becomes more cursed than the land. While it is difficult to speak for what an ideal reader or an original audience might suppose concerning a story, it would seem both from the structure of the language and from the larger, prior context that the story is advancing along the lines of this curse. The curse is expanding and deepening as it moves from serpent to land to Cain. It not only expands to Cain, but it also deepens if we take the comparative understanding of מן.

If this connection were all that we saw between chapters three and four, there would be sufficient cause to read the prepositional phrase in 4:11 as a comparative. There is another connection, however, that serves to connect the two narratives.

[18] One notable exception is Speiser's commentary, which consistently translates the formula *arur min* as separative. The Common English Bible takes 3:14 in a partitive sense *you are the one cursed out of all the farm animals*. The 1991 New American Bible translates this passage with a separative understanding of the preposition "you shall be banned from all the animals." The 2011 revision, however, changed this language to the comparative use.

In the second half of God's declaration to Eve in 3:16, he said, "Your desire will be to your husband, and he will rule over you." Note the Hebrew: ואל־אישך תשוקתך והוא ימשל־בך. Compare this statement with God's words to Cain in Gen 4:7 concerning sin's relationship to Cain: ואליך תשוקתו ואתה תמשל־בו. Allowing for the inflectional changes in person and gender, the two sentences are identical. The context of each statement, however, would seem to be entirely different, yet God expressed himself in the same way to both Eve and Cain about the way Eve would relate to Adam and personified sin would relate to Cain. While it is outside the bounds of this essay, I would argue that the translations of these two verses should be as similar as language and sense allows in order to mimic the matching of the two Hebrew sentences.

The patterning in these two chapters indicates that we do not have a new story in chapter four, but rather a continuation of the tragedy begun in chapter three.[19] As Sellers notes, the three blessings of chapters one and two—animals, mankind, the seventh day—have been followed by the three curses of chapters three and four—the serpent, the land, and Cain.[20]

If we shape the translation of 4:11 to match the translation of the same formula in 3:14, we must take one of two tacks. We can eliminate, it would seem, the instrumental sense of the preposition. That the curse against the serpent would come either through or from the other animals seems odd. We must conclude that the preposition should be taken as separative or comparative. Speiser, it was noted above, argues that both prepositions should be taken as separative and he does so by redefining the word ארר to mean "ban" or "banishment." His argument on the meaning of the word has been followed by some and has made its way into several translation traditions. The argument seems circular, however, because he seems intent on finding a definition that fits this particular context and then extending that definition to other passages rather than establishing a definition outside of this passage and then applying it here. In other words, while his definition can be seen to fit in many, but not all, other passages, it would nowhere else be thought of as the primary meaning.

[19] Cf. Alan J. Hauser, "Linguistic and Thematic Links between Genesis 4:1–16 and Genesis 2–3," *JETS* 23 (1980): 297–305, and Devora Steinmetz, "Vineyard, Farm, and Garden: The Drunkenness of Noah in the Context of Primeval History," *JBL* 113 (1994): 193–207. While Hauser points out several interesting links between these passages, he misses completely the connections made in the present work. He does not deal with the meaning of the curse in 4:11 other than to apparently accept uncritically Speiser's view. Steinmetz extends the links to include the conclusion of the Noah narrative.

[20] Sellers, 336.

He seems to be intent on finding a consistent separative use of the preposition and then imposing his own definition on the verb to make it fit.

Problems

Speiser does note one problem with a uniform comparative translation. He says that we have a problem with a comparative translation in 3:14. Could it accurately be said that the serpent was cursed more than the animals when they had not explicitly been cursed at that point in time? It does not seem a stretch, however, to say that God's statement to the serpent could be a use of hyperbole to emphasize the extent of the serpent's curse. Besides, to say that the serpent was cursed more than the other animals does not logically necessitate that the other animals had been cursed, but only that the serpent's curse was more severe than the non-existent curse of the animals.

Perhaps a more serious objection to translating our preposition in 4:11a as comparative lies in Cain's understanding of the curse. He complained after God's word to him that Yahweh had cast him out from upon the face of the earth and that he would be hidden from the face of Yahweh. Apparently whatever was meant in the curse, Cain took it as resulting in banishment.

This is a more serious problem but need not defeat the argument presented here. One could, as Sellers did, dismiss Cain's speech as hyperbole. I am not certain about the warrant for the hyperbole in this case, but if it suffices as a solution, then so be it. There are other options, however. More interesting, perhaps, is the possibility of an intentional wordplay that results in a rather clear example of Janus parallelism, in which one literary element has one meaning when seen in the preceding context, but then changes meaning in light of the succeeding context. If our understanding of the grammar of Genesis 3 is correct, then the reader who is approaching this text for the first time and who reads only as far as 4:11, I believe, would have no option but to understand the curse of Cain as a comparison showing the severity of Cain's curse compared to the curse on the ground in 3:17. It is only when one arrives at 4:14 that one sees a different possibility for understanding the grammar. Could it be that Yahweh and Cain, and then the author of Genesis, created a sort of wordplay with the prepositional phrase מן האדמה? I do not believe that the existence of this Janus parallelism here is necessary for the argument of this essay. It could simply be that Cain understood that the effects of this curse on him would include his banishment from the cursed land that he had

polluted with his brother's blood.[21] The existence of a wordplay at this point, however, would completely sew together the narratives of Genesis 3 and 4 into a whole piece. The destructive behavior of mankind in ever-increasing wickedness would be inescapable.

Conclusion

Based upon the larger context of Genesis 3 and 4 as well as the syntactic possibilities for the phrase ארור מן האדמה, I have concluded that it is best to translate Gen 4:11a as "you are more cursed than the ground."

If we translate the preposition in 3:14 as a comparative, then how does our translation affect our understanding of 4:11? If God said to Cain that he was cursed more than the land, we would seem to have a very important addition to our understanding of these chapters. It has been often noted that while the serpent and the land are cursed in chapter three, the two humans avoid directly being cursed. They did suffer the effects of the curse on the serpent and the land, but only secondarily. Now, with the murder of Abel in Genesis 4, mankind entered directly into the world of the cursed, joining the serpent and the earth. The curse on Cain, however, was not simply an addition to the curses of Genesis 3 but was specifically worse than those curses.

The narrative of the fall in chapter three is not a climax (or anti-climax) to which additional stories are added, but is rather the beginning of a longer decline. This decline is seen here in chapter four with the curse of Cain, continues with the boasting of Cain's descendant Lamech about his own evil in comparison to Cain (4:23–24), and then comes to a low point in Noah's generation in which "every inclination of his heart was only evil all the time" (6:5, 11–12). Cain's curse was not merely another type of curse or a kind of retelling or reapplication of the curse of the land in chapter three. Rather, it was very specifically an intensification of the tragedy of Genesis 3. While Adam's sin may have led to the sin of all men, it was clearly not the worst that mankind could or would do, as we see in the very next generation. Even Cain's sin was not the worst that mankind would do, as Lamech's boast would show and as Noah's generation made universal.

---

[21] In a similar way, Steinmetz implicitly accepts a bifurcated view of the meaning of the prepositional phrase. She accepts both the earth as the means of the curse and also in a separative sense taking Speiser's understanding of the curse as banishment. "[B]ecause Cain has violated the earth, the earth is the vehicle of Cain's punishment . . . and this curse constitutes a banishment from upon the earth" (Steinmetz, "Vineyard, Farm, and Garden," 201).

STR 8.1 (Spring 2017): 55–76

Rescuing Adam: Three Approaches to Affirming a Historical Adam

Kenneth D. Keathley
Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary

Over the past decade the creation/evolution debate among evangelicals has focused on one primary issue: the historicity of Adam and Eve. This article explores why this is so and surveys the approach taken by three conservatives to affirm the historicity of the original couple. Fazale Rana, C. John Collins, and John Walton are selected as representatives of the three primary approaches taken by evangelicals: concordist, semi-concordist, and non-concordist. These models demonstrate that adherence to Adam's historicity is a reasonable position. Evangelicals should not view the issue as trivial but continue to affirm the traditional view of Adam and Eve.

Key Words: archetypal Adam, biblical authority, concordism, creation, creationism, evolution, genetics, historical Adam, human genome.

The creation/evolution debate serves as a prime example of how academic specialization hinders as much as it helps. The discussion sprawls over a broad range of disciplines. In the natural sciences, biology, geology, and paleontology (just to name a few) are deeply involved. The theological side of the equation requires scholars in the Old and New Testaments, philosophers, historians, and theologians. All engage in the conversation. This article attempts to show why the discussion lately has focused on Adam and Eve and how some conservative evangelicals make the case for the historicity of the original couple.

The creation/evolution discussion is as big as it is broad—too big for any one researcher to master. In this field one must depend, more than ever, on the work of others. As we all know, dependence upon the scholarship of others has its own special perils. Which scholars? When it comes to creationism, there are three major tribes within evangelicalism, each promoting its own team of experts. Young-earth creationists (YEC), old-earth creationists (OEC), and evolutionary creationists (EC) all have their stable of fully credentialed specialists who argue their respective perspectives. Then there is the duckbilled platypus of the conversation—intelligent design (ID). ID defies easy categorization and therefore one can find advocates of ID within all three of the creationist camps.

The Hinge Issue

As sometimes happens with such big and bewildering subjects, one issue in particular becomes a cipher by which the larger picture is decoded. This cipher often comes to serve as a litmus test or (sometimes more darkly) as a shibboleth. Lately, the question about the historicity of Adam and Eve has started to perform this function. As Carl Trueman states, the historicity of Adam is "one of the big questions in the evangelical world at this time."[1] In this decade, evangelical scholars have published no less than a dozen books devoted exclusively to the subject.[2] What has happened to cause this flurry of activity? Why the focus on this particular question? In a word: genetics.

In the 1990s, Francis Collins directed the Human Genome Project, the multi-billion dollar research enterprise that first mapped the human DNA. A respected geneticist who has both a PhD and an MD, Collins had earlier played a pivotal role in the discovery of the genes responsible for a number of diseases—cystic fibrosis and Huntington's disease among them. For the past seven years he has served as director of the National Institutes of Health (NIH). In addition to being a world-renowned scientist and researcher, Collins is an evangelical who openly confesses his faith

[1] Carl Trueman, "Adam and Eve and Pinch Me," http://www.alliancenet.org/mos-beta/postcards-from-palookaville/adam-and-eve-and-pinch-me.

[2] Some examples are C. John Collins, *Did Adam and Eve Really Exist? Who They Were and Why You Should Care* (Wheaton: Crossway, 2011); Peter Enns, *The Evolution of Adam* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2012); Matthew Barrett and Ardel B. Caneday, eds. *Four Views on the Historical Adam* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2013); Hans Madume and Michael Reeves, *Adam, the Fall, and Original Sin: Theological, Biblical, and Scientific Perspectives* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2014); William Van Doodewaard, *The Quest for the Historical Adam: Genesis, Hermeneutics, and Human Origins* (Grand Rapids: Reformation Heritage, 2015); Karl W. Giberson, *Saving the Original Sinner: How Christians Have Used the Bible's First Man to Oppress, Inspire, and Make Sense of the World* (Boston: Beacon Press, 2015); Richard D. Phillips, ed. *God, Adam, and You: Biblical Creation Defended and Applied* (Phillipsburg: P&R, 2015); Richard Gaffin, Jr., *No Adam, No Gospel: Adam and the History of Redemption* (Phillipsburg: P&R, 2015); John H. Walton, with N. T. Wright, *The Lost World of Adam and Eve: Genesis 2–3 and the Human Origins Debate* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2015); Fazale Rana with Hugh Ross, *Who Was Adam? A Creation Model Approach to the Origin of Humanity* (2nd ed. 10-year update; Covina: RTB, 2015); Terry Mortenson, ed., *Searching for Adam: Genesis and the Truth about Man's Origin* (Green Forest: Master Books, 2016); and Dennis R. Venema and Scot McKnight, *Adam and the Genome* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2017).

in Christ.[3] He may be the most visible Christian in the scientific world today.

In 2006, Collins published *The Language of God: A Scientist Presents Evidence for Belief*. He gave his testimony of how he was converted from atheism to belief. Writing clearly and winsomely, Collins made a case for the Christian faith in a style reminiscent of C. S. Lewis, whose writings Collins credits with having a formative influence in his spiritual life. The book was a *New York Times* bestseller. However, what got the most attention was Collin's call to evangelicals to accept the scientific validity of Darwin's theory of evolution.

Collins argued for what he labeled "the BioLogos approach," a version of theistic evolution.[4] This approach contends that evangelical faith and evolutionary science can and should coexist in harmony. As for the historicity of the original couple, Collins appealed to the approach taken by C. S. Lewis. Lewis viewed Genesis 2 as teaching "a moral lesson" rather than presenting "a biography." He quotes Lewis at length:

> For long centuries, God perfected the animal form which was to become the vehicle of humanity and the image of Himself. He gave it hands whose thumb could be applied to each of the fingers, and jaws and teeth and throat capable of articulation, and a brain sufficiently complex to execute all of the material motions whereby rational thought is incarnated. The creature may have existed in this state for ages before it became man: it may even have been clever enough to make things which a modern archaeologist would accept as proof of its humanity. But it was only an animal because all its physical and psychical processes were directed to purely material and natural ends. Then, in the fullness of time, God caused to descend upon this organism, both on its psychology and physiology, a new kind of consciousness which could say "I" and "me," which could look upon itself as an object, which knew God, which could make judgments of truth, beauty and goodness, and which was so far above time that it could perceive time flowing past. . . . We do not know how many of these creatures God made, nor how long they continued in the Paradisal state. But sooner or later they fell. Someone or something whispered that they could become as

[3] When Collins was nominated to direct the NIH, some opposed his appointment because of his outspoken faith. See Sam Harris, "The Science Is in the Details," *New York Times* (July 26, 2009). http://www.nytimes.com/2009/07/27/opinion/27harris.html?_r=1&ref=opinion.

[4] Francis S. Collins, *The Language of God: A Scientist Presents Evidence for God* (New York: Free Press, 2006), 197–210.

> gods. . . . They wanted some corner in the universe of which they could say to God, "This is our business, not yours." But there is no such corner. They wanted to be nouns, but they were, and eternally must be, mere adjectives. We have no idea in what particular act, or series of acts, the self-contradictory, impossible wish found expression. For all I can see, it might have concerned the literal eating of a fruit, but the question is of no consequence.[5]

Like Lewis, Collins argued for a non-literal interpretation of Genesis 2. The Bible presents many events as having happened in a historically factual manner, but the account of Adam and Eve "frankly do not carry that same historical ring."[6]

In 2007, Collins founded the BioLogos Foundation as a science advocacy organization. Though he left shortly after its inception (to assume the directorship of the NIH), BioLogos has rapidly grown in influence, arguing for evolutionary creationism. The foundation leaves the issue of Adam and Eve as an open question, with some members affirming their historicity while others do not.

Some of the discoveries about the human genome seem to support the biblical account of human origins. First, the findings demonstrate clearly that we are all of one race. Everyone's DNA is 99.9 percent the same.[7] Genetically speaking, it makes no sense to talk about Caucasians, Africans, or Asians as belonging to different races. In fact, there is greater genetic variation within the so-called races than between them. Genetically speaking, skin color is a trivial difference. One might as well divide the human race by eye or hair color. We really are, as the apostle said, of one common blood (Acts 17:26).

Second, and even more to the point, research reveals that we all have a common mother and father. Analysis of mitochondrial DNA indicates that all humanity shares a single ancestral sequence that can be traced back to a solitary female ancestor. Studies of Y-chromosomal DNA indicate a similar ancestral sequence that points to a single male ancestor. Not surprisingly, these ancestors have come to be known, even in scientific circles, as "Mitochondrial Eve" and "Y-Chromosome Adam." Creationists argue that these findings harmonize very well with a traditional reading of Genesis 2 and provide empirical evidence that Adam and Eve were real

[5] C. S. Lewis, *The Problem of Pain* (New York, NY: Simon & Shuster, 1996), 68–71; quoted in Collins, *The Language of God*, 208–9.

[6] Francis Collins, *The Language of God*, 209.

[7] Ibid. 125–26.

people from whom the entire human race descended.[8]

Other genetics discoveries present challenges to the traditional understanding of the biblical narrative. For example, according to most models used by geneticists, the dates for Mitochondrial Eve and Y-Chromosome Adam go back much earlier than 10,000 BC. The results range from 50,000 to 150,000 years ago.[9] This creates few problems for OEC advocates but presents a dilemma for the YEC position.

In addition, evolutionary geneticists complain than creationists misinterpret the results concerning M-Eve and Y-Adam. Having them as common ancestors does not mean they were our original ancestors. Though for the most part the DNA of all humans is the same, nevertheless the diversity within the genome (according to current models) could not have come from two individuals. Instead of an original couple, comparative genomics point to an original population of around 10,000 people. Thus they conclude that, though M-Eve and Y-Adam were our common ancestors, they were not the only progenitors. BioLogos fellow Dennis Venema concludes, "As such, the hypothesis that humans are genetically derived from a single ancestral pair in the recent past has no support from a genomics perspective, and, indeed, is counter to a large body of evidence."[10]

Genomic findings pose other problems as well. Rather than beginning in Mesopotamia (the traditional understanding of Eden's location), humanity seems to have begun in Africa.[11] This has come to be known as the "Out-of-Africa" scenario.[12] In addition, Collins noted that, when the results of the Human Genome Project were first published, one of the first responses among scientists was surprise. Very little—less than two percent—of the DNA code seemed to have any active role.[13] The rest appeared to be "junk."[14] And to top it all off, the similarity between the

[8] Rana and Ross, *Who Was Adam?*, 66–70.

[9] Francis Collins, *The Language of God*, 126.

[10] Dennis R. Venema, "Genesis and the Genome: Genomics Evidence for Human-Ape Common Ancestry and Ancestral Hominid Population Sizes," *Perspectives on Science and Christian Faith* 62.3 (September 2010): 175.

[11] Francis Collins, *The Language of God*, 126.

[12] Rana and Ross, *Who Was Adam?*, 40–42.

[13] Francis Collins, *The Language of God*, 124–25.

[14] Collins noted that labeling those stretches of code as "junk DNA" was probably unwise, saying "a certain amount of hubris was required for anyone to call any part of the genome 'junk,' given our level of ignorance" (*The Language of God,* 111). Indeed, later research has determined than almost all of the genome performs some type of function, and very little can be described as "junk."

genomes of humans and chimpanzees turns out to be 98 percent.[15]

Should Evangelicals Say Goodbye to Adam?

In the early days of BioLogos, physicist Karl Giberson briefly served as president, Old Testament scholar Peter Enns as a senior fellow, and theologian Denis Lamoureux as a blog author. During their time with BioLogos, they argued (as they continue to argue) that evangelicals must relinquish adherence to the historicity of Adam and Eve.[16] We must do so, even though they admit that there will be some significant theological consequences when we do.

Enns candidly acknowledges the theological impact involved. Accepting evolution requires not just a change in our understanding of human origins, but also a reinterpretation of the nature of sin and of death.

> A true rapprochement between evolution and Christianity requires a synthesis, not simply adding evolution to existing theological formulations. . . . [T]he very nature of what sin is and why people die is turned on its head. Some characteristics that Christians have thought of as sinful—for example, in an evolutionary scheme the aggression and dominance associated with 'survival of the fittest' and sexual promiscuity to perpetuate one's gene pool—are understood as means of ensuring survival. Likewise, death is not the enemy to be defeated. . . . Death may hurt, but it is evolution's ally. . . . Evolution is not an add-on to Christianity: it demands synthesis. . . . Such a synthesis requires a willingness to rethink one's own convictions in light of new data, and that is typically a very hard thing to do.[17]

Enns is not calling for a Christian understanding of evolution, but an evolutionary understanding of Christianity. Lamoureux concurs with Enns' assessment of what the abandonment of a historical Adam does to the theological understanding of the relationship between sin and death: "To conclude, there is no sin-death problem. Adam never existed, and consequently, sin did not enter the world through him. Nor then did physical death arise as a divine judgment for his transgression, because once

[15] Ibid., 127.

[16] The fact that the three are no longer active with BioLogos indicates a shift within the organization. Many within BioLogos continue to understand Adam in non-historical terms, but a number of scholars have been brought in who do affirm a historical Adam, albeit in evolutionary terms.

[17] Enns, *The Evolution of Adam*, 147.

again, Adam never existed."[18]

Such theological shifts have ripple effects. Enns may not believe Adam was a real person, but he admits that the Apostle Paul did. He argues that the apostle's error does not matter because Paul's theological argument rests on Adam only as a representative.[19] This conclusion impacts, at the very least, one's understanding of the inspiration and inerrancy of Scripture. Giberson acknowledges this and provides a reply: "Traditionalists have forever understood that Christianity does not need an inerrant Bible any more than the United States needs an inerrant Constitution."[20]

Along with the authority of Scripture, jettisoning the original couple affects soteriology. With characteristic clarity Giberson declares, "There is no original sin and there was no original sinner."[21] This in turn leads some EC proponents to call for a move away from a penal substitutionary understanding of the Atonement. Dan Harlow argues: "Once the doctrine of original sin is reformulated, the doctrine of the atonement may likewise be deepened. But the new understanding of sin requires that we now favor theories of the atonement like the *Christus victor* model or the moral influence theory, instead of the theory of a ransom paid to the Devil or a satisfaction paid to God's honor."[22]

The pushback from conservative evangelical scholars has been clear and strong. Their position is summed up in the title of a brief pamphlet published by Richard Gaffin, Jr: *No Adam, No Gospel*.[23] They argue that Adam is more central to biblical theology than Enns and Giberson admit. The biblical genealogies connect Adam to Abraham (Genesis 5 and 11) and to the tribes of Israel (1 Chron 1–9), and Luke traces the genealogy of Jesus back to Adam (Luke 3). On a number of occasions both Jesus and Paul used the events of Genesis 1–3 to make a point (Matt 19:4–5; 1 Cor 11:7–12; 2 Cor 11:3; 1 Tim 2:13–14). In each instance it appears they understood the Genesis account to be historical. Paul draws parallels between Adam and Jesus more than once (Rom 5: 12–21; 1 Cor 15: 21–22). The theological changes advocated by Enns and Giberson are not trivial.

[18] Denis O. Lamoureux, *I Love Jesus and I Accept Evolution* (Eugene: Wipf and Stock, 2009), 148.

[19] Enns, *The Evolution of Adam*, 131–35.

[20] Giberson, *Saving the Original Sinner*, 165.

[21] Ibid., 176.

[22] Daniel Harlow, "After Adam: Reading Genesis in an Age of Evolutionary Science," *Perspectives on Science and Christian Faith* 62.3 (September 2010): 192.

[23] Examples include Madume and Reeves, *Adam, the Fall, and Original Sin*; Van Doodewaard, *The Quest for the Historical Adam*; Phillips, *God, Adam, and You*; and Gaffin, Jr., *No Adam, No Gospel*.

Conservative evangelicals cannot in good conscience abandon their commitment to the authority of Scripture or substitutionary atonement. In fact, a number of conservative EC proponents are balking at the direction that their progressive EC colleagues are headed.

This work agrees with the concerns of these conservative scholars. The remainder of this article surveys the approaches taken by three evangelical scholars who continue to argue for a historical Adam and Eve. Each approach attempts to take the scientific evidence seriously while affirming the inerrancy of the Bible.

Three Approaches to Affirming the Historical Adam

The attempt to understand what Genesis teaches about Adam and Eve in the light of the latest genetic findings brings up the question of "concordism." Concordism is typically understood as the attempt to reconcile science with the Bible, more specifically, the findings of science and the creation account of Genesis 1–2.[24] Reasons to Believe (RTB) is an old-earth apologetics organization committed to "soft" concordism. Hugh Ross, president and founder of RTB, makes a distinction between "hard" and "soft" concordism. Hard concordists believe that God embedded numerous scientific truths into the Bible that scientists can discover later by empirical means. (An example of hard concordism is the notion that Isa 40:22, "the circle of the earth," teaches that the earth is round, long before humans were able to know this in a demonstrable way.) Ross distances himself from this approach in favor of soft concordism. He explains,

> *Soft* concordists seek agreement between properly interpreted Scripture passages that describe some aspect of the natural realm and indisputably and well-established data in science . . . . [W]e must always guard ourselves from reading more into the biblical text than what the text actually warrants. When we overreach, we set ourselves up for possible embarrassment and the church at large for possible ridicule.[25]

For the purposes of this article, Ross' definition will be used. Thus the three approaches examined in this article can be categorized as concordist, semi-concordist, and non-concordist. Fazale Rana, C. John Collins, and

[24] Some define concordism more narrowly to refer specifically to the attempt to interpret Genesis 1 in light of the scientific findings of an ancient earth (typically by means of the day-age view or the gap theory).

[25] Hugh Ross, "Defending Concordism: Response to *The Lost World of Genesis One*," http://www.reasons.org/articles/defending-concordism-response-to-the-lost -world-of-genesis-one.

John Walton will serve as proponents of each of the respective positions. All three affirm a historical Adam and Eve. Of the three, Rana's approach most firmly affirmed a historical Adam (and for that reason is the most attractive to this author). Collins provides a theological and biblical framework for exploring the issue rather than a specific model. His contribution is less detailed, so this essay gives less attention to it than the other two models. BioLogos presently promotes Walton's model as an attractive approach for conservative evangelicals, so this article gives it the most consideration.

Concordism: The Testable Model of Fazale Rana

Fazale ("Fuz") Rana is a biochemist and prolific author who serves on staff at Reasons to Believe. In 2005, Rana along with Hugh Ross published *Who Was Adam* for the purpose of proposing a scientifically testable model of human origins. They explain, "[O]ur goal was to show that the biblical account of human origins possessed scientific credibility. To do this, we proposed a scientifically testable, biblically derived creation model for humanity's origin and early history."[26] Ten years later, in 2015, they republished the work. The second edition left the original work unchanged but added a 150-page supplement, which provided an update. The update acknowledged that some of the predictions made in the first edition have not panned out, but that overall the RTB model is viable.

Rana and Ross build their case for a historical Adam within the framework of a day-age interpretation of Genesis 1, contending that such an approach "readily accommodates, even anticipates, the scientific dates for the age of the universe and Earth."[27]

First, the RTB model contends that God directly and miraculously created Adam and Eve without using preexisting hominids.[28] Therefore, when genetics demonstrate that humanity can be traced back to one woman and one man (i.e., M-Eve and Y-Adam), this conforms to the creation account given in Genesis 2. The evolutionary approach taken by Francis Collins and Bio-Logos is rejected:

> Thus RTB's model for humanity's origin must reject any form of theistic evolution that doesn't posit God's direct involvement. The RTB model asserts that attempts to establish evolutionary relationships among the hominids in the fossil record and to identify the evolutionary pathways to modern humans will ultimately prove unfruitful.[29]

[26] Rana and Ross, *Who Was Adam?*, 14. In their attempts to provide a testable model they are joined by their young-earth counterparts. See Mortenson, *Searching for Adam*.

[27] Rana and Ross, *Who Was Adam?*, 46.

[28] Ibid., 47.

Second, the RTB model contends that all humanity derives from this original couple.[30] Therefore, rather than merely being one member of a small population, Adam was the progenitor of the original small population that genetic research seems to have discovered. Rana and Ross contend that current genomic models make assumptions that practically insure results that require an evolutionary interpretation. Other mathematical models point to an original, solitary couple.[31]

Third, Rana and Ross argue that the region designated by Genesis 2 as "Eden" extends across the Middle East to include eastern Africa.[32] The biblical text mentions four rivers. Two—the Tigris and the Euphrates—are easily recognized. The other two—the Pishon and Gihon—are not so easily identified. Rana and Ross suggest that these rivers could correspond to the Blue and White Niles.[33] If so, then this would mean that current day Ethiopia was also part of Eden, and thus the "out-of-Africa" scenario would be compatible with the biblical record.

Fourth, the RTB model contends that God created Adam and Eve relatively recently (i.e., in old earth terms). By relatively recently, Rana and Ross mean somewhere between 10,000 and 100,000 years ago.[34]

The fifth point answers a question that naturally arises from the previous point. Multiple species of hominids, from *homo erectus* to Neanderthal, can be found in the fossil record. According to scientific consensus, hominids date back over a million years ago. What was the relationship of Adam and Eve to the hominids? Rana and Ross argue that there is no genetic relationship:

[29] Ibid., 48.

[30] Ibid.

[31] Other ID and OEC mathematicians and geneticists make a similar argument. See Ola Hössjer, Ann K. Gauger, and Colin Reeves, "Genetic Modeling of Human History Part 1: Comparison of Common Descent and Unique Origin Approaches," *Bio-Complexity* (2016); http://bio-complexity.org/ojs/index.php/main/article/viewArticle/BIO-C.2016.3.

[32] Ibid., 48–50.

[33] John Sailhamer seems to hold to a similar interpretation. See John Sailhamer, *Genesis Unbound: A Provocative New Look at the Creation Account* (2nd ed.; Colorado Springs: Dawson, 2011), 75–84.

[34] Rana and Ross, *Who Was Adam?*, 50–51.

> The RTB model maintains that while human beings reflect God's image in their activities, hominids did not. The model asserts that humans are uniquely spiritual and hominids were not. The archeological record associated with hominid fossils supplies key data to evaluate this prediction.[35]

The RTB model asserts that hominids were neither truly human nor were they modern humanity's ancestors. Though human beings share characteristics with other animals (especially hominids), humanity was created in God's image and, as such, displays unique characteristics distinct from all other creatures. Human culture manifests and reflects the divine image.

Accordingly, archeological evidence reveals the time of humanity's origin. Archeological findings show that about 40,000 years ago human culture suddenly appeared and then expanded explosively. Rana sees this as the anthropological equivalent of the Big Bang. He explains, "I see this sociocultural big bang as a signature for God's intervention, denoting the creation of the first humans—creatures that uniquely bear God's image"[36] The creation of the original couple is not clearly evident in the physiological and anatomical artifacts of fossil record. One must look to the archeological evidence instead.

Just as the fifth point answers a question raised by the fourth, the sixth point answers a question raised by the fifth. If humans did not descend from the hominids, then why are there such similarities? Humans share anatomical, physical, biochemical, and genetic similarities with the extinct hominids, great apes, and other animals. For his answer, Rana and Ross point to the work of the biologist Sir Richard Owen, a contemporary of Darwin. Owen argued that homologous (i.e. similar) structures indicate that God used "archetypes" in creating:

> [B]oth man and animals were fashioned by the Creator from the same substance and design template. It follows, then, that anatomical, physiological, biochemical, and genetic similarities should exist between humans and other animals, including the '99% genetic similarity' between humans and chimpanzees. In other words, shared features reflect common design, not common descent.[37]

[35] Ibid., 53.

[36] Fazale Rana, "Who Was Adam? An Old-Earth Creation Model for the Origin of Humanity," in *More than Myth? Seeking the Full Truth about Genesis, Creation and Evolution* (ed. Paul D. Brown and Robert Stackpole; Reston, VA: Chartwell, 2014), 172.

[37] Ibid., 168.

Shared features reveal that certain archetypes served as recurring templates or blueprints. Therefore we should not be surprised by biological similarities.

With the RTB model, Rana and Ross present a hypothesis that they hope is testable. They recognize that the model will have to undergo "adjustments and fine-tuning" as further scientific discoveries are made. Acknowledging such adjustments was, in fact, the primary purpose of the second edition to *Who Was Adam?* They candidly admit that some of the model's predictions have not panned out, but they argue that, as a whole, the model is still a viable working theory.

Semi-Concordism: The Mere Adam-and-Eveism of C. John Collins

C. John "Jack" Collins teaches Old Testament at Covenant Theological Seminary in St. Louis, MO, and is author of *Did Adam and Eve Really Exist? Who They Were and Why You Should Care*. He does not call his approach "semi-concordism" as such. However, he contrasts concordism with "anti-concordism" and places his position somewhere in between. Collins explains, "If the account in Genesis intends to make an historical reference, then—at least in theory—it may be *possible* to find some connection between its subject matter and the results of other fields of study."[38] A robust, full-fledged scientifically testable model constructed from Scripture may or may not be possible, but some areas of congruence between the claims of the biblical authors and the findings of science should be evident. So the label of "semi-concordism" to Collins' approach seems appropriate.

In *Did Adam and Eve Really Exist?* Collins takes an approach that he calls "mere historical Adam-and-Eveism," following the pattern of the "mere Christianity" set by C. S. Lewis.[39] Like Lewis, Collins does not think a believer should simply remain at this "mere" level. Rather, he hopes to provide a platform—an irreducible common denominator—that gives guidance to those involved in researching the issue. Therefore, Collins doesn't address issues such as "the origin of the material for Adam's body, or how long ago he lived." Nor does he address the doctrine of original sin or how the first two chapters of Genesis relate to each other.

[38] John Collins, *Did Adam and Eve Really Exist?*, 105–7 (emphasis original).

[39] Ibid., 14. In other works Collins does address many of these issues. See C. John Collins, *Science and Faith: Friends or Foes?* (Wheaton: Crossway, 2003); and idem, *Genesis 1–4: A Linguistic, Literary, and Theological Commentary* (Phillipsburg: P&R, 2006).

Collins is an old-earth creationist who affirms a *de novo* creation of Adam and Eve. He does not think the author of Genesis "intended to relay 'straight history,' with a minimum of figurative language." Rather he argues that the "author was talking about what he thought were actual events, using rhetorical and literary techniques to shape the readers' attitudes towards those events."[40]

So what does "mere Adam-and-Eveism" look like? Without embracing or rejecting the latest consensus on genetics, Collins advises caution:

> At this point I am mostly asking that we be careful. This is why I have sought ways to allow advocates of these conclusions to stay within the bounds of sound thinking. In other words, even if someone is persuaded that humans had "ancestors" and that the human population has always been more than two he does not *necessarily* have to ditch all traditional views of Adam and Eve, and I have tried to provide for these possibilities more than to contend for my particular preferences on these matters.[41]

Collins argues that "sound thinking" requires four criteria.[42] First, the origin of the human race must be understood as something greater than merely the product of natural development. Humans possess the divine image, and it is difficult to see how this could emerge from merely evolutionary processes. Second, Adam and Eve must be understood as "the headwaters of the human race." Otherwise the unity of the human race is lost, along with humanity's collective and individual dignity and moral responsibility.

Third, we must affirm the historicity of the Fall, along with its corporate culpability. In addition, the Fall should be understood to have "occurred at the beginning of the human race." Fourth, any attempt to merge evolutionary theory with a historical Adam and Eve must somehow preserve the notion of Adam's federal headship. This is to preserve the New Testament teaching concerning original sin. Collins does not rule out a scenario in which Adam is the head of a small tribe.

In many ways Collins' approach mirrors that of Francis Schaeffer.[43] Like Schaeffer, he advocates a "humble openness" that affirms a set of non-negotiable biblical parameters while expressing a willingness to consider alternative interpretations.

[40] John Collins, *Did Adam and Eve Really Exist?*, 16–17.

[41] Ibid., 120 (emphasis original).

[42] Ibid., 120–21.

[43] Francis Schaeffer, *Genesis in Time and Space: The Biblical Flow of History* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 1972).

Non-Concordism: The Archetypal Adam of John Walton

John Walton is professor of Old Testament at Wheaton College and he serves on BioLogos' advisory council. In a series of books he argues for a functional interpretation of Genesis 1–2 and for an archetypal understanding of Adam.[44]

Concerning evolution as a viable scientific theory, Walton professes agnosticism.[45] He takes pains to affirm his commitment to the Chicago Statement on Inerrancy.[46] His prominent role at BioLogos is indicative of the shift in emphasis and approach there. The organization still takes a broad tent attitude concerning the historicity of Adam, but the leadership recognizes that if they hope to get a hearing among conservative evangelicals they must demonstrate that evolutionary creationism is at least compatible with affirmations of inerrancy.

Walton's position can be presented under six points: (1) the creation account of Genesis 1–2 provides no scientific revelation; (2) the seven days of creation should be understood as a literary or theological framework; (3) Genesis 1–2 portrays God as ordering creation to be his sacred temple; (4) Genesis 1–2 deals only with functional ordering rather than material origins; (5) Genesis 1–2 are chronologically sequential rather than parallel accounts covering the same time period and events; and (6) the biblical authors viewed Adam primarily in archetypal terms. The first three of Walton's points are shared by a substantial number of other Old Testament scholars; the last three are more innovative. The way Walton presents his position as a coherent whole makes his argument an intriguing yet problematic option. Those who wish to embrace both current evolutionary theory and a high view of Scripture find his proposal very attractive.

First, Walton takes a firmly non-concordist approach to interpreting Genesis 1–2, arguing that the creation account provides no scientific revelation. The Bible communicates within the worldview of its original audience. However, contra evolutionary creationists such as Denis Lamoureux, Walton contends that this does not mean the biblical authors

[44] John Walton, *The Lost World of Genesis One: Ancient Cosmology and the Origins Debate* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2009); idem, *Genesis 1 as Ancient Cosmology* (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2011); and idem, *The Lost World of Adam and Eve: Genesis 2–3 and the Human Origins Debate.*

[45] John Walton, "A Historical Adam," in *Four Views on the Historical Adam* (ed. Matthew Barrett and Ardel B. Caneday; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2013), 114.

[46] John Walton with D. Brent Sandy, *The Lost World of Scripture: Ancient Literary Culture and Biblical Authority* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2013), 9–14.

affirmed error. The author of Genesis utilizes the worldview of the ANE without affirming it. The accounts have nothing to say about the age of the earth or the process by which things were made. This means there is no new scientific information embedded in the text.

Second, Walton accepts that the seven days of creation form a literary or theological framework.[47] The framework view sees Gen 1:1 as providing a summary statement for the creation account. Verse 2 presents the earth initially as unformed and unfilled. The first three days recount the forming; last three days give the filling. On the seventh day God rests, in the sense of taking his throne. Thus the seven days are understood to be a topical arrangement rather than a chronological report.

On this point Walton is in agreement with other Old Testament commentators such as Meredith Kline, who first posited the days of Genesis 1 as a literary framework.[48] However, he chides framework proponents for not going far enough, since they generally do not recognize the text primarily to be teaching functional ordering instead of material origins (a point we will examine later).[49]

A third theme argued by Walton is what is sometimes described as the temple inauguration view. This theory sees the creation account in Genesis 1–2 to be presenting God as ordering the cosmos to be his sacred space.[50] The six days of creation are the acts of God whereby he inaugurates the world to be his temple, culminating with him taking possession of his throne on the seventh day (the "rest" of the Sabbath day is his enthronement).

The ancient near-Eastern religions commonly connected the temples of their respective deities with the cosmos. In addition to the ancient near-Eastern evidence, both Old and New Testaments present the temple motif. The Tabernacle, the Temple, and the New Jerusalem all point to creation as God's Temple. Eden was the original Holy of Holies, where God and humanity met face-to-face. On this point, like the previous two points, Walton can marshal support from a significant number of conservative biblical scholars such as Greg Beale.[51] For the next three points,

[47] Walton, *The Lost World of Genesis One*, 38.

[48] Meredith Kline, "Because It Had Not Rained," *WTJ* 20.2 (May, 1958): 146–57.

[49] Walton, *The Lost World of Genesis One*, 312.

[50] Ibid., 72–86; *The Lost World of Adam and Eve*, 47–52.

[51] G. K. Beale, *The Temple and the Church's Mission: A Biblical Theology of the Dwelling Place of God* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2004); *The Erosion of Inerrancy in Evangelicalism: Responding to the New Challenges to Biblical Authority* (Wheaton: Crossway, 2008); and *God Dwells Among Us: Expanding Eden to the Ends of the Earth* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2014). Significant to the topic at hand, Beale wrote *The Erosion of Inerrancy* in response to the arguments made by Peter Enns. Specifically as it pertains to Walton's project, in chapters entitled "Can Old Testament Cosmology Be Reconciled with Modern Scientific Cosmology?" (Parts 1 and 2), Beale argues for the non-concordist approach of the temple motif. Beale seems to be arguing that, not only is the non-concordist approach compatible with inerrancy, but perhaps it is the preferable approach.

however, Walton takes a lonelier venture.

Walton, fourth, contends that Genesis 1–2 deals only with functional ordering, therefore the opening chapters tell us nothing about material origins.[52] Walton affirms *creatio ex nihilo* as Christian doctrine, but he does not think that is the point of Genesis 1–2. Nor he does think the text deals with *de novo* creation. Creation is not the point. Rather, the focus is on establishing order out of disorder by the assigning of roles. In Genesis 1, God names the elements in heaven and earth. The act of naming is the speech act of God establishing his sovereign rule over the elements. Then in Genesis 2, God brings the animals for Adam to name. This similar process of naming establishes the man's role as God's vice-regent over the other creatures. If Walton's thesis is right, then Genesis 1–2 tells us nothing about material origins. This does not argue in favor of evolution, but it would mean that the debate about evolution is misguided.[53]

When God established functional order, he declared it "good." This does not mean that creation was completed in an original state of pristine perfection. Walton explains, "For example, the same description is given to the Promised Land (Numbers 14:7), though it is filled with enemies and wicked inhabitants, not to mention wild animals who are predators."[54] "Good" and "perfect" are not to be understood as synonyms. If his interpretation is correct, then this would provide a response to those (generally in the young-earth camp) who contend there was no animal death before Adam's fall.

Fifth, Walton argues that the first two chapters of Genesis are sequential rather than parallel.[55] Typically, Genesis 2 is understood to be an expanded retelling of the creation account of Genesis 1, particularly the events of the sixth day. In this understanding, Genesis 1 speaks of the

[52] Walton, *The Lost World of Genesis One*, 23–71; idem, *The Lost World of Adam and Eve*, 24–44

[53] Walton, *The Lost World of Genesis One*, 132–41, 170.

[54] Walton, *The Lost World of Adam and Eve*, 57.

[55] Ibid., 63–70.

creation of humanity in general ("pre-adamites," if you will),[56] while Genesis 2 presents God's interaction with a particular individual—Adam. In other words, God first created humans (though Genesis 1 does not tell us the means by which he created us), then God chose to enter into a relationship with Adam and Eve (Genesis 2). They are not the first humans to exist, but they are the first humans to have a relationship with God.

When the text speaks of God forming Adam from the dust of the ground (2:7), Walton understands this to be an archetypal statement of Adam's mortality, not an explanation of his origin. Walton posits a similar approach to the account concerning Eve (2:21–23). Adam's "deep sleep" was a revelatory vision rather than unconsciousness. When the text speaks of God removing a rib from Adam, this should not be understood as a surgical procedure, nor as an account of Eve's origin. Rather, Adam's "side" does not refer to his body (and certainly not to one of his ribs), but to his "half" or "counterpart." He explains, "Consequently, we would then be able to conclude that the text does not describe the material origin of Eve. The vision would concern her identity as ontologically related to the man. The text would therefore have no claims to make about the material origin of woman."[57] Rather than material origins, Genesis 2 presents Adam and Eve as the archetypal man and woman.

Which brings us to Walton's archetypal understanding of Adam, and this is the main thesis of his argument. He states, "The core proposal of this book is that the forming accounts of Adam and Eve should be understood archetypally rather than as accounts of how those two individuals were uniquely formed."[58] By archetype, he means that Adam represents humanity. Adam operates as a universal symbol that has a common and recurring representation. Though he argues for understanding Adam primarily as an archetype, Walton is careful to affirm Adam and Eve as historical persons. He explains:

> In the view that I present here, I believe that Adam and Eve were real people who existed in a real past in time and space; but I believe that both in Genesis and in the New Testament, there is more interest in them as archetypes (notwithstanding their reality). Abraham was a real person in a real past, but the New Testament shows its interest in him as an archetype when it identifies him as the father of all who believe (Rom. 4:11–12).[59]

[56] For a fascinating discussion of the various pre-adamite theories proposed from the Reformation to the current day, see David N. Livingstone's *Adam's Ancestors: Race, Religion, and the Politics of Human Origins* (Baltimore: John Hopkins: 2008). The first Christian author to posit that the human race existed before Adam appears to have been Isaac La Peyrere (1596–1676). La Peyrere published *Men before Adam* in 1655, and within one year over a dozen refutations were in print (26).

[57] Walton, *The Lost World of Adam and Eve*, 80.

[58] Ibid., 74.

Just as Paul utilizes Abraham as an archetype, so the apostle also portrays Adam in similar terms. By archetype, Walton does not mean prototype. He distinguishes between the two: "A prototype is the first in a series that serves as a model for subsequent production. It establishes a pattern but is otherwise unrelated to the later products. In contrast, an archetype serves as a representative of all other."[60] Walton argues that rather than being "Primeval Man" (a prototype), Adam should be understood as "Everyman" (an archetype).

This archetypal understanding is similar to and is (seemingly) compatible with a federal view of Adam but should not be understood to be the same as federal headship. Walton explains the distinction: "Such representation could be either as an archetype (all are embodied in the one and counted as having participated in the acts of the one) or as a federal representative (in which one is serving as an elect delegate on behalf of the rest)."[61]

Walton's archetypal proposal is comprehensive, learned, and innovative. It incorporates many elements of other models currently proposed by other evangelical Old Testament scholars (i.e., the temple inauguration view, the literary framework view, and others). Walton makes extensive use of the ancient near-Eastern literature, and he demonstrates that the Genesis account interacts with (but does not accept) the theological viewpoints of the competing cosmogonies of the surrounding cultures. He admits his model is innovative, particularly his claims that Genesis 1–2 are chronologically sequential and address functional concerns rather than material origins. Walton puts together a fairly complete paradigm.

Walton is also to be commended for his concern about core theological beliefs. He affirms the inerrancy of Scripture, the historicity of Adam and Eve, and the subsequent historicity of the Fall. If his proposal is viable, then it removes practically all of the significant obstacles in the current creation/evolution debate. Walton does not resolve the debate; he doesn't attempt to do so. Rather, he intends to render it moot. This is why Jim Stump, senior editor at BioLogos says, "Reading Walton's book

[59] Walton, "A Historical Man: Archetypal Creation View," 90.

[60] Ibid.

[61] Walton, *The Lost World of Adam and Eve*, 61.

helped me become a biblically fulfilled evolutionary creationist."[62]

However, the archetypal proposal has a number of significant weaknesses. First, it abandons Adam and Eve as the common ancestors of humanity. A federal understanding of Adam is still viable in this model, but not Adam and Eve as the original humans. This is not a minor problem. As Richard Gaffin explains,

> But this view is faced with an insuperable difficulty: Adam is not simply the "first"; he is that, "first," only for those who "bear [his] image" (I Cor. 15:49). *Image bearers of Adam* is hardly an apt, much less valid or even intelligible, description of human beings who are held either to have existed before Adam or subsequently not to have descended from him. Adam is representative of *all* who, by descending from him, are in natural union or solidarity with him, and he represents *only* them.[63]

Even a sequential understanding of Genesis 1–2 does not remove the difficulties Gaffin highlights.

Second, the purely functional understanding of Genesis one has not convinced most other Old Testament scholars.[64] Walton admits his functional interpretation is an outlier. He claims, "This is not a view that has been rejected by other scholars; it is simply one they have never considered because their material ontology was a blind presupposition for which no alternative was ever considered."[65] It is true that many Old Testament scholars do not see *creatio ex nihilo* ("creation out of nothing") in Genesis 1–2, but very few think that *de novo* creation is also absent.

In a way, Walton's functional interpretation sounds surprisingly modern. He argues that the ancient readers would not have understood the modern distinction between material and functional (teleological or final) causation. Without a doubt, a distinctive feature of the scientific revolution was the shift away from teleological to material causation. Ask someone today why it rains and one will likely get an explanation of the evaporation, condensation, and precipitation cycle. The person answering probably will not be aware that he gave a material answer to a teleological

[62] James Stump, "A Biblical Fulfilled Evolutionary Creationist," in *How I Changed My Mind about Evolution: Evangelicals Reflect on Faith and Science* (ed. Kathryn Applegate and J. B. Stump; Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2016), 118.

[63] Gaffin, *No Adam, No Gospel*, 12 (emphasis original).

[64] For examples, see C. John Collins, "Review of *The Lost World of Genesis One*," *Reformed Academic* (November 2009): 1–8; and Richard Averbeck, "The Lost World of Adam and Eve: A Review Essay," *Themelios*, 40.2 (August, 2015): 226–40.

[65] Walton, *The Lost World of Genesis One*, 44.

question. A Hellenist from the Classic era would have given the teleological answer: "Because the grass needs to be watered." However, a Hebrew living during the time of Genesis 1–2 would simply have said, "Because God made it rain." The ancient Hebrew does not seem to have distinguished between levels of causation in a way that resembles Aristotelian categories.

Walton's argument seems to hinge on the notion that the original audience would have been interested only in functional/teleological/final causes. Even if we grant that the account in Genesis 1–2 focuses primarily on function or role (as Walton himself points out), the ancient audience would have understood origin and function as a unified whole. Recognizing the functional nature of naming does not eliminate the ontological claims of origination from the texts. It appears that Walton overstates his case, and this is unfortunate, because the point he makes—that the focus of Genesis 1–2 is primarily on functional ordering—is an important and helpful insight.

Third, Walton's sequential interpretation of Genesis 1–2 has not convinced most other Old Testament scholars. Jack Collins points out that traditional rabbinic readings took the activities of Genesis 2 to be an elaboration of the sixth day of Genesis 1.[66] More importantly, in Matt 19:3–9 Jesus combined Gen 1:27 with Gen 2:24 in a way that strongly indicates that he understood the two passages to be speaking of the same creation event.

Concluding Observations

I confess that my sympathies lie with Rana and Ross's concordist approach, but even they admit that it faces challenges. The jury is still out; the discussion is ongoing. After considering all three models, several areas that need further work become evident. First, there appears to be significant disagreement about what role the ancient near-Eastern texts should take in interpreting Genesis. Some, such as Bill Barrick, accuse Walton of allowing the ANE evidence to have a "magisterial role."[67] Inerrantists generally see the original audience's understanding of the text as a key component to properly interpreting the text today. So Barrick's accusation may be unfair to Walton, but the concern he raises is valid.

Second, there needs to be a clearer understanding of how the concept of divine accommodation fits into a robust doctrine of inerrancy. Using

[66] C. John Collins, "Response from the Old-Earth View," 127.

[67] William Barrick, "Old Testament Evidence for a Literal, Historical Adam and Eve," in *Searching for Adam*, 17–18, 23, 44–45.

the insights developed by Kevin Vanhoozer about speech-act theory, Walton's approach to accommodation is to locate inspiration at the locution of the text (what the text says), but inerrancy in its illocution (what the text means).[68] He points out that the Chicago Statement on Inerrancy carefully locates inerrancy "in all that is affirmed." There is a world of difference between understanding inspiration to have accommodated limited capacity and understanding it to have accommodated error. Enns, Giberson, and Lamoureux understand accommodation in the latter sense, and this understanding falls short of a proper view of Scripture.

Third, the question remains as to whether or not Gen 1:1–2:3 presents *creatio ex nihilo*. My conviction is that it does, but the matter appears to be an item of debate among evangelical Old Testament scholars.[69] There is general agreement that the Bible as a whole teaches *creation ex nihilo*. But whether or not this is the point of Genesis 1–2 remains a matter of debate.

Fourth, we must recognize the shadow cast by scientific discoveries over biblical interpretation. No evangelical who holds to a high view of biblical authority wishes to give science a magisterial role. However, the discussion about the proper relationship between the natural sciences and biblical interpretation continues.

Fifth, the present debate reminds us that there are still unresolved issues concerning the Augustinian view of original sin (and its various derivatives). A proper understanding of original sin was an ongoing theological controversy long before Darwin ever put pen to page, but now the matter is even more acute.

As the conversation progresses, there are number of core beliefs that evangelicals must continue to affirm. First, any creation model worthy of the name evangelical must submit to the authority of Scripture. To echo Jack Collins, "We must decide whether we accept the authority of Jesus; and that authority includes his right to have people like Moses, Paul, and

[68] Walton and Sandy write, "Accommodation on the part of the divine communicator resides primarily in the locution, in which genre and rhetorical devices are included. These involve the form of the communication. Yet our conviction is that even though God accommodates the communicator and his audience in the trappings and framework of locution, he will not accommodate an erroneous illocution on the part of the human communicator. We are therefore distancing ourselves from Sparks with regard to the extent and nature of accommodation" (*The Lost World of Scripture*, 42).

[69] See J. Daryl Charles, ed., *Reading Genesis 1–2: An Evangelical Conversation* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2013). For a sustained argument for *creatio ex nihilo* in Genesis 1, see Paul Copan and William Lane Craig, *Creation Out of Nothing: A Biblical, Philosophical, and Scientific Exploration* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2004).

John as his authorized messengers, who show us how to interpret the redemptive story . . . [I]t seems to me that Adam and Eve at the headwaters of the human family, and their fall, are not only what Jesus believed but also an irremovable part of that whole story."[70]

Even many evolutionary creationists realize that there has been a problem within their camp. At a BioLogos meeting, Tim Keller declared: "I don't believe Genesis 1 can be taken literally because I don't think the author expected us to. But Paul is different. He most definitely wanted to teach us that Adam and Eve were real historical figures. When you refuse to take a biblical author literally when he clearly wants you to do so, you have moved away from the traditional understanding of the biblical authority."[71]

Second, evangelicals must recognize that Adam and the Fall figure prominently in biblical theology. This includes both testaments. Some have tried to minimize the role Adam plays in the Old Testament after Genesis 3. Yet as Jack Collins points out, "[T]he Old Testament as a whole seems to assume that sin is an alien intruder; it disturbs God's good creation order."[72] Similarly, the New Testament views the creation of Adam and his subsequent Fall as historical events.

Finally, evangelicals must be willing to engage candidly with recent scientific discoveries. This is true even when they require us to examine carefully our understanding of the events recounted in the first 11 chapters of Genesis. In the providence of God, the 21st-century Church finds itself ministering at a time when amazing and exciting advances are being made, particularly in genetics. We do not currently have a complete resolution to all challenges, but these challenges do not appear insurmountable. Evangelicals must continue to affirm the historicity of the original couple.

[70] Collins, *Did Adam and Eve Really Exist?*, 134–35.

[71] Tim Keller, "Creation, Evolution, and Christian Laypeople." http://biologos.org/uploads/projects/Keller_white_paper.pdf.

[72] C. John Collins, "Adam and Eve in the Old Testament," in *Adam, the Fall, and Original Sin*, 17.

STR 8.1 (Spring 2017): 77–107

Book Reviews

Brian Wintle, ed. *South Asia Bible Commentary: A One-Volume Commentary on the Whole Bible*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2015. 1807 pp. Hardback. ISBN 978-0310286868. $44.99.

Home to greater ethno-linguistic and religious diversity than any other region of the world, South Asia has no *single* worldview. In contrast, the Bible had numerous divinely inspired human authors spanning nearly two thousand years, yet it has proven to be both timeless and truly transculturally relevant. These two great realities met in 2015 with the release of the *South Asia Bible Commentary (SABC)*. The brainchild of the Langham Partnership, founded by John Stott and now stewarded by Christopher J. H. Wright, this single-volume commentary has the distinction of being the first written *by* and *for* a diverse South Asian population that makes up nearly one-fifth of the world's population. In his foreword Ajith Fernando notes, "The needs here are so great that we cannot afford the luxury of pure (scholarly) specialization. But this source of frustration has given us an opportunity to sharpen a skill that could well be our distinctive contribution to the world of biblical scholarship: the skill of integration" (p. v). So, while intended for South Asian "pastors, lay preachers and teachers who are being trained," this volume has the potential to shed light on many a western theological blind spot.

Its ninety-two contributors (none expatriate) are all currently living and ministering in one of the eight SAARC countries: Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Bhutan, India, the Maldives, Nepal, Pakistan, or Sri Lanka. However, whenever contributors are gathered from various denominations and worldviews, the theological drift often associated with ecumenism is suspect. Yet one of the ways this volume avoids that potential is by recruiting contributors that affirm and adhere to the Lausanne Covenant. In its own words, "This commentary upholds the divine inspiration and authority of Holy Scripture. Its general aim is to interpret the word of God to speak relevantly to South Asian realities today. It seeks to equip Christian leaders at the grassroots level—pastors, students and lay leaders—who under the guidance of the Holy Spirit can be instrumental in the establishment and nurture of a vibrant church in this region" (p. vi). The commentary is based upon the NIV 2011 and seeks to "explain the meaning of the text, relate the meaning to the context and apply it to wider life and ministry" (p. vi).

One of this reviewer's primary concerns at this valiant attempt of an

applied ethno-hermeneutic is that, though South Asian, no small number of its contributors were trained in a western context. Though these men and women do view the world through distinctively South Asian eyes, their vision has surely been shaped by their wearing, even if only for a season, western educational "lenses." So, one must ask whether the outcome is truly a "South Asian" commentary, or some hybrid that is perhaps more reflective of a blend of eastern and western thinking. Add to this the fact that the volume is published only in English (to my knowledge there has been no attempt to provide translated versions), the scholarship herein has a limited audience. Missiologists note that much of the growth of the church in South Asia is occurring in places and among people that are not English-speaking. And most of the local indigenous leadership in those movements has no formal educational or theological training. It thus remains to be seen whether the insights of a volume like this will make their way into the non-traditional churches that are multiplying throughout the region.

As to structure, each of the Bible's 66 books are prefaced with an Introduction and Outline to aid the reader in understanding context, themes, relevance and preaching units. Those units are then identified within the text of Scripture by the addition of sub-headings. Bold and italic make key words and verses stand out where commentary is being provided. Application points that are often distinctively South Asian are dispersed throughout. Each book then has a list of recommended further reading—all of which is also English-medium. In addition, articles are provided throughout, dealing with distinctively South Asian topics from a biblical perspective. Examples include "Resurrection and Reincarnation," "Pilgrimages and Holy Places," "Gurus and Godmen," "Dalits," "Indigenous Music and Worship," "Caste," "South Asian Responses to Christ," "Christian Bhakti," "God among Other Gods," "Yoga and Meditation," and "Avatar and Incarnation" among others.

A brief survey of key texts shaping the biblical grand meta-narrative yielded interpretations that were both insightful and helpful for my own decades-long ministry in and among South Asians. These exegetical spot-checks also drew attention to some of my own culturally-based theological blind-spots. Perhaps all students of the Bible would benefit from the global community and such diversity of insight, characterized by theologically sound and contextually informed interpretation.

In conclusion, though the *SABC* certainly has several weaknesses, overall it is a helpful volume that is a step in the right direction. For far too long western missionaries have exported their own culturally-biased hermeneutics into the South Asian context, rendering churches there subject to theological paternalism. Though this volume does not eliminate

those biases, it does begin the long arduous process of helping South Asian members of the majority world church to fill a respected seat at the table of biblical scholarship.

George Robinson
Wake Forest, North Carolina

Miles V. Van Pelt, ed. *A Biblical-Theological Introduction to the Old Testament: The Gospel Promised.* Wheaton: Crossway, 2016. 600 pp. Hardback. ISBN 978-1433533464. $50.00.

A Biblical-Theological Introduction to the Old Testament, edited by Miles V. Van Pelt, is the collaborative work of 13 contributors who are past and present professors of Reformed Theological Seminary. Van Pelt specifies in the preface that this volume is intended to relate the message of each Old Testament book within the context of the biblical canon in a manner that produces a distinctively "biblical-theological" introduction intended for pastors, teachers, and students.

This volume attempts to provide a self-consciously nuanced introduction to the Old Testament that does not "dismantle" the Bible into disparate parts but rather demonstrates its interconnectedness as the divine "covenantal testimony to the person and work of Jesus Christ by the power of the Holy Spirit according to the eternal word of God the Father" (p. 14). As such, the book does not conform to the traditional genre of "special introduction" or "survey." Rather it provides a hybrid, devoting limited attention to critical discussions of authorship, date, and background and more robust discussions of a book's message, theology, and relationship to the New Testament. In addition, this work takes as its point of departure the final form as represented in the Masoretic tradition, following its book divisions (e.g., Ezra-Nehemiah as a single composition) and ordering (i.e., Law, Prophets, and Writings). In doing so, this volume follows a recent trend in introductory texts structured after Jewish canonical orderings, such as *What the Old Testament Authors Really Cared About: A Survey of Jesus' Bible* edited by Jason DeRouchie (Grand Rapids: Kregel, 2012), which follows a different ordering found in *Baba Batra* 14b (e.g., Jeremiah and Ezekiel before Isaiah, Ruth before Psalms, and Daniel preceding Esther).

In the introduction, Van Pelt presents a biblical-theological framework for the 24 chapters that follow. He identifies Jesus as the theological center of the Old Testament, contends that the OT ultimately presents the promise of the gospel, and draws upon passages such as Rom 1:1–3 and Luke 24:25–27 in support of this claim. In addition to Christ as the theological center, Van Pelt argues that the kingdom of God provides the

"thematic framework" for the Old Testament (and the New). So, the kingdom of God offers the theological context where one finds Jesus as the theological center of the biblical canon. He contends that the presentation of the kingdom unfolds progressively along the lines of redemptive history, which he suggests is structured covenantally as Covenant, Covenant History, and Covenant Life (i.e., Law, Prophets, and Writings). He sees this structure mirrored in the New Testament by the Gospels, Acts, and the Writings (i.e., the Pauline and catholic epistles).

Each chapter is structured around five foci: Introduction, Background Issues, Structure and Outline, Message and Theology, and Approaching the New Testament. While space does not allow a review of each chapter, a limited survey of a couple of chapters should provide sufficient orientation to the volume.

In chapter 2, John C. Curid introduces the book of Exodus. In line with the ethos of this volume, Curid does not spend much time discussing authorship beyond noting that the "biblical author" employs Egyptian vocabulary and idioms (pp. 70–71). He tackles the message and theology of the book in a topical fashion; discusses the exodus as a *Leitmotif*; presents common plot patterns between Exodus and other ancient Near Eastern literature; and examines various important aspects, such as the plagues, the hardening of Pharaoh's heart, the Decalogue, and the Book of the Covenant.

In chapter 13, Daniel C. Timmer provides an excellent overview of recent research on the shape of the Book of the Twelve and its hermeneutical significance. He concludes that it is best to approach the Twelve not as a redactionally unified whole but rather as a collection of books. He claims "our hermeneutical point of departure must take account of the fundamental fact that each book of the Twelve *is a book*" (p. 327). Like Curid, Timmer provides a thematic presentation of the message and theology of the Twelve as a whole by presenting how a book within the Twelve contributes or develops a theme, such as sin, punishment, repentance, and deliverance.

A Biblical-Theological Introduction to the Old Testament presents at least two weaknesses worth noting. First, the chapters do not integrate explicitly with the biblical-theological vision cast in the introduction. The introduction creates the expectation that the chapters will present the message and theology of each book in relation to its place within the canon of Christian Scripture as conceived by Van Pelt. While some chapters come close to such integration (e.g., Jeremiah), others fall short (e.g., Chronicles). Second, the restricted treatment of standard introductory matters may limit the utility of this text within seminary and graduate courses intended to prepare students not only for the church, but also for engagement with

scholarship beyond the evangelical orb.

Despite these criticisms, Van Pelt and his fellow contributors provide an excellent resource for churches and seminaries. The contributors' commitment to the integrity of the Old Testament as a witness to the person and work of Jesus Christ gives this introduction a distinctively and unashamedly Christian ethos. While perhaps more biblical-theological integration is needed, this volume fills a necessary gap in introductory texts with its biblical-theological nuance.

Benjamin S. Davis
Raleigh, North Carolina

T. Desmond Alexander. *Exodus*. Teach the Text Commentary Series, ed. Mark L. Strauss and John H. Walton. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2016, xii + 204 pp. Paperback. ISBN 978-0801092145. $17.52.

This commentary by Desmond Alexander is part of a new series, the Teach the Text Commentary Series that is designed to aid pastors who teach consecutively through entire books of the Bible, verse by verse. Each preaching unit in the commentary series is structured around a number of standard sections.

Considering Alexander's treatment of the Book of Exodus, the first major section is referred to as the "Big Idea." This identifies the primary theme that drives both the passage and the exposition. It is followed by a detailed interpretation of the text, including the literary context of the passage, historical background material, and interpretive insights. He explains how each unit fits the flow of the text around it and the individual unit's contribution to the purpose of the book. This is followed by theological insights where Alexander selects a few carefully selected theological insights about the passage. In the section "Teaching the Text," he reviews the main themes and applications of the passage. The final main section is entitled "Illustrating the Text." The illustrations bring alive the passage's key themes and message.

To illustrate the method, I will examine Exod 12:31–13:16 which Alexander entitles, "Some Things Should Never Be Forgotten." Here the big idea is stated as: "*Constantly recalling how God has saved us is vital to nurturing our relationship with him*."

In the "Understanding the Text" section Alexander points out specific details about the departure of the Israelites from Egypt (Exod 12:31–42). These details are immediately followed by several speeches that contain instructions outlining how the Israelites are to commemorate their rescue from Pharaoh's control in the future. These instructions apply to the reenactment of the Passover (12:43–49), the celebration of the Festival of Unleavened Bread (13:3–10), and the setting apart of all firstborn males, both people and animals (13:11–16). Alexander astutely points out that no other event in Israel's history receives this type of comprehensive and unique recognition.

In the next section, "Interpretive Insights," Alexander observes that the reference to the Israelites asking for articles of silver and gold for clothing fulfills God's earlier instructions (Exod 3:22; 11:2) and is the reward the Israelites receive for their years of service as slaves. The section closes with the summation that now after 430 years God's people are leaving Egypt "to the very day." The latter phrase should be understood to mean that the Israelites departed on the day immediately following the Passover night (cf. 12:51). On that very day, Alexander states, they began their journey out of Egypt. In the final section on setting apart all firstborn males (13:11–16), we learn that because of the Passover, all firstborn males belong to God in a unique way. Passover sacrifices should be viewed as ransoming the firstborn males from the power of death.

Alexander then addresses "Theological Insights." Here he points out that since God's instruction regarding the Passover in 12:43–49 highlights the necessity of circumcision, we are reminded that at the heart of the covenant of circumcision was the promise that all nations would be blessed through the royal descendant of Abraham. Thus circumcision is not given as a mark of ethnicity but rather as a sign pointing forward to how God's covenant with the patriarchs would be fully established through Jesus Christ (Gal 3:8–18).

In the section "Teaching the Text" Alexander points out that there is no other event in the Old Testament like the Passover that enjoys such prestige. By emphasizing the importance of circumcision, the Passover regulations connect what happens in Egypt with God's earlier covenant with Abraham. This is noteworthy because God's covenant with the patriarchs concerns the blessing of the nations. As Gen 17:3–4 states, Abraham is to be the father of many nations. Furthermore, Alexander notes the concept of ransom in Exod 13:11–16. By being a substitute, and dying in the place of the Israelite males, the Passover lambs and goats rescue them from death. Thus at the heart of the Passover is the concept of substitution.

This commentary not only utilizes the best of current biblical scholarship but also presents the material in a clear, concise, and easy to follow format. Technical material is kept to a minimum, and the endnotes point the reader to more detailed discussion and additional resources. Alexander's work is a vital source for those who would preach or teach the book of Exodus and is highly recommended. The reader of the commentary

will certainly find information that becomes sermon and teaching material for each text unit of Exodus.

Mark F. Rooker
Wake Forest, North Carolina

Francis Landy, Leigh M. Trevaskis, and Bryan D. Bibb (eds.). *Text, Time, and Temple: Literary, Historical and Ritual Studies in Leviticus*. Hebrew Bible Monographs 64. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix, 2015. xi + 239 pp. Hardback. ISBN 978-1909697515. $95.00.

The book of Leviticus continues to enjoy an upsurge in scholarly interest, attention that is well served by this latest edition to the Hebrew Bible Monographs Series. Each of the volume's editors—Francis Landy, Leigh M. Trevaskis and Bryan D. Bibb—has contributed a major study on this part of the Hebrew Bible. Thus they are well positioned to collect and present this compendium of essays from leading scholars in the field. Contributors include many well-known names. In addition to the editors, chapters are offered by Michael Hundley, Jonathan Burnside, Israel Knohl, Reinhard Müller, James Watts, Christophe Nihan, Deborah Rooke, Rüdiger Schmitt, Ida Fröhlich and Jeremy Milgrom (son of the late Jacob Milgrom). The thirteen essays collected here, therefore, promise a valuable snapshot of the multifaceted state of contemporary Leviticus scholarship.

On that score, the reader is not disappointed. As the subtitle of the volume indicates, included studies variously pursue literary, historical, and ritual concerns. Needless to say, space prohibits detailed engagement with all thirteen essays. Instead, I draw attention to two representative examples.

The essay by Rooke—"The Blasphemer (Leviticus 24): Gender, Identity and Boundary Construction"—is fascinating and presents a veritable tour de force in methodological adaptability. In approaching this problematic text, Rooke employs insights derived from ideological, feminist, ethnic, and post-colonial concerns. Moreover, the pericope is read in its final form and in light of its wider Pentateuchal context. The exegetical payoff from such a nuanced reading is readily apparent, and Rooke's essay thus provides a helpful model for reading other texts—whether in Leviticus or beyond.

Schmitt's contribution ("Leviticus 14.33–57 as Intellectual Ritual") builds on the anthropological insights of Mary Douglas and others to explore the function of the צרעת ritual. He argues (rightly in my estimation) that the text functions as much more than simply a "handbook for priests." Rather, the stylization of the legislation points to its pedagogical

function. Indeed, he suggests the whole ritual sequence serves a didactic purpose. While not all will agree with the postexilic provenance assumed by Schmitt, the case for a community-shaping intent of the text is well made.

One more general point of interest in relation to the collection is a widespread willingness to make the final-form text of Leviticus the basis of inquiry. In that vein, Burnside highlights a prior tendency in scholarship to "simply avoid . . . the challenge of the final form of Leviticus 20" (p. 42), a tendency his essay seeks to overcome. Nihan pursues a line of inquiry he describes as "largely synchronic" (p. 96). Rooke, similarly, argues that "it is worth considering Leviticus 24 as a whole," even if the pericope "seems to consist of a number of disconnected elements" (p. 158). Müller's rhetorical study of the אני יהוה formula is based on the canonical text. Herein lies perhaps the clearest evidence of how much Leviticus scholarship has shifted from the behind-the-text focus that dominated twentieth-century approaches. While such methods may still be valuably employed, they now sit alongside a plethora of other interpretive options.

There are of course points where readers will disagree with positions being argued, or desire further clarification. For instance, while Knohl presents a case for reading biblical priestly rituals in light of Hittite-Horite traditions based on "deep connections" (p. 66), he doesn't allow for or discuss any "deep differences"—a vital consideration in comparative methodology, as Bryan Babcock has recently argued (*Sacred Ritual: A Study of the West Semitic Ritual Calendars in Leviticus 23 and the Akkadian Text Emar 446* [BBRSup 9; Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2014]). There is also a degree of editorial inconsistency across the volume. Chapters are of varying lengths (Knohl's is only seven pages; Nihan's is thirty-seven); some use transliteration (e.g., Nihan), others original languages (e.g., Watts); bibliographies are sometimes provided (e.g., Burnside), at other times not (e.g., Müller).

Such quibbles aside, this remains an important work. Some of that value is signaled in the introductory essay by Bryan Bibb which categorizes contemporary approaches to Leviticus. Bibb comments, "The most interesting work in the current context involves the creative cross-pollination of . . . methods—studies that combine source-critical, anthropological and narrative methods in their approach to Leviticus as a literary work of art" (p. 2). The point is well made. Certainly one of the more tangible benefits of the demise of the Graf-Wellhausen hegemony in biblical studies has been the proliferation of interpretative methods applied to the canonical texts. Thus, while each of the individual authors in this volume operates within his or her own paradigm, the *collective* weight of

the volume is an implicit validation of the multiple approaches required to render a competently "thick" interpretation of Leviticus. For this reason alone, *Text, Time, and Temple* makes a valuable contribution to a field so often divided along methodological lines. One can only hope for further instances of "creative cross-pollination."

G. Geoffrey Harper
Croydon, New South Wales

Matthew Newkirk. *Just Deceivers: An Exploration of the Motif of Deception in the Books of Samuel*. Eugene, OR: Pickwick, 2015. xviii + 244 pp. Paperback. ISBN 978-1498201179. $31.00.

Mentir pour son avantage à soi-même est imposture, mentir pour l'avantage d'autrui est fraude, mentir pour nuire est calomnie; c'est la pire espèce de mensonge. Mentir sans profit ni préjudice de soi ni d'autrui n'est pas mentir: ce n'est pas mensonge, c'est fiction. (Jean-Jacques Rousseau, Les Rêveries du promeneur solitaire, Quatrieme Promenade)

To put it simply: lying is debased or, worse, delusional. The same conclusion is found of speaking falsely in Exodus (20:16; 23:1–3) and Leviticus (19:11). And yet, some biblical narratives appear to extol and not reprove deception. For example, the fallacious assertion of the midwives that protected the lives of male Hebrew children from Pharaoh is celebrated (Exod 1:19–20). These women are said to fear God and even received the blessing of households (Hebrew: *battim*; Exod 1:21) on account of their reverence (cf. 2 Sam 7:11!). Providing coherence between these ethical norms and the narrative descriptions is the central focus of Matthew Newkirk's book.

The prolegomena differentiates lying and deception. Lying is purposefully communicating a falsehood. Deception occurs "when one causes someone to believe a falsehood" (p. 3). These do not always coincide. Deception need not entail lying if it was inadvertent or unintentional. Lying does not necessarily occasion deception: one may lie with the intent to deceive but be unsuccessful in persuading another of the falsehood. Following several theorists, Newkirk holds that intention and response play a role in determining this distinction. In order to incorporate these added components, he adopts Kevin Vanhoozer's definition of deception for the study: *"x deceives y" means that x intentionally causes y to believe p, where p is false and x knows it to be so* ("Ezekiel 14: 'I, the Lord, Have Deceived That Prophet': Divine Deception, Inception, and Communicative Action," in *Theological Commentary: Evangelical Perspectives* [ed. R. Michael Allen; New York: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2011], 77).

Aiming to comprehend the motif of deception, Newkirk analyzes the terminology for deception in the Hebrew Bible, interacts briefly with prescriptive ethical passages primarily in the Torah, and provides a close reading of twenty-eight episodes in Samuel. He does not, however, discuss issues with divine deception (e.g., 1 Kgs 22; Ezek 14). In the Samuel accounts, the "narrator's disposition" is assessed as to whether each is positive or negative. Deception is determined to be negative when unjust harm is desired or the intent is to bring personal benefit to the detriment of another. It is considered positive when unjust harm is forestalled or the intent was to benefit another. Although one case is judged as unclear (Ahimaaz's news in 2 Sam 18:19–30), fifteen instances are evaluated as negative and twelve as positive. Most of the study is composed of this evaluation. A final synthesis chapter attempts to systematize these portrayals with the assumed biblical principle that deception requires unjust harm or disadvantage.

Newkirk's study is a lucid and helpful foray into applying Vanhoozer's definition of deception to a particular biblical book. The monograph, however, suffers from several overarching ailments.

First, the study betrays its origin as a doctoral dissertation. As such, the language in places is stilted and affected. For instance: "What is needed is a comprehensive investigation of the motif of deception that extends across both 1 and 2 Samuel" (p. 11). Is this really a *need*, or merely a somewhat arbitrary textual sampling? Elsewhere, a "history of research" section seems all too brief with almost no interaction with early interpreters. Do the rabbis have nothing to say about these questionable ethical situations? What of early Christian readers? These voices would have added greatly to the study.

Second, the author's literary-synchronic approach fails to deal with the significant and well-known variations amongst the different Samuel texts of the MT, LXX, and Qumran. He bases his study on "the Hebrew text as represented in *BHS*" (p. 12; rare exceptions include a lone mention of 4QSam^{a} on p. 57 n. 11 and a brief interaction with the Greek text of 2 Sam 4:6 on pp. 98–99). But a much more sophisticated analysis regarding the textual composition of the book is needed.

Third, the conclusions are too far-reaching. On pp. 104–5 Newkirk ventures into situational ethics without explanation, except for a dismissive quotation of the work of Joseph Fletcher. Deception in the NT—a monograph-worthy topic itself—is also given only six pages (pp. 198–204). Further, Christian dogmatic and doctrinal conclusions, such as "not all lying and deception is wrong" (p. 104), should require a detailed discussion, yet this assertion is made without any reference to NT didactic standards or the church's teaching. While the desire to make the study

applicable is admirable, the execution is too hasty to be a significant resource for the broader discussion of the ethical norms of falsehood.

H. H. Hardy II
Wake Forest, North Carolina

Nazek Khalid Matty. *Sennacherib's Campaign against Judah and Jerusalem in 701 B.C.: A Historical Reconstruction*. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 487. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2016. xii + 226 pp. Hardback. ISBN 978-3110447880. €89.95/$126.00.

Sennacherib's invasion of the western Levant in 701 BC is well-documented, both in biblical (2 Kgs 18–19; Isa 36–37; 2 Chron 32) and non-biblical sources. Nevertheless, while the general contours of the campaign are agreed upon, the details continue to generate considerable discussion. In this revised version of a doctoral thesis completed under John Day (Oxford), Nazek Khalid Matty, a Dominican Sister who lives and works in Iraq, examines Sennacherib's incursion with the aim of providing a historical reconstruction that is sensitive to all the extant evidence.

Several key questions propel the investigation. Matty wonders "whether Sennacherib . . . really accomplished his mission. Was there any reason for receiving Hezekiah's tribute in Nineveh? Did Sennacherib return to Nineveh unexpectedly? If so, what was the reason for his return?" (p. 2). Her aim, therefore, is to evaluate prior reconstructions against the textual (biblical and Assyrian) and non-textual data. Importantly, she notes that many previous examinations have limited the scope of evidence considered. Work on the Assyrian inscriptions, for example, has tended to focus only on Sennacherib's third campaign. Thus, insights derived from a broader appreciation of Assyrian campaigning strategy have not been sufficiently considered (p. 2). Matty's approach, then, is to more widely consider the Assyrian and biblical accounts (p. 14).

Accordingly, the study is divided into two parts. Part 1 looks at the Assyrian evidence. The inscriptions are examined first to outline Sennacherib's campaigns (pp. 23–35). Consideration of a broad suite of operations allows Matty to make some general observations about Assyrian military policy. The results are revealing. First, it becomes clear that the annals take a particular rhetorical stance and evidence a certain form (p. 35). Second, the inscriptions avoid details that do not serve Assyrian ideology (p. 64). Third, against this backdrop, it becomes evident that Hezekiah is an exception to the norm—no other king is treated in the same way (p. 40).

Assyrian reliefs are examined next. The focus here is the well-known portrayal of the siege of Lachish, depicted in room XXXVI of the South-West Palace (the slabs are reproduced in an appendix, pp. 205–20). While

obviously important, the Lachish siege is not mentioned in the annals. This fact highlights the selective nature of the Assyrian accounts. Moreover, the portrayal serves certain ends. Although some have suggested that the absence of destruction imagery indicates that Sennacherib had a non-aggressive policy in his third campaign (and hence towards Jerusalem), Matty argues that the Lachish reliefs are instead designed to emphasize the effectiveness of Assyrian tactics (p. 85). Thus again, rhetorical aims dictate the presentation. Indeed, archaeological evidence demonstrates the complete destruction of Lachish c. 701 BC (pp. 85–87).

Part 2 considers the biblical texts. Although Assyrian material allows Sennacherib's third campaign to be outlined with a degree of detail, one important question is nowhere addressed: Why did Sennacherib withdraw from Jerusalem in 701? The biblical accounts provide the only data we have. Yet the texts are not straightforward. Four different (although not mutually exclusive) reasons for Sennacherib's return to Nineveh are given—Hezekiah's payment of tribute (2 Kgs 18:13–16); the hearing of a "rumor" (2 Kgs 19:6–7); the impending attack of Tirhakah (2 Kgs 19:9); and the action of the angel of YHWH (2 Kgs 19:35–36). Matty examines each pericope in order (pp. 119–90), concluding that the most likely explanation is a rumor of Babylonian unrest, provoking the return to Nineveh and a campaign against Babylon the following year (pp. 189–90).

This is a fascinating study and its broad assessment of biblical and non-biblical material is to be commended. Indeed, it is its willingness to look at tangential data, outside of the scope of the question per se, which uncovers patterns and trends that allow for more nuanced readings of the various media. The payoff is evident throughout. For example, Matty lists twenty-six occasions on which tribute was paid to Sennacherib (pp. 48–53). Seeing the wider pattern adds color to the Hezekiah episode, for the tribute he offered does not fit the observed pattern; it was larger than any other, was paid following Sennacherib's return to Nineveh, and was clearly not an act of submission. Matty suggests instead that it was an effort to avoid future conflict (pp. 60–61).

Nevertheless, there are several methodological tensions within Matty's study, particularly in part 2. While none are fatal for the thesis being advanced, they do raise questions about the integration of biblical evidence within the study. Two examples will suffice.

As with Assyrian material, Matty wants to assess the rhetorical purposes behind the biblical accounts (p. 122). Her modus operandi, however, is a detailed source-critical reading of the pericopes—an approach at odds with the starting point of rhetorical-critical appraisals (viz. the final-form text). Moreover, while her source analysis is sometimes helpful, much discussion feels superfluous to the task at hand.

Also evident is an overly strong dichotomy between theology and history. Matty regards annalistic sources as more historically credible (e.g., 2 Kgs 18:13–17). So-called "prophetic narrative," however, is deemed to be "drenched in theology" (p. 149). What this means in practice is that when there is conflict, annalistic material is preferred over what is deemed theological. Moreover, Assyrian material tends to trump the biblical account (e.g., p. 180), even though earlier in the study Matty acknowledges the rhetorical, ideological, and selective nature of the Assyrian annals.

In any event, this is an engaging and well-conceived study. While generating questions about method in places, the reconstruction of Sennacherib's 701 BC incursion into Judah is compelling.

G. Geoffrey Harper
Croydon, New South Wales

Michael Kruger, ed. *A Biblical-Theological Introduction to the New Testament: The Gospel Realized*. Wheaton: Crossway, 2016. 656 pp. Hardback. ISBN 978-1433536762. $50.00.

In this companion volume to *A Biblical-Theological Introduction to the Old Testament: The Gospel Promised*, editor Michael Kruger and the team of former and current professors at Reformed Theological Seminary offer a fresh introduction to the New Testament (NT), characterized by sound biblical scholarship and theological reflection. An exceptional scholar, capable of instructing scholarly and popular audiences, Kruger holds evangelical commitments as well as a commanding grasp of NT scholarship. His fellow contributors likewise are excellent evangelical scholars, and some of them currently serve local churches as pastors.

The contributors' dual commitment to academic excellence and pastoral care drives this volume's goal of creating an introduction that presents foundational material "in a way that could be readily accessible to ministry leaders, preachers, Bible study teachers, and, of course, seminary students" (p. 21). In light of this goal, Kruger asserts this volume's distinctiveness as six-fold. First, it is "accessible," adopting a "streamlined" approach to more technical issues and offering additional extensive discussions of certain critical matters in the appendices (p. 22). Second and third, it is "theological" in that it prioritizes elucidating each book's theological message, which then, since the volume is "redemptive-historical," is related to unfolding salvation-history (pp. 23–24). Fourth, it is "reformed" in that the contributors are committed to Scripture's authority and the Reformation's five *solas* (p. 25). Fifth and sixth, it is multi-authored and "pastoral" (pp. 26–27). While contributors exercise editorial

discretion in presenting a book's theological message, each chapter follows the same broad format: "Introduction, Background Issues, Structure and Outline, Message and Theology, and Select Bibliography" (p. 26).

After the theological message of each book is presented, the appendices address important topics related to NT study. First, Kruger defends Scripture's self-authentication as the basis for its authority and asserts that the "attributes of canonicity" that Scripture itself outlines—"divine qualities," apostolic origins," and "corporate reception"— affirm the authority of the NT canon (pp. 555–66). Second, Charles Hill introduces the field and practice of textual criticism, assuring the reader that the original reading can be discerned (pp. 567–80). Third, Guy Prentis Watters briefly surveys the Synoptic problem and proposed solutions (pp. 581–91). Fourth, Robert Cara introduces the NT's use of the Old Testament (OT) with the chief goal of encouraging the reader to trust that the NT authors correctly understood and applied the OT (pp. 593–602).

A Biblical-Theological Introduction to the New Testament has five major strengths. First, as intended, it is readily accessible since the contributors avoid technical jargon and present critical matters in a clear manner. Second, the contributors do not sacrifice academic excellence for the sake of accessibility. They deftly navigate the most important background issues for each book while offering exceptional insight into its theological message. Third, the volume promotes theological integration. The contributors draw from the fields of biblical studies, biblical theology, historical theology, and systematic theology as they instruct their readers in understanding and embracing each book's theological message. Fourth, the volume equips its readers to be better interpreters of Scripture. This strength is observable throughout the book, but especially when the contributors offer hermeneutical and preaching suggestions ranging from how to interpret parables (pp. 111–12), to advice on navigating the challenges and value of mirror reading (pp. 251–53). Fifth, the appendices are valuable and accessible resources, capable of introducing the novice to issues important to understanding and interpreting the NT.

However, this volume also has four minor weaknesses. First, the quality of the chapters is uneven, a problem common to multi-authored works. While some chapters like William Barclay's on the Pastoral Epistles (pp. 349–400) or Charles Hill's on the Johannine Epistles (pp. 483–508) are exceptional in their attention both to background issues and theological matters, a few chapters are noticeably brief in treating either of these. Second, while the choice to discuss the Synoptic problem in an appendix is understandable given the goal of making the volume accessible, it introduces new problems for the reader. For instance, the novice is

unprepared to understand and evaluate discussions of composition history (pp. 33, 95) or to recognize when authors assume Markan priority and to understand the implications thereof (pp. 33, 65). Adding a brief introductory chapter on the Gospels would better prepare readers to understand this literature and would provide a framework for understanding terms like "redaction critic" that are used but not explained (p. 105). Third, while Robert Cara's discussion of the NT authors' hermeneutical methods is helpful, it is incomplete in that it focuses almost exclusively on typology and lacks sufficient explanation. Quite frankly, his insistence that "*the biblical writers' hermeneutics are an infallible guide for modern Christians*" is not properly explained (p. 596, emphasis original). Can a pastor create new types to explain the OT or should one restrict oneself to only those types identified in the NT? Are believers free to allegorize the OT because Paul did so in Galatians 4? Cara is a competent and brilliant scholar who certainly could provide well-reasoned answers to such questions. Perhaps he did not address them due to constraints in space. However, given that this book is intended for pastors and lay people and that this appendix addresses proper biblical hermeneutics, it seems like a significant oversight. Fourth, given the title and the biblical-theological focus of this volume, more space should have been devoted to defining what is meant by "biblical theology" and distinguishing it from other approaches to this discipline, than the single page in the introduction (p. 24).

Despite these weaknesses, *A Biblical-Theological Introduction to the New Testament* is a useful resource that accomplishes its purpose of serving as an accessible, theological introduction to the New Testament. It is certainly a valuable resource for pastors and students as they seek to understand, obey, and cherish the Scriptures.

Levi Baker
Wake Forest, North Carolina

J. K. Elliott. *A Bibliography of Greek New Testament Manuscripts*. 3rd ed. Supplements to Novum Testamentum 160. Leiden: Brill, 2015. xliii + 408 pp. E-book. ISBN 978-9004289680. $149.00.

J. K. Elliott is Honorary Professor of New Testament textual criticism at the University of Leeds. His *Bibliography* is a "comprehensive listing" of books and articles (including those treating the text, illustrations in the manuscripts, and paleography), facsimiles, photographic plates, and albums related to approximately 3,600 manuscripts of the Greek New Testament. The bibliography is divided into the categories commonly used in New Testament textual criticism and in the official registry of the Münster

Institute for New Testament Textual Criticism: papyri, majuscules, minuscules, and lectionaries in the order in which they are presented in the apparatuses of the UBS[5] and NA[28] editions of the Greek New Testament. This third edition of the bibliography includes entries from the two previous editions, three supplements that appeared as articles in *Novum Testamentum*, as well as additional material published even after the supplements. It intentionally excludes entries related to short notes in journals or brief discussions in commentaries that treat isolated textual variants found in particular manuscripts. The references in each entry are arranged in descending chronological order (i.e., from the most recent to the oldest).

The Third Edition treats manuscripts included in the *Liste* through April 2014. The most recently added manuscripts in each category were 𝔓[128], 0323, 2927, and *l*2463. This edition has also added references to a number of works focusing on paleography, codicology, and scribal habits due to the growing interest of New Testament scholars in these fields. The Third Edition has added a significant number of entries of sources containing illustrations that appear in manuscripts. It also adds all references to the paragraphs discussing particular manuscripts in Hermann von Soden's catalogue.

The Introduction to the *Bibliography* includes very helpful guidance for a number of different research projects including tracing the use of particular Greek New Testament manuscripts in various editions of the Greek New Testament, understanding the history of collecting, collating, and classifying New Testament manuscripts, and how to reconstruct reliably the running text of certain manuscripts even when one has no direct access to the manuscripts themselves.

Readers looking for a source that will identify the date, provenance, writing materials, text type, etc., of a particular manuscript will not find those details on the pages of the bibliography per se, but only by consulting the resources listed in the bibliography. Thus the bibliography is an immensely helpful supplement to the *Liste*, introductions to textual criticism, and so forth, but should not be assumed to serve as a substitute for these tools. However, a close examination of the entries for the manuscripts with which I am most familiar found the bibliography to be impressively thorough and up-to-date.

Eight separate appendices give data on (1) text types, (2) introductions to textual criticism, (3) catalogues of libraries that house important manuscripts, (4) other bibliographies helpful for textual criticism, (5) guides to various approaches to transcriptional probability, (6) collections of essays, (7) links to important websites, and (8) explain why Elliott discontinued his earlier practice of including a list of unregistered manuscripts.

The obvious limitation of a printed work is that new manuscript discoveries will undoubtedly be added to the registry by the time that the book is published. As of September 14, 2016, the highest numbered manuscripts in each category were 𝔓[131], 0323, 2933, and *l*2465. Thus since the publication of the bibliography, three papyri, six minuscules, and two lectionaries have already been added to the registry.

Some of the resources listed in the bibliography can be quickly located by other means such as a search of the ATLA database. However, researchers will have greater difficulty locating sometimes essential discussions buried in chapters of books or monographs. Although the book is quite expensive and the e-book surprisingly costs just as much as the hardback, the book can potentially save the researcher a significant amount of time and will be a worthy investment for specialists in the field. The bibliography is an unrivaled resource for advanced students and scholars seeking to locate quickly important works related to New Testament manuscripts, textual criticism, paleography, codicology, scribal habits, and art history.

Charles L. Quarles
Wake Forest, North Carolina

George H. van Kooten and Peter Barthel (eds). *The Star of Bethlehem and the Magi: Interdisciplinary Perspectives from Experts on the Ancient Near East, the Greco-Roman World, and Modern Astronomy*. Leiden: Brill, 2015. xxi + 695 pp. Hardback. ISBN 978-9004307971. $241.00 (Hardback), $69.00 (Paperback).

The Star of Bethlehem and the Magi is not one contiguous text, but rather a compilation of papers from twenty different scholars discussing the Star of Bethlehem from a range of perspectives and disciplines. These papers were initially presented in 2014, at a conference in the Netherlands that was held in honor of the University of Groningen's 400th anniversary. The impressive assembly of specialized knowledge makes the book both a fascinating and a daunting read. One perspective that goes almost unrepresented is that of a Christian believer who accepts Matthew's Gospel as inspired Scripture.

I began *The Star of Bethlehem and the Magi* expecting to read analyses of Matt 2:1–12 both from professional astronomers like myself and from ancient historians and textual critics. In fact, seven out of the twenty contributors are professional astronomers, but only two (David Hughes and Bradley Schaefer) discuss in detail what modern astronomy indicates the Magi might have seen. The rest—even the astronomers—write as historians. This is reasonable because, as Hughes and Schaefer demonstrate,

no astronomical object could have exhibited the behavior Matthew describes for the Star of Bethlehem. The contribution of modern astronomy is therefore mainly to rule things out: it cannot explain the star. The question remains whether history can do so.

Michael Molnar makes a noteworthy attempt to find an answer through history. Although himself an astronomer, Molnar has researched ancient astrology, including evidence from stars depicted on coins minted by the biblical Quirinius. Molnar has concluded that the land of Judea was associated with the constellation of Aries, the ram. On April 17, 6 B.C., the Moon occulted Jupiter in Aries on the very day of Jupiter's heliacal rising. Such an occultation is not rare, but Molnar argues that the positions of the other planets and the coincidence with Jupiter's heliacal rising added up to a staggering astrological jackpot predicting that a child born in Judea would rule the world. A conjunction does not match Matthew's text, but Molnar suggests the story got muddled: "Matthew probably struggled with arcane astrological jargon he had heard, most likely handed down through several sources, which would explain why the star mysteriously 'went before' the biblical Magi and 'stood over' the child" (p. 30).

Stephan Heilen expresses profound skepticism with Molnar's view, and states that Aries was by no means uniquely identified with Judea. Aaron Adair points out that astrological horoscopes did not predict birth, only the fate of a child already born. Peter Barthel suggests that the Magi might have been making a diplomatic tour, and that Jerusalem was only one of several stops. Antonio Panaino writes that Matthew's account cannot be true because any attempt by the Magi to evade Herod would have failed: he would have sent an army of spies after them and killed the infant Jesus that very night. Roger Beck mentions the interesting fact that Tiridates of Armenia in A.D. 66. led a bona fide delegation of Magi from the east to Rome, where they did homage to Nero and possibly worshiped him as a god. Beck suggests that Matthew's account is a fiction based on the Tiridates story.

The Star of Bethlehem and the Magi is almost universally skeptical of the biblical account, the one exception being astronomer David Hughes, who writes, "To me, the Gospel of Matthew rings true. All of it" (p. 105). No writer seriously considers the possibility that the star was a miracle beyond both modern astronomy and ancient astrology. The book comes nowhere close to a consensus on the meaning of Matthew's text. Even though it is full of interesting historical factoids such as Tiridates' journey, *The Star of Bethlehem and the Magi* is likely to be of limited value to evangelical pastors and teachers.

The chief value I derived from the book was quite unexpected. As an evangelical Christian with academic training in science but not in history

or ancient texts, I have often been troubled by popular deconstructions of the Scriptures, proving, for example, that Paul didn't write Paul's epistles. *The Star of Bethlehem and the Magi* was my first experience with scholarly literature from the relevant fields. Even though I was impressed with the detailed information from ancient sources, I was astonished at the lack of rigor, the abundance of contradictory claims, and the profound absence of a consensus. I used to assume that skeptics of the Scriptures had what a scientist would call a valid argument behind their claims. Not anymore.

Ari Heinze
Waianae, Hawaii

John B. Cobb, Jr. *Jesus' Abba: The God Who Has Not Failed.* Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2015. xxiv + 157 pp. Hardback. ISBN 978-1506405704. $22.99.

In this book John Cobb urges Christians to follow Jesus in their thinking about and relationship to God. These have too often differed from those of Jesus, according to Cobb. It is not Jesus' Abba, but rather a deviation, that is objectionable to secular moderns. In fact, the modern world actually needs Abba. Thus, "it is time for thoughtful Christians to free themselves from acquiescence to the late modern worldview" and to embrace the "biblical worldview in general . . . the worldview of Jesus and Paul in particular," albeit in updated form (pp. xxi, 155).

Cobb begins with his reconstruction of the historical Jesus, which is similar to the Jesus Seminar's. Jesus was no apocalyptic preacher but rather a social reformer who proclaimed the already present kingdom of God (or "divine commonwealth") in an itinerant ministry involving healings, exorcisms, and charismatic gifts. Jesus' Abba was loving, compassionate, "intimate and tender" (p. 11), inclusive, and opposed to social injustices. Jesus' message was countercultural in its challenging of existing societal institutions and its call for total devotion to and trust in Abba.

Next, Cobb traces how he believes Jesus' Abba was historically lost in western consciousness. Paul faithfully transmitted Jesus' vision of Abba with *pistis Christou*—meaning "Christ's faithfulness," not "faith in Christ"—but concomitantly made the divine commonwealth more otherworldly than countercultural. In the Middle Ages, mediators like the church, the saints, and Mary took Abba's place while God became an "all-male Trinity that had evolved a long way from the experience and teaching of Jesus" (p. 38). A key moment was when modern Cartesian dualism objectified the natural world as a vacuous actuality devoid of subjectivity. When Darwin firmly placed man within nature there was opportunity to see subjectivity in all of reality but most opted to see man as just one more

object to be studied scientifically and understood in a reductively materialistic way.

Subjectivity is a main theme of the book, and Cobb's tour de force for subjectivity based on the primacy of experience comes next. All experience is selective and interpreted, which implies a subject. Our immediate experiences of subjective freedom and real possibilities contradict modern materialistic determinism, which Cobb shows to be internally inconsistent. He likewise argues for the correspondence theory of truth over the coherence theory of truth, which contradicts the way people actually live: "Modern thought profoundly conflicts with common sense" (p. 69). Abba, says Cobb, is necessary for the past to be real and efficacious in the present, as well as for real possibilities graded according to value, which morality requires.

In opposition to the modern exclusion of God from causal explanations, Cobb argues for the necessity of God as a causal subject in the world. Cobb undercuts the modern assumption that subjects cannot be causal factors and, then, in a way reminiscent of the classical theistic proofs for God's existence, argues that only God as subject explains otherwise inexplicable aspects of the world. This he does by evincing evidence from contemporary science and individual experience.

From the question of God's credibility Cobb moves to that of God's desirability. In Christian interactions with other religious traditions—or "wisdom traditions"—what historically became the dominant Christian view of God, not Jesus' Abba, has been intellectually objectionable and practically detrimental. Rejecting both Christian exclusivism and soteriological pluralism, Cobb espouses "deep pluralism." Abba is compatible with the key beliefs and intuitions of major wisdom traditions but Christian followers of Abba can also learn from other wisdom traditions.

Abba is also desirable for addressing the world's problems today. Biblical historical consciousness coupled with the almighty Lord of traditional Christian belief has issued in tribalism, exceptionalism, violence, and genocide. Abba's power lies in persuasion, liberation, and empowerment, not coercive omnipotence and exhaustive divine sovereignty. Abba can remedy communal, societal, economic, and ecological problems. Abba is the only real hope for the future.

Cobb's book raises many questions. One general question regards the degree to which Cobb's vision of Jesus' Abba is biblically and historically grounded versus the degree to which it is a presentation of Alfred North Whitehead's philosophy. From among the contested reconstructions of the historical Jesus, Cobb presents one that is very much at home in Protestant liberalism. Cobb sees little apocalyptic in the New Testament (p. 18) even though Ernst Käsemann once remarked that apocalyptic is

the mother of Christian theology.

Similarly, one may wonder at Cobb's repeated and strenuous criticism of the modern worldview when his own vision is so heavily informed by modern assumptions and sentiments. The prominence of "subjectivity" is telling: Jürgen Moltmann once argued that the transition from "substance" to "subjectivity" as the primary category of being is a hallmark of modernity.

These and other more particular questions notwithstanding, there is much that commends this book. Cobb evidences a sophisticated command of a number of disciplines from modern biblical scholarship to physical science to the social sciences. He adeptly translates abstruse points into terms laymen can easily understand and in an enjoyable style. Importantly, Cobb makes a plausible case for God to secular moderns on their own terms—a notable strength of process theology. The book would serve well as an introduction to contemporary liberal Protestant thought in an academic or ecclesial context and may even be helpful for those struggling with the viability of faith today.

Marc A. Pugliese
Richmond, Virginia

Keith T. Marriner. *Following the Lamb: The Theme of Discipleship in the Book of Revelation*. Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2016. xv + 274 pp. Paperback. ISBN 13: 978-1498237390. $35.00.

Keith T. Marriner serves as Executive Editor of One Accord Resources and is an adjunct professor at the School of Christian Ministries at Emmanuel College in Franklin Springs, Georgia. *Following the Lamb: The Theme of Discipleship in the Book of Revelation* is Marriner's Doctor of Education dissertation at Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary in Wake Forest, North Carolina, written under the direction of David R. Beck. Reacting to a scholarly neglect of the topic of discipleship in the Apocalypse, Marriner seeks to address this theme through biblical and theological analysis (p. 8).

Three questions in particular serve as the focus of his research: (1) What forms of discipleship existed in the ancient world? (2) How is the theme of discipleship developed in the Gospel of John according to current research? and (3) How is the theme of discipleship developed in the book of Revelation? Addressing these questions, Marriner employs a qualitative content analysis methodology from the area of social scientific research. He follows the example of others who apply content analysis to the field of biblical studies (e.g., Lioy, Bazar, Ray, Hudgins), seeing it as capable of producing fruitful results. This methodology, which consists

of a systematic analysis of texts, includes the use of a coding frame with accompanying categories or topics that assists in identifying the theme of discipleship in Revelation. Marriner establishes his coding frame by employing both inductive and deductive approaches. The qualitative content analysis approach allows him to move beyond manifest content to latent content. The result is a thoroughly biblical and insightful examination of discipleship in the Apocalypse.

Marriner divides his writing into five chapters. In chapter one, he recognizes the lack of studies in biblical scholarship, Christian education literature, and spiritual formation literature on discipleship in Revelation. While New Testament scholars such as Fiorenza, Aune, and Stuckenbruck do examine the topic (pp. 2–4), their works are limited in scope. In addition, most literature related to Christian education and spiritual formation ignores discipleship in the Apocalypse since authors do not believe the writing contributes to our understanding of educational ministry (p. 4).

In chapter two, Marriner examines the forms of discipleship in the ancient world, including the New Testament. Greco-Roman and Jewish writings present a disciple as a student of a (human) teacher. While the student-teacher model is not completely absent in the Old Testament, more prominent is the notion that the Lord serves as one's teacher (p. 27). Discipleship in the Gospels and Acts by and large refers to one committed to Jesus' teaching, mission, and authority, among other features (p. 45). Discipleship in the New Testament Epistles is often portrayed as imitating Jesus (p. 46). Insights gleaned from this chapter, which concentrates especially on terminology, provide helpful information about discipleship that one may compare with the Apocalypse's presentation.

Chapter three consists of a review of recent works (1970s-present) on discipleship in the Fourth Gospel. Marriner also formulates a coding frame, employed in chapter four in his examination of discipleship in Revelation. More specifically, from the Johannine literature examined in chapter three, themes emerge which Marriner applies to his study of the motif in the Apocalypse in chapter four (e.g., union with Christ, belief in Jesus for salvation, membership and election of the people of God, bearing witness to Jesus, keeping and obeying Jesus'/God's commands, consequences of following Jesus, marks of discipleship, distinction between Jesus' disciples and non-disciples, and Jesus as the model for his disciples). However, some may question the emphasis Marriner gives to the call narrative in John 1:35–51, its importance notwithstanding, which he labels as "paradigmatic" (p. 73).

The final portion of the book (chapter five) provides a summary and synthesis of his research with specific suggestions as to how Revelation's

presentation of discipleship might be applied to the life of a Christian disciple. Marriner's conclusions in this chapter are sound and insightful, the result of careful research, not an attempt to force the text to fit his themes. He also includes helpful recommendations for future research (p. 237).

Some may criticize Marriner for his use of a method (content analysis) from social scientific research in his examination of the biblical text. Also, biblical theologians who affirm common authorship may question the appropriateness of applying categories or themes from the Fourth Gospel onto the book of Revelation (i.e., one must let John express himself on his own terms in each writing), though I did not find evidence of Marriner forcing themes from one writing onto the other. Nevertheless, these concerns aside, the author has produced a work that has advanced biblical scholarship's understanding of discipleship in the Apocalypse. Marriner's effort should be taken seriously as it makes a valuable contribution to biblical studies in general and to discipleship studies in particular. Those interested in understanding Revelation's presentation of discipleship are strongly encouraged to read his work. It is an excellent resource.

Michael L. Bryant
Charleston, South Carolina

Andrew Christopher Smith. *Fundamentalism, Fundraising, and the Transformation of the Southern Baptist Convention, 1919–1925*. America's Baptists. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 2016. xiii + 249 pp. Hardback. ISBN 978-1621902270. $46.00.

It is common for Southern Baptists to claim we are not a denomination, but a convention of autonomous congregations. While this distinction recognizes that the Southern Baptist Convention (SBC) is not a hierarchical or (explicitly) connectional organization, it is nevertheless a distinction made by few besides SBC insiders. The SBC is a not only a denomination, but a remarkably centralized one, especially for a tradition committed to local church autonomy. The SBC became a denomination in the years immediately following World War I. And as Andrew Smith argues in his recent monograph, fundraising and fundamentalism were the engines that drove the denominational machine.

Fundamentalism, Fundraising, and the Transformation of the Southern Baptist Convention, 1919–1925 is a revision of Smith's dissertation at Vanderbilt University. It also serves as the inaugural volume in the University of Tennessee Press's new series, America's Baptists, edited by Southeastern Seminary's own Keith Harper. It is an impressive first entry, and one that bodes well for the series as a whole. Smith, assistant professor of religion

at Carson-Newman University, has written a groundbreaking book that offers some much-needed nuance to key years in Southern Baptist history.

Smith divides his book into six chapters, plus a brief conclusion. He discusses figures and topics that are familiar to historians of the SBC: Norris, E. Y. Mullins, L. R. Scarborough, J. B. Gambrell, anti-evolution controversies, the Seventy-Five Million Campaign, and the Baptist Faith and Message (1925). He also includes as an appendix a brief essay exploring how the historiography related to J. Frank Norris and the SBC has evolved since the publication of George Marsden's *Fundamentalism and American Culture* in 1980.

Often, the story of this era is told as follows: Like nearly all the major Protestant denominations, the SBC launched a massive fundraising drive after World War I. The goal was $75 million, which was over-pledged ($92 million) but under-met ($58 million). This unfortunate situation was further complicated because denominational institutions borrowed money on the assumption that the pledges would be honored. But the good news is that the doomed campaign united Southern Baptists nationwide, giving birth to the Cooperative Program in 1925. As an added bonus, Southern Baptists united against evolution and adopted the first edition of the Baptist Faith and Message, also in 1925. Thus, the SBC as we know it came into its own. Everything about this narrative is basically accurate. As Smith shows, it is also far too simplistic.

Smith interprets the era as a victory for southern progressives who wanted a more centralized denomination, rather than the more democratic convention championed by many grassroots pastors. Using fundamentalists such as Norris as their foil on the right, and the ecumenical movement as their leftwing nemesis, progressives such as Mullins and Scarborough used the $75 Million Campaign to create a new Southern Baptist bureaucracy. This new bureaucracy was theologically conservative, like fundamentalism, but was fiercely committed to denominational unity, much like the more ecumenical mainline denominations. The rallying point was cooperative giving for the sake of foreign and domestic missions and theological education, emphasized during the original 1919–1924 campaign and then perfected, though gradually, in the Cooperative Program. Smith calls this center-right approach advocated by SBC progressives the "Scarborough Synthesis," after $75 Million Campaign chairman L. R. Scarborough, who emphasized both the institutional defense of orthodoxy and denominational loyalty (pp. 136–37).

Progressive leadership worked hard to gain the support of rank-and-file Southern Baptist pastors for the Scarborough Synthesis. Most of the state newspaper editors became defenders of the new status quo, though

some raised concerns about centralization (e.g., L. L. Gwaltney of Alabama) and a few even registered populist protests against the new bureaucracy (e.g., Victor Masters of Kentucky). While local church protectionism remained prominent in the SBC, denominational loyalists ostracized and often pushed out completely anti-denominational Landmarkers. The same was true of most self-proclaimed fundamentalists. Pastors who supported the $75 Million Campaign were rewarded with praise in the denominational press and recommendations to more strategic pastorates. Denominationalists treated critics as disloyal malcontents. By 1925, despite the failure of the $75 Million Campaign, the SBC was fast becoming a centralized denomination. The Baptist Faith and Message appealed to the orthodoxy impulse of the Scarborough Synthesis, while the Cooperative Program appealed to the denominational loyalty impulse. The Scarborough Synthesis became the denominational consensus that prevailed until the Inerrancy Controversy finally upended it in the final two decades of the twentieth century.

Smith's book offers a needed corrective to earlier studies that overestimated the influence of J. Frank Norris and underestimated the influence of progressivism among leading SBC pastors and institutional leaders. Later denominational controversies, often interpreted as being either battles for the Bible or denominational power politics, were actually more complicated: they were debates over the integrity of the Scarborough Synthesis. Conservatives were concerned that moderates downplayed the orthodoxy impulse, while moderates were convinced conservatives had rejected, or inappropriately redefined, the loyalty impulse. To understand what happened in 1979, historians need to understand what happened between 1919 and 1925 and how those years shaped the postwar SBC. Smith's fine study plays a signal role in helping us to do just that. Highly recommended.

Nathan A. Finn
Jackson, Tennessee

Drew Hart. *Trouble I've Seen: Changing the Way the Church Views Racism*. Harrisonburg, VA: Herald Press, 2016. 198 pp. Paperback. ISBN 978-1513800004. $16.99.

Pastor, blogger, and PhD candidate in Theology and Ethics, Drew Hart has contributed to the growing literature on the Church and race relations. Part memoir, part social theory, and part theology, this is a well-rounded, accessible work that refuses to shy away from arguably the most important issue facing Evangelical churches today—their complicity with systemic racism. Hart's major argument is that American Christians have

chosen to uphold a racist and patriarchal social system that has marginalized people of color and women at the expense of following Christ fully—the Christ who stood in solidarity with the socially and culturally marginalized. Hart demonstrates that white American Christian acceptance of the racial and patriarchal structures of society are subtler and more tacit than people believe. Hart's purpose in the work is to expose how white Christians have been complicit in the perpetuation of these social structures and offer practical steps for Christians to live as Christ (i.e., by living counter-culturally in a context of societal racism).

The major strength of the book is the way Hart works through issues like racism, white privilege, black respectability, and patriarchy. In all of these, Hart draws from sociology and recent theological works. In terms of racism, Hart engages the definition of prominent sociologists Michael Omi and Howard Winant, who define race in terms of socially constructed categories of people, rather than biological categories. This is important, since it points to the fact that race has been created at a certain historical moment to serve political and ideological ends, as Omi and Winant assert. This definition undergirds all the issues that Hart investigates.

In particular, Hart's treatment of whiteness is very thoughtful yet honest. He asserts, and rightly, that whiteness as a concept is rarely considered among Christians. Because America is racially hierarchical with whites occupying the top place, whiteness is thought of as normal, while blackness, for example, is "otherized." Using the definition of race as a social construct, Hart is able to unpack the construction of whiteness and show how it serves to empower whites and to marginalize blacks. Part of this white empowerment has meant the creation of a "white Jesus" who serves the needs of the powerful at the expense of the weak. Hart is critical of this construction as he asserts that this view of Jesus has no support in the gospel narratives. Hart argues that Jesus lived and ministered to colonized persons in first century Palestine as a colonized person. Jesus was intimately associated with those marginalized by Imperial Rome.

Hart admits that most of the book is from his perspective as an African American man. However, he argues that racism and patriarchy have been dually aligned in American society. He thus challenges racism that marginalizes people of color but also challenges patriarchy that marginalizes women. What is interesting is that Hart asserts that patriarchy does damage to white men since they have been viewed as "heroes and as ideal human beings." This is something that sets white men up to fail. In fact, it is blasphemous according to Hart. For Hart, Jesus is the norm; he is central. These are key issues discussed by Hart; all of them challenge the Church to live like Christ in response to racism and patriarchy.

Though Hart engages these issues with honesty, he elects to leave his readers with the task to apply the gospel to racism and even to white male superiority. In the final chapter, Hart offers seven practices to undo the ravages of racism and patriarchy. Among those is "to see the world from below." This practice calls for white Christians to renounce their white privilege and their perceived superiority and to occupy the place of fellow believers who are in the place of the lowly and weak. Hart asserts this is the place the Incarnate Christ assumed; therefore, to live as Jesus means all Christians should assume this position in the world. It also means that white Christians will listen to the stories of African Americans, Native Americans, Asian Americans, and Latinos in order to empathize with them.

Though there are other books on the issue of racism and racial reconciliation, Hart's work utilizes the body of scholarship on race and gender, thus giving it scholarly credibility. At the same time, its being part memoir allows readers to listen with empathy to Hart's stories about living as an African American man. Nevertheless, scholarly readers may desire Hart to engage more scholarship that would add complexity and nuance to his arguments. Those reading the book who lack familiarity with the tenets of the sociology of race or critical race theory may thus be dismissive of Hart's articulation of these findings, thinking them to be extra-biblical, and that Hart relies too heavily on social science, rather than on biblical exegesis. This is a problem a book of this sort faces.

In the end though, Hart's work offers a strong biblical argument against racism and patriarchy since it defines these categories as being socially constructed. This book should be read alongside Ta-Nehisi Coates's *Between the World and Me* so that readers can see how an African American Christian has experienced racism in America in much the same way as an African American atheist. Both writers unapologetically criticize the racist structures of the United States, but unlike Coates, Hart, a Christian, leaves his readers with the belief that change can occur.

Eric M. Washington
Grand Rapids, Michigan

Jonathan Leeman. *Don't Fire Your Church Members: The Case for Congregationalism*. Nashville: B&H Academic, 2016. viii + 200 pp. Paperback. ISBN 978-1433686238. $24.99.

Jonathan Leeman is an elder at Capitol Hill Baptist Church in Washington, D.C. He also serves as the editorial director for 9Marks. He has previously written on the importance of church polity ("Why Polity?" in *Baptist Foundations: Church Government for an Anti-Polity Age*, ed. Mark Dever

and Jonathan Leeman, Nashville: B&H Academic, 2015) and church membership (*The Church and the Surprising Offense of God's Love: Rediscovering the Doctrines of Church Membership and Discipline*, Wheaton: Crossway, 2010). Leeman demonstrates his conviction of the importance of church polity and the role of church membership in this book as well, writing in the preface: "If Jesus calls every Christian to be a part of a church, then those congregational responsibilities belong to basic Christian discipleship" (p. viii).

The goal of the book is to "present a biblical-theological and systematic case for pastor-led or elder-led congregationalism. Elder-led congregationalism makes every member a priest-king, and it trains them for the work" (p. 16). Rather than pursuing an approach to church polity that is "wholly pragmatic," Leeman seeks to demonstrate that the "fundamentals" of church government grow out of the gospel (p. 14, 15).

Chapter 1 presents the hermeneutical process of discerning the gospel roots for church polity. This process seeks to ascertain who the Bible says has the "power in the church," thus the title of the chapter, "Who's In Charge of What Around Here" (p. 31). Leeman contends that one must embrace an "institutional hermeneutic." Ultimately, he persuasively contends that "church polity is a subcategory of ethics and that whatever hermeneutical principles are used for Christian ethics should also be used for polity" (p. 17). He thus offers five rules to govern the hermeneutical process: (1) ask who is authorized to do what; (2) employ wisdom for determining how to fulfill an authorization; (3) heed canonical horizons and covenantal administrations; (4) be sensitive to different kinds of authority; and (5) treat polity as a subcategory of ethics (pp. 19–31).

Chapters 2 through 4 offer the theological argument for congregationalism. Leeman considers the Adamic office of "priest-king" an indispensable ingredient to the concept of congregationalism. His argument is that God gave this office first to the "federal head" (Adam) and repeated throughout history through Noah, Abraham, Israel, and David. Finally, the office was conferred on Jesus, the final "federal head of God's new covenant people," who perfectly fulfilled the office. Through Jesus, the office of priest-king is "re-conferred on every member of the church" (pp. 58–59). Thus, every member of the church has the responsibility to work for Christ's kingdom and to watch over the members of the church.

In chapters 3 and 4, Leeman unpacks the significance of Matthew 16 and the "keys of the kingdom." He evaluates primarily where church authority resides, and he seeks to dismantle the idea that either the authority descends from the apostles or is grounded and ascends from the whole church. For Leeman, the whole congregation, including elders, has received authority to fulfill the office of priest-king, giving the congregation

the "keys of the kingdom." Elders have the authority to lead the congregation in its use of the keys. Chapter 4 concludes the discussion of the "keys of the kingdom" by placing them in the hands of the gathered local church.

Chapter 5 examines the connection between congregational rule and elder leadership. While the congregation has the "authority of command," elders have the "authority of counsel." As Leeman emphasizes, "the congregation has final earthly rule over the church" (p. 146), and the elder is the spiritually gifted guide to counsel the congregation on its use of authority. He suggests that elder leadership and congregational rule, with its concomitant ingredients of submission to and trust in the elders, provide a powerful tool for discipleship.

Chapter 6 evaluates the interconnectivity between a local church and other churches. Through an analysis of Acts 15, Leeman argues that local churches are independent of one another but are also interdependent in the fulfillment of the Great Commission. Chapter 7 concludes with practical applications of elder-led congregationalism. He emphasizes that the right kind of preaching and the right administration of ordinances lead to healthy congregationalism.

Leeman offers a strong biblical-theological argument for elder-led congregationalism. His contention that the congregation is the final authority over the church should assuage the temper of those who struggle with the idea of elder leadership. Leeman also addresses the issue of "multi-site" (especially pp. 118–20), yet I was left wanting more detailed analysis. The growth of "multi-site," as well as the commonality of "multi-service," begs for richer biblical-theological examination. The biblical heft of Leeman's interplay with differing opinions on other topics in the book would have well served his analysis of "multi-site." Overall though, I agree with others who positively endorse this book. Leeman provides a significant, robust defense of elder-led congregationalism.

Eric J. Thomas
Norfolk, Virginia

Megan Hill. *Praying Together: The Priority and Privilege of Prayer in Our Homes, Communities, and Churches*. Wheaton: Crossway, 2016. 125 pp. Paperback. ISBN 978-1433550515. $12.99.

The thesis of the book, *Praying Together* is both in the title and in the first line following the Introduction: "A Christian never prays alone" (p. 17). This might be a bit misleading, in that Megan Hill intends a reader to understand that God is present in every prayer, even those prayed in sol-

itude. However, her central call is for community prayer. In the introduction, she clearly states what she hopes the reader would gain when she writes, "This book is a call to each one of us to consider the praying together we have done and are doing and hope to do; the childhood dinner prayers, the youth-group prayer vigil, the spontaneous prayer in dorm rooms and parking lots and at the back of the church, the planned prayer during Bible studies and prayer meetings and in the Lord's Day worship service" (p. 13).

I confess that because of the cover art and the description of the author as a "pastor's wife and pastor's daughter," my first impression was that it was mostly a practical book, written primarily for women. She does state in the introduction that, "This book is not an exhaustive theology of prayer. Many and better minds than my own have written that book several times over" (p. 13). Yet, in reading the book and investigating the further substantial credentials of the author, I am first to admit my error and to caution a reader not to regard the scholarship of the text too lightly. *Praying Together* is a substantial treatise on community prayer, biblically supported and theologically sound.

Following the introduction, the book is divided into three parts, *The Foundation of Praying Together, The Fruits of Praying Together,* and *The Practice of Praying Together*. The first part, *Foundation,* stresses the nature of relationship in prayer—the definition of the "together" in praying together. We pray in relationship to God and we unite our hearts with other believers, including the mingling of our prayers in heaven with those of the saints who have prayed before us (p. 27). In this section, Hill discusses the biblical imperatives for praying together (duty) and the biblical incentives for praying together (promise). She traces a hermeneutic history of collective prayer, saturating the reader with Scripture.

In the second part, *Fruits,* the author describes love as a byproduct of praying together, saying that if we pray with (not just for) each other, a deep love will follow. Discipleship is a result of community prayer, especially as younger believers learn the "why" and "how" of prayer from praying with others. She closes the section with a discussion on the role of prayer in revival. She includes revival as a fruit of community prayer, calling it "God's answer to our prayer" (p. 81). However, this was the only place in the book where I had a bit of tension—Hill clearly states that revival is not an automatic response to community prayer (p. 83), and she states that "we avoid praying for something different, a magic bullet, that bears no resemblance to God's normal work in our midst" (p. 85), but she tells multiple stories that insinuate that we prompt God's sovereignty with our prayers.

The last part, *Practice,* is what I expected from the book. After laying

down the biblical and theological foundations, and describing the byproducts of praying together, Hill switches to the pragmatic and lets the reader know how to engage in community prayer so that it becomes natural. The author admits in the opening lines of the chapter on praying with the church, "I wrote this entire book so I could write this chapter" (p. 95). Her stories early in the book regarding her practice of finding the church prayer meeting at various life moments tips her hand. She believes that a church needs to pray together. She does not depart from her attention to Scripture and her supportive anecdotes as she describes strategically how to make praying together a reality, a normative practice in the church, in prayer groups, and among families.

Following the three sections are study questions, endnotes, and a bibliography which testifies to her thorough research for the book. Megan Hill is a voracious reader, if the supportive evidence is any indication. Also included is a scripture index, which gave me further confidence that this book is appropriate for both corporate and personal advancement in the practice of community prayer. The chapter on discipleship might provide an additional suggestion—this book makes a great curriculum for personal discipleship.

It is unusual to conclude a book review with favorite quotes, but Megan Hill is a wordsmith. I feel it helpful to close with her own turns of phrase:

> We pray "in Jesus's name" because he is the one whose blood secures our right to pray, whose perfect will and blameless character direct our prayers, and whose ongoing intercession in heaven makes us bold on our knees. (p. 34)

> When we pray together, we declare in the hearing of others who our God is—we build an area in which to showcase God's sovereign work and his gracious character. Our corporate prayers demonstrate that we are a people who know our God and who delight in his ways. (p. 47)

> When believers unite in prayer for Christ's bride, no one is preferred and no one is forgotten. (p. 62)

> What if we prayed for "prayer appointments"? What if we looked daily for God-given moments to pray together? By prayer and expectation, we may discover that a friendship, a crisis, a Bible study meeting, a phone call, or a hospital room reveals yet another occasion to gather at the throne. (p. 113)

Allen Jackson
Atlanta, Georgia