CONTENTS

ARTICLES

BOOK REVIEWS

STR 13.1 (Spring 2022): 1–23

Male and Female in Galatians 3:28: A Short Biblical Theology of Unity

Daniel Wayne Roberts
Cameron Avenue Church of Christ, Colonial Heights, VA

Abstract: *Paul's use of the OT has been a subject of great interest within the field of biblical theology, with special interest on Pauline echoes and/or allusions. While direct quotations are often obvious, recognizing echoes and/or allusions requires more sophistication and nuance. Galatians 3:28 is a rare case of a direct quote going relatively unnoticed by scholarship, which is then followed by a one-word allusion to further solidify Paul's claims concerning unity. This study contends that in Gal 3:28 Paul quotes Gen 1:27 (ἄρσεν καὶ θῆλυ), though it appears without an introductory formula, and that this purposeful quotation of Gen 1:27 is meant to couple with an allusion to Gen 2:24 to articulate further Paul's theology of unity found in Christ. The subtlety that Paul employs underscores the variety of ways Paul utilizes the OT and how Paul's deliberate change of wording illuminates his theology.*

Key Words: *allusion, biblical theology, echo, female, Galatians 3:28, gender, male, Paul, unity*

The study of the NT's use of the OT is notoriously slippery, particularly when it comes to categorizing the various methods the NT authors employ.[1] Direct quotes are usually the easiest to identify in that there is

[1] Defining biblical theology itself can also be a daunting task—a wide spectrum separates more descriptive uses from prescriptive ones. Depending on one's position on this spectrum, there are numerous ways of identifying the disparate uses of the OT in the NT. James Barr says as much in the beginnings of his own work on biblical theology, though not speaking expressly of the NT use of the OT. He explains, "One of its weaknesses, however, has been the difficulty of defining exactly what it is. The very idea of 'biblical theology' seems to hang uncertainly in middle air, somewhere between actual exegesis and systematic theology." James Barr, *The Concept of Biblical Theology: An Old Testament Perspective* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1999), 2. Edward Klink and Darian Lockett provide a helpful taxonomy of biblical theology in *Understanding Biblical Theology: A Comparison of Theory and Practice* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2012). Works focused on the NT use of the OT include G. K. Beale, *Handbook on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament: Exegesis and Interpretation* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2012), and the volume edited by G. K. Beale and D. A. Carson, *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007). Many works practice "biblical theology" but do not necessarily focus on the NT use of the OT, at least not the NT as a whole. A few examples include G. K. Beale, *John's Use of the Old Testament in Revelation*, LNTS (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1998); C. H. Dodd, *According to the Scriptures: The Sub-structure of New Testament Theology* (London: Nisbet Co., 1953); R. T. France, *Jesus and the Old Testament: His Application of Old Testament Passages to Himself and His Mission* (Vancouver: Regent College, 1998); Steve Moyise, *Jesus and Scripture: Studying the New Testament Use of the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2010).

substantial verbal agreement between the new text and the text being quoted, or there is the ever-helpful introductory formula (e.g., "it is written ...").[2] However, on some occasions, though a text is being quoted, there is no introductory formula, and the text quoted may consist of only a word, or maybe a few words. For example, in 1 Pet 2:9 a string of such quotations is taken from Isa 43:20–21, Exod 19:5–6, Deut 4:20, 7:6, and 14:2 (as well as a possible allusion to Isa 9:2).[3] Sometimes, these short quoted texts may also be intended to draw one's attention to the "rest of the story," so to speak, and to borrow and reimagine it in a new context.[4] These uses are the most difficult to identify because they require a greater degree of sophistication, both of author and reader. This study contends

[2] It should be noted that sometimes a formula does not "introduce" a quote but may follow it (e.g., Matt 24:14; Rom 2:24). At any rate, the formula is a signal that what is being said, or had been said, is purposefully being quoted as evidence of a claim.

[3] Another example is Mark's account of Jesus's words concerning the "abomination of desolation." In Matthew, Jesus specifically mentions Daniel. However, in Mark, the phrase "abomination of desolation" serves as a marker to the book of Daniel, though there is no specific reference outside of the phrase "let the reader understand" (see Mark 13:14 and Matt 24:15).

[4] One such example may be Jesus's cry from the cross quoted from Psalm 22 in Matthew. Jesus's cry of abandonment is not isolated from the rest of Psalm 22 or even divorced from his own ministry and death. Just what Jesus is indicating through his cry is debated, but that he is purposefully drawing one's mind to Psalm 22 and the surrounding context of his own abandonment is obvious. Matthew helps in this regard as he records other happenings in the Passion narrative that also find resonance and reference within Psalm 22 (e.g., Matt 27:43/Ps 22:4, 8). For a more thorough examination of the various correlations between Psalm 22 and the Passion in Matthew, see Craig Blomberg, "Matthew," in Beale and Carson, *Commentary of the New Testament Use of the Old Testament*, 97–100. See also Luke 13:19.

that Paul in Gal 3:27–28 quotes Gen 1:27, though the quote appears without an introductory formula, and that this purposeful quotation of Gen 1:27 is meant to couple with an allusion to Gen 2:24 to articulate further the unity found in Christ.[5]

Galatians 3:27–28 is a theologically significant passage, some of which Paul repeats as a liturgy of sorts in some of other epistles.[6] The theological thrust of the passage is one of the pillars of his theology—that being "in Christ" dismantles worldly partitions. Galatians 3:28 provides a special quandary for the interpreter because of the addition of ἄρσεν καὶ θῆλυ ("male and female"), a phrase found nowhere else in Pauline literature and found only two other times in the whole of the NT (Matt 19:4; Mark 10:6). Several commentators have noted the similarity of Gal 3:28 to Gen 1:27, but these (to my knowledge) have not argued systematically whether or not Paul is quoting or alluding to Gen 1:27 and, if so, how that affects the way in which one should read the surrounding context of Gal 3:27–28 in relation to Gen 2:24.[7]

This study proposes to accomplish several goals. (1) This study will focus on the context of the phrase ἄρσεν καὶ θῆλυ in the Greek OT, noting the specific use of the phrase in Gen 1:27 and 5:2. The context of Gen 2:24 will also be considered because it is explicitly connected with 1:27 in two of the three occurrences of the phrase ἄρσεν καὶ θῆλυ in the NT (Matt 19:4–5; Mark 10:6–7) and likely has some important implications for Gal 3:28. (2) This study will also examine the way in which the phrase ἄρσεν καὶ θῆλυ is understood in Gen 1:27 as well as Gen 2:24 in the Second Temple/early Jewish period. This early Jewish literature does not consist of seminal discussions taken up by Jesus and the Christians. In other words, Jesus (and subsequently, Christianity) seems to be the first

[5] Richard Hays's study is especially significant for the study of Paul's more subtle uses of the OT, what he calls echoes and allusions. This specific example, not discussed by Hays, arguably passes all seven of his tests for Pauline echoes. See Richard Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul* (New Haven: Yale University Press), 29–32.

[6] Rom 10:12; 1 Cor 12:13; Eph 6:8; Col 3:11.

[7] For example, see F. F. Bruce, *Galatians*, NIGTC (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982), 189; Richard N. Longenecker, *Galatians*, WBC 41 (Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1990), 157; James D. G. Dunn, *The Epistle to the Galatians*, BNTC (London: A & C Black), 206–7, and Ronald Y. K. Fung, *The Epistle to the Galatians*, NICNT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1988), 175. One exception may be Richard Hove, *Equality in Christ? Galatians 3:28 and the Gender Dispute* (Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 1999), 66–69, who argues that Paul is likely deliberately quoting Gen 1:27, yet Hove still opts for translating the phrase "male nor female" in keeping with the first two couplets. One should also note that the UBS 4th and 5th revisions do not include a reference to Gen 1:27 in Gal 3:28.

to tie Gen 1:27 and 2:24 together explicitly. (3) The way in which Jesus used these passages in conjunction with one another will also be reviewed in an attempt to make a case that Gen 1:27 and 2:24 are related in Christian thought with regard to the unity of marriage, which Paul compares to the unity of Christ and the church. (4) Paul's use of Genesis 1–3 will be examined (both direct and indirect references) in an attempt to situate his theology within Jesus's theology of Gen 1:27 and 2:24. Several similarities and differences will be pointed out in Galatians and other Pauline literature in order to demonstrate that Gal 3:28 fits within the wider context of Pauline theology and that his addition of the phrase ἄρσεν καὶ θῆλυ is purposeful and has significant theological value. Within this section, several motifs and themes found within Gal 3:28 will be traced as well as significant verbal and syntactical clues. (5) Galatians 3:27–28 will be expounded focusing on the Pauline themes and verbal cues that suggest Paul is explicitly and purposefully quoting Gen 1:27 and means to imply the latter part of Gen 2:24 through the use of the word εἷς/μίαν (Gal 3:28//Gen 2:24).

Implications

The modern debates concerning Gal 3:28 revolve not around the text itself, but about how the text is interpreted concerning the role of women in the church. Feminist readings have predominantly read in Gal 3:28 a gospel that completely erases all distinctions of race, gender, or social class in church leadership and ministry in particular.[8] However, on the whole of Pauline exegesis, this interpretation cannot be supported because it presses one into taking Gal 3:28 as more fundamental than other texts or makes Paul ambivalent and confused.[9] Keener warns against this sort of cultural reading, stating, "One of the greatest tragedies of history is when God's holy Scripture, addressing one situation, is uncritically applied to another situation while ignoring the larger tenor of Scripture."[10] One must read Gal 3:28 within the overall matrix of Pauline theology, which accommodates gender distinctions as well as instructions to slaves and Jewish

[8] See, e.g., Pauline Nigh Hogan, *"No Longer Male and Female:" Interpreting Galatians 3:28 in Early Christianity*, LNTS 380 (New York: T&T Clark, 2008), 6–19. Hogan's work traces the history of interpretation of this passage giving special attention to those like Stendahl, Meeks, MacDonald, and Firoenza.

[9] See, e.g., W. M. Ramsay, *The Teachings of Paul in the Present Day* (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1913), 214–15, and Craig Keener, *Paul, Women and Wives: Marriage and Women's Ministry in the Letters of Paul* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1992), 20–21.

[10] Keener, *Paul, Women and* Wives, 210.

cultic practices. Thus, though the Jews no longer had to practice certain food regulations or attend feasts, they had the freedom to do so. They did not have to give up their Jewish identity completely. Though Philemon was urged to treat Onesimus as "no longer a slave but a brother" (Phlm 16) slaves were still asked to serve their masters well, and masters were told how to treat their slaves (1 Cor 7:17–24;[11] Eph 6:5–9; Col 3:22–4:1). Gender roles, or gender distinction, are also discussed by Paul, even in his undisputed letters (e.g., 1 Cor 11:8–9; 14:34–35).[12] Thus, Gal 3:28 is not about gender equality *per se* but about the unity found in Christ. To be balanced, a certain liberty and an equality that otherwise had not been granted to women were offered in Christ (by his actions) as well as Paul and the early church (e.g., Acts 16:14–15; Rom 16:1).

One should note that in each of these cases in which Paul appeals to Genesis, he is attempting to strengthen the position he takes on these gender roles. For example, when explaining that a man ought not to have intercourse with a prostitute, he quotes Gen 2:24 to prove that whoever joins himself to a prostitute has become one with her (1 Cor 6:15–16).[13] Interestingly enough, in this instance, he also makes a case about unity with the Lord, ὁ δὲ κολλώμενος τῷ κυρίῳ ἕν πνεῦμα ἐστιν ("… the one who is joined to the Lord is one Spirit with him"), using the same verb used in 1 Cor 6:15 and the unquoted portion of Gen 2:24 as used in Matt 19:5.[14] In other words, this is yet another case in which the oneness of marriage is both physical and/or sexual as well as spiritual in Paul's thinking (Gen 2:24 is used as is the word "one").

Because there are no instances of these connections in contemporary literature (or in early Jewish literature), Paul may have relied upon the Jesus tradition (or one of the early Gospels) for his theology. While the questions Paul and Jesus are answering are different, one cannot easily dismiss the fact that the phrase ἄρσεν καὶ θῆλυ appears in only these two places in the NT, both in close conjunction to the unity found in two becoming one. So, the two ethnicities of Jew and Gentile become one in Christ, just as the two classes of slaves and freemen. The "male and female" dichotomy is also erased through marriage/intercourse, and marriage creates a new "oneness" that otherwise is not achieved.[15] So, in 1 Corinthians 7 Paul can understand that slaves remain slaves yet still be equal active participants in the body of Christ. The same is true of Jew/Gentile relationships, which is a prevalent issue in Galatians and throughout Pauline literature, a distinction that drove the premier battle of the early church.

[11] It is worth noting, however, that in 1 Cor 7:17–24 the only situation in which release is encouraged is slavery (1 Cor 7:21).

[12] First Corinthians 14:34–35 is particularly problematic if taken out of its context or if "as in all the churches" is to be taken with the silence of women. See Keener, *Paul, Women and Wives*, 70–88.

[13] Proof, again, in an undisputed Pauline letter that he was familiar with and used Gen 2:24 in a way similar to the argument of this work.

[14] The form of the verb used in Gen 2:24 in the LXX is προσκολλάω.

Paul's quotation of Gen 1:27 illuminates his theology. If, in some mysterious way (as in Ephesians), a man and woman can become one flesh,[16] and so Christ and the church are also wed (2 Cor 11:2), then in a similar way, the distinctions of Jew and Gentile, slave and free, and male and female can be erased in Christ while still being Jewish, free, and male or female.[17] Paul is quoting Gen 1:27 and in turn 2:24 in order to compare the unity that comes in Christ with the unity of marriage. As has been (and will be) demonstrated, Paul's biblical theologies of marriage and unity in Christ are not isolated to Gal 3:28. However, Paul's quotation of Gen 1:27 (2:24) solidifies the radical nature of his proposal to the Galatian Jews—Greeks can be one with Jews in Christ just as men and women can be one through marriage, and in this case, can be one in Christ. There may be further implications for modern society, gender roles in the church, and the ministries of women. However, this study is seeking primarily to demonstrate Paul's subtle, deliberate quotation of Gen 1:27 to draw one's mind to the unity found in Christ compared with the unity of man and woman in marriage by an allusion to, or echo of, Gen 2:24.

ἄρσεν καὶ θῆλυ in the OT

In order to demonstrate the way in which Paul uses the phrase ἄρσεν καὶ θῆλυ in Gal 3:28, a review of the phrase in the OT is necessary, focusing especially on the LXX because Paul seems to quote from the LXX.[18] The phrase as Paul uses it appears only in Gen 1:27; 5:2; 6:19, 20;

[15] Further illustrating this point is Paul's argument in 1 Cor 7:1–7 regarding marriage and singleness. Marriage itself requires attention be given to one's spouse, whereas the single person is wholly devoted to God. Cf. also 1 Cor 6:16–17.

[16] See also 1 Cor 6:15–16 above.

[17] See Martin Luther, *Commentary on Galatians*, trans. Erasmus Middleton (Grand Rapids: Kregel, 1979), 223–24, and Dunn, *Galatians*, 207–8.

[18] Paul, although often quoting the LXX, feels free to modify slightly these texts. For example, in Romans 4, Paul quotes Gen 15:6 three times, not once

7:2, 3, 9, 16 (Exod 1:16, 22, and Lev 12:7 all have the same words in the passage but not the specific phraseology of Gal 3:28; see also 2 Macc 7:21).[19] This cluster of uses in the first portion of Genesis demonstrates the primary significance of the phrase as that which conveys the elementary aspects of creation, procreation, and multiplication. Each instance in Genesis 6–7 refers to the male and female animals that entered the ark.[20] Exodus 1:16 and 1:22 refer to the male and female children being born to the Hebrews. The one example in Leviticus also refers to the sex of children born (12:7). The exact phrase Paul uses in reference to humanity is found in Gen 1:27 and 5:2. In the LXX, both of these verses contain the sentence ἄρσεν καὶ θῆλυ ἐποίησεν αὐτούς.[21] In Gen 1:27, the focus is humanity (τὸν ἄνθρωπον) made in the image and likeness of God, which

quoting it precisely the same way (Rom 4:3, 9, 22). Similarly, see Paul's quotation of Isa 29:14 in 1 Cor 1:19, wherein he quotes the LXX text verbatim aside from the final verb. See C. D. Stanley, *Paul and the Language of Scripture: Citation Technique in the Pauline Epistles and Contemporary Literature* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), 186. Though beyond the scope of this study to exhaust fully, many works focus on the NT use of the OT, and more specifically Paul's use of the OT. These works include E. Earle Ellis, *Paul's Use of the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1981); C. D. Stanley, *Arguing with Scripture: The Rhetoric of Quotations in the Letters of Paul* (New York: T&T Clark, 2004); Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul*; Richard Longenecker, *Biblical Exegesis in the Apostolic Period*, 2nd ed. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999), 88–116. Among these, Ellis's and Hays's works are premier works on the subject. As noted in earlier, sometimes identifying or categorizing references to the OT can prove problematic. The primary intent of this work is not to situate the use of Gen 1:27 and 2:24 among the already-constructed categories, but to determine whether Paul's use of these passages is purposeful, and what that purposeful use conveys. However, if pressed, I would classify Paul's use of Gen 1:27 as a quotation and his use of Gen 2:24 as an intertextual "echo."

[19] ἄρσην in the LXX: Gen 1:27; 5:2; 6:19–20; 7:2–3, 9, 16; 17:14, 23; 34:24; Exod 1:16–22; 2:2; 12:5; Lev 1:3, 10; 3:1, 6; 4:23; 6:22; 7:6; 12:2, 7; 15:33; 18:22; 20:13; 22:19; 27:3, 5–7; Num 1:2; 3:40; 31:17–18; Josh 17:2; Judg 21:11–12; Job 3:3; Isa 26:14; 66:7; Jer 20:15; 37:6; Mal 1:14; Tob. 6:12; Sir 36:21; 2 Macc 7:21; 4 Macc 15:30; Odes Sol. 5:14.

θῆλυς in the LXX: Gen 1:27; 5:2; 6:19–20; 7:2–3, 9, 16; Exod 1:16, 22; Lev 3:1, 6; 4:28, 32; 5:6; 12:5, 7; 15:33; 27:4–7; Num 31:15; Judg 5:10; 1 Kgs 10:26; 2 Chr 9:25; Prov 30:31; Job 1:3, 14; 42:12; Amos 6:12; Jdt 9:10; 13:15; 16:5; 2 Macc 7:21.

[20] The only exception is Gen 7:16, which refers to the male and female of all flesh (ἀπο πάσης σαρκὸς), likely a reference to both animals and humanity.

[21] The Hebrew reads זָכָר וּנְקֵבָה בָּרָא אֹתָם.

some have understood to be an androgynous human.[22] However, in Gen 5:2, rather than referring to them (the man and woman) as τὸν ἄνθρωπον ("man" or "mankind"), they are referred to by the name *Adam* (ἐπωνόμασεν τὸ ὄνομα αὐτῶν Αδαμ, "He named them man …"). So, in the context of Genesis the phrase refers to the distinct sex of both humanity and animals.[23]

The context of Gen 2:24 encompasses a more thorough explanation of the creation of woman. Adam ("mankind")[24] was alone (and presumably male), so a helper was sought among the animals (Gen 2:18–20).[25] A helper was not found from the animals, so God caused a deep sleep to fall upon him and he took a rib from his side. The flesh closed up, and woman (אִשָּׁה; γυνή) was formed.[26] Adam proclaims about her, "This is now bone of my bones, and flesh of my flesh" (Gen 2:23), which is a Semitic phrase found throughout the OT denoting familial relationships

[22] For example, see Hans Dieter Betz, *Galatians* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1979), 195–200. See also Wayne A. Meeks, "Image of the Androgyne: Some Uses of a Symbol in Earliest Christianity," *HR* 13.3 (1974): 165–208. This discussion of androgyny is peripheral (at best) to the present inquiry. However, it should suffice to say that commentators seem to be in relative agreement that although the post-Pauline church may have understood the passage in this way, Paul himself likely did not mean to erase social distinction, race, or gender, but to speak to the oneness—unity—found in Christ in spite of these differences. Galatians 3:28 should not be interpreted in isolation from the rest of Pauline theology and church practice. See Dunn, *Galatians*, 206–7 and Fung, *Galatians*, 175.

[23] Cf. Gen 1:27, 5:2; 6:19, 20; 7:2, 3, 9, 16.

[24] It should be noted that the name and designation of humankind as "Adam" can refer to both the individual Adam as well as humankind. One study recounted every use of both אָדָם and אִישׁ in the OT, concluding that Adam is best understood as "mankind" and not "male." However, the study itself is not altogether helpful as it pertains to our specific inquiry because Paul is not quoting the MT, but the LXX. In the LXX, ἄνθρωπος is used in place of אִישׁ in Gen 2:24. However, in Gen 1:27, the LXX still uses the term ἄνθρωπος although the word in the MT is Adam. See Alison Grant, "'Adam and 'Ish: Man in the OT," *ABR* 25 (1977): 2–11. There is some overlap in the meaning of the words, but ἄνθρωπος encompasses, in some way, the meaning of them both. However, ἄρσην captures well the idea of gender and is thus used instead of either word for "man/one" or "humankind." See BDAG, "ἄρσην," 135.

[25] See Josephus's interpretation in *Ant. 1.1.33* and *1.2.35–6*. In Gen 1:27 he seems to think that what God created "male and female" were the animals. And that "Moses, after the seventh day was over, begins to speak philosophically" (*Ant. 1.2.34*).

[26] The creation of male then female will be significant later in one of Paul's arguments concerning gender roles (1 Tim 2:13).

(Gen 29:14; Jdg 9:2; 2 Sam 5:1; 19:12–13; 1 Chr 11:1; Job 2:5; 19:20). Then comes the editorial comment of the writer of Genesis: "For this reason a man shall leave his father and his mother, and be joined to his wife; and they shall become one flesh" (2:24).[27] In connection with this editorial comment, France writes, "In the Genesis context the 'one flesh' image derives from the creation of the woman out of the man's side to be 'bone of my bones and flesh of my flesh' (Gen 2:21–23); in marriage that unity is restored."[28] In other words, the marriage of Adam and Eve—two separate beings—restores the "one flesh" of humankind.

In the immediate context of Gen 2:24, there does not seem to be a purposeful reference to Gen 1:27. In fact, depending on the interpreter, 2:24 may simply represent another iteration of the account of the creation of mankind.[29] Genesis 1:27 is a bird's eye view concerning the creation of man and woman and their distinct roles (thus the phrase ἄρσεν καὶ θῆλυ), while 2:24 is a commentary on the unity between the two that stands above even the relationship between father and mother.[30] As will be noted in the following sections, according to Matthew and Mark, Jesus connects the two passages with regard to the unity of marriage. There are possibly other considerations for these original texts, but for the purpose of this study it is important to note (1) the clustering of usage early in Genesis, (2) the phrase ἄρσεν καὶ θῆλυ as demonstrative of creative activity, and (3) these two (male and female) are brought together (by God) into one

[27] See William Reyburn and Euan McG. Fry, *A Handbook on Genesis* (New York: United Bible Societies, 1997), 75, and Gerhard von Rad, *Genesis: A Commentary* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1972), 84–85. Certainly, some see this narrative as mythic—not referring to the specific persons of Adam and Eve. So, in their case, this excursion/editorial comment is a way for the author/editors of Genesis to justify and explain marriage. For example, see Georg Fohrer, *Introduction to the Old Testament*, trans. David Green (Nashville: Abingdon, 1968; originally published in German 1965), 85–95.

[28] R. T. France, *The Gospel of Matthew*, NICNT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007), 717.

[29] In fact, many Introductions discuss the Documentary Hypothesis and its various iterations citing Genesis 1 and 2 as examples of two separate documents/traditions edited and/or redacted as the Genesis account. For example, see Michael D. Coogan, *The Old Testament: A Historical and Literary Introduction to the Hebrew Scriptures* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), 10–14, 21–29, and William Samford Lasor, *Old Testament Survey: The Message, Form, and Background of the Old Testament*, 2nd ed. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996), 6–13.

[30] Honoring one's father and mother is a significant OT motif iterated many times. This comment in the creation account may have been added to strengthen and validate a man who must leave his own household to live with his wife (e.g., Exod 20:12; Deut 5:16).

flesh.[31]

Genesis 1:27 and 2:24 in Early Jewish Literature

These Genesis narratives are retold numerous times in early Jewish literature.[32] Several works such as the Jubilees,[33] Life of Adam and Eve, and the Genesis Apocryphon retell the story of creation; however, the explicit meaning of Gen 1:27, 2:24, and 5:2 is not discussed in great detail. Philo expounds both passages, though his discussions are not immediately relevant to its use in the NT, or Gal 3:28 in particular. In one case, Philo allegorizes the text: mind (the man), father (God), mother (the "mother of all things"), and woman (external sensation/rose).[34] He also expounds the reasons that the man (not the woman) leaves his father and mother, which include fidelity, the man's "master-like authority," and the woman "being in the rank of a servant, is praised, for assenting to a life of communion" (*QG* 1.29). Concerning Gen 2:24 and the "one flesh" of the union of man and woman he states that the "flesh is very tangible and fully endowed with outward senses" (*QG* 1.29), which are pain and pleasure enjoyed by the man and woman. Watts notes that later Rabbinic tradition mentions both 1:27 and 2:24 in various forums and "often together."[35] Most notable are the discussions of marriage and "procreation as a requirement thereof" (m. Yebam. 6:6; b. Mo'ed Qat. 8b; 23a; b. Yebam. 61b).[36] According to Watts, the Babylonian Talmud also uses these verses in conjunction, but after having reviewed the material he cites, there seems to be no explicit, purposeful connection between these

[31] Watts also notes regarding Gen 2:24, "In other words, this is not merely descriptive, but rather, in the context of Torah, constitutes a divine decree." Rikk Watts, "Mark," in *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament*, 197.

[32] Cf. 4 Macc 18:7 and the connection between "rib" and womanhood.

[33] See especially Jub. 3:7.

[34] Alleg. Interp. 2.49.

[35] Watts, "Mark," 198.

[36] Watts, "Mark," 198. In contrast to the predominant focus on marriage and procreation by the rabbis, Ben Witherington argues that Paul purposefully invokes Gen 1:27 in Gal 3:28 in opposition to the idea that one *must* be married or married to a circumcised male to be considered part of the community. For Paul, the oneness found in Christ is not based on ethnic, social, or marital status. In other words, as Witherington understands it, Paul's emphasis is not on gender distinction (male *or* female), but that marriage is not a requisite of covenant membership (male *and* female; cf. 1 Cor 7). See Ben Witherington III, "Rite and Rights for Women—Gal 3:28," *NTS* 27.5 (1981): 599.

two verses and no substantial similarity with the argument Jesus made.[37] This reality should not be overstated, lest some details have been missed. At any rate, one would be hard-pressed to demonstrate that the Talmud or Mishnah predated Jesus's or Paul's own quotations of these passages for the purpose of defining marital and Christian unity.

The DSS contain two documents that mention Gen 2:24. CD 4:21 quotes this passage as an argument against polygamy. The writer of the Damascus Document explains, "[T]hey are caught in two traps: fornication, by taking two wives in their lifetime although the principle of creation is 'male and female He created them.'"[38] Also 4Q416 2 iii 21–iv.1 reiterates the teaching of the passages as a midrash. The wife is to be lived with (in contrast to living with father and mother) and that "He has made you rule over her, so [...] God did not give [her father] authority over her, He has separated her from her mother, and unto you [He has given authority.... He has made your wife] and you into one flesh." Thus, the argument of the community was that because the woman has left father and mother, this gives the man authority over her and that they share one flesh.[39]

Later Gnostic tradition and apocryphal gospels understood these passages (possibly coupled with Gal 3:28) to erase sexual identity.[40] For example, Hippolytus says that the Naassenes believed in a bisexual being, "For ... Attis was castrated, that is, (cut off) from the earthly parts of the creation (here) below, and has gone over to the eternal substance above where, he says, there is neither female nor male (οὐκ ἔστιν θῆλυ **οὔτε** ἄρσεν),[41] but a new creature, a new man, which is bisexual

[37] The texts to which he refers are Gen. Rab. 17:4; b. Ketub. 8a; Tg. Ps.–J. Gen 1:27; Gen. Rab. 8:1; b. Ber. 61a; b. 'Erub. 18a; Midr. Ps. 139:5; b. Mo'ed Qat. 7b; 8b; 18b; 23a; b. Git 43b; m. Yebam 6:6; b. Yebam 61b. See Watts, *Mark*, 198.

[38] The writer follows with Gen 7:2 (the animals entered the ark two by two) and the command to the king not to multiply wives (Deut 17:17), which follows with an explanation of why David was justified in his multiplying of wives. One might note that this quotation may go beyond polygamy and prohibit having more than one wife at all (even if one wife should die), which Paul mentions two times in the NT, except in regard to a woman's responsibility to her husband (Rom 7:2–3; 1 Cor 7:39). Notice that Jesus holds a similar position regarding divorce (Matt 5:32; Mark 10:11–12; Luke 16:18).

[39] This may be an implicit argument of Paul in 1 Cor 7:36–39, though he does not cite Gen 2:24 as evidence.

[40] See Betz, *Galatians*, 195–96, especially n. 118–21.

[41] This syntax and verbiage are what one would expect in Paul's tripartite formula in Gal 3:28.

(ἀρσενόθηλυς)."[42] One can see from this text that some early Christians misread Paul and followed the syntax of the first two pairings (Jew/Greek, slave/free) which read οὐκ ἔνι Ἰουδαῖος οὐδε Ἕλλην, οὐκ ἔνι δοῦλος οὐδε ἐλεύθερος. However, as will be noted more fully below, the conjunction Paul uses between male (ἄρσην) and female (θῆλυς) is not "nor" (οὐδέ) but "and" (καί).

In sum, early Jewish literature does not combine Gen 1:27 with 2:24 explicitly; thus, this connection is likely an early Christian link, following the theology of Jesus himself. For example, though the explicit verbal connection between being "male and female" and intercourse or marriage is absent prior to Christianity, several apocryphal gospels and Nag Hammadi literature seem to make this connection.[43] As is demonstrated below, Jesus does explicitly connect Gen 1:27 to 2:24 and both 1:27 (Gal 3:28) and 2:24 (Eph 5:31) are used elsewhere in the NT, which may have made up part of the sub-structure of NT theology concerning marriage/divorce and unity.[44] So, though Gen 1:27 and 2:24 are discussed in early Jewish literature, the explicit theological connection of these two passages seems to be one of Christian ingenuity.

Genesis 1:27 and 2:24 in the New Testament

Besides Gal 3:28, the phrase ἄρσεν καὶ θῆλυ is used only three times in the NT. These two quotations are found in the Gospel accounts of Jesus's discussion about divorce with the Pharisees (Matt 19:4; Mark 10:6).[45] It is the intention of this study to draw a connection between Jesus's use of Gen 1:27 in Matthew 19 and Mark 10 and a similar usage in Gal 3:28. This phrase (ἄρσεν καὶ θῆλυ) is encountered so few times, it is difficult to imagine Paul and the Gospel writers not referring to the same two passages, each followed by the idea of unity using a form of the word εἷς ("one"). As noted above, these phrases have not been connected prior to Matthew and Mark in early Jewish literature, so Paul may be using a

[42] Hippolytus, *Ref. Her.* 5.2.15.

[43] Betz, *Galatians*, 195–96; Watts, "Mark," 198.

[44] See Dodd, *According to the Scriptures*, 30. Dodd's hypothesis is that unless otherwise noted, when the same texts are quoted, a common tradition is represented.

[45] It is worth noting that Luke, who shares considerable continuity with Matthew, does not incorporate this quotation or Jesus's teaching on divorce.

uniquely Christian hermeneutic.[46] What follows is a review of the Evangelists' and Paul's usage of the phrase.

Jesus in Matthew and Mark

The two instances of ἄρσεν καὶ θῆλυ in Matt 19:3 and Mark 10:4 are essentially the same though there are slight variations in the verbiage of the accounts. The Pharisees ask Jesus about the lawfulness of divorce (Matt 19:3; Mark 10:4)[47] in an attempt to test him.[48] Jesus answers by saying that "from the beginning" (ἀπὸ δὲ ἀρχῆς κτίσεως, Mark 10:6; ὁ κτίσας ἀπ'ἀρχῆς, Matt 19:4) "God made them male and female" (ἄρσεν καὶ θῆλυ ἐποίησεν αὐτούς). Then Jesus connects Gen 1:27 with Gen 2:24, both of which are quoted in Matthew and Mark:[49] Ἕνεκα τούτου καταλείψει ἄνθρωπος τὸν πατέρα καὶ τήν μητέρα καὶ κολληθήσεται τῇ γυναικὶ αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἔσονται οἱ δύο εἰς σάρκα μίαν.[50] The quotation is identical to the LXX except for some slight, relatively insignificant derivations.[51] Then, Jesus explains, ὥστε οὐκέτι εἰσὶν δύο ἀλλὰ σὰρξ μία. ὃ οὖν ὁ θεὸς συνέζευξεν ἄνθρωπος μὴ χωριζέτω ("so no longer are they two but one flesh; Therefore, whatever God has joined let not man separate").

[46] Though there may be some difficulty with the dating and chronology of the Gospels and Galatians, one can justifiably assume that even if Galatians were written first, that Jesus's words attested by the tradition found in both Matthew and Mark provide the backdrop for this uniquely Christian hermeneutic. In either case, regardless of which came first, Paul and the Evangelists seem to be the only ones to employ Gen 1:27 and 2:24 in this way.

[47] In the Matthean account the Pharisees ask if a man can put away his wife for any reason (κατὰ πᾶσαν αἰτίαν), whereas in Mark they simply ask the question, εἰ ἔξεστιν ἀνδρὶ γυναῖκα ἀπολῦσαι, πειράζοντες αὐτὸν. Also, Mark seems to be stating their question as an indirect quotation, while Matthew has the statement recorded as a direct quotation.

[48] Both Matthew and Mark record the reason for the Pharisees' questioning of Jesus (πειράζοντες αὐτὸν; Matt 19:3; Mark 10:2).

[49] A textual variant in Mark omits καὶ κολληθήσεται τῇ γθναικὶ αὐτου. Bruce Metzger and the committee for the UBS[3] opt for the fuller reading: "In order to represent the very close balance of probabilities, a majority of the Committee decided to include the clause in the text (where it seems to be necessary for the sense, otherwise οἱ δύο in ver. 8 could be taken to refer to the father and the mother!), but to enclose it within square brackets." Bruce M. Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*: *A Companion Volume to the UBS Greek New Testament*, 3rd ed. (New York: United Bible Societies, 1971), 104.

[50] "Because of this, man will leave his father and mother and be joined to his wife, and the two shall become one flesh."

[51] Matthew omits αὐτοῦ as well as the prefix προσ- and the word πρός before τῇ γυναικὶ αὐτοῦ.

In both Matthew and Mark, Jesus expects his audience to make an important connection in his argument. Jesus could have quoted Gen 2:24 if his point were only that man and woman come together in marriage and thus become one flesh. However, the first quotation of 1:27 "establishes the complementarity of male and female within God's created order, but does not itself directly address the issue of divorce or indeed marriage as such."[52] The connection to be made is that God made male and female with the intention to join them. France points out that Jesus is not concerned with a documentary hypothesis behind two different creation stories as in modern critical studies.[53] Rather, Jesus's focal point is his conclusion, "what God has joined, let no man separate" (Matt 19:6; Mark 10:9). Notice also his words just prior that reiterate Gen 2:24, "so they are no longer two, but one flesh," which is quite similar to Paul's "male and female" (two) made "one" in Christ Jesus. Jesus is not insinuating that God was only performing the first marriage, but that the joining of man and woman was God's intention "from the beginning" (Matt 19:4) by the creation of two sexes.[54] Similar to the use of the DSS, Jesus combats marriage/divorce or the multiplication of wives with Gen 1:27. However, the connection with Gen 2:24 seems to be original with Jesus.

[52] France, *Matthew*, 716–17.

[53] France, *Matthew*, 717.

[54] Jesus here does not intend to suggest that God created an androgynous, sexless being that was later sexualized, or that the two becoming one somehow erases sexual identity. Rather, Jesus's point seems to be that Gen 1:27 speaks of macro-creation—that male and female were created in complement to one another. Then, with the addition of 2:24, he further explains that these two created beings became one. This complementarity can be seen in the use of the words "male and female" in regard to both animals and mankind. Other implications may include that because Eve was taken from the rib, Adam and Eve began as one flesh and returned to that state with marital unity. However, one must draw concrete conclusions based on the evidence of the passage and Jesus's usage, which is that two distinct beings are (re)joined by God—two become one flesh. See Betz, *Galatians*, 195–200, and Meeks, "Image of the Androgyne," 165–208. See also Daniel Boyarin, "Paul and the Genealogy of Gender," *Representation* 41 (1993): 1–33. Both Meeks's and Boyarin's works stand in opposition to what seems to be the plain sense of Paul's isolated use of "male and female" in Gal 3:28. Boyarin focuses on the "spiritual" element of Galatians in contrast to the "fleshly" element of 1 Corinthians. I am not sure this bifurcation is completely warranted. He often cites Meeks and Dennis MacDonald, *There Is No Male and Female: The Fate of a Dominical Saying in Paul and Gnosticism*, HDR (Philadelphia: Augsburg Fortress, 1987).

Paul

Although he does not always use direct quotations, Paul points to the Genesis account of Creation and the Fall regularly.[55] In 1 Tim 2:13–15, the Pauline tradition points to the Fall as evidence for the submission of wives, or better, that women should not "exercise authority" over men.[56] Paul concludes, "For it was Adam who was first created, *and* then Eve. And *it was* not Adam *who* was deceived, but the woman being deceived, fell into transgression" (NASB, italics original). So, even though a specific text is not quoted, the story of Creation and the Fall are utilized to strengthen his argument for the creation story as the foundation of his thought on the roles of men and women in marriage and in the church.[57] One major facet of Paul's Christology is also based on the Creation story and the Fall (Rom 5:12–21; 1 Cor 15:21–22, 47)—Adam and the death that reigned through his disobedience is juxtaposed with the life granted through Jesus and his resurrection. This usage has a typological element and is understood only through the lens of the Genesis account of Creation and the Fall. Another facet of Paul's theology, though not quoted from Genesis explicitly, is the concept of "image" (εἰκόνος). Paul uses the word εἰκόνος nine times.[58] In 1 Cor 11:7, Paul explicitly references man (not humankind, but *a* man/ἀνήρ) made in the image and glory of God.[59] In 1 Cor 15:48–49, however, the "image" humans bear is that of Adam (earthly), but that humanity shall also bear the image of the heavenly

[55] See Rom 5:12–21; 1 Cor 6:16–17; 11:8–9; 15:21–22; 45–51; 2 Cor 11:3; Eph 4:24; 5:31–32; Col 3:10; 1 Tim 2:13–15. Although the monograph does not contain any reference to Gal 3:28 as an explicit quote from Genesis, *Genesis in the New Testament* demonstrates the prolific use of Genesis in the NT with two chapters devoted wholly to Pauline and "pseudo-Pauline" epistles. See chapters 6 and 7 in Maarten J. J. Menken and Steve Moyise, eds., *Genesis in the New Testament* (London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2012), 99–129.

[56] An entire monograph was written with this passage in mind with contributors discussing various aspects of the passage from the Ephesian situation, the history of interpretation, to the meaning of the word αὐθεντεῖν. See Andreas Köstenberger and Thomas Schreiner, eds., *Women in the Church: An Interpretation and Application of 1 Timothy 2:9–15*, 3rd ed. (Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2016). In this study, Ephesians, Colossians, and 1 Timothy are considered Pauline documents. Whether Pauline or not, these passages demonstrate reliance on the Genesis account of the creation of man and woman as well as an early Christian quotation of Gen 2:24.

[57] Similarly, see 2 Cor 11:2–3.

[58] Rom 1:23; 8:29; 1 Cor 11:7; 15:29 (twice); 2 Cor 3:18; 4:4; Col 1:15; 3:10.

[59] The woman in this case is the glory of the man which keeps with Paul's understanding of headship. Christ is the head of the man, and the man is the head of the woman (1 Cor 11:3; Eph 5:23).

(Christ). So again, Paul uses Adam and the Fall as an antithetical archetype to Christ and the resurrection. Pauline theology also acknowledges Christ as the One who bears God's image (2 Cor 4:4; Col 1:15; 3:10). None of these instances are direct quotations of the OT, but each refers to and provokes thoughts of the Genesis account of Creation and the Fall. In some cases, Paul slightly nuances the meaning of words in their original setting in order to further strengthen his claims about Christ and his work (e.g., Col 1:15).

As noted above, the text of Genesis 1–3 is used often in the letters of Paul. Specific passages (such as Gen 1:27 and 2:24) may make up part of what Dodd calls the "substructure of NT theology."[60] Whether separate *testimonia* made up these writings or they simply became Christian proof-texts of sorts is, in this case, irrelevant. What is relevant is that Christians seem to have used clusters of texts as witnessed in the NT (e.g., Psalm 110). Dodd refers specifically to Messianic texts, but other facets of NT theology also have these clustered texts. Dodd writes, "Our first task will be to collect passages from the Old Testament which, being cited by two or more writers of the New Testament in *prima facie* independence of one another may fairly be presumed to have been current as *testimonia* before they wrote."[61] For example, Paul uses Gen 15:6 three times in Romans 4 and then again in Gal 3:6 in an attempt to draw a connection between faith and being reckoned as righteous. James uses this same text to reinforce a different argument (Jas 2:23). James may have been able to find a more suitable passage for his purpose, but he drew from this well-known Christian passage.[62] If Paul is quoting, or even alluding to, Gen 1:27 in Gal 3:28, then Gen 1:27 has a high probability of being a Christian *testimonia*. And if both Gen 1:27 and 2:24 are Christian *testimonia* taken from Jesus himself (2:24 is also used by Paul, Matthew, and Mark),[63] the likelihood of them both being used in Gal 3:28 are higher, even though they are not quoted in their entirety—the first (Gen 1:27) is quoted, the other is a natural allusion (Gen 2:24) based on Jesus's teachings and the early church signaled by the word "one."

Paul does something similar with regard to unity. What follows are

[60] Dodd, *According to the Scriptures*, 28–29.

[61] Dodd, *According to the Scriptures*, 28–29.

[62] Many scholars have pointed out these two contrasting emphases of Gen 15:6. See, for example, D. A. Carson, "James," in *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament*, 1004–5.

[63] Though technically two occurrences of this Christian *testimonia*, Matthew and Mark are likely not independent sources.

very similar passages that many believe are early baptismal creeds/formulas: Gal 3:27–28, 1 Cor 12:13, and Col 3:9–11.[64] Common themes found in these three formulas are baptism (1 Cor 12:13; Gal 3:27) or baptismal language (Col 3:9–11), antithetical couplets, and unity. Though Paul in Col 3:9–11 does not mention baptism explicitly,[65] the language of "putting on" (ἐνδύω) Christ is used in Gal 3:27 in reference to baptism. There are also significant verbal similarities. In each case the couplets Jew/Greek and slave/free are mentioned (notice that in Col 3:9–11, "Greek" comes before "Jew"). Galatians is the only one among them that mentions "male and female" (this point will be discussed further below). Each example places emphasis on unity with either the word πάντες or εἷς/ἕν, or both.

Table 1.1[66]

Galatians 3:27–28	1 Corinthians 12:13	Colossians 3:9–11
ὅσοι γὰρ εἰς Χριστὸν **ἐβαπτίσθητε**, Χριστὸν **ἐνεδύσασθε**. **Οὐκ ἔνι Ἰουδαῖος** οὐδὲ **Ἕλλην**, οὐκ ἔνι **δοῦλος** οὐδὲ **ἐλεύθερος**, οὐκ ἔνι ἄρσεν καὶ θῆλυ· **πάντες** γὰρ	καὶ γὰρ ἐν **ἑνὶ** πνεύματι ἡμεῖς **πάντες** εἰς **ἓν** σῶμα **ἐβαπτίσθημεν**, εἴτε **Ἰουδαῖοι** εἴτε **Ἕλληνες** εἴτε **δοῦλοι** εἴτε **ἐλεύθεροι**, καὶ **πάντες ἓν** πνεῦμα	μὴ ψεύδεσθε εἰς ἀλλήλους, ἀπεκδυσάμενοι τὸν παλαιὸν ἄνθρωπον σὺν ταῖς πράξεσιν αὐτοῦ καὶ **ἐνδυσάμενοι** τὸν νέον τὸν ἀνακαινούμενον εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν κατ' εἰκόνα τοῦ κτίσαντος αὐτον,

[64] Fung, *Galatians*, 175; Betz, *Galatians*, 188–89; Longenecker, *Galatians*, 154; A. Andrew Das, *Galatians*, Concordia Commentary (Saint Louis: Concordia, 2014), 379–83; and MacDonald, *There Is No Male and Female*. The statements are certainly similar, but there may be some problems with labeling them baptismal formulas. Part of the formula is used elsewhere (1 Cor 12:12–13; Col 3:11) and the male and female portion would have had to have been omitted from these other two instances or added in this one (which, admittedly, is not an altogether insurmountable problem). There is no more reason to place the male/female distinction in Galatians than in any other case. Paul has made no argument concerning gender roles. In this particular discussion he has only been concerned with the Jew/Gentile (Greek) relationship, and in the following passage, slavery and freedom as represented in the Old Law and Promise, allegorized through Sarah and Hagar. So, the phrase "male and female" probably serves some other function. I submit that the function is to direct the Galatians to Gen 1:27 and the implication of unity found in the last phrase ἄντες γὰρ ὑμεῖς εἷς ἐστε ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ.

[65] Paul does mention baptism in Col 2:12.

[66] Shared words between the passages have been placed in bold type and underlined. Though each passage is similar, one can also detect originality.

ὑμεῖς **εἷς** ἐστε ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ.	ἐποτίσθημεν.	ὅπου **οὐκ ἔνι Ἕλλην** καὶ **Ἰουδαῖος**, περιτομὴ καὶ ἀκροβυστία, Βάρβαρος, Σκύθης, **δοῦλος**, **ἐλεύθερος**, ἀλλὰ [τὰ] **πάντα** καὶ ἐν **πᾶσιν** Χριστός.

Ephesians 5:31–32 is another passage in which one can find Paul's theology of unity coupled with a reference to Genesis, specifically Christ's unity with the church—in this case Gen 2:24 is explicitly quoted. After quoting Gen 2:24 in Eph 5:31, Paul writes, "This mystery is great; but I am speaking with reference to Christ and the church." This passage carries particular significance in this study because one is dealing with each of the several important themes found in Gal 3:27–28 but without explicit reference to "male and female," though marriage implies it. In Ephesians, Paul makes a case for unity (e.g., Eph 4:1–13) and transitions into the household, first focusing on the marital relationship. Paul compares this relationship to Christ and the church, then makes an appeal to Gen 2:24 for clarification. The clarification is not the mystery of marriage itself, but the mystery of unity found in the two becoming one, specifically the unity between Christ and the church.[67] So, both Gal 3:27–28 and Eph 5:31 deal with man and woman (though different words are used for man and woman), a subtle connection to baptism in Ephesians (or similar ritual ablution; cf. Eph 5:26), an appeal to the origin story of Genesis, and the concept of unity (both the unity of the husband and wife as well as the unity of Christ and the church; Eph 5:30). Admittedly, many of these connections in Ephesians are not proof within themselves, but when the evidence is taken in sum, one begins to see a Pauline trend. The direct quote of Gen 2:24 is also explicit evidence that Paul is not only familiar with the passage but that he uses the passage in connection with marital and spiritual (Christian) unity.[68]

Although not the familiar "baptismal formula" mentioned above, Eph 4:24 has special significance as well. Like 2 Cor 5:17, Gal 3:27, and Col 3:9–11, the old self is put away and the new self (man) is put on. Paul writes, "... and put on the new self (ἄνθρωπος), which in *the likeness of* God

[67] See Andreas J. Köstenberger, "The Mystery of Christ and the Church: Head and Body, 'One Flesh,'" *TJ* 12 (1991): 79–94. For other options see John Muddiman, *The Epistle to the Ephesians*, BNTC (New York: Hendrickson, 2001), 269–70, and Brooke Foss Westcott, *Saint Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1952), 86.

[68] Consider also 1 Cor 6:15–16.

has been created in righteousness and holiness of the truth" (NASB, italics original). Both Col 3:9–11 and Eph 4:24 refer to creation. In both cases the word κρίζω is used. In Colossians, the reference is to renewal—"to image of the One who created him" (Col 3:10). So, the creation of man is alluded to once again in a discussion of putting away one self for another self. Paul is redefining or appropriating creation language in light of Christ. In Genesis, humanity was made in the likeness of God, but because of Adam and sin, humanity becomes like Adam. However, through the re-creation found in Christ, the new self is made in his image (Rom 5:12–21; 1 Cor 15:45–49).[69]

Significant Phrases in Galatians 3:28

The phrase "Jew nor Greek" is a relatively common phrase in Pauline literature and as can be seen in Table 1.1 is used in all three of these "baptismal formulas" as well as in Rom 10:12.[70] The second of the three couplets is "slave nor free." The language of slavery and freedom are so prolific in Pauline discourse that they cannot be adequately considered in this study.[71] However, in the context of Galatians, this language is taken up in 4:1–5:1 and represents a major theme in the discourse and plays a significant role in Paul's theology. Though at first glance this phrase may simply be a part of the common baptismal formula noted above or part of the freedom Paul preaches to those in Christ, in the case of Galatians, the phrase is likely more intentional. Of the three couplets mentioned, Paul discusses two of them in depth. The Jew/Gentile couplet is an obvious subject of contention in Galatians, but after 3:28 and the reference to the slave and free, Paul takes up a discussion about slaves, sons, Sarah, and Hagar. After only one verse (3:29), Paul highlights the dichotomy of a son and a slave (4:1–7) trying to demonstrate the superiority of the sonship granted through being an heir of Abraham (which comes through the promise realized in Christ) and not simply a servant. Then, he transitions to the verbal form used throughout the remainder of chapter 4 and not

[69] Paul again quotes from Genesis 1–3 although this is the only time this specific verse is explicitly quoted (Gen 2:7). See Harold W. Hoehner, *Ephesians: An Exegetical Commentary* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2002), 609–11, and Ernest Best, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Ephesians*, ICC (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1998), 436–41.

[70] See also Rom 2:9, 10; 3:9, 29; 9:24; 1 Cor 1:24 wherein Gentiles and Greeks are essentially the same. See Dunn, *Galatians*, 205.

[71] Cf. Rom 8:15, 21 (creation and slavery); 1 Cor 7:21–22; Gal 4:1–8, 25; 5:1; Philemon. For an investigation of the theme of slavery and sonship in Galatians, see Sam Tsang, *From Slaves to Sons: A New Rhetoric Analysis on Paul's Slave Metaphors in His Letter to the Galatians*, SBLit 81 (New York: Peter Lang, 2005).

used again in Galatians (4:8, 9, 25).[72] Paul then uses Sarah and Hagar as examples. Though Hagar is not called a δοῦλος, her children are called δουλείαν, and Sarah is described as being "free" (ἐλευθέρας). These women represent two covenants. Hagar is Sinai and the "now" Jerusalem. Sarah is the Jerusalem above and is "free." In contrast, Sarah is the Jerusalem above and she is "free." So, though the phrase "slave nor free" is probably part of a common formula, Paul expands the language, referring to more than only slaves and freemen. For Paul, unity comes because all are free, though their social status may not have changed. In other words, Paul has spiritualized[73] both slavery and freedom. "It was for freedom that Christ set us free; therefore keep standing firm and do not be subject again to a yoke of slavery" (Gal 5:1 NASB). If one follows that each of the three couplets are discussed in Galatians with the Jew/Gentile couplet being paramount, followed by the son/slave language, then the relationships of Hagar and Sarah to Abraham may correspond to the "male and female" couplet, only one of whom was a legitimate wife (Sarah) with a legitimate heir (Isaac).

The phrase "male and female" is found only here in Pauline literature.[74] The individual terms are used by Paul only in Rom 1:26–27 referring to the natural function of male and female. As noted above, the terms (phrase) are used in the LXX in a similar way. That Paul in Gal 3:28 uses such specific, uncommon vocabulary (uncommon to him and both words combined used only ten other times in the NT, two of which are a direct quote from Gen 1:27) seems to indicate that Paul is purposefully quoting Gen 1:27.[75] Unity that is found in Christ is also one of the dominant themes of the Pauline epistles. Paul labored among the churches trying to establish unity. Galatians 3:28 has garnered special attention in recent years because of the phrase "male and female" and the changing roles of

[72] The noun is not used again either.

[73] Dunn uses the term "relativized." Dunn, *Galatians*, 205.

[74] One should also note the use of ἐνδύω in both Gal 3:27 and Gen 3:21 (LXX). The baptized are "clothed" with Christ and God "clothed" Adam and Eve with garments made of skin, yet another common Pauline word also found in the story of Creation and the Fall (Rom 13:12, 14; 1 Cor 15:53–54; Gal 3:27; Eph 4:24; 6:11, 14; Col 3:10, 12; 1 Thess 5:8).

[75] Many commentators of Galatians draw a connection to a later Jewish prayer that thanks God for not being a Gentile, a slave, or a woman. Though the roots of this type of thinking probably date before Christianity (there was a similar prayer among the Greeks), Gal 3:28 does not necessitate knowledge of such a prayer. The status of women and slaves in antiquity is well known, so with or without knowledge of such a prayer, Paul's words are still provocative and progressive. See Bruce, *Galatians*, 187.

women in church and society, but Paul's primary concern was racial unity between Jews and Gentiles as people of the promise, not ethnic erasure.[76] In fact, in Romans, Paul gives precedence to Jews on a number of occasions (1:16; 2:9, 10; 11:13–31) in order to prevent the Gentiles from becoming arrogant concerning their salvation as those grafted in.

Syntactical Considerations

Two syntactical issues hint at Paul's use of Gen 1:27 (and subsequently 2:24). First, the negative οὐκ ἔνι is coupled with οὐδέ in the first two couplets. However, in the final couplet the same negative statement (οὐκ ἔνι) is used except the conjunction is changed to καί. Although Paul does use οὐκ ἔνι with καί in Col 3:10 he uses the καί throughout. In 1 Cor 12:13 οὐκ ἔνι is not used at all. This change is quite likely deliberate, not a stylistic or grammatical issue, and yet is either passed over by most translations or purposely translated as "nor," though BDAG does not list "nor" as a potential gloss for καί.[77]

Another syntactical issue is Paul's phraseology in Gal 3:26 in contrast to Gal 3:28b. Galatians 3:26 reads Πάντες γὰρ υἱοὶ θεοῦ ἐστε διὰ τῆς πίστεως ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ while 3:28 reads πάντες γὰρ ὑμεῖς εἷς ἐστε ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ. Longenecker draws attention to the difference: "The only somewhat new features of v 28b are the explicit use of εἷς ('one') and the more direct correlation of εἷς to ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησου, but they are new only in focus and directness, for both are inchoate in v. 26."[78] Similarly Fung states, "The masculine gender of 'one' suggests that the meaning here is that all who are in Christ form a corporate unity."[79] With the addition of "male and female," the word εἷς signals the idea of these two becoming one flesh (Gen 2:24). This subtle change in wording and syntax hints that Paul is doing so deliberately.

[76] See James D. G. Dunn, *The Theology of Paul the Apostle* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 592–93. For a contrast see Witherington, "Rite and Rights for Women," 593–604.

[77] See Hove, *Equality in Christ*, 66–69, 80–86, wherein he argues that though Paul is quoting Gal 1:27, that the intended meaning requires negation ("nor"). See also BDAG, "καί," 494–96. Admittedly, nuances in language may permit such a translation. However, when the word has been changed deliberately in a triplet like this one, it seems wise to translate it woodenly to capture the intention of the author.

[78] Longenecker, *Galatians*, 158.

[79] Fung, *Galatians*, 176.

Conclusions

This study has sought to argue that Paul is quoting Gen 1:27 in Gal 3:28 and that by doing so he is drawing the Galatian audience into the Genesis account of creation. Through this quotation, Paul expects his audience to find a natural parallel with or allusion to Gen 2:24 and the oneness of the male and female through marriage. Though the allusion to Gen 2:24 may not be as convincing as the quotation of 1:27, there are several reasons to consider its plausibility. (1) Paul changes the wording from πάντες γὰρ υἱοὶ θεοῦ ἐστε διὰ τῆς πίστεως ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ in 3:26 to πάντες γὰρ ὑμεῖς εἷς ἐστε ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ in 3:28.[80] This change is significant because Paul spends no more time unpacking the implication of the couplet ἄρσεν καὶ θῆλυ, but he does spend the rest of chapter 4 describing freedom in Christ found in sonship (πάντες γὰρ υἱοὶ θεοῦ ἐστε διὰ τῆς πίστεως ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ) and the problems with Judaizing. This shift in wording and syntax from other similar formulas signals Paul's connection to Gen 1:27 and 2:24. Admittedly, trying to make such a bold claim by the use of only one word ("one") is tenuous. However, this one word taken in context of the only Pauline quotation of Gen 1:27 further strengthens the argument.

The congregations that Paul had visited probably already knew the basic tenets of his theology, or in some cases he expected them to make implicit connections to an already stated theology. For example, in Romans, Paul spends much of the first three chapters arguing that both Jews and Gentiles were all under sin, incorporating several OT quotations strung together to prove his thesis (Rom 3:10–18). But in Gal 3:22 Paul simply states, "But the Scripture has shut up everyone under sin, so that the promise by faith in Jesus Christ might be given to those who believe" (cf. Rom 11:32). Paul does not necessarily need to articulate fully his theology in Gal 3:28. What is more is that in Eph 5:31–32, Paul does quote Gen 2:24 explicitly and with regard to the oneness of man and woman and Christ and the church, demonstrating that Paul was not only familiar with Gen 2:24, but that he has used it in conjunction with both marital and spiritual unity.

(2) Paul uses similar phraseology referring to the Genesis account in other passages. As noted above, Paul explicitly quotes Gen 2:24 in Eph 5:31 in respect to the mystery of the unity of Christ and the church.[81] (3) In two of the three so-called baptismal formulas a reference is made to creation, and in some cases "new man" language is also used. (4) The only

[80] See Longenecker, *Galatians*, 158.

[81] Köstenberger, "The Mystery of Christ and the Church," 79–94.

other instance of the phrase ἄρσεν καὶ θῆλυ found in the NT is in Matthew 19 and Mark 10 (both referring to the same event and also quoting Gen 2:24). As Christians used clusters of texts for Christology, Gen 1:27 and 2:24 may also have been part of a cluster of texts used of marriage and, in turn, the unity found in Christ often compared to marriage (e.g., 2 Cor 11:2). There is certainly a natural draw to the teaching of Christ where these two texts (Gen 1:27; 2:24) are found back-to-back. In this case, the intertextuality, or "echo," is threefold—from Genesis to Jesus, then finally, to Paul. Each of these factors plays an important role in the argument of this study and comprehensively they make a strong case that Paul was quoting Gen 1:27 and alluding to 2:24.

STR 13.1 (Spring 2022): 25–39

Righteous or Dangerous? An Investigation of Ὀργίζεσθε in Ephesians 4:26

Thiago Bitencourt
Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary, Wake Forest, NC

Abstract: *This article investigates the imperative phrase found in Eph 4:26, ὀργίζεσθε καὶ μὴ ἁμαρτάνετε ("Be angry and do not sin"). Whereas traditional interpretations of this verse either explain away the force of Paul's imperative phrase or understand the anger spoken of here as something that might be helpful at first but must soon be put away (i.e., before the sun sets), the present author argues that Paul's command is best understood as a true imperative that encourages believers to take action against anything that may disrupt the unity of the Spirit within the believing community (Eph 4:3). The thesis is supported by four arguments: grammatical (Is this phrase a true imperatival phrase?); contextual (What is the function of this phrase within its immediate context?); semantic (What should the sun not be allowed to set on?); and Metaleptic (How does this phrase's function in Psalm 4 illuminate its use in Ephesians 4?).*

Key Words: *ecclesiology, Ephesians, Greek grammar, intertextuality, metalepsis, Pauline studies, righteous indignation*

"When you two get married, you will soon encounter several occasions to become angry. It is very important, however, that you do not hold on to that anger, and never go to sleep without being reconciled to one another. That is why the apostle Paul said that when we become angry, we must not sin. We must never let the sun go down on our anger. If you do, you will give the devil an opportunity to destroy your marriage." With these and many other words of wisdom, our pastor counseled my soon-to-be-wife and me as we prepared to embark on that frightfully wonderful journey called marriage. There is no denying that his counsel was indeed filled with wisdom and insight. After all, harboring anger and allowing a new day to dawn without having made peace is certainly no recipe for a healthy marriage. But is this actually what Paul intended when he wrote to the Ephesian Christians: Ὀργίζεσθε καὶ μὴ ἁμαρτάνετε·ὁ ἥλιος μὴ

ἐπιδυέτω ἐπὶ [τῷ] παροργισμῷ ὑμῶν, μηδὲ δίδοτε τόπον τῷ διαβόλῳ?[1] The purpose of this essay is to investigate whether this traditional understanding is indeed the appropriate interpretation of Eph 4:26–27. Is the anger spoken of here to be seen as righteous or as potentially dangerous?

Traditionally, this passage has been translated and interpreted in a way that renders the imperatival phrase in 4:26a as either conditional, "*If* you are angry do not sin," "In your anger do not sin" (NIV);[2] or permissive/concessive, "Be angry, if you must, but do not sin," "Be angry and yet do not sin" (MSG, NASB, ISV).[3] These renderings have given rise to the interpretation witnessed in my former pastor's pre-marital counsel. "If you get angry," or "when you get angry," or "sometimes you may indeed need to get angry," "make sure your anger does not lead to sin by being prolonged beyond its necessity." As I mentioned above, this is certainly good advice, but the premise of this essay is that this is not how this passage should be interpreted.

My thesis is as follows: Eph 4:26–27 should not be understood as a warning against the potential dangers of prolonged anger; rather, it should be interpreted as a call to respond in righteous anger/indignation against anything that may disrupt the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace to which the believing community has been called. These peace-destroying actions and attitudes (whether found in the individual himself or in other members of the community) must not be allowed to linger but should be dealt with swiftly and quickly, lest they give room for the devil to infiltrate the community and bring an end to the divinely desired unity.

I will establish the cogency of my thesis via four supporting arguments. First, I will piggyback on Daniel Wallace's noteworthy essay to demonstrate that rendering the first clause of 4:26 as a simple command

---

[1] Barbara Aland et al., eds., *The Greek New Testament*, 5th rev. ed. (Stuttgart, Germany: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2014), Eph 4:26–27. Unless otherwise noted, all translations are the author's own work.

[2] Commentators who take this interpretation include Frank Thielman, *Ephesians*, BECNT (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2010), 313–14; Andrew T. Lincoln, *Ephesians*, WBC 42 (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2014), 292; William J. Larkin, *Ephesians*, A Handbook on the Greek Text (Waco: Baylor University Press, 2009), 98; Ernest Best, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Ephesians*, ICC (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1998), 449.

[3] See also S. M. Baugh, *Ephesians*, Evangelical Exegetical Commentary (Bellingham, WA: Lexham Press, 2016), 387; W. Hendriksen, *Ephesians*, New Testament Commentary (London: The Banner of Truth Trust, 1967), 217.

is indeed the ideal grammatical option.[4] Second, I will argue that the surrounding context of Ephesians 4 and 5 leads us to understand the imperatives in 4:26–27 as actions that have as their intended goal the maintenance of the community's unity and peace. Next, I will demonstrate that τῷ παροργισμῷ in 4:26b has erroneously been interpreted as synonymous with anger. This misconstrued rendering has added to the confusion regarding this passage's significance. Lastly, I will demonstrate that the context of Psalm 4 (especially in the LXX) serves to clarify that the phrase Ὀργίζεσθε καὶ μὴ ἁμαρτάνετε is not a statement regarding the sinful potential of anger; rather, it is a call to use righteous anger as a tool to fight against sin and to maintain the community's holy unity.

Grammatical Argument

In his landmark essay, Daniel Wallace successfully demonstrates that the traditional way of rendering Ὀργίζεσθε καὶ μὴ ἁμαρτάνετε as a conditional or concessive/permissive imperative phrase is faulty. He argues that despite the popularity of this interpretation, grammatically, it is difficult to maintain.[5] There are several reasons for this difficulty. First, conditional imperative phrases are "always or almost always found in the construction *imperative* + καί + *future indicative*. The idea is, 'If X, then Y will happen.'"[6] Thus, the clause in Eph 4:26 does not match the typical construction of conditional imperatival phrases since the construction found here is *imperative* + καί + *imperative*.

It is possible, though, for a conditional imperative phrase to be constructed as witnessed in Eph 4:26: *imperative* + καί + *imperative*. It is important to note, however, that there are no indisputable examples of conditional imperatival phrases constructed in this fashion.[7] Furthermore, Wallace argues that all the possible conditional imperatives constructed this way "require the second imperative to function semantically as a future indicative (i.e., stating the consequence/fulfillment of the implied

[4] Daniel B. Wallace, "Ὀργίζεσθε in Ephesians 4:26: Command or Condition?" *CTR* 3 (1989): 335–72.

[5] Since the initial publication of the article, Wallace and others have further elaborated on his original arguments. See Wallace, *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1997), 491–93; Wallace, *The Basics of New Testament Syntax: An Intermediate Greek Grammar* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2000), 211–12; Andreas J. Köstenberger, Benjamin L. Merkle, and Robert L. Plummer, *Going Deeper with New Testament Greek: An Intermediate Study of the Grammar and Syntax of the New Testament*, rev. ed. (Nashville: B&H Academic, 2020), 214.

[6] Wallace, *The Basics of New Testament Syntax*, 211. Examples of this construction include Matt 7:7; 8:8; Jas 4:7.

[7] Wallace, *The Basics of New Testament Syntax*, 212.

condition)."[8] If this were the case, Eph 4:26 would read, "If you are angry, then you will not sin." Hardly anyone would consent to such an interpretation. In addition, conditional imperative phrases likewise require the imperatival force of the verb to remain.[9] In other words, ascribing to a conditional or concessive interpretation of the passage does not do away with the fact that Paul is still commanding his readers to be angry.[10] In light of this, Wallace concludes that the imperatives found in Eph 4:26 should be interpreted as forming a simple command and prohibition phrase: "Be angry and do not sin." Following his grammatical investigation, Wallace explains the meaning of the verse as such:

> One should not give a place to the devil by doing nothing about the sin in the midst of the believing community. Entirely opposite of the "introspective conscience" view, this text seems to be a shorthand expression for church discipline, suggesting that there is biblical warrant for δικαία ὀργή (as the Greeks put it)—righteous indignation.[11]

Much more can be said and has been said in regard to the grammatical details of conditional imperatival constructions.[12] My intention, however, is not to rehash everything that Wallace and others have already delineated; rather, I would like to provide supplemental arguments to support their conclusions, and hopefully, to provide firmer ground for future translators, commentators, and preachers to translate, interpret and proclaim Eph 4:26–27 in a way that honors Paul's original intention.

Contextual Argument

Having determined in the previous section that the traditional acceptance of a conditional or concessive interpretation is grammatically improbable, the hermeneutical conclusions stemming from them likewise

[8] Wallace, "Ὀργίζεσθε," 371. A prime example of this is found in John 1:46, "Ἔρχου καὶ ἴδε." The idea here is, "If you come, you will see."

[9] Wallace, "Ὀργίζεσθε," 371.

[10] This conclusion is rather surprising in light of the fact that some renowned Greek scholars attempt to argue against the imperatival force of Ὀργίζεσθε. See Baugh, *Ephesians*, 392, who despite acknowledging that Wallace is correct in his argumentation, concludes that Paul is not giving a command to be angry, he is simply acknowledging that certain kinds of anger "are warranted and permissible." See also Thielman, *Ephesians*, 313, who rejects Wallace's argument in favor of the conditional interpretation and argues that the passage "is concerned with avoiding sin in the situations where anger is present."

[11] Wallace, *Beyond the Basics*, 492 (emphasis original).

[12] See note 5 above.

become difficult to maintain. If we are correct in interpreting the phrase Ὀργίζεσθε καὶ μὴ ἁμαρτάνετε as a simple command, how then should we understand it? What exactly did Paul expect to accomplish by writing these imperatives for his audience?

Before being able to comprehend what Paul expected to accomplish with the use of the imperatives in Eph 4:26a, it is important to understand what he was attempting to accomplish with the entire subunit containing 4:26–27, namely 4:25–5:2. This small subunit of verses serves as a continuation of the exhortations begun in 4:17–4:24. There, Paul exhorts his readers to no longer walk according to their former life, as the Gentiles still do (4:17–19), but to walk according to the new creation life that is created after the likeness of God (4:24). Regarding our present section, Baugh argues that "Paul continues his instruction on how citizens of the new creation are to walk together in love, word, and deed."[13] Thus, it is prudent to understand 4:25–5:2 as a further explication of how the members of this new community are to walk in a way worthy of this new creation life, rather than understanding it as a distinct section that merely seeks to comment on the pros and cons of certain virtues and vices.

Having discussed the nature and unity of the new humanity that Christ established through his Spirit—one people, under one Lord, in one Spirit and one God and Father (4:1–6)—and having also reflected on the means and gifts that Christ has provided to maintain this Spirit-established unity, as well as the dangers that stand against it (4:7–16), Paul begins in 4:17 to discuss how each member of the community is responsible for the continual edification of the entire body. In 4:25 then, Paul continues what he began in 4:17, and thus exhorts his readers to walk (i.e., live) in a manner that promotes the growth and protects the peace and unity of the community. It must be stressed that the overarching goal of this section is not to provide a commentary on the virtues and vices themselves, but to demonstrate how they play a part in either building up or breaking down the peaceful unity of the community. Thus, each exhortation must be seen in light of this overarching goal.

Several aspects of this passage bear witness to the fact that the goal of the imperatives found in 4:25–5:2 and beyond is indeed to promote how the members of the community can play a part in maintaining spiritual unity. A first piece of evidence is the fact that this section begins with a summarizing statement, Διὸ ἀποθέμενοι τὸ ψεῦδος (4:25a). Although some commentators see this statement as a simple reference to doing away with the actual practice of lying and dishonesty,[14] to understand it as

[13] Baugh, *Ephesians*, 380.

[14] Benjamin L. Merkle, *Ephesians*, Exegetical Guide to the Greek New Testament (Nashville: B&H Academic, 2016), 147; Thielman, *Ephesians*, 313.

a summarizing statement that is parallel to 4:22 makes better sense of the context and thus serves to establish a link between the two sections.[15] In this view, the phrase "putting away falsehood" stands synonymously with the statement found in 4:22, "Put off your old self." This old self is further described as belonging to the former existence of the saints, which was chiefly characterized by a separation from the life of God (4:17–19). In light of this connection, the command to "speak truth to one another" (4:25b) is likewise not only a call to be honest in one's words, but also a call to speak and live in a manner that promotes the growth of the whole body,[16] and encourages its members to not turn back to their old ways. It is thus synonymous with living out the "true righteousness and holiness" in the likeness of God that Paul speaks of in 4:24. The fact that the command to speak truth is grounded on the statement "we are members of one another" further indicates that the overarching focus of this section is indeed on maintaining the spiritual unity described earlier in the chapter.

Another reason for understanding the present section as focused on promoting the growth and protecting the peace and unity of the community is the fact that λαλεῖτε … πλησίον αὐτοῦ (4:25b) is a direct quote from Zech 8:16. Understanding the original context of the Zechariah passage will greatly illuminate the function that it plays in our current passage.[17]

Zechariah 8:16 is part of a subunit spanning from 8:1–17. This unit addresses the reconstruction of the temple and seeks to incentivize the people to work hard at rebuilding the temple by pointing them to the unimaginable restoration and prosperity that will come when God visits his people when they complete the temple. Klein argues that Zechariah 8 serves as a call to repent and to live righteous lives in light of the future restoration that will come about by the coming presence of God.[18] Boda likewise reasons that in 8:16–17 Zechariah provides moral imperatives that are necessary for the community to avoid God's wrath, experience His holy presence, and maintain the peace of the restored community

[15] See also Markus Barth, *Ephesians: Translation and Commentary on Chapters 4–6* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1974), 511; Baugh, *Ephesians*, 390.

[16] This is precisely how the presence of truthfulness in 4:15 functions.

[17] Although some commentators are skeptical about allowing the original context of the quote to illuminate our understanding of the current passage, I believe the following discussion will display the fruitfulness of such investigation.

[18] G. L. Klein, *Zechariah*, NAC (Nashville: B&H Academic, 2008), 232. For more discussion on the connections between the building of the temple in Zechariah and the building of the new temple in Ephesians, see Baugh, *Ephesians*, 390.

who will dwell in God's holy city; namely, the "city of truth" (Zech 8:3).[19]

In light of the previous discoveries about the context of Zechariah 8, we can begin to see how Paul may have intended to utilize Zech 8:16 in a similar fashion to Zechariah himself; that is, to urge God's restored community to live in a way that maintains the Spirit-established peace and unity.[20] In this light, speaking truth to one another in a way that protects the unity and the devotion of the body is thus seen as the counterpart to the empty deceitful words that undermine God's righteous requirement over the community (Eph 5:6). Thus, this conclusion provides further reason for understanding all the imperatives in this present section, including 4:26a, as serving this ultimate goal.

As noted above, Eph 4:26–27 is not meant to provide a treatise on the possible dangers of anger; rather, it is a simple command to be angry. What it means to be angry will be further discussed below, but for now we must recognize that whatever being angry entails, it needs to be understood as something that Paul saw as playing a significant role in maintaining the unity and the peace of the community. Consequently, in giving the command to be angry, Paul does not initially place "anger" in a misleading optimistic light only to later unveil its true character by warning his readers of its dangers. Rather, he presents it as something positive, something that may be used to keep the community from returning to their old ways and to thus maintain the unity of the Spirit.

Semantic Argument

So far in our study we have concluded that the imperatival phrase found in Eph 4:26a should be understood as a simple command and that regardless of what it means to be angry, the anger that Paul encourages here ought to be seen as something that is used to promote growth and to protect the peace and unity of the community. It must be acknowledged, however, that up to this point in the argument one could still maintain that although Paul prescribes anger under certain circumstances, the focus of the rest of 4:26–27 is on the fact that anger, even righteous anger, can lead to sin if allowed to linger for too long. After all, is that not what

[19] M. L. Boda, *The Book of Zechariah*, NICOT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2016), 505–6.

[20] Much can be said about how Paul's use of Zech 8:16 sheds great light into his understanding of God's new covenant people and the relationship between Israel and the Church. For further information regarding this topic, see Baugh, *Ephesians*, 390.

Paul means by saying that we should not let the sun set on our anger?[21] In other words, Paul might very well be commanding his audience to respond in righteous anger under certain occasions, but this anger should quickly be done away with lest its prolonged duration provide a timely opportunity for the devil to infiltrate the community and breed destruction and turmoil in its midst.

Once again, there is no denying that such conclusions are certainly profitable. Prolonged anger does provide a potent opportunity for destructive attitudes and actions (e.g., bitterness, wrath, clamor, slander, and all sorts of malice) to fester within a community, and these must surely be put away (4:31). But is this meaning actually what Paul is attempting to communicate when he says, ὁ ἥλιος μὴ ἐπιδυέτω ἐπὶ τῷ παροργισμῷ ὑμῶν (4:26b)? Having commanded his audience to respond in righteous anger as a means to protect the peace and unity of the community, would Paul then in the same breath demand them to put that very same peace-protecting-anger away? Would he actually command anger as a tool in the battle against sin and before drawing another breath inform the community that this very same weapon can itself become the cause of sin if wielded for too long? This is certainly plausible; but is it probable?

This section will demonstrate that just as the traditional interpretation of the imperatival construction found in 4:26a is faulty, the traditional rendering of τῷ παροργισμῷ in 4:26b as synonymous with "anger" is likewise improbable. In its discussion on παροργισμός, BDAG acknowledges that the term may at times refer to a "a state of being intensely provoked" (i.e., anger), but it gives preference to understanding it as "provoking to anger" or "an action that calls forth anger in someone."[22] Despite the

[21] The phrase "Do not let the sun set upon …" is an idiom referring to accomplishing something promptly before the day ends (i.e., before the sun sets). Its clearest example is Deut 24:15 where those in charge of hired workers are commanded to pay their workers daily and to not let the sun set on their wages. Philo likewise used the phrase when paraphrasing Deut 21:22–23. The original refers to not letting the body of man who has been put to death spend the night on a tree. Philo paraphrases it as "Do not let the sun go down upon the crucified but let them be buried before sundown." See, Philo, *Philo*, trans. F. H. Colson, G. H. Whitaker, and J. W. Earp, LCL 7 (London; Cambridge, MA: William Heinemann; Harvard University Press, 1929–1962), 571. In both cases the object of the preposition "upon" is what should be addressed promptly. Thus, in our passage what should be handled before long is τῷ παροργισμῷ.

[22] Frederick W. Danker, Walter Bauer, and William Arndt, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*, 3rd ed. (Chicago:

information found in BDAG and other lexicons, a quick investigation of the major English translations demonstrates that, without a single discrepancy, all render παροργισμός as a synonym of ὀργή ("anger") rather than exploring its other potential meanings.[23] Many commentators reach the same ominous conclusion.[24] Such translations imply that what must be dealt with before the setting of the sun is the very same anger that was commanded just a few words prior. In other words, anger may very well be permissible, or even required, but it must not be allowed to endure very long.

There is, however, a path of divergence from the majority; a path that, though minimally trodden, has been trodden nonetheless. One example of such bold trailblazing efforts is none other than Daniel Wallace himself. As was discussed above, Wallace argues that what must be dealt with before the setting of the sun is not anger, but rather, the things within the community which cause the righteous anger to come about, namely, sin.[25]

Another brave example of non-conformity in the area of Bible translation is found in the Complete Jewish Bible, translated by David Stern. Stern renders this passage as such: "Be angry, but don't sin—don't let the sun go down before you have dealt with the cause of your anger; otherwise, you leave room for the Adversary."[26] It is difficult to say whether or

University of Chicago Press, 2000), 780. See also the entries found in Henry George Liddell et al., *A Greek-English Lexicon* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996); J. Lust, Erik Eynikel, and K. Hauspie, *Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2003).

[23] NIV, NLT, ESV, NASB, KJV, NKJV, HCSB, ISV, RSV. The same is true of the Vulgate and its English translation as found in the Douay-Rheims.

[24] See Baugh, *Ephesians*, 392; Barth, *Ephesians*, 515; Merkle, *Ephesians*, 149; Thielman, *Ephesians*, 314. Thielman acknowledges that in its LXX usage παροργισμός "most often refers to the provocation of anger." Yet, rather than investigating further how such rendering of παροργισμός would function in the present context, Thielman defaults to the traditional interpretation. He concludes, "Here the word probably serves as a synonym for ὀργή (*orgē*), perhaps with a hint, supplied by the prefix παρά (*para*), that as time passes, unattended anger is likely to increase." Thielman bases his conclusion on the word's root rather than on how it functions in the present context and in the other contexts where it is found. I believe this serves as a good example of the "root fallacy" that D. A. Carson warns against. See D. A. Carson, *Exegetical Fallacies*, 2nd ed. (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 1996), 28.

[25] Wallace, "Ὀργίζεσθε," 365. Wallace's conclusion seems to take the information found in the lexicons seriously.

[26] David H. Stern, *Complete Jewish Bible: An English Version of the Tanakh (Old Testament) and B'rit Hadashah (New Testament)*, 1st ed. (Jewish New Testament Publications, 1998).

not Stern understands "cause of your anger" in a similar fashion to what Wallace and the present author argue for, but his example does serve to demonstrate that we are not alone in rendering παροργισμός as something other than "anger."

Part of the confusion in translating παροργισμός is due to the fact that it is a *hapax legomena* in the NT and is virtually non-existent in ancient Greek literature.[27] This has led some commentators, such as Thielman, to rely on the etymology of the word to discern its meaning, rather than on the way it functions within its various contexts.[28] Fortunately, παροργισμός is not as infrequent in the LXX. As a noun, παροργισμός occurs seven times in the LXX. In all its occurrences, with only one exception, παροργισμός is used in a similar fashion to its verbal relative in the NT.[29]

[27] After performing a search for παροργισμός in the ancient Greek database http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/, I only found one positive match besides Eph 4:26. It occurs in Epistle 22 of Saint Basil, Bishop Caesarea, titled 'Περὶ τελειότητος βίου μοναχῶν' (Concerning the perfection of the life of monks, or life of solitaries). Interestingly, the use of παροργισμός in this letter is found in a context describing how to deal with sin within the monastic community. St. Basil emphasizes that sin must be dealt with so severely that unrepentant brothers are to be excluded from the community. In explaining his reasoning for treating sinful behavior as such, St. Basil quotes Eph 4:26 and says, "The sun must not set upon the brother's παροργισμός." He continues his reasoning by explaining, "So that night may not separate brothers from one another, and so that the accusation may not stand immovable on the day of judgment. The brother must not delay the time of his restoration, because there is no certainty about tomorrow, because many, in their many plans, have not reached tomorrow" (My own translation). See, Saint Basil and Roy DeFerrari J, *The Letters*, vol. 1, LCL 190 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1926), 138.

[28] See note 24. Interestingly, although παροργισμός is rather scarce, the NT does contain two occurrences of its verbal form παροργίζω (Rom 10:19; Eph 6:4). In both of its usages, it refers to when one party performs deeds that stir up anger in another. It must be noted, however, that using a word's verbal form to argue for the meaning it carries as a noun may likewise qualify as an example of the root fallacy. Thus, although these verbal forms found in the NT may illuminate our understanding of παροργισμός more than its mere etymology, it should not be definitive.

[29] The seven occurrences are: 1 Kgs 15:50; 2 Kgs 19:3; 23:26; Jer 21:5; 2 Esd 19:19, 26; Pss. Solomon 8:9. The exception is found in Jer 21:5 where it is used synonymously with God's great anger and wrath. Yet even here the context indicates that this great παροργισμός of the Lord is something that will greatly provoke the people as they are hauled off into exile (Deut 32:21; Ezek 32:9; Rom 10:19).

One instructive example is found in 1 Kgs 15:30 where παροργισμός is used to refer to the sinful actions (particularly idolatrous actions) of Jeroboam, as well as the rest of Israel, which caused God's anger to be stirred up against them. Here, the author helpfully placed παροργισμός in apposition to ἁμαρτία, thus strengthening our argument. Two other illuminating examples are found in 2 Esd 19:18 and 26.[30] In the former, παροργισμός is used to refer to the idolatrous acts Israel committed when they worshiped the golden calf. In the latter, it is used to describe the disobedient and rebellious lifestyle of the Israelites, who upon entering the Promised Land, cast the Lord's law behind their back and killed his prophets. In both instances, παροργισμός is used to translate the Hebrew term נָאַצָה, typically rendered as "blasphemy." Thus, in the majority of its usages in the LXX, παροργισμός is not used synonymously with anger. Rather, it is used as a reference to actions that stir up another's anger, typically idolatrous, sinful actions that stir up God's judicial anger.[31]

This conclusion is all the more elucidated when we consider the feminine form of παροργισμός: παρόργισμα. In its feminine form, the word only occurs three times in the LXX. On each occasion παρόργισμα is used to describe idolatrous, sinful actions that stir up God's righteous anger.[32] The most illuminating of these examples is found in 1 Kgs 16:33. Having described how Ahab did greater evil than Jeroboam by serving and worshiping Baal, erecting an altar for Baal and a house of idols, as well as a sacred grove (Asherah), the author (translator) then used παρόργισμα to summarize Ahab's idolatrous and wicked lifestyle.

This rendering of παρόργισμα and παροργισμός is strengthened by the fact that its verbal form παροργίζω (occurring 57x in LXX) is predominantly used to describe actions similar to those witnessed to by its nominal relatives. In Deut 4:25 and 31:29 it is used synonymously with making carved images and doing evil deeds. In Jdg 2:12, 17 it is used as a reference to going after other gods. In 1 Kgs 16:2, 13, 26 it is used to describe going after vain idols. In 2 Kgs 17:7, 11 it is used in reference to idolatrous actions such as burning incense, burning children, and practicing divination. In Jer 7:18; 8:19; 11:17; and 25:6 it is used to describe going after idols, making carved images, burning incense, and abandoning the Lord. In Ezek 16:26 and 20:27 it is used to describe turning towards the nations

[30] In English translations this is cataloged as Neh 9:18 and 9:26, respectively.

[31] In light of this information, including the discussion found in the Lexicons, particularly BDAG, it is surprising that most English translations have continued rendering παροργισμός as a synonym for anger.

[32] 1 Kgs 16:33; 2 Kgs 20:22; 2 Chr 35:19.

rather than to God.[33]

In light of this investigation, we can conclude that anyone familiar with the LXX (particularly the literature of Deuteronomy, Judges, 1–2 Kings, 2 Esdras (Nehemiah), Ezekiel, Jeremiah, and Isaiah), would surely know that παροργισμός and its lexical relatives are used to refer to unpleasant actions that stir up anger. More specifically, the terms refer to evil idolatrous deeds that stir up God's righteous anger. It seems then, that we can confidently conclude that παροργισμός in Eph 4:26b should likewise be rendered as such.[34] Thus, the audience is not told to keep the sun from setting on their anger, but to not let the sun set on the things that stir up anger (presumably God's righteous anger). In other words, what should not linger, but rather should be dealt with immediately, is not anger but sinful, idolatrous deeds that if left unchecked will give room for the devil to destroy the unity of the body and will ultimately bring about God's righteous wrath (Eph 5:6).[35] This conclusion makes sense in light of the appeal found in 4:17–24 to put off the old idolatrous self. The word idolatry does not occur explicitly in Eph 4:17–24; but Eph 5:3–5 hints at the fact that the former life described in the first passage was indeed a life of idolatry:

> But sexual immorality, and all impurity or lust must not even be named among you just as is proper for saints; as well as shamefulness, foolish talk, or inappropriate joking which is not proper. But rather, (let) gratitude (be named among you). For you know this well, that all sexually immoral, and impure, and lustful—which are idolaters—have no inheritance in the kingdom of Christ and God.

Metaleptic Argument

Thus far we have seen that the imperatival phrase in 4:26a should be interpreted as a simple command that has as its goal the promotion of growth and the protection of unity and peace in the community. We have also seen that the παροργισμός that must not be allowed to linger is not a reference to the same anger commanded in 4:26a, but a reference to sinful, idolatrous deeds that if left unchecked can destroy the community. Thus, such actions should be met with righteous, judicial anger from the

[33] Some other examples include Isa 1:4; Pss 77:40, 58; 1 Kgs 20:22; 22:54; Jdt 11:11.

[34] This is based not so much on the fact that Paul's audience would have been familiar with the LXX, but on the fact that Paul was not merely familiar with the LXX, but deeply influenced by it.

[35] It is important to emphasize that this is a call to be vigilant for sin, not only in the life of others within the community, but also in one's own life.

members of the community. That the command to anger is indeed a call to action against sin in the community is further confirmed when we consider that 4:26a is a direct quote from the LXX translation of Ps 4:4 (4:5 in LXX). This section will demonstrate that a comprehension of the context of Psalm 4 (particularly its LXX rendering) will greatly illuminate our understanding of its literary/rhetorical function in Paul's letter to the Ephesians; namely, as a call to action against sin.

That Eph 4:26a lacks a standard introductory formula has led many to downplay the significance of the Psalm's original context in Paul's writing.[36] We must add, however, that the lack of an introductory formula by no means necessitates the lack of the transumption of material from the original context of the citation into the new context. Such material may very well provide a literary backdrop for the new context regardless of whether or not a formal introductory formula is present. This transumption of material is especially true in the case of exact quotations, as is the case in Eph 4:26a. Additionally, if we only allow the original context of citations that live up to this standard to play any significant role in illuminating the new context, we will be left with only allowing what is cited in Eph 4:8 and 5:14 to serve as any sort of literary backdrop for the epistle—since these are the only two citations that are introduced by the formula διὸ λέγει.[37] Although some doubt that the context of Psalm 4 is of any significance to understanding Eph 4:26a, it is the burden of this section to demonstrate that comprehending the literary/rhetorical function of the imperative phrase in its original context will illuminate our understanding of how Paul intended to use it in his context.

There is great divergence among commentators regarding what exactly the historical context of Psalm 4 was, and thus the specific literary/rhetorical function of the phrase "be angry and do not sin."[38] Yet, there is still agreement on important matters. Regardless of who exactly the imperatival phrase was intended for, and what specific need/occurrence

[36] Sadly, this assumption is shared by Wallace, who thus far has provided major support for my argument. Wallace, "Ὀργίζεσθε," 359. See also Merkle, *Ephesians,* 148; H. Leupold, *Exposition of the Psalms* (Columbus: Wartburg Press, 1959), 69.

[37] A serious problem with using this standard to explain away the existence of literary significance from a citation's original context is that several OT passages play a significant role in creating a literary backdrop for Ephesians. Such passages are never explicitly cited, yet nevertheless provide an important background. One prime example of this is the importance of Psalm 110 and Psalm 8 as regards the exaltation of Christ in chapter 1 of Ephesians.

[38] The MT reads רִגְזוּ וְאַל־תֶּחֱטָאוּ (Ps 4:5) which would be best rendered, "Tremble and do not sin."

made it necessary for the psalmist to issue this warning, we can be sure of one thing: namely, that it is indeed a warning. Regardless of who was being addressed, whether it was Absalom's helpers or other shameless individuals who were making false accusations about the psalmist (presumably David),[39] or whether it was some of the psalmist's own friends who were discouraged because of difficult times,[40] or whether the psalmist was addressing himself because of his great anxiety about the uncertainty of his relationship with the Lord,[41] or even if it was some within the community who had turned to idols for the blessing of rain upon their crops,[42] one thing still remains: in using this phrase, the psalmist is calling his audience to repentance and to turn in trust to the Lord.[43] He is calling them to turn away from loving vanity (רִיק; ματαιότης; cf. Eph 4:17), to leave behind their search for falsehood (כָּזָב; ψεῦδος; cf. Eph 4:25), and to live so as to offer unto the Lord a righteous sacrifice (זֶבַח; θυσία; cf. Eph 5:2).

The connection between Psalm 4 and Ephesians is further elucidated when we consider that in the LXX rendering, rather than being asked, "How long shall my honor be turned to shame?" as is the case in the MT, the addressees are asked, "How long will you be hard hearted (βαρυκάρδιοι)?" The reference to βαρυκάρδιοι clearly sets up the drama of Psalm 4 in a narrative of sin, rebellion, and idolatry. The noun βαρυκάρδιοι only occurs here in the Greek Bible, but the combination of the verb βαρύνω (to harden) with the noun καρδία (heart) occurs seven times in the LXX. Each time, minus one, it is a clear reference to an individual whose heart has become hardened due to their rebellion against God.[44] The prime example of this is Pharaoh who was unwilling to listen to the word of the Lord, and so five of the seven occurrences refer to him.

The presence of the phrases ἀγαπᾶτε ματαιότητα and ζητεῖτε ψεῦδος

[39] Leupold, *Psalm*, 68; A. I. Ezra, *Rabbi Abraham Ibn Ezra's Commentary on the First Book of Psalms, Chapters 1–41*, trans. H. Norman Strickman (Brooklyn: Yashar Books, 2006), 42; L. A. Schokel and C. Carniti, *Salmos I (Salmos 1–72): Traduccion, Introduciones y Comentario* (Navarra: Verbo Divinio, 2002), 176.

[40] A. Weiser, *The Psalm: A Commentary* (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1962), 119.

[41] E. Charry, *Psalms 1–50: Sigh and Songs of Israel,* Brazos Theological Commentary on the Bible (Grand Rapids: Brazos Press, 2015), 17.

[42] M. Dahood, *Psalms*, AB 16 (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1966), 23.

[43] If you are convinced by Charry's argument, the audience here would be the psalmist himself.

[44] The seven occurrences are as follows: Exod 8:11; 8:28; 9:7; 9:24; 1 Sam 6:6; Ezek 27:5; Sir 3:27. Ezekiel 27:5 provides the exception. There the reference is to ships who are weighed down in the heart of the sea.

(4:3) likewise indicates that the Psalm (as rendered in the LXX) is staged against a backdrop of idolatry and sin. These terms are frequently used in the LXX to refer to idolatrous deeds and other sinful actions that stir up God's righteous anger. An informative example is found in Jer 8:19. There we see that the people of Israel have provoked (παροργίζω) the Lord with their carved images and with their idols/vanities (ματαιότης). Thus, we see that the call to "be angry and not sin" in Psalm 4 is not a simple acknowledgment of the appropriateness of anger under certain circumstances, but rather, a call to do away with apathy towards sin and rebellion. It is a call to repent, and thus, to turn to the Lord. There is good reason, therefore, to believe that this clarion call against sin and rebellion found in Psalm 4 is likewise what Paul intended to accomplish in his epistle.

CONCLUSION

This essay has argued that Ephesians 4:26–27 should be interpreted as a call to respond in righteous anger/indignation against anything that may disrupt the holy unity of the Spirit-indwelt community. Such peace-destroying actions and attitudes (whether found in the individual himself, or in other members of the community) must not be allowed to linger, but should be dealt with swiftly and quickly, lest they give room for the devil to infiltrate the community and bring an end to the divinely desired unity.

This conclusion has been promoted via four supporting arguments: grammatical (The phrase in 4:26a is a true imperative phrase); contextual (The imperatives in 4:26–27 commend actions that have as their intended goal the maintenance of the community's unity and peace); semantic (παροργισμός in 4:27 should be interpreted as referring to sinful actions and attitudes that jeopardize the community's unity and bring about God's righteous anger); metaleptic (The literary/rhetorical function of the imperatival phrase in 4:26a mimics the function it served in the original context of Psalm 4 of the LXX).

The command to be angry in Eph 4:26a is indeed a command to anger, but it is not a justification for sinful, self-centered anger. Rather, it is a call to swift action, in godly justice and love, against anything that may threaten the growth, unity, and peace of the community as well as anything that may grieve the Holy Spirit (4:30). It is a call to act in a very similar fashion to the way our own Lord acted in the presence of injustice and sin. Mark records that when confronted with the sinful arrogance of the Pharisees, Jesus "looked around at them with anger, grieving at their hardness of heart" (Mark 3:5). It is my contention that in writing to the Ephesians, as well as to us, Paul hoped that we would all likewise be stirred up and grieve at the presence of hard-heartedness and sin within ourselves and within the Christian community.

STR 13.1 (Spring 2022): 41–57

A Proverb Performance Study of James 1:19

David Seal*
Cornerstone University, Grand Rapids, MI

Abstract: *While in the last two decades or so orality and performance have entered the mainstream of biblical studies, the genre of wisdom literature, specifically the proverb, has remained largely unexplored from these perspectives. This essay will address this omission, by looking at the proverbial statements in the New Testament through the lens of orality and performance—specifically the maxim in Jas 1:19. The essay will first, label James's genre as an oral paraenesis written in epistolary form. Second, the essay will describe the nature of a proverb performance and demonstrate how Jas 1:19 can be classified accordingly. Third, the essay will investigate the introduction to the proverbial statement in Jas 1:19, asserting the statement's traditional nature, and explaining its meaning in its literary context. Finally, the essay will examine the proverb's strategic value for the author, including the authoritative force derived from the saying's performance, traditional nature, and oral aesthetics. The analysis of Jas 1:19 through the lens of orality and performance will highlight the value of this methodology, demonstrating that there is not only value in what James says but in how he says it.*

Key Words: *Epistle of James, orality, performance criticism, proverb performance, Proverbs*

While in the last two decades or so orality and performance have entered the mainstream of biblical studies, the genre of wisdom literature, specifically the proverb, has remained largely unexplored from these perspectives.[1] To address this omission, I intend to draw attention to the

* I am grateful for the comments and suggestions received from the anonymous reviewers for *STR*.

[1] Some scholars who have concentrated on performance or orality in the biblical wisdom genre are: Thomas McCreesh, *Biblical Sound and Sense: Poetic Sound Patterns in Proverbs 10–29*, JSOTSup 128 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1991); Carole R. Fontaine, *Smooth Words: Women, Proverbs, and Performance in Biblical Wisdom*, JSOTSup 356 (London: Sheffield Academic, 2002), 160–61; Gary A. Rendsburg, "Literary and Linguistic Matters in the Book of Proverbs," in *Perspectives on Israelite Wisdom: Proceedings of the Oxford Old Testament Seminar*, ed. John Jarick (New York: T&T Clark, 2018), 113; J. J. Burden, "Decision by Debate: Examples of Popular Proverb Performance in the Book of Job," *OTE* 4 (1991): 37–65; Katheryn Pfisterer Darr, "Asking at Abel: A Wise Woman's Proverb Performance in 2 Samuel 20," in *From the Margins 1: Women of the Hebrew Bible and Their Afterlives*, ed. Peter S. Hawkins and Lesleigh C. Stahlberg, Bible in the Modern World 18 (Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix, 2009), 102–21; Alan P. Winton, *The Proverbs of Jesus: Issues of History and Rhetoric*, JSNTSup 35 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1990), esp. ch. 5.

value of looking at the proverbial statements in the New Testament through the lens of orality and performance—specifically I will examine the maxim in Jas 1:19. In part, I am concerned with determining the ancient understanding of the authoritative force of the words in this text. I will proceed in four steps. First, I will label James's genre as an oral paraenesis written in epistolary form. Second, I will describe the nature of a proverb performance and demonstrate how Jas 1:19 can be classified accordingly. Third, I will investigate the introduction to the proverbial statement in Jas 1:19, assert the statement's traditional nature, and explain its meaning in its literary context. Finally, I will examine the proverb's strategic value for the author, including the authoritative force derived from the saying's performance, traditional nature, and oral aesthetics.

Genre: An Oral Epistolary Paraenesis

James is written in a gnomic and proverbial style, offering moral instruction while employing a strong hortatory tone like the content and style of Old Testament wisdom literature. Given that fifty-four of James's 108 verses contain imperatives, the work can appropriately be labeled as paraenesis.[2] However, there is significant similarity in the general characteristics of the subgenre of paraenesis and wisdom literature. Both contain imperatives and aphorisms.[3] Luke Cheung argues that the vocabulary characteristic of paraenesis is found lacking in James and certain features in James such as the use of aphorisms as confirmatory summary and the subject matter of James can only be found in wisdom instruction, leading Cheung to identify James as wisdom instruction.[4] Yet he acknowledges that James shows formal features of both Hellenistic paraenesis and Jew-

[2] Dale C. Allison Jr., *The Epistle of James*, ICC (New York: Bloomsbury, 2013), 72. For other suggested genre classifications see pp. 72–76.

[3] Luke Cheung, *Genre, Composition, and Hermeneutics of the Epistle of James*, Paternoster Biblical Monographs (Milton Keynes, UK: Paternoster, 2003; repr., Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock, 2007), 37.

[4] Cheung, *Genre, Composition, and Hermeneutics*, 15–52.

ish wisdom instruction. Richard Bauckham identifies James as a "paraenetic official letter or "paraenetic encyclical."[5] Bauckham refers to Jas 1:19b–20 as a wisdom admonition with a motive clause.[6]

James includes an opening form characteristic of an epistolary salutation but does not disclose any information about the sender with the exception of his name, "James," and the designation "servant of God and the Lord Jesus Christ" (1:1).[7] While James is addressed to the twelve tribes in the Dispersion (1:1), the work does not contain an extended greeting nor does it have any closing formula typical of ancient letters. However, Thomas Winger has suggested that certain epistles like James, which end abruptly, not having the usual blessings and greetings or closing formulas, might assume that the lector and congregation will do these rituals on their own, according to the liturgical custom of their congregation.[8]

In addition to its classification as epistolary paraenesis literature, James provides many clues indicating that it was situated in and written for a primarily oral culture. The first-century Mediterranean world was a blend of an oral and a scribal culture. It was a world familiar with writing, but still significantly, even predominantly, oral. First-century oral cultures enjoyed literature primarily through the ears, hearing it recited by a person reading out loud.[9] Most people could not read according to our standards of literacy. Scholars believe that the overall level of literacy in the first-century New Testament world was about twenty percent among men and a lower rate for women and individuals living in the provinces.[10]

[5] Richard Bauckham, *James: Wisdom of James, Disciple of Jesus the Sage*, New Testament Readings (New York: Routledge, 2014), 13.

[6] Bauckham, *James*, 40.

[7] All quotations are from the NRSV unless otherwise noted.

[8] Thomas M. Winger, "Orality as the Key to Understanding Apostolic Proclamation in the Epistles" (PhD diss., Concordia Seminary, 1997), 215.

[9] Raymond J. Starr, "Reading Aloud: Lectors and Roman Reading," *The Classical Journal* 86 (1991): 338.

[10] Glenn S. Holland, "Paul and Performance," in *Paul in the Greco-Roman World. A Handbook*, 2 vols., ed. J. Paul Sampley (reprinted; London: Bloomsbury, 2016), 2:242. There is some debate on the literacy level in the first-century biblical world. In his extensive study of ancient literacy, William V. Harris concludes that the overall level of literacy in the first-century ancient eastern Mediterranean world was below fifteen percent (*Ancient Literacy* [Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1989], 267). Catherine Hezser believes that the literacy rate among Jewish individuals may have been as low as three percent, depending on how one understands and defines "literacy" (*Jewish Literacy in Roman Palestine*, TSAJ 81 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001], 496). Based on his study of first-century communal

James divulges its oral dimension by the customary use of aural[11] expressions such as "listen" (2:5; 5:4) when he intends to gain his listeners' attention. James also employs alliteration, a rhetorical device that is best experienced when a text is spoken out loud. For example, he alliterates the initial letter π in 1:2, 11, 17, 21; 3:2; 4:1, 13–14, the initial δ in 3:8, and the initial μ in 1:11–12. Other aural devices that James utilizes extensively include assonance (e.g., 3:8, 13), asyndeton (e.g., 1:19, 27; 2:13; 3:15, 17; 4:2; 5:6), anaphora (e.g., 4:11), anadiplosis (e.g., 1:3–4, 19–20, 26–27), and homoeoteleuton (e.g., 1:6, 14; 2:12, 16, 19, 22, 23; 3:17; 4:8, 9; 5:4). Finally, rhetorical questions serve to capture the listeners' attention and invite their participation with the oral performance of this epistle (e.g., 2:4, 14, 16; 3:11–13; 4:5, 12, 14; 5:13–14).

Ancient Letter Writing, James, and Proverb Performance

The epistle of James served as the author's go-between—a written document, carrying communication from James in absentia to the church in the diaspora. His letter acted as a substitute for face-to-face communication (cf. Cicero, *Att.* 8.14.1; 12.53; Seneca, *Ep.* 75.1), which would presumably have taken place if James were physically present with the congregations receiving his correspondence. As is the case today, a letter in the ancient Mediterranean world was a written message employed because of the spatial separation of the correspondents.

In oral societies, written correspondence was often spoken out loud. While low literacy rates contributed to the popularity of oral recitation, even highly literate persons were accustomed to listening to passages read out loud, especially when the availability of texts was limited.[12] Reading

reading events, Brian J. Wright contends that written texts were experienced broadly by people of various social and educational levels. This might suggest that the low percentages of literacy among the Roman and Jewish population in the first century was much higher (*Communal Reading in the Time of Jesus: A Window into Early Christian Reading Practices* [Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2017]). See also Stanley E. Porter and Andrew W. Pitts, *Fundamentals of New Testament Textual Criticism* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2015), ch. 3.

[11] "Aural" means of or relating to the ear or to the sense of hearing.

[12] E.g., Pliny, *Ep.* 9.34 (Pliny the Younger, *Letters, Volume 2: Books 8–10. Panegyricus*, trans. Betty Radice, LCL 59 [Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1969]). Seneca articulated the benefit of listening to something recited, even if a person was fully literate, when he asked and answered, "'But why,' one asks, should I have to continue hearing lectures on what I can read?'" "The living voice," one replies, "is a great help." 'Why should I listen to something I can read?

aloud the Jewish sacred books was a common practice in the synagogues of the first century (Philo, *Good Person* 81–82; Luke 4:16–21; Acts 13:15). Letters written to the churches by James and others were also read aloud to the assembly (e.g., Acts 15:22–35; Col 4:16; 1 Thess 5:27; Rev 1:3).

Given that James's letter, including the proverbial statements (e.g., 1:19, 2:26, 4:6), were read aloud before a gathering of people, it is fitting to refer to the oral reading of the maxims as proverb performances. Carole Fontaine describes a proverb performance as "the purposeful transmission of a saying in a social interaction."[13] Katheryn Pfisterer Darr's translation of Ezek 18:2–3 illustrates Fontaine's definition. In this passage, she translates משלים (use a proverb) as "performing," with the understanding that the proverb was performed before an audience. Her rendition is "What do you mean by performing this proverb concerning the land of Israel, 'The parents have eaten sour grapes, and the children's teeth are set on edge?'"[14] Nearly every instance of משל (often translated as "proverb") in the Old Testament, outside of its use in the book of Proverbs, is a composition that is orally performed by characters in the narrative (e.g., 1 Sam 24:13; Ezek 12:22–23; 18:2).[15] Alan Winton has investigated how Jesus's proverb performances recounted in the Synoptic

Because the living voice contributes so much"' (*Ep.* 33.9; Seneca, *Epistles, Volume 1: Epistles 1–65*, trans. R. M. Gummere, LCL 75 [Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1917], 239). As noted by Rex Winsbury, *The Roman Book: Books, Publishing and Performance in Classical Rome*, ed. David Taylor, Classical Literature and Society (London: Gerald Duckworth & Co., 2009), 112.

[13] Carole R. Fontaine, *Traditional Sayings in the Old Testament: A Contextual Study*, ed. D. M. Gunn, Bible and Literature Series 5 (Sheffield: The Almond Press, 1982), 72.

[14] Katheryn Pfisterer Darr, "Proverb Performance and Transgenerational Retribution in Ezekiel 18," in *Ezekiel's Hierarchical World Wrestling with a Tiered Reality*, ed. Stephen L. Cook and Corrine L. Patton, SBLSymS (Atlanta: SBL, 2004), 199.

[15] See Fontaine for a selection of definitions based on either the style and content, function, or structure of a proverb (*Traditional Sayings*, 32–34). See Galit Hasan-Rokem for a list of criteria for determining the presence of a proverb (*Proverbs in Israeli Folk Narratives: A Structural Semantic Analysis* [Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia, Academia Scientiarum Fennica, 1982], 11, 18–19, 53). Jacqueline Eliza Vayntrub argues that משל is a speech act voiced in performance (*Beyond Orality: Biblical Poetry on Its Own Terms*, The Ancient World, ed. S. Sanders [London: Routledge, 2019]). For another survey of proverb definitions see J. J. Burden, "The Wisdom of Many: Recent Changes in Old Testament Proverb Interpretation," *OTE* 3 (1990): 341–59.

Gospels function in their literary context.[16] He focuses on the oral, public, and rhetorical nature of these proverb performances. Wolfgang Mieder defines a proverb as "a concise statement of an apparent truth, which has [had or will have] currency among the people."[17] Mieder's focus on the proverb as a statement (as opposed to a composition) having group acceptance is important for this study because we are concerned with a proverb recited in a communal setting—a "proverb performance."[18] The formal introduction of the proverb performance in Jas 1:19 will be discussed subsequently.

James 1:19: The Introduction to the Proverb

James's proverb is introduced as: Ἴστε, ἀδελφοί μου ἀγαπητοί ("You must understand this, my beloved" [NRSV] or "This you know, my beloved" [NASB]). Scholars differ in their view of how ἴστε should be read. Some consider it as an imperative ("You must understand this," e.g., Dibelius, McCartney[19]), while others understand ἴστε as an indicative form of οἶδα ("This you know," e.g., Reicke, Talbert[20]). However, it seems best to view ἴστε as an indicative that refers to the proverbial statement that follows in Jas 1:19.[21] As a part of the listeners' common knowledge,

[16] Winton, *The Proverbs of Jesus*, 127–40. For examples of Jesus's proverb performances, see Matt 7:6; 9:10–13; 19:16–26; Mark 7:24–30; Luke 4:23.

[17] Wolfgang Mieder, *Proverbs: A Handbook*, Greenwood Folklore Handbooks (Westport, CT: Greenwood, 2004), 4.

[18] A good example of a proverb performance in a narrative context comes from the story of the unnamed wise woman of Abel Beth-Maacah (2 Sam 20:1–22). Also see Job 32:7 and 34:3 where Elihu cites proverbs in the performance arena of Job and friends. These examples were noted by Fontaine, *Smooth Words*, 160–61. For another example of a proverb performance see Isa 37:3b. For more on proverb performance, see Katheryn Pfisterer Darr's discussion of Isa 37:3 ("No Strength to Deliver: A Contextual Analysis of Hezekiah's Proverb in Isaiah 37.3b," in *New Visions of Isaiah*, ed. M. A. Sweeney and R. F. Melugin, JSOT 214 [Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1996], 219–56).

[19] Martin Dibelius, *James*, Hermeneia (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1988), 108–9; Dan McCartney, *James*, BECNT (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2009), 114.

[20] Bo Reicke, *The Epistles of James, Peter, and Jude*, AB 37 (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1964), 19–20; Charles H. Talbert, "James: Teaching Outlines and Selected Sermon Seeds," *RevExp* 97 (2000): 172.

[21] Scot McKnight understands ἴστε as an indicative that relates to what precedes it in Jas 1:18 (*The Letter of James*, NICNT [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2011], 135). In this sense verses 18–19a would be rendered: "In fulfillment of his own purpose he gave us birth by the word of truth, so that we would become a kind of first fruits of his creatures. You know this."

a maxim already known in some form by the addressees,[22] ἴστε introduces the proverb as such and would then be translated: "You know (ἴστε) *this* my beloved brothers, everyone must be quick to hear, slow to speak, slow to anger."[23] This translation will be defended later in the essay.

Formulas preceding or following the recitation of a proverb tag the saying so listeners understand the statement's source, authority, and credibility. These tags mark a statement as an appeal to the traditional wisdom, beliefs, and the cultural tenets of faith of the community at large. An example of an identification formula preceding a proverbial quote is spoken by the wise woman at Abel: "They used to say in the old days ..." (2 Sam 20:18). Pfisterer Darr notes that the pronoun "they" in this formula links the saying to the wise woman's and Joab's "esteemed ancestors"—a saying that certainly deserves attention.[24] It is likely that the introductory phrase "You know this" served as a signal to alert the listeners that they are about to hear something familiar—perhaps a tradition they have memorized that is relevant to James's instruction.

The strongest argument against understanding Jas 1:19 as a proverb performance and instead labeling it simply as an innovative catchy maxim is if James intended the verb ἴστε as an imperative ("You must understand this, my dear brothers") rather than an indicative ("You know this my dear brothers"). If James was not having his recipients recall a proverb they knew, then a proverb performance reading of the passage is not as strong. This is true because a proverb is performed in situations in which it is likely that the audience was familiar with the proverb, which is implied if the verb ἴστε is in the indicative mood.

Those who take the verb as an imperative do so based on one of two premises or both. The first premise is since James has a penchant for imperatives then it follows that Jas 1:19 should be viewed as an imperative. However, James's proclivity for imperatives does not mean that he could not have chosen to change his typical style and have intended the indicative mood in Jas 1:19. A second argument often posited for translating ἴστε as an imperative is that since elsewhere in James the phrase ἀδελφοί μου ἀγαπητοί ("my dear brothers") accompanies an imperative (e.g., Jas 1:16, 2:5), it does so in Jas 1:19 as well.[25] However, in Jas 3:10, the phrase

[22] So Benjamin B. Hunt, "Tenor Relations in James," in *The Epistle of James: Linguistic Exegesis of an Early Christian Letter*, ed. James D. Dvora and Z. K. Dawson, McMaster Linguistic Exegesis of the New Testament 1 (Eugene, OR: Pickwick, 2019), 266. Hunt believes the maxim or proverb extends through verse 20.

[23] My translation.

[24] Pfisterer Darr, "Asking at Abel," 108.

[25] E.g., Craig L. Blomberg and Mariam J. Kamell, *James*, ZECNT 16 (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2008), 85.

is present in a declarative sentence rather than an imperatival one. Further, this argument fails to consider why James uses the phrase ἀδελφοί μου ἀγαπητοί. Simply because the vocative appears with imperatives elsewhere in James it does not necessarily follow that this was James's motive for employing the phrase. Here Benjamin Hunt is helpful. He argues that ἀδελφοί is a familial term, which marks out James as a member of a fictive kin group (the church), expressing his co-belonging to this community.[26] By using the phrase in the context of an imperative or in the case of Jas 1:19, an indicative, James is able to maintain his honorable status within the group, while still asserting his role as one capable of reminding the addressees of their knowledge of this proverb and quelling any potential rebuttals to it.[27] The proverb will likely be more well received if James identifies himself as a member of the church family.

Further supporting that James was performing a known proverb as opposed to simply asserting a novel imperative conveying proper communication ethics is that the maxim of being quick to listen, slow to speak, and slow to anger seems to have been a universal adage. The Greeks were familiar with it (e.g., Dio Chrysostom, *Alex.* 32.2; Isocrates, *Demon.* 41) and similar proverbs can be found in both biblical and non-biblical sources.[28] Thus, it is likely James's audience has heard the proverb in some form.

A final reason for understanding Jas 1:19 as being a well-known proverb that James's audience knew and thereby supporting a proverb performance reading is that the passage contains the unanticipated conjunction δέ (but). Most all English versions omit it in translation (ἔστω δὲ πᾶς ἄνθρωπος; "Every person must be" [LEB]). The NASB retains it ("But everyone must be"). Peter Davids argues that the unexpectedness of the conjunction may indicate that the entire line is a well-known proverb of which the conjunction was once a part.[29]

[26] Hunt, "Tenor Relations," 262. Christian writers frequently used the term ἀδελφοί (brothers) for fellow members of the community (e.g., Acts 15:25; Rom 1:7; 16:5, 8, 9, 12; 1 Cor 4:14, 17; 2 Cor 12:19; Phil 2:12; 4:1; Col 1:7; Phlm 1; Heb 6:9; 1 Pet 2:11; 2 Pet 3:1; 1 John 2:7; Jude 3).

[27] Hunt, "Tenor Relations," 266.

[28] For other proverbs similar in thought to Jas 1:19 see Prov 16:23a; 29:20; Sir 11:8; 20:7a; 22:27–23:1; 23:7–8 (on being "slow to speak"), and Prov 14:29; 15:18; 18:13; Eccl 7:9; Sir 28:8–12 (on being "slow to anger"). For a copious list of other ancient texts that combine instruction about speech, listening, and anger, see the footnotes in Allison, *Epistle of James*, 297–99.

[29] Peter H. Davids, *The Epistle of James*, NIGTC (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982), 91.

James 1:19: The Proverb

Nothing is known of a source that has the exact full proverbial statement as it appears in James: ἔστω δὲ πᾶς ἄνθρωπος ταχὺς εἰς τὸ ἀκοῦσαι, βραδὺς εἰς τὸ λαλῆσαι, βραδὺς εἰς ὀργήν ("You know this my beloved brothers, everyone must be quick to hear, slow to speak, slow to anger").[30] However, as previously noted, similarly themed maxims are abundant. One of the closest is "Be quick to hear, and with patience give an answer" (Γίνου ταχὺς ἐν ἀκροάσει σου καὶ ἐν μακροθυμίᾳ φθέγγου ἀπόκρισιν, Sir 5:11 LXX).[31] We cannot be sure from which of the earlier wisdom sayings James has acquired the insights he expresses in the first half of the verse, but it seems he has formulated an aphorism of his own. The motive clause in the second half of the verse was most likely formulated originally as an independent aphorism. This is a fine example of the way the sage, making the wisdom of the tradition his own, expresses it in an apt proverb of his own formulation, not only transmitting but adding to the wisdom of the tradition.[32]

Lack of an exact citation does not mean that James's statement was not a traditional proverb that was widely known and respected by his recipients. André Lardinois argues that certain Greek proverbs were, at least until the fourth century BCE, part of a living and dynamic tradition.[33] In every performance of a proverb there was a re-creation of the saying—very much like what occurred in the oral transmission of epic verse. Proverbs were re-created with the help of traditional formulae and themes. To support his view, Lardinois cites several proverbs that are not identical but communicate a similar theme.[34] For example, Plutarch's Lycurgus (19.12) demonstrates one form of a proverb: "A city will be well fortified which is surrounded by brave men and not by bricks."[35] A comparable idea

[30] My translation.

[31] The Greek translation comes from *Septuaginta: With Morphology* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1979). The English translation is from Rick Brannan et al., eds., *The Lexham English Septuagint* (Bellingham, WA: Lexham, 2012). For other proverbs similar in thought to Jas 1:19 see footnote 28.

[32] Bauckham, *James*, 83–84.

[33] André Lardinois, "The Wisdom and Wit of Many: The Orality of the Greek Proverbial Expressions," in *Speaking Volumes: Orality and Literacy in the Greek and Roman World*, ed. Janet Watson, Mnemosyne: Supplementum 218 (Leiden: Brill, 2001), 94.

[34] Lardinois, "The Wisdom and Wit of Many," 94.

[35] "Οὐκ ἂν εἴη ἀτείχιστος πόλις ἅτις ἄνδρεσσι, καὶ οὐ πλίνθοις ἐστεφάνωται" (Plutarch, *Lives, Volume I: Theseus and Romulus. Lycurgus and Numa. Solon and Publicola*, trans. Bernadotte Perrin, LCL 46 [Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1914], 266–67).

surfaces in a proverb by Alcaeus. It says, "… for warlike men are a city's tower" (*Fragments* 112.10).[36] Often in comparing similar proverbs, one of the main terms is either left out altogether or replaced by a synonym or a circumlocution. Sometimes the proverb was expanded. For example, in the proverb cited above, ships were added to the equation. Therefore, Sophocles said that "a wall or a ship is nothing without men who live inside it."[37] In another version, Thucydides stated, "… for it is men that make a State, not walls nor ships devoid of men" (*History of the Peloponnesian War* 7.77.7).[38] Lardinois notes that in many ancient oral societies the mere repetition of words was frowned upon.[39] So "traditionality" hardly ever meant an exact repetition of words from the past.

An adapted proverb is present in 4 Macc 18:16. It cites the first line of a slightly altered proverb from Prov 3:18: "He recounted to you Solomon's proverb, 'There is a tree of life for those who do his will.'" Novel renditions or alterations of traditional proverbs occur in several New Testament books. For example, Jas 4:6 quotes Prov 3:34 from the Septuagint but has θεός (God) instead of the LXX's κύριος (Lord).[40] The Masoretic Text lacks either designation. Romans 12:20 cites Prov 25:21–22 LXX but uses ψώμιζε—a different verb than the Septuagint's τρέφε, to describe the act of feeding. Finally, 2 Pet 2:22 cites only a portion of Prov 26:11.

It is important to understand that in societies like ancient Greece or the first-century Mediterranean world, where most verbal art was still produced orally, a saying could be both traditional and repurposed at the same time. Thus, it is probable that no source can be found for the exact wording of Jas 1:19 because it is a repurposed adage by the author, having been slightly adapted from some portions of well-known proverbs.[41] The adapted adage preserved some main kernel of ancient wisdom, allowing it to still be recognized by the listeners as traditional material.

[36] Alcaeus Sappho, *Greek Lyric, Volume I: Sappho and Alcaeus*, ed. and trans. David A. Campbell, LCL 142 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1982), 285.

[37] Sophocles, *Ajax. Electra. Oedipus Tyrannus*, ed. and trans. Hugh Lloyd-Jones, LCL 20 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1994), 331.

[38] Thucydides, *History of the Peloponnesian War, Volume 4: Books 7–8*, trans. C. F. Smith, LCL 169 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1923), 159.

[39] Lardinois, "The Wisdom and Wit of Many," 105.

[40] 1 Peter 5:5 cites Prov 3:34 LXX and uses θεός rather than κύριος. Romans 12:17 cites Prov 3:4 LXX with some alterations.

[41] So Allison, *Epistle of James*, 299.

James 1:19: The Proverb's Context

Some scholars assign the context for the proverb in Jas 1:19 to the discussion in verses 17–18.[42] Others claim it belongs to the topic following in verses 20–27.[43] A few commentators assert a broader context for the proverb and claim that the maxim represents general advice applicable to all sorts of situations.[44] This last group of scholars contend that the verse intentionally allows for a wide application. So, the proverb was meant to admonish James's recipients to hear God and put into practice his commands and to also encourage the church to embrace proper speech ethics when in dialogue with fellow congregants.

Rather than claim that James intended broad application for the proverb as suggested above, it is important to note that paroemiologists have demonstrated that much of the intent of a proverb's utterance is dependent on the social context in which it is used.[45] Raymond Firth states, "The meaning of a proverb is made clear only when side by side with the translation is given a full account of the accompanying social situation, the reason for its use, its effect, and its significance in speech."[46] I would add that in the case of James, a written composition, the literary context must also be considered to determine the proverb's meaning.[47]

The immediate literary context for the proverb in Jas 1:19, both before and after, involves a focus on the divine word and the need for undivided attention to it. In the material preceding the proverb, James asserts that

[42] E.g., Luke Timothy Johnson, *The Letter of James: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, AB 37A (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2008), 199.

[43] E.g., Dibelius, *James*, 108–9.

[44] E.g., Allison, *Epistle of James*, 301–2. Also see William R. Baker, *Personal Speech-ethics in the Epistle of James*, WUNT 2/68 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1995), 87.

[45] The folklorist research of proverbs is called paroemiology.

[46] Raymond Firth, "Proverbs in Native Life, with Special Reference to those of the Maori," *Folklore* 37 (1926): 134.

[47] A proverb's use in two different social contexts is found in the books of Ezekiel and Jeremiah. In Ezekiel, the prophet says, "What do you mean by repeating this proverb concerning the land of Israel, 'The fathers have eaten sour grapes, and the children's teeth are set on edge?'" (Ezek 18:2). Here the prophet is instructing the people that every individual is accountable before God. No one can blame the former generation for their own difficulties. The same proverb is employed in Jeremiah, where it has been applied differently. In Jeremiah, it is more consoling, declaring that any who open themselves to God's goodness will eventually be restored by him: "In those days they shall no longer say: 'The fathers have eaten sour grapes, and the children's teeth are set on edge'" (Jer 31:29). This example was noted by Susan E. Gillingham, *The Poems and Psalms of the Hebrew Bible*, Oxford Bible Series (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994), 96.

while God is not the source of temptation (1:13), he is the source of good (1:16–18). James's prime example of God's goodness is Christian conversion, described as first fruits, which is brought about by hearing and embracing the gospel, "the word of truth" (1:18).[48] The first requirement of those who have been given birth by the word of truth is to receive the implanted word[49] that has the power to save their souls (1:21) and allow it to become the norm for their existence. In this context, James's proverb is describing the proper stance for reception of the implanted and truthful divine word. That stance requires a swift, perhaps enthusiastic hearing—a hearing of both God and the teachers through whom the word is proclaimed. The proper stance also involves a slowness to speak and slowness to anger. In other words, obedience to the perfect law, the law of liberty, which is highlighted in verses 1:22–25. Only this stance to the divine word will achieve the righteousness that God desires (1:20).

Present also in the larger context of James is a focus on the divine word as a source of authority, to which James's listeners are to submit. The divine word is referred to as the "royal law" (2:8)[50] and Scripture (2:8, 23; 4:5). At other places in James, God's word is simply called the law (2:9, 10, 11), or wisdom that comes from above (3:17). Ultimately James's proverb, asserting swift hearing, slowness to speak, and controlled anger, means submission to God (4:7) and his teaching through divinely appointed instructors, including James (3:1).

James 1:19: Performance Analysis

Performing a proverb in a social setting had several functions and could serve various purposes. It was often employed to: (1) maintain or restore peace in a communal setting, (2) separate the author from the source of the instruction by first, invoking traditional wisdom and second, by utilizing a poetic sound arrangement. The poetic sound arrangement imparts the proverb with a persuasive force, giving the impression of having perhaps even a divine origin. I will discuss these features and functions subsequently.

An initial reason for citing a proverb was to maintain or restore harmony in a tense or potentially tense social setting. A proverb was considered wise if it was felt to promote a harmonious society, with appropriate

[48] See Johnson for a discussion of the understanding of the phrase "word of truth" (*The Letter of James*, 197–98).

[49] For a discussion on the potential meanings of "implanted word" (ἔμφυτον λόγον), see Allison, *Epistle of James*, 289–90.

[50] For a discussion on the notion of royal law, see Allison, *Epistle of James*, 402–5.

and agreeable relations on all levels, ranging from the immediate family (husband-wife, father-son, mother-daughter, sibling-sibling), to the residential unit (master-slave, mistress-maid), to the village, city, church, to the whole kingdom (king-subjects), and to God's realm (God-humans).[51] Every proverb that promotes harmony at any level was considered true. Thus, proverbs were fashioned to direct positive attitudes and behavior that promoted harmony at all social levels of a community. Sayings were also formulated that would discourage attitudes and behavior that would be obtrusive to an orderly and harmonious world. As proverbs were created and employed, they became part of a community's powerful and respected traditions of time-tested wisdom.

The literary context where the proverb is situated in Jas 1:19, both the immediate and the larger context of the entire epistle, involves divine instruction. Therefore, the proverb was likely aimed to preserve and/or restore peace between God and the letter's recipients who were being exhorted to submit to him. If the recipients recognize the proverb as "true," agreeing it "fits" their situation, then it follows that they ought to act in accordance with the weight of the traditional proverbial wisdom.

The traditional nature of proverbs is an important factor, which helps to facilitate another function of a proverb performance—it allows speakers who use them to express opinions without strictly being accountable for them. In quoting an ancient proverb, the speaker fades into the background by calling the community's proverbial wisdom to mind. People can have an immense veneration for the past and for the wisdom that has been handed on to them by past generations. Because of a proverb's antiquity and accuracy of insight, it becomes sanctioned or almost "sanctified" by the culture as wisdom of the elders that must be taken seriously and must be given "weight" when spoken.[52]

[51] The discussion of the community hierarchy relies on Michael V. Fox, "The Epistemology of the Book of Proverbs," *JBL* 126 (2007): 678.

[52] Joseph Russo, "The Poetics of the Ancient Greek Proverb," *Journal of Folklore Research* 20 (1983): 121. It is noteworthy that in 1 Kgs 20:11 and Judg 8:21 a proverb performance takes place between two different population groups, suggesting that proverbial sayings had some acceptance even between hostile foreign groups. Fontaine says, "The sages were comparative thinkers: because of their association 'vertically' through time with 'tradition' and 'horizontally' (across cultures during the same time period) with wisdom contacts in other cultures, they did not perform their intellectual activities in a theological, ethical, literary or practical vacuum. In the midst of Israel's culture which emphasized its theological 'uniqueness,' the sages worked with the connections and similarities of their teachings to those of their neighbors, creating a kind of intellectual ecumenism, as it were" ("The Social Roles of Women in the World of Wisdom," in *A Feminist Companion to Wisdom Literature*, ed. Athalya Brenner, The Feminist Companion to the Bible 9 [Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1995], 26–27).

James frequently cautions his listeners about the dangers of speech.[53] Because he is engaged in the very speaking acts that he warns his audience about, James must make his speech avoid the perils he cautions against.[54] To avoid self-contradiction, James manages to be consistent with his own notions of the proper use of speech, in part, by citing traditional proverbs.

While James steps aside by asserting proverbial authority, he simultaneously attains the superior position of being the leader who can impose appropriate standards on the church community. By invoking a wise tradition on listening, speaking, and anger, James not only disappears as an individual, but he also imposes the weight of traditional wisdom on his church. The need to depersonalize speech when James is the one speaking for God is important. James's proverb concerning speaking and listening (to him and ultimately God) allows him to say what is necessary without creating additional social tensions. James is able to convey an opinion (perhaps a dissident one), "all the while from within a 'safety net' of shared assumptions."[55] Further, the citation will more likely ensure that his (God's) teaching gains acceptance by his audience.[56]

In addition to the content of an ancient traditional proverb, possessing authoritative weight within a group, proverbs also sound authoritative by the way the words and letters of the saying are arranged. Their poetic acoustical features and formal qualities give the impression of an idea and authority that originates from a source other than the speaker. An analysis of the proverb in Jas 1:19 reveals several sound features bolstering its authority. The proverb is set in parallel below with certain sound elements tagged. A parallelism results from the repetition of similar grammatical

[53] James believes that it is more difficult to avoid errors in speech than in any other aspect of daily life for he says, "anyone who makes no mistakes in speaking is perfect" (Jas 3:2). Mistakes in speech are significant. Like ships guided by a small rudder "the tongue is a small member, yet it boasts of great exploits" (3:4–5). James states that though "every species of beast and bird can be tamed ... no one can tame the tongue, a restless evil full of deadly poison" (3:7–9).

[54] Carol Poster, "Words as Works: Philosophical Protreptic and the Epistle of James," in *Rhetorics for a New Millennium*, ed. J. D. Hester, Studies in Antiquity and Christianity 14 (New York: T&T Clark, 2010), 250.

[55] Fontaine, *Smooth Words*, 164–65.

[56] Arland D. Jacobson, "Proverbs and Social Control: A New Paradigm for Wisdom Studies," in *Gnosticism and the Early Christian World: In Honor of James M. Robinson*, ed. J. E. Goehring (Sonoma, CA: Polebridge, 1990), 81.

constructions and phrases.

ἔστω δὲ πᾶς ἄνθρωπος
ταχὺς εἰς τὸ ἀκοῦ**σαι**,
βραδὺς εἰς τὸ λαλῆ**σαι**,
βραδὺς εἰς ὀργήν·

Several features give the proverb a musical ring: the initial nominative adjectives in the first two phrases of the proverb all ending in υς, the duplication of the εἰς τό plus the active infinitives each ending in –σαι, and the presence of the same number of syllables in each line.[57]

The second and third line of the proverb is an example of anaphora (Rhet. Her. 4.13.19; Quintilian, *Inst.* 9.3.30), where the same words (βραδὺς εἰς) begin successive phrases. Anaphora contributes to the rhythm and rhyme in the proverb. Rhythm transpires when there is the periodic re-emergence of the same significant element or factor. Pseudo-Longinus, in discussing the sublime or that which produces exalted language and has the effect of being dignified and filled with grandeur, points to the aural effects of rhythm ([*Subl.*] 39–42).

The final line relates to the previous two by having the initial nominative adjective followed by εἰς. However, the third line lacks an article, and it finishes with a noun rather than an infinitive. Given it is the final phrase, William Baker contends that those differences serve to highlight a progression.[58] A calm temperament is more likely to be achieved when one puts the previous two lines into practice. This dynamic, present in many proverbs, is known as the "act-consequence" relationship, where certain good behavior produces good consequences.[59] There is a general sense of the harmony between action and result that a person may trust.

Like an incantation, there is something hypnotic and ritualistic about hearing a proverb. Its aesthetics might mesmerize listeners through its rhythms, making a listener more receptive to the content. Expressions of rhyme, alliteration, parallelism, and brevity among other poetic devices contribute to the idea that if it sounds right it must be true. Vessela Valiavitcharska remarks that rhythm has significant power.[60] If surrendered to, rhythm commands the human psyche and carries away judgment,

[57] Baker, *Personal Speech-ethics*, 86.

[58] Baker, *Personal Speech-ethics*, 86.

[59] Carole R. Fontaine, "Wisdom Traditions in the Hebrew Bible," *Dialogue: A Journal of Mormon Thought* 33 (2000): 103.

[60] Vessela Valiavitcharska, *Rhetoric and Rhythm in Byzantium: The Sound of Persuasion* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), 1.

making it the ultimate rhetorical tool.[61] Thus, the content of a proverb, recited in a performance arena, does not need to be validated because the poetic (magical) elements of the proverb have already accomplished this task.

These acoustic elements are often intended as mnemonic devices, which help the speaker to remember the exact wording of the proverb. However, since it appears that James has re-created a proverb from traditional material, not repeating any particular proverb verbatim, it is more likely that the poetics served to make the text stand out from the text before and after the maxim. Expressions displaying such poetic acoustic elements are, in some sense, the language of God. Their disparity from ordinary speech, the otherness of a poetic proverb, makes it appear as "revealed" truth.[62] According to one ancient Jewish tradition, the letters of the Hebrew alphabet as well as the art of writing were created on the sixth day (eve of the Sabbath; m. Avot 5, 6). The idea that writing was given to humanity as part of the very creation of the world was known also other ancient cultures.[63] James Kugel observes that some of the Psalms, which are poetic by nature, contain oracles where God is addressing himself to Israel, or to the nations or to pagan deities (e.g., Pss 81:6–16, 82:2–7).[64] As Robert Alter has said, poetry is our best human model of complex and rich communication, being "solemn, weighty, and forceful."[65] So, poetry is a fitting language style to represent divine speech. Thus, in addition to James's traditional proverb invoking ancestral authority, the maxim might have been perceived as if it was issuing from God himself.

Summary and Conclusion

James 1:19 can be classified as a proverb performance. With the help

[61] Valiavitcharska, *Rhetoric and Rhythm*, 1.

[62] Richard J. Clifford, "Your Attention Please! Heeding the Proverbs," *JSOT* 29 (2004): 157.

[63] E.g., The Egyptian god of writing was Thoth, who was said to have revealed the scribal arts to humanity (William M. Schniedewind, *How the Bible Became a Book: The Textualization of Ancient Israel* [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005], 26).

[64] James L. Kugel, "Poets and Prophets: An Overview," in *Poetry and Prophecy: The Beginnings of a Literary Tradition*, ed. James L. Kugel (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1990), 6.

[65] Robert Alter, *The Art of Biblical Poetry*, rev. ed. (New York: Basic Books, 2011), 147.

of traditional formulae and themes, James has re-created a proverb, conveying ancient wisdom that was recognized as truthful by his audience. A proverb performance analysis of Jas 1:19 has helped us to appreciate the value of the methodology, highlighting the indirect authority of the proverb and the importance of contextual factors in its interpretation. By invoking the traditional authority, James uses indirection to assert perhaps a dissident opinion about hearing divine instruction: "be quick to listen, slow to speak, slow to anger." Further, the rhythm in James's proverb, created by the poetic oral features, gives his language additional certification of the truth of its content, perhaps even establishing a divine stamp of approval on the saying. James, as the teacher of the divine word, can call for his recipients to listen to and obey him and in doing so hear God speaking, thereby preserving, or restoring them to a proper divine-human relationship.

Additionally, this essay has demonstrated that there is not only value in *what* James says but in *how* he says it. While James's use of rhetorical expressions has been well noted by scholars (e.g., alliteration, assonance, asyndeton, anaphora, anadiplosis, homoeoteleuton), proposing Jas 1:19 as an example of proverb performance advances the discussion for the study of James.

STR 13.1 (Spring 2022): 59–77

Of Gods, Government, and Gospel: A Missiological Application of Acts 28:11

Ant Greenham
Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary, Wake Forest, NC

Abstract: *Genuine Christian faith entails turning from idols. A question thus arises, why does Luke choose to mention the pagan* Διοσκούροις *(twin gods) figurehead in Acts 28:11? Most commentators say little on the subject. However, the final section of Acts, which details Paul's journey from Ephesus via Jerusalem to Rome, presents comparisons with the* Διοσκούροις*. In particular, the word two (*δύο*) or a cognate thereof occurs several times. The word group appears within a ring composition, which takes the form of a prophetic rhetorical template, with the climax in the center. In this case, the climax is a formidable Roman force, comprised of two centurions, two hundred soldiers, and two hundred spearmen (Acts 23:23), which left from Jerusalem with Paul and an official letter affirming his legitimate evangelistic activities. Validating Paul's ministry is a key Lukan concern. This concern is enhanced by the surrounding prophetic rhetorical template, which inter alia parallels the Ephesian crowd shouting for Artemis (Acts 19:34) with the* Διοσκούροις*. With this link, Luke subtly but clearly shows that the* Διοσκούροις *exemplify pagan folly. A three-part missiological application follows: Gospel proclamation by law-abiding Christians is legitimate in all contexts. Idolatrous tendencies should be identified in whatever form they appear. However, idolaters must have the freedom to worship their false gods without fearing Christians will ridicule or destroy them.*

Key Words: *Acts 28:11, Artemis, chiasm,* Διοσκούροις*, idolatry, ring composition, twin gods*

Abandoning Pagan Deities

In his affectionate letter to the Thessalonian believers, the apostle Paul recalls with gratitude how they "turned to God from idols to serve the living and true God, and to wait for his Son from heaven, whom he raised from the dead, Jesus who delivers us from the wrath to come" (1 Thess 1:9–10 ESV). Embracing Christ and his salvation is of course integral to genuine Christian faith. However, turning from idols is a key element in the process.

It may be asked to what extent "turning from" is necessary in any

given situation. How much of one's old life, culture, and religion must a believer in Christ relinquish? Answers will vary, but fidelity to Scripture surely requires abandoning idolatry and false gods. This is certainly the picture emerging from the book of Acts. As Fred Farrokh asserts in a piece challenging the proponents of insider movements,[1] Gentile believers abandoned their erstwhile pagan allegiances: "[T]hough they did not need to become circumcised Jewish proselytes to become disciples of Messiah Jesus, [they] nonetheless experienced dramatic discontinuity from their pagan religious past."[2] And that, of course, meant forsaking pagan deities like Artemis, the patron goddess of Ephesus.

Farrokh underlines this quite forcibly when he argues that Paul (in Acts) "sought to depose the Greek gods and render them powerless. Indeed, Paul does not even mention the name Artemis in his Epistle to the Ephesians. Neither does Jesus mention Artemis in his Revelation message to the Ephesian Church."[3] Since Artemis is downplayed in this way, it is a little surprising that Luke, the author of Acts, sees fit to mention two other pagan deities, in an apparently neutral context, in his account of Paul's journey to Rome.

The Διοσκούροις Problem

When Paul left Malta on the final leg of his dramatic but divinely protected journey, he boarded an Alexandrian ship bearing "the twin gods [Διοσκούροις] as a figurehead" (Acts 28:11). A scholarly consensus identifies these as the gods Castor and Pollux, whom superstitious sailors particularly favored. Indeed, seafarers' need for protection made perfect sense in an era when shipwrecks were common. However, Luke's narrative of Paul and his companions all surviving the shipwreck, which landed them in Malta, credits that positive outcome to God answering Paul's prayer for everyone on board (Acts 27:24), not to the manipulations of his pagan contemporaries' folk religion. The question thus arises why Luke chose to mention the detail of the twin gods at all.

---

[1] According to such proponents, Christ-followers in certain missions contexts comprise insider movements, where as a group, they retain the socioreligious identity of their birth community.

[2] Fred Farrokh, "The New Testament Record: No Sign of Zeus Insiders, Artemis Insiders, or Unknown-God Insiders," in *Muslim Conversions to Christ: A Critique of Insider Movements in Islamic Contexts*, ed. Ayman S. Ibrahim and Ant Greenham (New York: Peter Lang, 2018), 227.

[3] Farrokh, "New Testament Record," 238.

Commentators' Positions

Many commentators pass over Acts 28:11 in silence, while those mentioning it typically name the twin figures briefly, with some suggesting they were placed on the ship for protective effect. Most of these present the reader with an interesting snippet of historical/cultural background but have little to suggest how that relates to the rest of Luke's narrative. Exceptions are nineteenth-century writers W. J. Conybeare and J. S. Howson, the eighteenth century's Matthew Henry, and the twenty-first century's Craig S. Keener.

Conybeare and Howson link the figures to Rhegium, a port of call on Paul's journey between Malta and Rome (Acts 28:13). They relate that Paul's ship "put into Rhegium, a city whose patron divinities were, by a curious coincidence, the same hero-protectors of seafaring men, 'the Great Twin Brethren,' to whom the ship itself was dedicated."[4] However, they do no more than note the coincidence. And for his part, Luke simply describes the ship's circuitous route to Rhegium and departure a day later. Since Luke shows no interest in the city's twin patrons, it seems fair to say that Conybeare and Howson's extra-biblical observation has no connection to Luke's reference to the twins.

Matthew Henry, for his part, considers the Alexandrian ship (and its twin figures), which Paul boarded in Malta, and looks back at the earlier (wrecked) ship, which came from the same city (cf. Acts 27:6):

> See what different issues there are of men's undertakings in this world. Here were two ships, both of Alexandria, both bound for Italy, both thrown upon the same island, but one is wrecked there and the other is saved.… Events are thus varied, that we may learn both how to want and how to abound.[5]

Henry thus suggests that Luke's mention of the twin figures adds intelligible detail to the account, but no more (although Henry does add some disparaging remarks about the gods themselves).

Craig Keener, in his magisterial work on Acts, muses that Luke may have a theological purpose in mentioning the gods. If so, it shows the irony of Paul and his companions sailing on a ship relying on pagan gods after God's intervention. God had worked powerfully in Malta, but "most of the world remains unconvinced and perhaps even unaware of the truth." Nevertheless, that sobering theological reality in no way stymies

[4] W. J. Conybeare and J. S. Howson, *The Life and Epistles of St. Paul*, new ed. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1953), 663.

[5] Matthew Henry, *Acts to Revelation*, vol. 6 of *Matthew Henry's Commentary on the Whole Bible* (Old Tappan, NJ: Fleming H. Revell, n.d.), 353.

the accomplishment of God's intentions.[6] Keener then suggests Luke could mention the twins to point to Paul's coming destination. Castor and Pollux were associated with Rome in several ways and "Paul was now heading to the center of Roman paganism."[7] He quickly acknowledges the gods' far more important link to the sea than to Rome though. Thus, having examined an array of possible connections, Keener rests on the simple reality that the gods were well known in Paul's time. However, he asserts, "Luke's audience understands … that it is not the Dioscuri but Paul's God who stands watch over the voyage and protects his servant."[8] One might conclude, then, that Luke's mention of the twins is more incidental than deliberate.

Comparisons

A further idea, flowing from Henry's practical application, might be explored though. He points to *two* Alexandrian ships to underline the importance of knowing "both how to want and how to abound." Comparing two things in Luke's narrative allows him to derive a useful lesson. In a similar vein, Henry's approach might help explain why Luke saw the need to mention the twin figures. As already noted, Luke is not saying for a moment that pagan deities protected Paul. That is undergirded by Luke's specific mention of the Lord's assurance to Paul in Acts 23:11: "as you have testified to the facts about me in Jerusalem, so you must testify also in Rome." The Lord would see to it that Paul made it between the two cities in one piece, not the twin gods. Nevertheless, does Luke mention the two deities to make a specific comparison?

As Henry points out, the ship bearing the Διοσκούροις had a very different fate to the earlier one. While Luke says nothing about the Lord's provision (in contrast to implied pagan superstition) in Acts 28:11 itself, one may ask if comparisons might be drawn if the twins are viewed in a slightly wider context. In other words, since two Alexandrian ships from separate parts of the narrative are comparable, perhaps the broader story contains a link to the twin figures.

The Structure of Acts

The wider narrative for investigation should probably encompass Paul's movement from Jerusalem to Rome. Focusing on this last division

[6] Craig S. Keener, *Acts: An Exegetical Commentary*, 4 vols. (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2015), 4:3696.

[7] Keener, *Acts*, 4:3698.

[8] Keener, *Acts*, 4:3699.

of Acts follows Keener's observations on the structure of the book. Noting the absence of a current scholarly consensus on Acts's structure, he points to widespread agreement on the existence of Luke's six "panels" (or sections), which are divided by key summary statements.[9] The sixth and last section covers Acts 19:21–28:31,[10] beginning with the words, "Now after these events Paul resolved in the Spirit to pass through Macedonia and Achaia and go to Jerusalem, saying, 'After I have been there, I must also see Rome'" (Acts 19:21 ESV). While Keener concedes that Acts may be outlined in a number of ways, he asserts that several clear textual markers point "to the progress of the gospel toward Rome, which is the story that he [Luke] narrates."[11] This progress is relayed supremely in the last (and climactic) section, which encompasses the silversmiths' disturbance over Artemis in Ephesus, Paul's roundabout journey to Jerusalem, his travails there, his incarceration in Caesarea, and then his eventful journey to Rome, which includes that enigmatic reference to the Διοσκούροις.

We have already noted Luke's mention of two cities, two ships, and of course the two pagan deities. The question thus arises whether there are any other "twos" to be found between Acts 19:21 and 28:31. There are indeed. However, one may tally these in several ways.

The Search for "Twos"

One approach is to note any couple of items in the text. That results in a broad (and rather cumbersome) array. So, moving through the final section, one notes Macedonia and Achaia, then Jerusalem and Rome (19:21). These are followed by the dispatch of Paul's two assistants (Timothy and Erastus) to Macedonia (19:22), the Ephesians' seizure of Paul's two traveling companions (19:29) and the crowd loudly asserting the greatness of Artemis for around two hours (19:34). However, unless one counts the two Ephesian groups (Jews and Greeks) Paul had exhorted to repent and believe (20:21), Luke has no more couples until after Paul

[9] Keener, *Acts*, 1:574.

[10] Keener, *Acts*, 1:575.

[11] Keener, *Acts*, 1:576. The import of Luke's essential story is captured by Richard N. Longenecker in his discussion on why he ends Acts the way he does, with Paul imprisoned for two years in Rome, albeit freely proclaiming God's kingdom: "The gospel that Jesus effected in his ministry from Galilee to Jerusalem has reached its culmination in its extension from Jerusalem to Rome. And with that victory … accomplished, Luke felt free to lay down his pen" ("The Acts of the Apostles," in *John, Acts*, EBC 9, ed. Frank E. Gaebelein [Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1981], 235).

reaches Jerusalem. There, the Romans effectively rescue him from a Jewish mob, binding him with two chains (21:33). The next day he faces a Sanhedrin split between two groups, Pharisees and Sadducees (23:7). Shortly thereafter, the Lord himself encourages Paul that he would testify in Rome as he had in Jerusalem (23:11), the earlier reference to the two cities. Then, when the Roman tribune hears of the plot to kill Paul, he summons two centurions with orders to take him to Caesarea, protected by two hundred soldiers and two hundred spearmen—in addition to seventy horsemen (23:23).

The tribune's letter accompanying Paul mentions two penalties (death or imprisonment) which Paul didn't merit (23:29), although this might push the search for twos too far. However, the two years of Paul's imprisonment in Caesarea (under two Roman governors) is more specific (24:27). After this come the two ships of Alexandria, as Henry observes, although they are mentioned separately, in Acts 27:6 and 28:11. The latter verse, with its reference to the Διοσκούροις, is of course the subject of this inquiry. Finally, the last verses in Acts refer to Paul's proclamation in captivity for two years in Rome (28:30).

Another, certainly briefer, approach to identifying the twos in the final section of Acts is to limit one's observations to the word two or a cognate thereof. This produces Paul's two (δύο) helpers (19:22), the Ephesian crowd chanting for about two (δύο) hours (19:34), the two (δυσί) chains used to bind Paul (21:33), the two (δύο) centurions, two hundred (διακοσίους) soldiers and two hundred (διακοσίους) spearmen securing Paul's departure from Jerusalem (23:23), the passing of two years (διετίας) in Caesarea (24:27), the twin gods (Διοσκούροις) on the ship (28:11), and Paul's two-year (διετίαν) ministry in Rome (28:30).

Ring Composition

Did Luke deliberately insert these twos into his text? If so, it should be possible to discern a pattern apparent within the text itself. As we explore that possibility, Kenneth Bailey provides helpful guidance. Perhaps best known for his work on Jesus's parable of the lost sheep, lost coin, and lost son(s) in Luke 15,[12] Bailey has many insights on biblical composition. He displays a number of these in *Paul Through Mediterranean Eyes*, a work focusing on 1 Corinthians.[13]

[12] Kenneth E. Bailey, *Poet and Peasant and Through Peasant Eyes: A Literary Cultural Approach to the Parables in Luke*, comb. ed. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1983), 142–206.

[13] Kenneth E. Bailey, *Paul Through Mediterranean Eyes: Cultural Studies in 1 Corinthians* (Downers Grove: IVP Academic, 2011).

Taking a different tack to most commentaries on 1 Corinthians, he argues that this book's rhetorical styles (in particular) emerge from the parallelism of the Old Testament's writing prophets.[14] Without recapitulating Bailey's discussion, it is noteworthy that he especially underlines the importance of *inverted* parallelism (or chiasm), which is also called "ring composition."[15] He explains the importance of a ring composition's *center* for a text's rhetorical focus and then adds:

> The use of seven inverted cameos (the perfect number) with a climax in the center is so common it deserves a name. I have chosen to call it "the prophetic rhetorical template," and I have found seventeen of these prophetic rhetorical templates in the Gospel of Mark alone. Psalm 23 uses this same form and Paul employs it many times in 1 Corinthians.[16]

He thus argues that prophetic rhetorical templates occur in both Old and New Testaments, if one has the eyes to see them. The question then arises whether they may be discerned in Luke's writings.

A simple case from the Third Gospel occurs in Luke 16:13: "No servant can serve two masters, for either he will hate the one and love the other, or he will be devoted to the one and despise the other. You cannot serve God and money." Bailey diagrams this verse as follows:

No servant can serve *two masters*;	Two Masters
For either he will *hate* the one	Hate
And *love* the other	Love
Or be *devoted* to the one	Love
And *despise* the other	Hate
You cannot serve *God and Mammon*.	Two Masters[17]

Since this verse has six rather than seven inverted cameos (or parts) it does not strictly follow a prophetic rhetorical template, but it does demonstrate Luke's use of ring composition.

A further question concerns the incidence of ring composition in longer portions of text. Apart from the challenge of finding the climax in the middle rather than the end of a literary portion (as Western readers would expect), a text's length may hide the rhetorical structure altogether. As Bailey puts it, "We modern Christians may have the Old Testament stories in the backs of our minds, but not their literary 'tunes.' The longer

[14] Bailey, *Paul*, 21–22. As an example, Bailey points to the use of straight-line, inverted, and step parallelism to enhance meaning in Isaiah 55 (pp. 34–38).

[15] Bailey, *Paul*, 36.

[16] Bailey, *Paul*, 39–40.

[17] Bailey, *Paul*, 48.

the 'tune' the more difficult it is to hear it."[18] His essential argument here is for the presence of such "tunes" in 1 Corinthians, which readers typically don't discern in the light of Old Testament parallelism.

Further discussion of 1 Corinthians lies beyond the scope of this article, but Bailey's insights, having indicated the presence of ring composition in Luke's work, prompt two questions as we return to our discussion of Acts: Did Luke insert twos into the text of Acts 19:21–28:31? If so, may one discern a "tune" in the way he placed them, possibly in terms of a prophetic rhetorical template?

Finding a Pattern

Using the broader set of couples noted above (seventeen in all) may be too unwieldy (and possibly discordant), especially considering the subjectivity behind some of the "twos." It is also difficult to find correlations between the couples in every case. For instance, it is hard to relate the first two, Macedonia and Achaia (19:21), directly to the last, Paul's two-year captivity in Rome (28:30).[19] If Luke is responsible for a ring composition, its contours should be fairly easy to trace.

The briefer approach, which identifies only the word "two" or a cognate thereof (between Acts 19:21–28:31), seems to offer better prospects or at least greater clarity. As already noted, the words concerned are:

Two (δύο) helpers (19:22);
Two (δύο) hours' chanting (19:34);
Two (δυσί) chains (21:33);
Two (δύο) centurions, two hundred (διακοσίους) soldiers, and two hundred (διακοσίους) spearmen (23:23);
Two years (διετίας) in Caesarea (24:27);
Two gods (Διοσκούροις, 28:11); and
Two years (διετίαν) in Rome (28:30).

The centurions, soldiers, and spearmen are grouped together because they form a coherent military unit. However, there is a crucial element in the text of Acts 23:23–35, along with the Roman military, that is central to Luke's purpose in writing Acts. In fact, this element lends itself as the climax of the set of twos above.

[18] Bailey, *Paul*, 50. Bailey uses an example from classical music here, noting his inability to discern a tune in a substantial work without the aid of a professional musician.

[19] A difficult correlation is not necessarily an impossible correlation though. Acts 19:21 mentions Paul's intention to visit Rome after Macedonia and Achaia, which is where the last "couple" finds him, at the end of the book.

The military accompany (and protect) Paul, of course, but also carry a letter from the tribune in Jerusalem to Felix, the governor in Caesarea. That letter gives the Roman commander's (slightly skewed) account of what happened to Paul in Jerusalem and the need to send him away under guard due to the plot against his life. Critically though, the tribune confirmed that Paul was "charged with nothing deserving death or imprisonment" (23:29). This vital evaluation, as Longenecker remarks, "was of great significance not only for Paul's fortunes but also for Luke's apologetic purpose."[20]

Longenecker clarifies that Luke had more than one purpose in writing Acts. However, right after explaining Luke's kerygmatic purpose (to show that the gospel the church proclaimed continued Jesus's ministry), Longenecker underlines the apologetic purpose permeating the Book of Acts:

> Its author seeks to demonstrate that Christianity is not a political threat to the empire, as its Jewish opponents asserted, but rather that it is the culmination of Israel's hope and the true daughter of Jewish religion—and, therefore, should be treated by Roman authorities as a *religio licita* along with Judaism.[21]

In a similar vein, F. F. Bruce points to Luke's pioneering role in addressing a very specific apologetic "to the civil authorities to establish the law-abiding character of Christianity."[22]

This purpose was so important that Luke gives it center place in what appears to be a prophetic rhetorical template using an interesting series of "twos." Put differently, the assertion that Paul (and by extension anyone else proclaiming the gospel) was doing nothing to deserve prison or death is a keynote in Luke's overall "tune."

If that is so, a little more evidence that Luke utilizes ring composition here is in order. Returning to the couples noted above, is there a case for inverted parallelism, which would enhance Luke's central concerns? Yes, indeed.

The Structure of Luke's Prophetic Rhetorical Template

Paul's two helpers, Timothy and Erastus, in 19:22 parallel Paul's unhindered two years of ministry in Rome (28:30–31). Paul was about to experience a temporary hindrance in not being allowed to address the Artemis-maddened crowd in the theatre in Ephesus (19:30–31), but once the commotion ended, he left for Macedonia without hindrance (20:1). In

[20] Longenecker, "Acts," 536.

[21] Longenecker, "Acts," 218.

[22] F. F. Bruce, *The Book of the Acts*, rev. ed., NICNT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1988), 13.

contrast, Timothy and Erastus left to minister in Macedonia without any hindrance. This parallels the unhindered nature of Paul's ministry in Rome, which as Bruce notes ends the book "with the chief herald of the gospel proclaiming it at the heart of the empire with the full acquiescence of the imperial authorities."[23] That enhances a key Lukan concern, to show (ordinary) Christians like Timothy and Erastus ministering without hindrance, just as Paul was allowed to in Rome.

The next parallel places the crowd yelling for Artemis for two hours (19:34) with the Διοσκούροις (28:11), which is of central concern in this article. That being the case, Luke is subtly putting the twin gods in the same category as the confused yet passionate Ephesians whose monomania continues for two hours. In fact, their folly is highlighted by one of their own officials who points out their "danger of being charged with rioting … since there is no cause that … [they] can give to justify … [the] commotion" (19:40). In other words, using the parallel, Luke takes a very dim view of the Διοσκούροις indeed! Taking his cue from the events of 19:34, Luke firmly but gently shows how pointless the Διοσκούροις are. Moreover, in the light of the Lord's ample provision, Paul and his companions have no need of Castor and Pollux (or any other pagan deity) for their protection. That reality, of course, has already been noted by Keener. So, a direct link with the Ephesians' two hours of foolishness goes a long way toward explaining Luke's mention of the twin gods in 28:11.

Interestingly, Luke leaves the Ephesian citizens (but not the Ephesian church) still believing in Artemis and the myths associated with her (19:35–36) undisturbed. In a similar way, by noting Paul's peaceful passage on a ship with the Διοσκούροις as a figurehead, he shows that Christians were not in the habit of openly ridiculing the gods as they proclaimed the gospel.[24] That important demeanor serves Luke's apologetic purpose: Christianity was no threat to Roman power. Also note his demonstration that the disturbance in Ephesus was occasioned by local hotheads who ignored due legal process (19:38), not by Paul and other law-abiding Christians. This has missiological implications, as noted below.

The third and final parallel associates the two chains used to bind Paul (authorized by the tribune) on his arrest in Jerusalem (21:33) with the two

[23] Bruce, *Acts*, 8.

[24] Paul certainly showed the wrong-headedness of worshiping gods in his Areopagus address (see 17:29), but the speech did not resort to ridicule or iconoclasm.

years he spent incarcerated under Felix the governor in Caesarea (24:27).[25] Neither was justified, as the tribune discovered on hearing of Paul's identity as a Roman citizen (22:25–29) and as Felix's successor Festus (together with Agrippa) determined once he heard Paul's testimony (26:31–32). Once again, Luke's apologetic concern emerges from this parallel. Yes, Paul was bound by two chains, but that should never have happened to a Roman citizen (22:29), and yes, Paul was kept captive (bound!) for two years, but that was a miscarriage of justice since Felix kept him only to pander to his Jewish opponents (24:27), while Festus would surely have released him, had he not appealed to Caesar (26:32).

We thus return to the center or climax of what certainly seems to be a ring composition (or prophetic rhetorical template). A formidable Roman force comprised of two centurions, two hundred soldiers, and two hundred spearmen (23:23) left Jerusalem both with Paul and an official affirmation, in writing, of his legitimate evangelistic activities. As Keener notes, "The letter includes nine legal terms, confirming that it functions as an official referral."[26] More than a referral though, it declares Paul's innocence in the tribune's eyes. Reflecting on the insights of a number of scholars, ancient and modern, Keener points out "that Lysias [the tribune] states Paul's innocence in a manner that fits Luke's pattern of Roman declaration of innocence for Paul and Jesus."[27] It seems that Luke clusters the "twos" here to emphasize his point that Paul's activities were legal. The letter carried by the Roman military plays a key role in the lengthy narrative of Paul's travails in Jerusalem, in Caesarea, and on the journey to Rome: Paul wasn't a criminal; in fact, significant authorities (the tribune, Festus, and Agrippa) agree that nothing he was doing merited death or imprisonment (23:29 and 26:31).

Before diagramming Luke's ring composition using all these insights, one needs to deal with a potential objection surrounding the seventy

[25] It seems that Luke deliberately inserted the (factually correct) detail of two chains in Jerusalem to complete the parallel with the two years in Caesarea. Otherwise, the narrative would flow well enough if he simply recorded the fact of Paul's arrest. In addition, both verses concerned (21:33 and 24:27) use cognates of δέω ("bind" or "tie"). In Jerusalem, Paul was "bound [δεθῆναι] with two chains" while in Caesarea, Felix literally left Paul bound (δεδεμένον). This adds to the evidence that Luke intentionally links the two incidents.

[26] Keener, *Acts*, 3:3332.

[27] Keener, *Acts,* 3:3332. Earlier examples of Paul's declared innocence include Acts 16:39 (where the magistrates came and released him [and Silas] from the Philippian prison) and Acts 18:14–16 (where the proconsul Gallio refused to consider a Jewish complaint against him).

horsemen accompanying the Roman force (23:23). If twos and their cognates are vital to Luke's composition here, why does he mention *seventy* horsemen? He probably does so because they play an important role in the story. They continue with Paul from Antipatris to Caesarea the next day, after the others return to Jerusalem (23:31–33). Thus, it is horsemen (the cavalry!) who present Paul to the Roman governor. However, they don't present a miserable prisoner on foot. Paul himself is mounted (23:24), together with his Roman companions, which says a good deal about his status in the tribune's eyes, and that, once again, serves Luke's apologetic purpose. Finally, most likely, Luke says there were seventy (a considerable number) because that is how many there were.[28] It doesn't interfere with his prophetic rhetorical template.

Luke's ring composition from Acts 19:21–28:31 may thus be diagrammed as follows:

Two helpers (19:22)	Unhindered ministry
Two hours' chanting (19:34)	Pagan folly
Two chains (21:33)	Unjustly bound
The Roman force (23:23)	Legitimated ministry
Two years in Caesarea (24:27)	Unjustly bound
Two gods (28:11)	Pagan folly
Two years in Rome (28:30)	Unhindered ministry

Simply put, this captures the story of Acts: Proclaiming the gospel is (or should be) perfectly legitimate under Roman law.[29] Moreover, despite the fact that Christians, such as their exemplar Paul, are bound unjustly and encounter pagan folly, gospel ministry continues unhindered.

Seen from this perspective, Luke's mention of the Διοσκούροις makes perfect sense. They are part of a prophetic rhetorical template that enhances a key Lukan aim. However, before concluding this is indeed the case, one might explore whether Luke uses a slightly different ring composition involving the Διοσκούροις to see if it points in the same direction.

A Possible Variation

Conceptually, Paul's final and dramatic journey (as Luke relates it) begins with antagonistic Jews seizing Paul and falsely accusing him in the temple in Jerusalem (21:27–28) and ends with him freely proclaiming the kingdom of God in Rome (28:30–31). Although shorter than Keener's

[28] Luke may also have mentioned the number of horsemen because it conveniently coincided with a biblically significant number.

[29] This assumes that Luke completed Acts before official Roman persecution of Christians was entrenched.

sixth and last section (or panel) of the book (19:21–28:31), Paul's movement from Jerusalem to Rome echoes the movement of the gospel between those symbolic cities. That is a key theme of the book, as already noted.

So how may Luke's twos be arranged within Paul's final journey? An adaptation of (and addition to) the relevant elements diagrammed above looks like this:

Two chains (21:33)
  Two factions, Sadducees and Pharisees (23:6)
    Two cities, Jerusalem and Rome (23:11)
      The letter-bearing Roman force, in twos (23:23–30)
    Two years in Caesarea (24:27)
  Two gods (28:11)
Two years in Rome (28:30)

This schema goes beyond use of the word two (or a cognate thereof), and one needs some imagination to see linkages. It still demonstrates the centrality of the tribune's legitimating letter, bracketed between the start and end of Paul's final journey and the time it took, by way of Caesarea, to get there. However, the other connections are a harder sell. It is unlikely that Luke means to imply that the Sadducees and Pharisees are no better than two pagan gods, especially since the Pharisees (in the Jewish council) came to Paul's defense (23:9). Also, Paul had far more freedom during his two years in Rome than he did right after his arrest in Jerusalem (although he did manage to address the Jewish crowd at the time, 21:37–22:22). It thus seems best to downplay if not eliminate this variation, even though it points in the same direction.

Summary

Further options might present themselves as others investigate Luke's use of ring compositions in both his Gospel and Acts.[30] For now, it seems best to settle on the ring composition based specifically on twos and their cognates as presented, drawing from the last section of Acts (19:21–28:31) in its entirety. It certainly fits well with Acts's overall account of the gospel's advance and strengthens the important Lukan claim that the early Christian movement was legitimate in official Roman eyes.

[30] This could involve shorter or longer text portions in Luke-Acts, depending on the complexity of the literary tune. In addition, ring compositions used by Luke (and other biblical authors) might be investigated for the inferred meaning of God's providence in the details of history: I am indebted to John Burkett for this insight.

To summarize, impressive evidence indicates that Luke mentions the Διοσκούροις deliberately. He uses them in a prophetic rhetorical template to support his point that the Roman authorities had no legal problem with Paul's ministry. That is the central idea in Luke's ring composition involving twos and their cognates. However, seeing them within that ring composition (instead of being just a superfluous detail in Luke's narrative) gives them a role of their own. They highlight the folly of paganism by virtue of their link to the crazy crowd in Ephesus. Yet Luke makes his point, for those with eyes to see it, without being unnecessarily offensive.

Lessons for Christian Missions

Luke's skillful (and Spirit-inspired) structuring of the Ephesus-to-Rome narrative in Acts 19:21–28:31 has more than literary impact. In fact, one may draw at least three missiological principles from this carefully crafted ring composition. First, one can assert the legitimacy of gospel proclamation by law-abiding Christians in all contexts. Second, one should identify idolatrous tendencies in whatever form they appear. But third, one must give idolaters the freedom to worship their false gods without fearing Christians will ridicule or destroy them. A few applications of these principles follow.

The Legitimacy of Gospel Proclamation

Freedom to share one's faith varies considerably from one context to another. All too many believers in Christ are "unjustly bound," to use the phrase from Luke's ring composition, in a country like Iran, for instance. Yet their number continues to grow, as exemplified in the title of Mark Bradley's book on Christians in that country, *Too Many to Jail*.[31] While ministry in Iran is not unhindered, it is certainly apparent that the Lord Jesus Christ is building his church (Matt 16:18). However, looking beyond the reality of simultaneous persecution and church growth in Iran and beyond, the principle of *legitimacy* presents itself as something anyone sharing the good news of Jesus might grasp.

Ultimately, a Christian's legitimacy stems from God himself. Just as Peter and John refused the Jewish authorities' order to stop mentioning Jesus, surely everyone transformed by an encounter with him "cannot but speak of what [they] have seen and heard" (Acts 4:20).[32] Yet, as Luke's

[31] Mark Bradley, *Too Many to Jail: The Story of Iran's New Christians* (Oxford: Monarch Books, 2014).

[32] Unfortunately, this is not always the case in practice. Many believers are

ring composition would imply, the faith we proclaim should be presented not as a threat but as a characteristically law-abiding way of life. Practically then, as a first resort, Christians should seek to obey the law as they share the good news. This applies whether legal freedoms are granted or withheld.

In a restrictive context like Iran, as Bradley points out, evangelism occurs out of the public eye, in family settings, and new churches meet in homes. Iranian believers, drawing on the legitimacy God himself provides, are fulfilling the Great Commission to make disciples. However, they do so in an unobtrusive, non-threatening (and hence legitimate) way.

Interestingly though, some secular Iranians challenge the laws of their country head-on. Masih Alinejad documents examples in her *The Wind in My Hair*, covering the brutal repression of dissidents after the rigged 2009 elections and courageous women who deliberately removed their hijabs in public.[33] Despite the human rights validity of publicly protesting the Iranian regime's policies, this has not been Iranian Christians' approach. Instead, they are exercising their God-given legitimacy in a way that poses no direct challenge to the regime. And that fits well with the central theme emerging from Luke's ring composition.

Unfortunately, while Christians avoid direct challenges to the authorities, regimes in Iran and elsewhere nevertheless treat Christians harshly. As an example, *Release International's* periodical *Voice of Persecuted Christians* gives many details of Christian persecution.[34] One account from Pakistan is of interest for our purposes. Akbar, a pastor, was arrested after he intervened to stop a police-supported mob from confiscating a home belonging to two Christians. He was mocked and beaten in jail. However, when a guard heard him praying for the prison authorities, word reached the superintendent, who allowed him to hold an unprecedented Sunday service for the nominally Christian prisoners. In response to his preaching, twenty-two prisoners repented and put their trust in Christ. He was released shortly thereafter.[35]

This remarkable prison experience recalls Luke's central claim that the early Christian movement was legitimate in official Roman eyes. Pastor

afraid to share their faith. My encouragement here is to see one's relationship with Christ not as something to be "sold," but what flows naturally out of one, as with other significant things one sees and hears.

[33] Masih Alinejad, *The Wind in My Hair: My Fight for Freedom in Modern Iran* (New York: Little, Brown and Company, 2018).

[34] *Voice of Persecuted Christians*, July–September 2020, https://issuu.com/ releaseinternational/docs/r111-mag-ps-linked.

[35] "Sharing the Gospel Behind Bars," *Voice of Persecuted Christians*, July–September 2020, 10–11.

Akbar found favor with the Pakistani jail superintendent in a way reminiscent of the tribune's affirmation of Paul's ministry.[36] The takeaway here is Christians should look for (and even expect) allies in high places as they legitimately exercise their ministries, even in dire circumstances.[37] However, seeking such allies never implies compromising one's faith. In other words, speaking to and working with unbelieving authorities must accompany a personal recognition and rejection of idolatry. This is especially the case when the trappings of power or the establishment tempt us, as suggested in the next application.

Identifying Idolatrous Tendencies

Luke's ring composition shows his clear repudiation of idolatry. As already noted, he links the (prominent) twin gods on the ship with the Artemis-crazed crowd in Ephesus. Applying this example to an instance from our own era, it is easy to condemn a Hindu mob in India, with the name of the god Ram on their lips, as they bay for their Muslim compatriots' blood.[38] More subtle though, is one's own propensity for idolatry.

G. K. Beale explains that idolatry encompasses anything (other than God) that one loyally embraces for supreme security.[39] It is not restricted to gods depicted in physical images. Beale goes on to identify (Jewish) idolatry in the first century as "trusting in tradition instead of God and his living Word."[40] Moving to the Book of Acts, he identifies the idolatry of the Jews (who were enraged by Stephen's testimony) as the belief "that one was blessed by God's unique presence in the temple and not in Christ."[41] In contrast, God's ultimate design was not worship in a hand-

[36] It may also be compared to Joseph's jail experience in Egypt, where at the Lord's instigation, the prison-keeper favored him to the extent that he effectively ran the establishment (Gen 39:21–23).

[37] This principle should probably be coupled with Jesus's promise that his followers would be given the words to say when brought before all kinds of authorities (Matt 10:19).

[38] Hanan Zaffar and Hasan Akram, "Fear, Silent Migration: A Year After Anti-Muslim Riots in Delhi," *Al Jazeera*, February 23, 2021, https:// www.aljazeera.com/news/2021/2/23/fear-migration-a-year-after-anti-muslim-violence-in. The report cites a Muslim witness who "heard shouts of 'Jai Shri Ram' (Hail Lord Ram)—a Hindu chant that has lately become a rallying cry for murder—reverberating at some distance from her home."

[39] G. K. Beale, *We Become What We Worship: A Biblical Theology of Idolatry* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 2008), 17.

[40] Beale, *We Become What We Worship*, 28.

[41] Beale, *We Become What We Worship*, 188.

made temple, since "his presence would break out of that human structure and spread throughout the earth through Christ, his Spirit and his people. Thus to continue to worship at the old architectural temple and not to worship Christ is to make an idol out of the temple."[42] It is thus fair to say that Luke's condemnation of idolatry in Acts extends even to the Jewish temple, in addition to the cases considered in Ephesus and on the ship.

The application for evangelicals today is to watch carefully for idolatrous tendencies in ourselves. Like the Jews' trust in structural traditions, evangelicals are tempted to rely on and defend outward trappings—as ultimate things—rather than Christ himself. Such trappings would include comfortable (and legitimate) societal values, such as the traditional family unit. The trappings of medical science too, for all their twenty-first-century benefits, easily claim priority when illness strikes. However, given the brevity of life, families and medicine can only go so far in taking care of us. We need the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ for our eternal (ultimate) needs.

Over the years, Christian missions have rightly facilitated family values and medical advances as gospel byproducts. But if they, rather than the biblical God and his ways, are embraced for supreme security, that embrace fits Beale's explanation of idolatry. So, along with rejecting the Ephesians' idolatry, one must exercise careful vigilance to avoid being sucked into reliance on non-ultimate things. That means constantly prioritizing gospel hope and behavior as Christians navigate progressive challenges to traditional values and the far-reaching claims of medical science. Otherwise, idolatry will ensue.[43]

Giving Idolaters Freedom to Worship

Finally, a challenge presented by Luke's linkage of the Ephesian crowd with the Διοσκούροις is the task of condemning idolatry unequivocally but inoffensively. Returning to the Hindu mob mentioned above, the path of wisdom would indicate that one recognize the blinding idolatry controlling the crowd and, if possible, stay out of the way. That was the approach of the disciples (and others) in Ephesus when they kept Paul away from the crowd (Acts 19:30–31), even though Luke's account leaves one in no doubt about the folly of idolatry.

With the fatuity of idols established, Luke gives no hint that Paul or

[42] Beale, *We Become What We Worship*, 191.

[43] It may well be necessary to call out idolatrous Christian behavior for the sake of gospel integrity. However, that is not the right response when one deals with unbelievers who have yet to embrace Christ, as the following section makes clear.

his (Christian) companions took any action, verbal or physical, against the Διοσκούροις on the ship. As a prisoner, Paul had to travel on that vessel and was in no position to tamper with the gods. But he could have delivered a few choice comments about them, if not to everyone on board, at least to his companions. There is no record that he did so. By the same token, ridiculing Hindu gods is not the way to win Hindus to Christ. To illustrate this, W. Stephens shares the story of Suresh, an Indian student who was actively seeking Christ (though still a Hindu):

> On one of his first visits to a Bible-believing church, the pastor made some unkind remarks about Eastern religions. Even his American friend who brought him was uncomfortable. A few weeks later the same thing happened at a different church with a different pastor. Sadly, he did not … return to any Bible-believing churches and his quest was interrupted.… Our focus is to lift up the gospel and the Lord Jesus Christ and not belittle other religions.[44]

Put differently, one must develop the skill of presenting the hope of the gospel while overlooking idolatry, at least in the beginning stages of relationships with unbelievers.[45]

My wife and I have a ministry to international students, most of them Hindus. We are aware of their devotion to Krishna and other deities from the artifacts they have in their rooms and elsewhere.[46] However, we acquiesce in that devotion as we show our concern for their regular needs and share our faith in Christ with them through everyday experiences of life. This is hopefully in the spirit of Paul, who concluded his (extended) third missionary journey in the presence of the Διοσκούροις but paid them no heed, idols though they were.

Conclusion

Luke's deliberate mention of the Διοσκούροις in Acts 28:11 not only demonstrates his skill as a writer, but it also carries helpful principles for Christian missions. Just as the Roman authorities of Luke's day saw Paul's ministry as legitimate, it is always warranted for law-abiding Christians to

[44] W. Stephens, *Connecting with Hindu International Students: Sharing the Good News with Cultural Wisdom* (USA: InterVarsity International Student Ministry, 2019), 67.

[45] A time must come when an unbeliever embracing Christ abandons his or her idols (cf. 1 Thess 1:9–10). Paul was certainly aiming for such an eventuality with his speech to the Areopagites (see Acts 17:30). However, that did not require him to attack their idols (or those on the ship).

[46] Interestingly, Hindus call physical manifestations of their deities "idols," but without any negative connotation.

proclaim the gospel. At the same time, idolatrous tendencies should be identified, especially when Christians resort to them, in whatever form they appear. However, since the Διοσκούροις (and even Artemis of Ephesus) remained undisturbed, unbelievers to whom Christians witness should have no fear that they will openly ridicule their false gods.

STR 13.1 (Spring 2022): 79–94

Ethics in Public: Considering Community in Moral Evaluation

David W. Jones
Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary, Wake Forest, NC

Abstract: *This article considers the place and importance of community when assessing moral events. Two areas of public ethics are considered here. First, this work evaluates the phenomenon known as "second-order moral accountability," which is the idea that an individual may be reckoned guilty of the sins of another, or make another guilty of one's own sins, simply by being present within a given community. Second, this article investigates the exercise of Christian liberty in the public square with a focus on so-called adiaphora ethical issues, which are subjects that are considered to be morally indifferent within a particular context.*

Key Words: *adiaphora, Christian liberty, community, conscience, public ethics, second-order moral accountability.*

Carl F. H. Henry, arguably the father of evangelical ethics, titled his mid-twentieth-century basic ethics volume *Christian Personal Ethics*.[1] Indeed, the title Henry chose is quite appropriate for an introductory ethics text as, biblically speaking, moral reasoning is both Christian and personal—at least within the evangelical tradition. It is interesting to observe that in his book Henry focuses almost entirely upon the moral formation of individuals, scarcely mentioning the context in which his readers would live out their ethics—that is, the community. In all fairness to Henry, seven years after publishing *Christian Personal Ethics*, he did write a companion volume in which he explored the place of community in moral reasoning.[2] However, a perusal of modern-day introductory Christian ethics textbooks reveals that few evangelical ethicists have given much space to the concept of community in moral evaluation.[3]

[1] Carl F. H. Henry, *Christian Personal Ethics* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1957).

[2] Carl F. H. Henry, *Aspects of Christian Social Ethics* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964).

[3] For example, the following volumes lack any substantial discussion of the place of community in moral evaluation: John S. Feinberg and Paul D. Feinberg, *Ethics for a Brave New World,* 2nd ed. (Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2010); Wayne A. Grudem, *Christian Ethics: An Introduction to Biblical Moral Reasoning* (Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2018); Scott B. Rae, *Moral Choices: An Introduction to Ethics*, 2nd ed. (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2000). One contemporary basic ethics book that does discuss the importance of the context of moral events is John M. Frame, *The Doctrine of the Christian Life* (Phillipsburg, NJ: P&R, 2008).

[4] My approach to Christian ethics is detailed in David W. Jones, *An Introduction to Biblical Ethics* (Nashville: B&H Academic, 2013).

The purpose of this article is to consider the place and importance of community when assessing moral events. In this study two related aspects of ethics within community will be investigated. First, this work will look at the concept that can best be described with the phrase "second-order moral accountability." In short, second-order moral accountability is the idea that an individual may be reckoned guilty of the sins of another, or make another guilty of one's own sins, simply by being present within a particular community. Second, this work will investigate the exercise of Christian liberty in the communal public square, with a focus upon so-called *adiaphora* ethical issues. Moral topics classified as *adiaphora* in nature are those that are viewed as being morally indifferent within a given community. By examining Christian liberty and *adiaphora* ethical issues, this article will highlight the importance of considering the conscience of others who witness, or who are likely to witness, one's engagement in morally indifferent practices within the public square.

In considering the place of community in moral evaluation, with a focus upon the two areas identified above, the goal of this work is not to minimize individual moral accountability, nor to suggest a community-based hermeneutic, nor to argue for some form of societal utilitarianism. In fact, this work will assume the validity of an evangelical, deontological, divine-command theory of Christian ethics.[4] Yet, a historic liability of moral reasoning that focuses solely upon individuals is that the context of moral events can become minimized or even neglected. In other words, within a system of personal ethics it is possible to so emphasize individuals that the communities in which moral agents reside are either overlooked or viewed as not being relevant to moral evaluation. The aim of this article, then, in considering the place of community when assigning moral praise or blame is to offer a corrective to ethical approaches that have, perhaps, not weighed the importance of community in the process of moral evaluation.

Part 1: Second-Order Moral Accountability

As was noted above, the phrase "second-order moral accountability"

is the idea that an individual may be reckoned guilty of the sins of another, or make another guilty of one's own sins, simply by being present in a given community.[5] While it is difficult to find formal support for second-order moral accountability in academic literature, the concept is often present as an assumption in popular moral reasoning. Take, for instance, the notion that Christians ought to boycott a certain retail establishment because the store sells pornographic magazines. Such boycotts are often justified with the claim that to patronize the retailer makes one guilty of the sin of pornography by way of affiliation. Another popular example comes from the political realm where some believe that to vote for a candidate whose personal moral failures are well known, or who endorses sinful public policies, renders an individual voter culpable of, or at least complicit in, the candidate's known immorality.[6]

In the above examples, second-order moral accountability seems like a useful concept—and it may even be so—for it could help mobilize Christians to curb the spread of pornography in the public square, as well as to assist in keeping immoral candidates from public office. Indeed, these are worthwhile goals. Yet, while the moral objectives in view are praiseworthy, it is the contention of this work that the idea being employed in the process of moral evaluation—that is, second-order moral accountability—is not legitimate and, as will be demonstrated below, is ultimately not a viable concept. Note, however, that the problem with the above (and similar) examples is not the moral event itself, but the mechanism being employed in order to explain or to justify the ethic. We'll investigate this idea below by surveying an Old Testament passage, looking at a New Testament text, consulting an example from Jesus's ministry, as well as considering the practicality of second-order moral accountability. After this, we'll review three caveats related to second-order moral accountability, before moving on to consider the ethics of Christian liberty in the public square.

[5] Generally speaking, those who espouse second-order moral accountability teach that moral culpability increases with proximity within a community. Thus, advocates of this view teach that while an entire community may be guilty of an individual's sin, those closest to the offender actually bear the most guilt. Note that we can affirm the idea of moral proximity (or proximate obligation) without endorsing the idea of second-order moral accountability.

[6] Examples of other contemporary issues where second moral accountability has been discussed include receiving vaccinations developed with stem cells harvested from aborted fetuses, investing in so-called "sin stocks," paying taxes to immoral governments, and participating in pagan holidays such as Halloween, among many others.

Old Testament Example: Exodus 20:5–6

At first glance, holding the concept of second-order moral accountability up to the light of Scripture may seem to yield support for the idea. One Old Testament passage that appears to affirm this notion is the second commandment of the Decalogue.[7] To elaborate, after stating the second commandment,[8] which prohibits the manufacture and worship of idols, God declared to his people, "For I, the Lord your God, am a jealous God, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children to the third and fourth generations of those who hate Me, but showing mercy to thousands, to those who love Me and keep My commandments" (Exod 20:5–6).[9] A cursory reading of this passage could lead one to the conclusion that within a given community—in this case, a family—God imputes the moral guilt of one member to others in the clan, visiting the iniquity of a particular family member upon those who are not present, or perhaps even upon those who are not yet born.[10]

Further investigation, however, into Old Testament biblical teachings about the dynamics of sin and guilt reveals that this interpretation of the second commandment cannot possibly be correct, for other passages clearly contradict such an understanding. For example, Deut 24:16 reads, "Fathers shall not be put to death for their children, nor shall children be put to death for their fathers; a person shall be put to death for his own sin."[11] Similarly, the prophet Ezekiel wrote, "The soul who sins shall die. The son shall not bear the guilt of the father, nor the father bear the guilt

[7] Other passages that speak to the corporate nature of the effects of sin, or at least recognize its presence, include Exod 34:6–7; Num 14:18.

[8] In this article I am using the traditional Protestant enumeration of the Decalogue common among most non-Lutheran Protestants. For more on the enumeration of the Ten Commandments within various faith traditions, see my work *An Introduction to Biblical Ethics*, 132–34.

[9] All Scripture citations are taken from the NKJV unless otherwise noted.

[10] Observe that this is exactly what the Israelites incorrectly believed was happening to them as their culture deteriorated prior to the Babylonian exile, as they claimed, "The fathers have eaten sour grapes, and the children's teeth are set on edge" (Jer 31:29; Ezek 18:2).

[11] Note that both 2 Kgs 14:6 and 2 Chr 25:4 record King Amaziah's explicit enforcement of Deut 24:16 upon his ascendance to the throne of Judah. Another example of this principle is David's objection to God's slaying of the Israelites after his own sin of taking a national census. In 2 Sam 24:17 David complains to God as he rhetorically asks, "Surely I have sinned, and I have done wickedly; but these sheep, what have they done?" The Israelites, then, were slain not because they had committed David's sin of pride and self-reliance, but because they were guilty of their own sins and were affected by David's sin.

of the son. The righteousness of the righteous shall be upon himself, and the wickedness of the wicked shall be upon himself" (Ezek 18:20). In light of these citations, as well as other similar passages,[12] it seems clear that the Old Testament does not endorse second-order moral accountability—at least not in the sense in which it is commonly understood.

This, however, invites the question: How, then, are we to understand the generational warning appended to the second commandment? Rooker explains, "The text does not say that God holds one's descendant, a son or grandson, personally responsible for his father's sins (Ezek 18:20). Nor does this text say that the generational extension of punishment has anything to do with the legal administration of justice. But the text does hold out the threat that one's descendants may suffer for their parent's sin."[13] In other words, in the second commandment God reminds his people of the fact that sin is never just personal—that is, it always affects others, especially those to whom one is closest.[14] In sum, then, while the second commandment does not teach second-order moral accountability, as we assess moral events in the public square we must keep in mind the multigenerational effects of individual sins upon the community.[15]

New Testament Example: 2 John 10–11

A New Testament scriptural text we'll consider that relates to the idea of second-order moral accountability is 2 John 10–11. The short book of 2 John was written by the apostle John in order to warn a particular church about false teachers who were traveling in their general area. Specifically, John wrote to exhort believers in this church to *not* show hospitality to the itinerant heretics should they appear in their immediate community. Note that in the early church era, where safe lodging was not readily available, nomadic teachers and missionaries—whether authentic

[12] See, e.g., 1 Kgs 8:32; 2 Chr 19:1–3; Isa 3:10–11; Jer 31:29–30.

[13] Mark F. Rooker, *The Ten Commandments* (Nashville: B&H Academic, 2010), 44. Rooker continues, noting, "The threat of harm to one's descendants functions as a powerful deterrent as one naturally grieves over the affliction of his children and grandchildren more than his own hardship" (45).

[14] In his commentary on the second commandment, Brian Edwards helpfully observes, "Children suffer greatly for the sins of their parents, not by some arbitrary decree of a vengeful God but by the law of cause and effect." Brian Edwards, *The Ten Commandments* (Surrey, UK: DayOne, 2002), 92.

[15] Another area in the Old Testament where second-order moral accountability is sometimes discussed is the Jewish ceremonial laws. For example, ceremonial laws specified that if one came into contact with a corpse, it rendered one unclean (cf. Num 19:11; Hag 2:10–14). Note, however, that when uncleanness was transferred under such laws, it was ceremonial in nature, not sinful; thus, such laws are not an example of second-order moral accountability.

or corrupt—often relied upon the kindness and generosity of others in order to facilitate their ministries.[16] Given these dynamics, and the presence of false teachers in their region, John instructed the church, "If anyone comes to you and does not bring this doctrine [i.e., the gospel], do not receive him into your house nor greet him; for he who greets him shares in his evil deeds" (2 John 10–11).

Taken at face value, this passage may seem to affirm the idea of second-order moral accountability, for John refers to Christians who share in the deeds of false teachers by receiving them into their homes. Upon closer inspection, however, it becomes clear that John does not teach that showing hospitality to heretics makes one guilty of the sin of advocating false doctrine. Indeed, the term *koinōneō* that John employs in 2 John 11, which is rendered "shares" in many English translations, means just that—to support, to commune, or to enable.[17] Thus in this passage John's exhortation to the church is to not naively lodge itinerant false teachers, for doing so would enable the heretics' harmful ministry.[18] The unintended sin committed by the well-meaning believers who show hospitality, then, is not the error of false teaching; rather, in supporting these traveling deceivers, naïve Christian hosts would fail to discern truth and to love their neighbors well. By warning the church about this possible sin, John was simply endorsing Paul's earlier New Testament teaching that God "will render to each one according to his [own] deeds" (Rom 2:6).[19]

Jesus's Example: Matthew 22:15–22

A third biblical text relevant to the topic of second-order moral accountability is Matt 22:15–22. In this well-known narrative from Jesus's ministry, the Pharisees and Herodians were testing Christ, as they tried to provoke his downfall. In this passage these religious and secular leaders attempted to catch Jesus in a verbal trap as they asked him, "Is it lawful to pay taxes to Caesar or not?" (Matt 22:17). The tax in view here was most likely the poll tax, which was universally despised by the Jews, for it was used to finance the occupying Roman army. With their question, then, these scheming leaders sought to entangle Christ as follows: If Jesus

[16] The importance of Christian hospitality can be seen in the epistle of 3 John. Whereas 2 John warns Christians to *not show* hospitality to false teachers, 3 John encourages Christians *to show* hospitality to fellow believers.

[17] Joseph Henry Thayer, *The New Thayer's Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1981), 351–52.

[18] It is noteworthy in this passage that John does not explicitly address the issue of guilt.

[19] A similar Pauline passage is Col 3:25, which reads, "But he who does wrong will be repaid for what he has done, and there is no partiality."

spoke *against* the payment of taxes, the Herodians would have charged him with rebellion against Rome; if, however, Christ advocated *for* the payment of taxes, then the Pharisees would have accused him of disloyalty to the Jewish nation. Given the sensitivity of this question, Jesus's response is quite instructive. Perhaps in contrast to the expectation of Herodians, in his reply, Christ clearly supported the payment of taxes, but not before reminding his listeners that the coin he'd been handed was engraved with Caesar's image; therefore, since the coin was produced by Rome, it logically belonged to Rome.

Of interest to this study is the fact that Jesus did not understand the payment of tax monies, some of which would surely be used to finance immoral activities, as being an act that rendered one guilty of the many historically documented and egregious sins of Rome, which were financed, in part, by tax revenues.[20] Indeed, as was the case with the other biblical passages surveyed above, in this example from Christ's ministry we can see that second-order moral accountability is not endorsed. Jesus's response, though, ought not to have surprised his hearers, for Matthew records an occasion from earlier in Christ's public ministry where Jesus had explicitly taught about moral accountability. On this occasion Christ noted that in the end times, "The Son of Man will come in the glory of His Father with His angels, and then He will reward each [one] according to his [own] works" (Matt 16:27).[21]

Practical Considerations

Another aspect of second-order moral accountability to consider is the viability of the practice. In reviewing this idea, it becomes evident that second-order moral accountability would be very difficult to implement, at least in a consistent manner. To elaborate, by way of illustration, when writing about boycotts, Frame notes that if second-order moral accountability were a valid principle, "We would have to boycott any corporation that contributed in any way to immorality in society. On that basis, we would have to boycott nearly every business, withdrawing almost entirely

[20] Note Paul's similar and equally arresting teaching to the persecuted Roman church that believers are to "render therefore to all their due: taxes to whom taxes are due, customs to whom customs, fear to whom fear, honor to whom honor" (Rom 13:7).

[21] We should note that second-order moral accountability is not possible, even voluntarily (apart from the atonement). In Rom 9:3 Paul expresses his desire to be held accountable for the sins of his brethren, even though he knew this was an impossible transaction (cf. Rom 8:38–39). See, also, Moses's similar desire at Exod 32:32.

from the world of commerce. Scripture never takes that approach."[22] In fact, contrary to the notion of withdrawing from society, Paul instructed the Corinthian church that they *were* to associate with sinners in the public square as he noted, "I wrote to you in my epistle not to keep company with sexually immoral people. Yet I certainly did not mean with the sexually immoral people of this world, or with the covetous, or extortioners, or idolaters, since then you would need to go out of the world" (1 Cor 5:9–10). Clearly, Paul was not an advocate of second-order moral accountability, for such a notion is not supported in Scripture, nor is it viable for those who live in the fallen world.

Three Caveats

From the biblical passages considered above, it seems clear that second-order moral accountability is not taught in the Bible—at least not as an isolated practice. Furthermore, even if it were a valid concept, second-order moral accountability would be nearly impossible to implement with consistency. These facts notwithstanding, three caveats are in order. First, we must not confuse second-order moral accountability with the error of influencing, manipulating, or persuading another person to commit a sin. In other words, just because each one will be held accountable for his own sin, does not mean that it is permissible to influence another person to commit a sin, intentionally or otherwise. In such cases, the one who inspires transgression may not be guilty of the sin of the one who has been influenced; yet, the enabler is guilty of his own sin, which at a minimum would include a lack of neighbor love. Observe that Jesus identified love of neighbor as the second greatest commandment (cf. Matt 22:39);[23] therefore, the one who fails to properly love his neighbor is guilty of a great sin.

Another caveat related to second-order moral accountability is the

[22] Frame, *Doctrine of the Christian Life*, 447. Later Frame writes, "Scripture does not forbid us to give money to organizations implicated in sin.... If we boycott all sinners, we will not be able to buy anything at all" (805). However, Frame is not opposed to boycotts per se, as he later writes, "I do not think it wrong for Christians to boycott industries or companies which they believe are doing social and/or religious harm in the world.... On the other hand, I do not believe that Scripture requires us to boycott such organizations" (897).

[23] A scriptural example of such a sin is in the account of Ammon and Tamar in 2 Sam 13:1–21. In this narrative, Ammon's cousin Jonadab encouraged him to rape his half-sister Tamar. While Jonadab was not himself guilty of the sin of rape, the fact that the text describes him as being a cunning or crafty man (cf. 2 Sam 13:3) shows that he was not without sin.

concept of the corporate effects of sin. In short, awareness of the corporate effects of sin is the realization that we live in a fallen world, we are surrounded by those who are predisposed toward sin, and we ourselves are great sinners. Therefore, even though second-order moral accountability is not a valid concept in regard to guilt, we must acknowledge that our entire context is biased toward sin. Said differently, because the world is sloped toward sin, the community oftentimes carries us in that direction.[24] The danger in failing to acknowledge this is that it may lead one to view sin as normative. Yet, a recognition of the corporate effects of sin will position us to better see our own sin and the sins of others, as well as the impact of sin upon the world—including its inhabitants and structures. Such an awareness will enable us to effectively confront sin, wherever it may be found. By way of example, note that when the prophet Isaiah appeared before God, prior to presenting his prayer request, he acknowledged, "Woe is me, for ... I am a man of unclean lips, and I dwell in the midst of a people of unclean lips" (Isa 6:5).[25]

A third caveat related to the concept of second-order moral accountability is the doctrine of original sin, which is sometimes referred to as inherited sin. The passage most often cited in support of this doctrine is Rom 5:12–19.[26] In this passage Paul teaches, "Just as through one man sin entered the world, and death through sin, and thus death spread to all men, because all sinned" (Rom 5:12). In reference to this verse, Grudem explains original sin as follows, "When Adam sinned, God thought of all who would descend from Adam as sinners. Though we did not yet exist, God, looking into the future ... began thinking of us as those who were

[24] Although it is an extreme example, God's rationale for the so-called Canaanite genocide highlights the corporate effect of sin, as well as its perils. In Deut 24:18, God commanded his people to eradicate the Canaanites "lest they teach you to do according to all their abominations which they have done for their gods, and you sin against the Lord your God" (cf. Exod 34:10–16; Num 33:55; Deut 7:4). Note, however, that contact with the Canaanites would not have made Israel guilty of the Canaanites' sins; rather, it would render Israel guilty of their own sins that they'd be influenced to commit because of the Canaanites' example (cf. Prov 13:20; 1 Cor 15:33).

[25] Another verse that illustrates awareness of the corporate effects of sin is Ps 119:136. Here the psalmist prays to God, saying, "Rivers of water run down from my eyes because men do not keep Your law" (cf. Exod 34:9; Ps 119:158; Ezek 9:5–6; Dan 9:20).

[26] Other important passages related to the doctrine of original sin include Ps 51:5; 1 Cor 15:21; Heb 7:7–10.

guilty like Adam."[27] At first glance, the idea of original sin seems to support the concept of second-order moral accountability. Note, however, that this doctrine does not teach all men are guilty of Adam's sin. Rather, this doctrine holds that all men sinned in Adam, whether it be *with* Adam as our federal head or *through* Adam as our progenitor. Therefore, original sin teaches that man is held guilty of his own sin in Adam. Grudem explains, "[Original sin] is 'original' in that it comes from Adam, and it is also original in that we have it from the beginning of our experience as persons, but *it is still our sin, not Adam's sin, that is meant*."[28]

Part 2: Christian Liberty in the Public Square

A second important topic that relates to ethics in the communal public square is the exercise of Christian liberty. Christian liberty is the idea that there is a degree of freedom in the application—but not the content—of God's moral law as it is applied in one's life. This teaching relates to practices that are not explicitly prohibited, or specifically allowed, in the Bible. Thus, Christian liberty may include activities in which believers are free to engage; or, it may entail practices from which believers are free to abstain. Examples of areas where this teaching has been invoked in the past include consuming alcohol, worship practices, music styles, games of chance, military service, places of employment, matters of commerce, eating practices, the observance of special days, and the like. In each of these areas Christians have historically agreed that there is a degree of freedom in how the unchanging moral law of God is applied. As we'll explore in the discussion that follows, the exercise of Christian liberty in the public square is not subjective; rather, it is governed by several important, objective factors.

Frequently theologians will refer to practices that fall under the umbrella of Christian liberty as *adiaphora* ethical issues. The term *adiaphora* literally means "things indifferent"; thus, activities related to Christian liberty are commonly understood to be morally indifferent in nature. Out of convention, we'll use the phrase "*adiaphora* issues" in the dialogue below; however, we should note that this term is actually misleading, for when considered in the context of a moral event, every volitional act is either

[27] Wayne Grudem, *Systematic Theology: An Introduction to Biblical Doctrine*, 2nd ed. (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2020), 624.

[28] Grudem, *Systematic Theology*, 624 (italics original).

moral or immoral.[29] In the following discussion concerning *adiaphora* ethical issues we'll consider the place of weaker and stronger brethren in the community, review the importance of conscience in moral decision making, and conclude by suggesting several principles that will hopefully aid the practice of Christian liberty in the public square.

Weaker and Stronger Brethren

Oftentimes, assigning moral praise or blame is as simple as evaluating an ethical event in light of God's revelation in Scripture. In regard to *adiaphora* issues, however, another factor that must be considered is the presence or absence of weaker or stronger brethren in the context of the moral event. In fact, in the two most lengthy and significant passages in the Bible on the doctrine of Christian liberty, Rom 14:1–15:13 and 1 Cor 8:1–10:33,[30] Paul repeatedly exhorts believers to be mindful of the presence of weaker brethren in the community. When engaging in morally indifferent activities, such a purposeful awareness and vigilance is a mark of thorough-going neighbor-love. Since few people would self-identify as weaker brethren, Paul defines his categories when he discusses weaker and stronger brethren.

In mentioning weaker brethren, Paul characterizes such individuals as being weak in faith (cf. Rom 14:1, 23), lacking full biblical knowledge (cf. 1 Cor 8:1, 4, 7, 10–11), and having a fragile conscience (cf. 1 Cor 8:7, 10–12; 10:28–29). However, from Paul's discussion, it is clear that a weaker brother is not any immature believer, a so-called carnal Christian,[31] or a believer who happens to disagree with an aspect of one's theology or ethics. Rather, in Paul's discussion a weaker brother is identified as someone who will be caused to violate their own conscience, in regard to an *adiaphora* issue, because of the influence and example of another Christian in

[29] For more information on the essential components of a moral event, see Jones, *An Introduction to Biblical Ethics*, 1–27. The fact that every volitional act is either moral or immoral is why Paul instructs the believers in Colossae, "*Whatever you do*, in word or deed, do everything in the name of the Lord Jesus, giving thanks to God the Father through him" (Col 3:17 [italics added]; cf. 1 Cor 10:31).

[30] Other key passages that address Christian liberty include 1 Cor 6:12; Gal 5:13; and Col 3:17.

[31] While sometimes used to describe individuals who maintain a loose connection with the church, the idea of a "carnal Christian" is questionable, at best. Although it is certainly possible to backslide for a short season of time, Jesus taught that there will be many at the last judgment who have knowledge of Christ but who are not truly regenerate. According to Jesus, the way to tell the difference between an unregenerate "carnal Christian" and a true follower of Christ who is backslidden is, "You will recognize them by their fruits" (Matt 7:16).

the community.[32] It is important to observe that in regard to *adiaphora* issues, for the weaker brother, the sin committed is not engaging in or abstaining from a particular act. Rather, it is the defilement of their own conscience (cf. Rom 14:22–23; Titus 1:15).

In Paul's epistles stronger brothers are described as individuals who have a mature faith (cf. Rom 14:22), possess an abundance of scriptural knowledge (cf. 1 Cor 8:1, 4, 7, 10–11), and have a biblically-informed conscience (cf. 1 Cor 10:29–30). While we may be tempted to view a believer who is a meticulous law-keeper as a stronger brother, ironically such individuals are actually described as weaker brethren in Scripture. Perhaps counter-intuitively, the Bible identifies the stronger brother as he who is without extra-biblical moral scruples and a legalistic spirit. Indeed, stronger brethren exhibit a gracious freedom in Christ, for they understand that God's moral law is, as James wrote, "the law of liberty" (Jas 1:25; 2:12) and that, as Jesus taught, "If the Son sets you free, you will be free indeed" (John 8:36).[33] Note that in Scripture the stronger brother is always called to accommodate his actions—that is, to sacrifice his Christian liberty—for the sake of the weaker brother. This is because the stronger brother can do so without sinning, while the weaker brother can only accommodate his actions by violating his own conscience and thereby sinning.

Christian Liberty and the Conscience

Another factor to consider as we exercise Christian liberty in the community is the conscience. Indeed, the conscience is a frequently cited concept in the Bible, and it is an important component in the process of moral decision making. Scripture describes the conscience in various ways. Positively, the Bible speaks of having a "good conscience" (Acts 23:1; 1 Tim 1:5, 19; 1 Pet 3:21), a "clear conscience" (Acts 24:16; 1 Tim 3:9; 2 Tim 1:3; Heb 13:18; cf. 1 Pet 3:16), a cleansed conscience (cf. Heb 9:14), and a conscience without guilt (cf. Rom 9:1; 1 Cor 4:4; 2 Cor 1:12). Negatively,

[32] We ought not to confuse a weaker brother with a so-called "professional weaker brother." A professional weaker brother is someone, like the Pharisees in the Gospel narratives, who attempts to manipulate others to conform to their own extra-biblical moral scruples. At Matt 15:14 Jesus's instructions concerning such individuals are clear: "Let them alone; they are blind guides. And if the blind lead the blind, both will fall into a pit" (cf. Prov 16:22; 26:4; 29:9; Matt 7:6).

[33] This is not to say that stronger brethren disregard the moral law. Rather, mature believers have a transformed mind such that they desire to keep God's moral law, realizing that it is the only way to true freedom. Bear in mind the fact that true freedom is not the opportunity to do whatever one wants; rather, it is the ability to do what one is designed to do.

Scripture mentions the possibility of an "evil conscience" (Heb 10:22), a defiled conscience (cf. Titus 1:15; Heb 9:9), a weak conscience (cf. 1 Cor 8:7, 10), as well as a seared conscience (cf. 1 Tim 4:2).

Whether it is functioning positively or negatively, the conscience can be defined as the component of the human constitution that bears witness to the morality of actions (cf. Rom 2:15). The conscience communicates an inherent moral ought-ness that stems from humans being made in the image of God. In a perfect, unfallen world the conscience would accurately and comprehensively reflect God's moral will. However, since the fall of humanity, the conscience has been susceptible to being co-opted by sin. This is because the conscience is informed by the mind (or the intellect) and the brain is part of the fallen fleshly body (cf. 1 Cor 4:3–4; Eph 2:1–3). While believers receive a new immaterial nature at the moment of conversion, they must wait for a new material body until their resurrection at the return of Christ. Consequently, prior to glorification, Christians must wrestle with the sinful flesh, which includes the mind (cf. Rom 7:13–25). Additionally, the conscience is continually being conditioned by one's experiences, which are oftentimes sinful in the context of the fallen world.[34]

The fact that the conscience can be misled by the fallen mind and misaligned on account of sinful experiences means that it is possible for one's conscience to be wrong. In Pauline terminology, an individual whose conscience has been misinformed, or is as-yet unformed, in regard to an *adiaphora* issue is a "weaker brother." Concerning morally indifferent practices, when a stronger brother causes a weaker brother to violate his own conscience—even though the weaker brother's conscience may be incorrect—it is a sinful act. In such cases the stronger brother, in effect, encourages the weaker brother to disregard his conscience (cf. Rom 14:23). This is wrong, for in regard to non-morally indifferent practices, the weaker brother needs to follow his conscience. The possibility of this phenomena highlights the need for all believers to be aware of the presence of weaker brethren in the community. Moreover, Christians must be continually filling, training, and programing (or, perhaps, re-programming) their minds with the truth of the word of God.[35]

Principles of Christian Liberty

In regard to *adiaphora* issues, familiarity with the Bible, awareness of

[34] For a helpful work on the Christian conscience, see Andrew Naselli and J. D. Crowley, *Conscience: What It Is, How to Train It, and Loving Those Who Differ* (Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2016).

[35] Paul touches upon and exemplifies this idea as he claims, "My conscience bears me witness in the Holy Spirit" (Rom 9:1).

the presence of weaker brethren, and being sensitive to the consciences of others are indispensable components of doing ethics in public. In light of these factors, we can summarize a general approach to morally indifferent practices with several objective principles related to Christian liberty.

First, no one should impose their own moral scruples upon another in regard to morally indifferent practices. We must keep in mind the fact that God is the ultimate Judge of humanity, not man. Paul instructs the believers in Rome, "Therefore let us not pass judgment on one another any longer, but rather decide never to put a stumbling block or hindrance in the way of a brother" (Rom 14:13). This means that Christians who engage in morally indifferent practices ought not to despise those who do not do so (cf. Rom 14:1; 15:1). Likewise, those who abstain from *adiaphora* activities must not judge those who do so (cf. Rom 14:3). All such practices should be rooted in a godly mind (cf. Rom 12:1–2; Phil 4:8).

Second, those who engage in morally indifferent practices must be convinced in their own minds that such acts are helpful to the body of Christ, realizing that we all will be judged for our actions (cf. Rom 14:5, 12, 14, 23). In writing about *adiaphora* issues at 1 Cor 6:12 Paul notes, "'All things are lawful for me,' but not all things are helpful. 'All things are lawful for me,' but I will not be dominated by anything." Similarly, in 1 Cor 10:23 Paul writes, "'All things are lawful,' but not all things are helpful. 'All things are lawful,' but not all things build up" (cf. Rom 15:2). Morally indifferent practices, then, must be profitable for oneself and for others in the community, and ought not to enslave humanity—be it physically, emotionally, or spiritually.

Third, morally indifferent practices must be done unto the Lord—that is, in service to God, exalting God, and for the glory of God (cf. Rom 14:6–8; 15:6–7; 1 Cor 6:13; 10:31). In other words, *adiaphora* practices should be done in Jesus's name, and one ought to be able to thank him for them (cf. Col 3:17). This means that morally indifferent practices must be appropriate for the body, which is the temple of the Holy Spirit. Paul instructs the Corinthian believers, "Do you not know that your body is a temple of the Holy Spirit? ... You are not your own, for you were bought with a price. So glorify God in your body" (1 Cor 6:19–20).

Fourth, morally indifferent practices must not become a stumbling block for weaker brothers (cf. Rom 14:13, 15, 20–21). Paul cautions the Corinthian church, "But take care that this right of yours does not somehow become a stumbling block to the weak.... And so by your knowledge this weak person is destroyed, the brother for whom Christ died. Thus, sinning against your brothers and wounding their conscience when it is weak, you sin against Christ" (1 Cor 8:9–12). *Adiaphora* acts, then, ought

not to tear down other believers, but should promote peace, joy, love, edification, and even evangelism among the members of the body of Christ (cf. Rom 14:17, 19; 15:8–13; 1 Cor 8:1; 10:31–33).[36]

Fifth, as has been noted above, a morally indifferent act becomes sinful for a believer if it causes him to transgress his conscience. As he writes about *adiaphora* practices, Paul teaches, "I know and am persuaded in the Lord Jesus that nothing is unclean in itself, but it is unclean for anyone who thinks it unclean" (Rom 14:14). In this passage, Paul is not teaching that morality is subjective; rather, he is highlighting the importance of not violating one's conscience. Paul later states the same truth differently as he claims, "For whatever does not proceed from faith is sin" (Rom 14:23). John, too, expresses this idea as he writes, "If our heart does not condemn us, we have confidence before God" (1 John 3:21).

Sixth, a stronger brother must always be willing to sacrifice his Christian liberty for the sake of a weaker brother (cf. 1 Cor 8:13; 10:28–29). Indeed, a truly mature Christian ought to be strong enough to sacrifice his freedom for the welfare of and service to a weaker brother in the community. In regard to morally indifferent practices, an unwillingness to accommodate one's actions for the sake of a fellow Christian is a sure sign that one is, in fact, a weaker brother. Regarding this principle, Paul's exhortation to the Galatian believers is helpful, as he writes, "For you were called to freedom, brothers. Only do not use your freedom as an opportunity for the flesh, but through love serve one another" (Gal 5:13).

Seventh, and finally, the one who engages in morally indifferent practices must act in imitation of Jesus, for he is Lord (cf. Rom 14:9). Paul concludes his discussion of *adiaphora* issues in the book of Romans, writing, "We who are strong have an obligation to bear with the failings of the weak, and not to please ourselves. Let each of us please his neighbor for his good, to build him up. For Christ did not please himself.... Therefore welcome one another as Christ has welcomed you, for the glory of God" (Rom 15:1–3, 7). In short, then, as is the case with other areas of Christian living, so in regard to Christian liberty, believers must imitate Christ.

[36] The judgment of the Jerusalem council as recorded in Acts 15:19–21 endorses the idea of considering the lost in our public ethics. In this decision James notes that keeping several of the Jewish ceremonial laws would be prudent for Gentile converts: "For Moses has had throughout many generations those who preach him in every city, being read in the synagogues every Sabbath" (Acts 15:21). It seems that unsaved Jews in Gentile cities are in view here (cf. 1 Cor 9:22).

Conclusion

This article has sought to investigate the place and importance of community when assessing moral events. In considering the concept of second-order moral accountability, the argument presented in this work was mainly *deconstructive* in nature, as the survey of select biblical passages demonstrated the fallacy of second-order moral accountability. As was noted in the preceding discussion, oftentimes the conclusions that are reached in instances where second-order moral accountability is used are helpful, and sometimes even biblically faithful; yet the principle of second-order moral accountability is invalid. In such instances the problem is often not the moral conclusion that is reached, but the mechanism by which the moral conclusion is supported.

In contrast to the arguments against second-order moral accountability, the review of Christian liberty in the second half of this article was largely *constructive* in nature. Here this work sought to highlight the differences between weaker and stronger brethren, to draw attention to the place of the conscience in moral decision-making, and to give Christians several objective principles to follow in their exercise of Christian liberty within the public square. In short, then, while evangelicals still have more work to do, by discussing these two related aspects of ethics within community, hopefully this article will encourage evangelicals to develop a robust and biblically faithful doctrine of ethics in public.

STR 13.1 (Spring 2022): 95–107

The Ordered Animal: Accountability, Teleology, and Human Nature

Jordan Steffaniak
University of Birmingham, UK

Abstract: *What does it mean to be human? Recently, a new proposal has suggested that the human is an accountable animal. In this essay, I contend that this account can be broadened and strengthened by arguing that the human is an ordered animal. By "ordered" I mean that humans are directed toward specific ends within a twofold hierarchical matrix. They are ordered to their creator and ordered to creation. While such a framework is not exhaustive it can serve to ground and organize speaking well about human persons. To demonstrate this, I first summarize the recent work of Brendan Case on the "accountable animal." Second, I show how four separate resources, ranging from Reformed covenant theology to Aristotelian teleology, can serve to buttress and expand Case's argument to what I call the ordered animal. With these resources, I seek to show how the ordered animal can provide a robust and flexible foundation for further theological formulation.*

Key Words: *accountability, Christology, covenant, human nature, teleology*

What does it mean to be human? Candidate definitions abound: The human is a rational animal, a political animal, a language animal, etc. Recently, a new proposal has suggested that the human is an *accountable* animal.[1] I contend that this account can be broadened and strengthened by arguing that the human is an *ordered* animal. By "ordered" I mean that humans are directed toward specific ends within a twofold hierarchical matrix. They are ordered to their creator and ordered to creation. While such a framework is not exhaustive it can serve to ground and organize speaking well about human persons. To prove this, I first summarize the recent work of Brendan Case on the "accountable animal." Second, I show how four separate resources, ranging from Reformed covenant theology to Aristotelian teleology, can serve to buttress and expand Case's argument to what I call the ordered animal. Each resource will strengthen various aspects of Case's proposal and provide the portrait of the ordered

[1] Brendan Case, *The Accountable Animal: Justice, Justification, and Judgment* (New York: Bloomsbury Academic, 2021).

animal as a robust model for what it means to be human.

An initial precautionary word is in order about the scope of my thesis. While I certainly intend to argue for a robust model, it remains a model, nonetheless. Theological models are distinct from dogmatic or doctrinal declarations that would either be cardinal dogmas of the faith or confessional doctrines of the church. A model only *approximates* to the truth of the matter. It is not intended to capture every detail of a doctrine (in this case, anthropology). Models are "cut down" ways to selectively explain aspects of a doctrine for a specific purpose. Therefore, my model for the human person is intended to be taken *seriously* yet with the knowledge that it is *not* exhaustive. Even more, the resources used to elucidate the model are not essential. They are tools to "build up" the model as a more worthwhile research program. But one may find one—or even all—objectionable. This should not detract from the basic thesis that humans are ordered animals. After all, the human person is a mystery yet to be solved—and I am under no delusion to have discerned the fullness of the mystery.[2]

Brendan Case and the Accountable Animal

Brendan Case has recently argued that not only is accountability a virtue, but it is fundamental to the nature of human persons. Any Christian vision of anthropology should find the centrality of accountability quite natural given that Scripture beckons us to take exceedingly seriously the reality that we are accountable for our entire lives.[3] Therefore, Case seeks to explain *how* we are accountable and *why* it is fundamental for humanity. To understand his overall argument and its relevance for my model, I will summarize how he understands the nature of accountability before considering how accountability and human nature function together to form the accountable animal.

Case argues that virtue is "a deliberate disposition for excellent action in a given domain" and that accountability is excellent action *in relation to* those with some authority over the agent.[4] As a deliberate disposition for excellent action, accountability includes two aspects: duties and rights. *Duties* are obligations and commitments, and *rights* are legitimate claims and entitlements. Duties specify what others rightly expect from *me*, while my rights specify what I rightly expect from *others*. There are further aspects to both duties and rights, such as the distinction between a "permission" right and "claim" right, which is intended to explain the positive

[2] See Oliver D. Crisp, "A Parsimonious Model of Divine Simplicity," *Modern Theology* 35.3 (2019): 559.

[3] Case, *The Accountable Animal*, 3.

[4] Case, *The Accountable Animal*, 2.

and negative scope of rights. Permission rights are rights to a negative good (e.g., a right to non-interference from someone, like the right to not be murdered) and claim rights are rights to a positive good that is actively supplied by another.[5] There is a further distinction between social and natural rights.[6] Some rights are socially mediated (e.g., politically legislated) while others are natural pre-political entitlements.[7] But the basic outline is clear enough—accountability typically includes both duties and rights. Accountability as a trait or disposition is specifically a responsiveness or sensitivity to one's own duties and others' rights.

Case argues from this basic understanding of accountability that "we are rational or political or blushing animals, yes, but perhaps only because we are essentially accountable animals."[8] In other words, Case thinks that we are rational, political, and/or blushing animals *because* of an underlying metaphysical truth that we have and are nothing that we have not received.[9] So, our rational, political, and/or blushing capacities are compatible *because* our lives are structured at a fundamental level by accountable norms. In fact, Case believes that accountability is an "ingredient in every distinctively human practice, since it lies at the root of our capacity for recognizing moral obligations, and by extension, of our capacity for language itself."[10]

Resourcing the Accountable Animal

While I find Case's basic argument persuasive, I think it can be buttressed, expanded, and slightly modified with the assistance of Reformed covenant theology, an Aristotelian account of teleology, Oliver Crisp's Christological union account, and Herman Bavinck's understanding of creation. These resources and my description of them are designed to be gateways to a further research program and not robust treatments in themselves. Therefore, the summary of each resource is intended to be relatively brief since the goal is to show how they can benefit a more robust model of the human person. Moreover, one can jettison any of these resources and not destroy the overall basic claim that humans are fundamentally ordered animals. Through examining these resources, I show that the terminology of "order" captures the core idea from Case while allowing for a more flexible and broader framework than accountability

[5] Case, *The Accountable Animal*, 14.
[6] Case, *The Accountable Animal*, 15.
[7] Case, *The Accountable Animal*, 19.
[8] Case, *The Accountable Animal*, 13.
[9] Case, *The Accountable Animal*, 125.
[10] Case, *The Accountable Animal*, 8.

from which to understand the human person.

Reformed Covenant Theology

Reformed theologians have long made a habit of centering their theological convictions in covenant theology. As Michael Horton has mused, "*Reformed* theology is synonymous with *covenant* theology,"[11] which is precisely why Horton claims that "we were not just created and then *given* a covenant; we were created *as* covenantal creatures."[12] For Reformed theologians, covenant is central to what it means to be human. The reason such a vision of covenants is especially useful to a theology of accountability is because of the nature of covenants—particularly those found in Holy Scripture.

Covenants are variously defined from theologian to theologian. But there is a common ground in that they are bonds or binding promises between parties.[13] Distinct parties make an agreement of sorts. And each party has distinct duties and/or rights. For example, God makes a covenant with Noah and his offspring in Gen 8:20–9:17. God promises to never flood the earth again. God has the *duty* to prohibit a great flood, and Noah and his descendants have the *right* to life without the destruction of a flood. Such a way of thinking about covenants has direct implications for accountability as Case defines it. In modern terms, covenants are formally binding relationships of *accountability*.

Traditional Reformed covenant theology has said there are three broad covenantal structures or systems: the covenant of *redemption*, the covenant of *works*, and the covenant of *grace*. The covenant of redemption is not a historical covenant in time and space but an eternal and timeless one. It is an eternal pact between the persons of the Trinity in which the Father elects a people in the Son through the Spirit. The covenant of works is the original agreement made between God and Adam where God promises life to Adam upon the condition of his obedience to not eat of the tree of knowledge of good and evil. The covenant of grace is the historical outworking of the covenant of redemption in which God promises salvation by the seed of the woman and brings forth the promise in the death, resurrection, and ascension of Christ the seed.

[11] Michael Horton, *Introducing Covenant Theology* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2009), 11.
[12] Horton, *Introducing Covenant Theology*, 10.
[13] Thomas R. Schreiner, *Covenant and God's Purpose for the World*, Short Studies in Biblical Theology (Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2017), 13; O. Palmer Robertson, *The Christ of the Covenants* (Phillipsburg, NJ: P&R, 1985), 4; Meredith G. Kline, *Kingdom Prologue: Genesis Foundations for a Covenantal Worldview* (Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2006), 1–5.

The reason *Reformed* covenant theology is of special use for thinking about the human person as accountable is because of its systematization of the covenantal relationships as described above. For Reformed covenant theology *all* humans are related by covenant and ultimately accountable. They *all* have specific duties and rights. As Rom 5:12–21 explains, all humanity is related to either Adam or Christ by way of covenant—either under the covenant of works or of grace. Such a system of doctrine gives further grounding and texture to thinking about the human person as an accountable animal. It is not merely that we all have accountable communities but that we are accountable in covenant. And since God has structured the world to *always* be under some covenantal administration—whether of works or of grace—and has covenanted in eternity past, the idea that covenantal duties and rights form a foundation for what it means to be human makes enormous *theological* sense.

Aristotelian Teleology

An Aristotelian account of teleology is of great use for thinking about the human person as both accountable and ultimately *ordered*. The Aristotelian tradition has a long and storied heritage in Christian thinking, especially its causal framework. In the Aristotelian mode of thinking, every creature has distinct functions that spotlight distinct ends. These functions that work toward ends are what *teleology* is about—principles that *tend toward* certain types of outcomes.[14] Aristotelian teleology casts a vision for irreducible and universal principles that govern temporally extended development.[15]

Therefore, for Aristotle, the proper end is *different* depending on the object. The end is one thing for medicine, one thing for craft, one thing for the heart, and so on.[16] For example, the end of medicine is to procure health, but this is not the same end as the shoemaker whose goal is to create reliable footwear. In the same way, functions are biological facts—the heart, the eyes, the brain, they are all *supposed to do* something. The heart pumps blood. The eyes see. The brain thinks. These functions are hardwired into them, and they are only "good" insofar as they achieve their intended end. They are part of what Alvin Plantinga calls a "design plan."[17] Everything has certain metaphysical givens that cause them to

[14] Thomas Nagel, *Mind and Cosmos: Why the Materialist Neo-Darwinian Conception of Nature Is Almost Certainly False* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2012), 66.

[15] Nagel, *Mind and Cosmos*, 67, 92.

[16] Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, trans. Terence Irwin, 3rd ed. (Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing, 2019), 1097a15.

[17] Alvin Plantinga, *Warrant and Proper Function* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993), 14.

tend toward a given end. A purposeful and directed process is hardwired into creation—patterns that science can discern and represent.[18]

On Aristotle's account, *sans* Christian theology (e.g., ignoring the Christian claim that these patterns, functions, and ordering exist *because* of God's creative design), he surmises that the end of the human is the special function of the human. He thinks this special function is the activity of the soul in accord with virtuous *reason*.[19] However, one need not agree with Aristotle's conclusion about what counts as the proper end of human persons to use his teleological framework. The bare structure is eminently serviceable because it provides the footing for properly *ordered* relationships. It is not a bare layer of accountability that grounds what we are as humans (whether rational, political, and the like). It is a properly ordered function or end. Case claims that accountability and our sensitivity to others moral worth is the bedrock of our rational and political capacities, but I think this is too thin to make sense of humanity and its accountable relationships. What is needed is a further account of the function and goal of humanity. Further *Christian* accounts of these functions and ends can be found in both Oliver Crisp and Herman Bavinck, both to whom I now turn.

Christology and Union in Oliver Crisp

Anyone familiar with the work of Oliver Crisp will know his grand vision of Christological union. Crisp repeatedly argues that divine-human union is the *end* of creation.[20] Crisp thinks that God creates *this* world because he wants creatures to be united to himself—to participate in the divine life—and it is *this* world that is uniquely structured to achieve this end. Since union is the ultimate goal for humanity, God "hardwires" union into the metaphysics of creation and conceives of humans as creatures ideally suited for such participation in the divine life.[21] The way in which God "hardwires" this union into the metaphysics of creation is a bit of reverse-engineering. As Crisp explains:

> Like the prototype of an automobile and the production model that is based upon the blueprints of the prototype, Christ is the "prototypical" human. We are made in *his* image, as it were, so that we reflect God in some measure as we image Christ, the God-

[18] Alister E. McGrath, *A Scientific Theology* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003), 1:208, 218.

[19] Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, 1098a15.

[20] Oliver Crisp, *Analyzing Doctrine: Toward a Systematic Theology* (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2019), 130.

[21] Crisp, *Analyzing Doctrine*, 124, 130.

man.[22]

So, we humans are fashioned specifically as embodied rational animals *because* only such a structure can be conformed to and be in personal union with God the Son.[23]

Crisp's Christology and doctrine of union immediately resource the accountable animal, shaping it as an ordered animal. It is not only that we have duties and rights, but that the *end* of human persons is union with God. It is participation in the divine life that humans are fundamentally ordered toward. Therefore, we ought to think of humans as both metaphysically structured in such a way as to participate in this life and as teleologically ordered to God. All our duties ultimately tend *toward* this final goal. When we think about the underlying reason for our accountable relationships, we ought to always theorize with this end in mind.

Herman Bavinck on Nature, Duties, and Rights

Herman Bavinck was a towering Dutch intellect who is only continuing to gain relevance and popularity in English speaking circles due to the voluminous ongoing translation project of his works. But it is not a mere fad that Bavinck has gained such prominence in contemporary theology. Bavinck *is* a serious Christian thinker with numerous theological resources for contemporary theology. One such area of great use for the human person is his doctrine of creation.

Bavinck's maxim that "origin determines direction and purpose" is especially fruitful for thinking about the human person.[24] While Crisp gives clarity to the unique *end* of humans and reverse engineers metaphysical truths from this claim, Bavinck looks to the beginning—the origin of humans. As Bavinck says, "the essence of man corresponds to his origin."[25] If we are to understand what a human is about, we need to look at his original creation. Humans were originally created from the dust *and* the breath of God. Therefore, the human person is a sort of metaphysical hybrid or amphibian—part physical and part spiritual. They share traits

[22] Oliver Crisp, *The Word Enfleshed: Exploring the Person and Work of Christ* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2016), 52.

[23] Crisp, *The Word Enfleshed*, 63, 66. It is worthwhile to note that Case *does* have arguments that track along similar lines (though with varying emphases) in chapters four and five of the *Accountable Animal* in which the incarnation is presupposed to Edenic justification and the church is presupposed to ultimate human accountability to God.

[24] Herman Bavinck, *Reformed Ethics*, ed. John Bolt (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2019), 1:35.

[25] Herman Bavinck, *The Wonderful Works of God*, trans. Henry Zylstra (Glenside, PA: Westminster Seminary Press, 2019), 180.

with both animals and angels.[26] Humans are spiritual beings, as God created us with a yearning for an eternal order.[27] But as humans are a *physical*-spiritual hybrid, God creates humans with the *double* task of culture making and obedience to divine commands. These twin duties and ends are intertwined throughout all of life: "Work and rest, rule and service, earthly and heavenly vocation, civilization and religion, culture and *cultus*."[28] Religion, like the soul for the body, is the *animating principle* for all of life.

Bavinck, therefore, provides further breadth for human teleology. For Bavinck, humans have a threefold set of relations: God, others, and nature.[29] Humans are not only ordered to *God* but to creation more broadly, hence the twin duties to both *cultus* and culture. These relations are naturally construed in terms of accountability and form the bedrock of the human person.

A further insight from Bavinck comes from his careful dispelling of any form of *natural* human rights. He explains at length:

> A creature cannot bring along or possess any rights before God…. A creature as such owes its very existence, all that it is and has, to God; it cannot make any claims before God, and it cannot boast of anything; it has no rights and can make no demands of any kind.[30]

So, for Bavinck, *before* and *after* the fall, humans as creatures have *no* rights before *God*. Note carefully what Bavinck does not say. He does *not* dispel natural human rights before other humans. But he *does* dispel any natural rights before God. Since God is the Creator, he has the right to do with his creation whatever he pleases. So, where do human rights before God come from? They come from Reformed covenant theology. As Bavinck explains, we have rights before God "solely because God in his condescending goodness gives rights to his creature. Every creaturely right is a given benefit, a gift of grace, underserved and nonobligatory."[31] The upshot from Bavinck's account of rights is that while divine *duties* are natural, divine *rights* are supernatural. It is only by means of the covenant of redemption and covenant of grace that man has any rights before God.

[26] Bavinck, *The Wonderful Works of God*, 181.

[27] Bavinck, *The Wonderful Works of God*, 3.

[28] Bavinck, *The Wonderful Works of God*, 169.

[29] Bavinck, *Reformed Ethics*, 1:50.

[30] Herman Bavinck, *Reformed Dogmatics*, ed. John Bolt, trans. John Vriend (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2003), 2:570.

[31] Bavinck, *Reformed Dogmatics*, 2:570.

The Ordered Animal

A thick and robust model of the human person should be grounded in order. Order is a deeper level of reality than is accountability. God is a God of order and not confusion or disarray (see 1 Cor 14:33). Order is not a mystical naturalistic notion but one infused by God's own creative act of wisdom.[32] God has both created and positively instituted elements of order for humans that structure their lives. While anthropological discussions can oftentimes focus on narrow aspects like the nature of the soul (or if there is one), the ethical demands for humans, and even the *imago Dei*, thinking about the human person in terms of an ordered animal can provide a solid foundation from which to explore all these areas of the human person and more. The ordered animal has enough thickness to its meaning that it can hold accountability as a central aspect of humanity alongside other elements like teleology.

As I have shown above, Case's definition of the human as an accountable animal is a crucial insight into the nature of the human person but lacks some of the texture available to it from the wealth of the Christian tradition. It is also slightly narrow in its conception of the human person. Thinking of humans as ordered allows for notions of teleology to form our thinking about humans from the start. Given these claims, I offer a formal definition of what the ordered animal is supposed to mean, followed by filling out the model from the resources I've examined in the above section, alongside several ways the model might be enhanced in future research. Finally, I conclude by showing how the ordered animal allows for a firmer foundation for various important anthropological doctrines.

> **The Ordered Animal Model** $=_{df}$ Human Persons are creatures that are fundamentally *ordered* to God and creation with certain duties and rights toward each.

Such a definition naturally leaves a significant amount of vagueness. What does it mean to be *fundamentally* ordered? What does the ordered relationship consist in? What sort of duties and rights do humans have to God and creation? How are their duties and rights unique compared to non-humans? And so on. I now address each in turn.

[32] McGrath, *A Scientific Theology*, 1:155, 200; James K. Dew Jr. and Jordan L. Steffaniak, "Alister E. McGrath: Scientist and Theologian as Apologist," in *The History of Apologetics: A Biographical and Methodological Introduction*, ed. Benjamin K. Forrest, Joshua D. Chatraw, and Alister E. McGrath (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Academic, 2020), 791.

Fundamentality and Order

The notion of fundamentality can become rather confusing rather quickly. Fundamentality can mean there is *nothing* more ultimate or it could mean that it is *relatively* important. I intend to take it in the former sense, wherein humans being ordered animals is the core claim about their existence. I think such a claim is viable because the ordered animal can sustain both the *imago Dei* and further claims, as I will show in a later section ("Christian Anthropology and Order").

Ordered to God

The vision of an ordered animal has special importance for humanity's relation to God. I argue, with the assistance of the aforementioned resources, that man is *ordered* to God as both origin and end with duties and rights through both creation and covenant. The distinctively *human* kind of order involves a responsiveness, not merely to outside stimuli or innate desires, but to *reasons* of various kinds.[33]

As creatures created by God, humans are ordered to God as receivers of the breath of life. We are ordered to the duty of obedience to all that God has commanded. We are also indued with rights and privileges from God before creation because of our status as the image of God. Even more, as creatures of *covenant*, we are given further special rights of privilege before God himself. We are offered kinship with God, Christ being our elder brother. Without God's covenantal condescension, humanity would have no rights before God. As Reformed theologians are fond of saying, it would be all "Law" and no "Gospel." Moreover, as Crisp has argued, the human end is union with God—to be partakers of the divine life. Everything is ordered to this end. To properly understand humans, we must know our ultimate end (union with God), our duties to God, and our rights before God.

Ordered to Creation

The human person is also ordered to creation, which has a dual focus on other humans and the rest of creation. While we have a heavenly calling, we also have an earthly calling. The first ordered relation is to our fellow person, as the second table of the Ten Commandments elucidates. We are accountable to live as virtuous people, loving our neighbor as ourselves. But while there is a general sense in which humans are obligated to love *everyone*, there are distinct centers of locality that *increase* our duties. Global, national, and local communities all have differing senses of moral

[33] I am thankful to Brendan Case for this phrasing and suggested addition.

obligation, down to the individual family, which is the greatest moral center. Holy Scripture abounds with examples of this ordered taxonomy.

Consider 1 Tim 5:4: "But if a widow has children or grandchildren, let them first learn to show godliness to their own household and to make some return to their parents, for this is pleasing in the sight of God." Later in the same chapter, Paul says in 1 Tim 5:8: "But if anyone does not provide for his relatives, and especially for members of his household, he has denied the faith and is worse than an unbeliever." These claims from Saint Paul assume truths about the human person, which I suggest can be made sense of when thinking about humans as ordered animals. The *reason* various moral obligations differ in scope are because we are fundamentally ordered. We are created within a matrix of accountable relationships, both given and chosen. The most basic accountable relationship that is given is the biological family. It is appropriate and virtuous to prioritize the biological family given this naturally given accountable relationship. Humans are thus ordered to such partiality. And such partiality reaps greater virtue for the family, the individual, and the society at large.

But humanity's relation to creation is not exhausted by an accountable relationship to fellow image bearers. It also extends to *every* created thing. The ordered relationship is captured well in the original creation mandate to take dominion and cultivate. There have been significant theological studies of these important themes throughout Scripture but they all rest on the intelligibility of humans as ordered animals.[34]

Christian Anthropology and Order

The ordered animal model ought to be attractive because it tracks with the basic claims of Christian anthropology quite well. While there are numerous sub-fields in anthropology ranging from the *imago Dei* to metaphysics and the philosophy of mind to human origins, I suggest that the ordered animal can provide a helpful foundation for addressing all these topics because it is not married to any one specific view. It is ecumenical in its posture.

Take the *imago Dei* as the first example. It is impossible to canvas all the various views on the *imago Dei* throughout Christian history, but they are often categorized as substantial, functional, or relational accounts.[35] The benefit of the ordered animal model is that it is compatible with all

[34] See, e.g., Stephen G. Dempster, *Dominion and Dynasty: A Biblical Theology of the Hebrew Bible*, New Studies in Biblical Theology 15 (Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 2003).

[35] Joshua R. Farris, *An Introduction to Theological Anthropology: Humans, Both Creaturely and Divine* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2020), 80.

three versions. Whether the image is meant to be some metaphysical capacity, like reason, some function like dominion, or a relationship, the human as an ordered animal grounds each of these accounts. The image is substantial *because* humans are ordered, functional *because* humans are ordered, or relational *because* humans are ordered. The concept is flexible enough to resource all three main views.

Consider metaphysics and the philosophy of mind next. Contemporary philosophy and theology have tended toward a more physicalist account of human persons, wherein we are biological organisms without a non-physical part, such as a soul, whereas much of the older tradition has affirmed a strong duality of the human person, both body and soul. But one need not choose between these conceptions for the ordered animal model to be of great assistance as an anthropological foundation. Humans can reduce to biological organisms or have robust non-physical souls and remain distinctively and fundamentally ordered. While the metaphysics of order likely differ—even widely—the basic point that we are ordered animals remains and serves as a springboard for further inquiry.

Finally, note issues of human origin. Again, in contemporary theology there has been a tendency to reject a young earth creationist view of human origins in favor of legion evolutionary friendly narratives. While one may have serious theological reasons to hold tightly to young earth creationism, the ordered animal has the flexibility to function in both models. In both views, God has designed the world with certain functions, goals, or ends. While it may be more difficult to make sense of some of these on a strongly evolutionary account, more modest accounts can continue to utilize the ordered animal as a framework for thinking about the human person.

Conclusion

I firmly believe that human nature will always remain shrouded in mystery. Humans are created in the image of God, and if God is incomprehensible, we are unlikely to understand his image in full. Therefore, I think fruitful ways of understanding the human person can be advanced through various flexible models that can ground further inquiry. I have offered one such account in the ordered animal. Thinking of the human person as fundamentally ordered has the benefit of prioritizing the most fundamental things about human persons—we are accountable to God and creation and are ordered to particular ends—most importantly union with God. But it also is flexible enough to serve as a foundation for numerous viewpoints in anthropology and can serve as a key desideratum when testing the validity and coherence of Christian doctrine. While the

ordered animal account herein is not exhaustive, I hope it serves as a modest gesture toward a more robust account of thinking well about human persons.[36]

[36] My thanks to Brendan Case for reviewing an early draft of this paper and providing substantial feedback and criticisms. Any errors that remain are solely my own.

STR 13.1 (Spring 2022): 109–39

Book Reviews

L. Michael Morales. *Exodus Old and New: A Biblical Theology of Redemption*. Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 2020. ix + 207 pp. Paperback. ISBN 978-0830855391. $19.80.

Exodus Old and New is an accessible, insightful, and gripping introduction to the exodus theme in Scripture. Michael Morales weaves together a keen understanding of the biblical text, theological sensitivity, and practical application as he unpacks this prominent biblical theme, often leaving the reader with a sense of wonder at the exodus-deliverances that YHWH accomplished in redemptive history.

In the Introduction Morales claims that the exodus theme (broadly defined) is the center of biblical theology. He has misjudged the center of biblical theology though. Peter Gentry and Stephen Wellum make a convincing case that the Bible's central theme is the advancement of God's kingdom *through* his covenants (*Kingdom through Covenant,* 2012). In any event, in chapter 1, the author presents the subjects of creation, exile, and increasing alienation from God in Genesis 1–11 as the backdrop for the exodus theme in Scripture. According to Morales, YHWH is the God of exodus before the book of Exodus. He is the God of exodus in Genesis.

The author argues in chapter 2 that Abraham's journeys prefigure the future deliverance of his descendants from Egyptian slavery (see Gen 12:1–20; 15:13–16; 22:1–19). He astutely identifies a prefiguring of the exodus in the Abraham narrative. However, this exodus theme in the Abraham narrative must not eclipse its primary themes of land, offspring, and blessing (as his treatment might imply). Chapter 3 deftly explains the purpose of the exodus as YHWH's relational revelation of himself to his redeemed people. Moreover, Morales correctly argues that YHWH subjects the land of Egypt to a de-creation process with the ten plagues. He sends the land back into the primordial state of chaos that the entire earth knew before YHWH formed it into a habitable space for human and animal life. One might, however, quibble with the author's unusual translation of Hebrew *kabed* as "strengthen" (Pharaoh's heart) rather than the traditional English translation "harden."

In chapter 4 he contends that Egypt symbolizes death in the biblical narrative and that Pharoah and the Egyptian army correspond to the ancient sea monsters in ancient Near East mythology. Both ideas seem reasonable. He proceeds to argue that "the Passover is the exodus" (p. 66)

in chapter 5, contending, "The exodus story, then, is defined by Passover, and Passover signifies the redemption of Israel, God's firstborn son, from death" (p. 69). He also identifies an interesting and plausible connection between the Passover ritual and the consecration of Aaron's family for priestly service in Exodus 29 and Leviticus 8. Both involved sacrifice, smearing of blood, and eating holy meat and, therefore, Morales concludes, "each Israelite household functioned in a priestly manner" (p. 71).

Chapter 6 depicts Moses as the forerunner of Israel's deliverance, the mediator of the covenant, the intercessor for Israel, and as a type of the new Moses to come. The author also contends that Moses's experience with YHWH foreshadows and grounds Israel's later experience with YHWH (e.g., the tent-revelation of YHWH to Moses in Exod 33:7–23 both foreshadows and grounds YHWH's tent-dwelling with his people in Exod 40:34–38). In chapter 7 he surveys elements of the Cultic Exodus (i.e., the cultic system outlined in Exodus 25–40 and Leviticus 1–16 which allows the people to dwell with the holy deity). The key point here is that the sacrificial rites (generally) move from expiation (purification offering) to consecration (whole burnt offering) to fellowship with God (peace offering).

Morales argues in chapter 8 that the exodus was "the first stage in a threefold pattern of sacred history: (1) the redemption of Israel led to (2) the nation's consecration by covenant at Mount Sinai and then to (3) the consummation of the inheritance in the land of Canaan" (p. 108). Chapter 9 shows that there is an escalation between the first and second exodus outlined in the Prophets (i.e., YHWH changes the hearts of the people in the second exodus). In chapter 10 he suggests that the structure of Isaiah 40–66 artistically depicts the servant(s) of YHWH: Isaiah 40–48, failed Israel as blind, deaf servant; Isaiah 49–55, true Israel as obedient servant; and Isaiah 56–66, renewed Israel as faithful servant. Chapter 11 identifies the ultimate servant of YHWH as a new eschatological Moses, new David, and the manifestation of Yahweh in the Prophets and Psalms. This chapter naturally serves as a segue to the last three chapters in which the author shows that Jesus is the Suffering Servant of YHWH who procured a new exodus from sin and death for his people.

In chapter 12 Morales argues that the Gospel of John depicts Jesus's death as the ultimate Passover sacrifice and his resurrection as a new exodus. While his overarching points are sound, his suggestion that the language of Jesus's ascension to the Father is exodus language seems unlikely (pp. 165–66). Chapter 13 then explores the theme of the outpouring of the Spirit as it relates to the new exodus in the Gospel of John. This chapter helpfully summarizes the prominent themes of the Spirit and the exodus in the Gospel of John (two themes that are sometimes eclipsed by

emphasis on the Father-Son relationship and the nature of the Son in studies of John's Gospel). Morales concludes the book in chapter 14 with an inspiring reflection on resurrection hope in Scripture (i.e., the final exodus of God's people out of the grave).

Despite a few idiosyncrasies, *Exodus Old and New* is a must-read for anyone interested in an exposition of the exodus theme in Scripture.

Robb Coleman
Wake Forest, North Carolina

Jeannine K. Brown. *The Gospels as Stories: A Narrative Approach to Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2020. xiv + 210 pp. Paperback. ISBN 978-0801049842. $21.99.

The Gospels as Stories serves as an introduction to the narrative analysis of the Gospels and is Jeannine Brown's most recent contribution to the field of biblical studies. She has demonstrated expertise in hermeneutical method (*Scripture as Communication*, 2007) and Gospel studies (two commentaries on Matthew, 2015 and 2018), and the present work brings both together for an accessible approach to this important methodology.

Brown has organized the content into six distinct parts: Parts 1 and 6 are an introduction and conclusion, Part 2 addresses plot and plotting, Part 3 deals with character and characterization, Part 4 covers intertextuality, and Part 5 focuses on narrative theology.

The book opens with an argument for the narrative approach that she will then delineate in the coming chapters. She articulates a broad definition of narrative criticism as that which "attends to the literary and storied qualities of a biblical narrative, like a Gospel" (p. 11). She notes that this criticism takes place in the final form of the text and does not emphasize issues of the text's production. The remainder of the chapter introduces several important concepts: the two levels of the narrative (story and discourse), the implied author, and the implied reader.

In Part 2, Brown pairs a chapter discussing the selection, sequence, and shape of the story (chapter 2) with a treatment of narrative plotting in the Gospel of Luke (chapter 3). The former interacts with literary theory, and the latter is an extended application. Part 3 addresses the development of characters in a narrative by pairing a methodological chapter on the people in the story (chapter 4) with Matthew's presentation of the disciples (chapter 5).

In Part 4, Brown addresses "the varied ways the evangelists engage the Old Testament as well as the study of these connections," using the term

"intertextuality" (chapter 6). She pairs this discussion with a chapter exploring John's use of intertextuality with the themes of the Passover lamb and creation's renewal. The final pair of chapters concentrates on how "each evangelist is reflecting intentionally and theologically on the Jesus story" (p. 148). She begins by focusing on how a narrative presents this theological reflection (chapter 8) and then goes in-depth on Mark's presentation of God—theology proper (chapter 9).

The work concludes by situating the approach to the Gospels as stories within the rubric of story, history, and theology. Brown argues that these are not at odds but starting with the story is the best approach. She states: "Reading the Gospels for their story line is not only organic to their form but also immensely helpful for hearing what these writers wanted to communicate about Jesus and what they wanted their audiences to experience" (p. 183).

Brown's treatment of a narrative approach to the four Gospels is praiseworthy in many respects. She writes at an accessible level, which makes the work worth consideration for an introductory-level course on the Gospels or for employ in the educational program of a local church. It is a well-organized foray into a methodology often bypassed in favor of alternative interpretive schemas or introduced at an advanced level.

Also striking is how well structured the work is. Bracketed with an introduction and conclusion are four core parts that pair a methodological chapter and an extended application of that methodology. Each application chapter draws from one of the four Gospels, so having finished the book, the reader has a taste of how she or he might go about engaging the Gospels in a narrative critical manner.

Along the way, Brown bridges the gap between narrative and biblical studies by associating the concepts with well-known works (e.g., "The Princess and the Pea," Shakespeare's *Romeo and Juliet*, Dickens's *A Christmas Carol*, Aesop's "The Ant and the Grasshopper"). These touchpoints with the reader make for a helpful segue to topics that may be foreign to the introductory study of the Gospels. Importantly, Brown avoids unnecessary technical jargon and, upon introducing new terminology, bolds the term and provides a glossary in the rear material.

One suggestion to improve the work would be to include a discussion of Brown's rationale for choosing the four emphases and how they fit within the larger conversation on narrative criticism. Are these the only four areas one must explore to engage narrative criticism? Though Brown does well to interact with other advanced discussions in her methodological chapters, these focus only on the four parts she addresses. Perhaps an epilogue could be added to provide resources for suggested next steps

into this advanced conversation.

Hayden S. Fleming
Franklinton, North Carolina

ChoongJae Lee. *Metánoia (Repentance): A Major Theme of the Gospel of Matthew*. Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2020. 258 pp. Paperback. 978-1725261044. $31.00.

Metánoia (Repentance): A Major Theme of the Gospel of Matthew is ChoongJae Lee's revised PhD dissertation, written under the supervision of Jonathan T. Pennington, who contributes a gracious foreword to the work.

Chapter 1 introduces the necessity and thesis of this study. According to Lee, no prior work has investigated Matthean repentance as a major theme of the first Gospel. He thus argues for the significance of μετάνοια in Matthew. For the first evangelist, μετάνοια is a major theme of Jesus's teaching on the kingdom of Heaven, marking the launch of John the Baptist's and Jesus's public ministries (Matt 3:2; 4:17), and summarizing Jesus's teaching in the five major discourses in his Gospel.

After investigating the history of literature on the theme of repentance (chapter 2), chapter 3 offers criticisms of Tyndale's English translation of μετανοέω as "repent," which has misled many to understand biblical repentance merely as to feel sorry for sin, to stop sinning, and to change one's mind. Lee insists that both the Old and New Testaments present repentance as "turning to God in mind and heart," leading to the amendment of one's entire life (p. 47).

Chapter 4 introduces the thematic significance of μετάνοια in the Gospel of Matthew, highlighting the message of repentance proclaimed by both John the Baptist (Matt 3:2–3) and Jesus (Matt 4:17). Chapters 5 and 6 examine conceptual overlaps between the theme of repentance and five major themes in Matthew: (1) discipleship, (2) the Great Commission, (3) Gentile inclusion, (4) righteousness, and (5) soteriology.

The next five chapters (7–11) elaborate on the thematic significance of repentance in Matthew's five major discourses: Chapter 7 covers the Sermon on the Mount (Matthew 5–7); chapter 8 the Missionary Discourse (Matt 9:36–11:1); chapter 9 the Parabolic Discourse (Matthew 13); chapter 10 the Community Discourse (Matthew 18); and chapter 11 the Olivet Discourse (Matthew 23–25). These teaching blocks contain some or all the five major themes noted above and communicate the thematic significance of repentance.

Chapter 9 maintains that while the kingdom parables (Matthew 13) hide Jesus's repentance message, figuratively they echo "Matthew 4:17's commandment of μετάνοια as exhortation through illustration, which is a common function of biblical parables" (p. 163). Chapter 10 investigates the Community Discourse (Matthew 18) that promotes humility and servanthood. Chapter 11 first surveys the thematic significance of repentance in Matthew 18–22 and then examines the Olivet Discourse (Matthew 23–25). Chapter 12 concludes the book by stating, "The Gospel of Matthew is Jesus' μετάνοια message. This does not mean μετάνοια is the only theme of Matthew, but it is a significant or major theme" (p. 233).

Lee has served both the academy and the church well by publishing this study. He is correct that many have missed or neglected the significance of the repentance theme in Matthew, which deserves better attention. The most noteworthy strength of this work is Lee's success in demonstrating that the message of repentance is a *significant* theme in the first Gospel. Despite the rare occurrences of repentance terminology as such, the theme of repentance explicitly and implicitly appears throughout the Gospel.

Nevertheless, while fulfilling its purpose, this book contains several weaknesses. First, at times Lee eisegetes individual passages to prove his thesis. For instance, he unreasonably associates the theme of repentance with the short parable of the old and new treasure (Matt 13:52), which includes no obvious thematic or conceptual ideas related to repentance (p. 187). A similar tendency appears in his treatment of the parable of the ten virgins (Matt 25:1–13, p. 228).

Second, Lee's use of a "μετάνοια conceptual inclusio" between Matt 4:17 and 28:19–20 is questionable (pp. 76–78). Lee argues that the first and last words of Jesus's public ministry (4:17 and 28:19–20) and their immediate contexts share many similarities; therefore, they form a "μετάνοια conceptual inclusion." He asserts that "this inclusio verifies that μετάνοια of all nations is an overarching plot of the Gospel of Matthew" (p. 77). While it is true that Matt 4:17 and its immediate context indeed focus on the theme of repentance, it is highly doubtful that the Evangelist focuses explicitly on that theme in Matt 28:19–20. Moreover, the notion and boundary of "conceptual inclusio" are somewhat arbitrary.

Third, this work lacks originality. While commendably consulting a variety of scholars, Lee too often relies on the data of others when he could and should have conducted his own research. For example, when examining "Repentance in the OT," Lee primarily offers a summary of Mark J. Boda's research instead of presenting his own word study (p. 35).

Fourth, the title of chapter 11 ("The Thematic Significance of μετάνοια in Matthew 23–25: The Last Discourse of μετάνοια") is somewhat misleading because the first half of this chapter (thirteen of twenty-

seven pages) does not deal with Matthew 23–25 but with 18–22. This part could have been dealt with in a more condensed manner or in an excursus since Matthew 18–22 is not part of the last discourse.

Despite these weaknesses, Lee's work deserves the attention of both the academy and the church, given their underappreciation of Matthew's repentance theme.

Yeonghwi Jo
Cary, North Carolina

David R. Bauer. *The Book of Acts as Story: A Narrative-Critical Study*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2021. xii + 284 pp. Paperback. ISBN 978-0801098321. $32.99.

This is David Bauer's first monograph to concentrate on the book of Acts. It is not his first work dealing with narrative critical issues in interpretation. His previous publications focus broadly on Matthean Studies (*The Gospel of the Son of God: An Introduction to Matthew*, IVP Academic, 2019) and hermeneutics (*Inductive Bible Study*, Baker, 2011). However, issues of narrative criticism hearken back to his dissertation-turned-monograph *The Structure of Matthew's Gospel: A Study in Literary Design* (JSNT, 1995).

The Book of Acts as Story has two main sections: (1) introductory material and methodology (Introduction–chapter 3), and (2) narrative-critical commentary (chapters 4–7). Bauer articulates his goal to "examine the book of Acts in its entirety according to the principles of narrative criticism, so as to lead to a fresh interpretation of Acts and insights into the meaning of some of the major themes and motifs of the book" (p. 3). Additionally, he desires to demonstrate three aims: (1) the exalted Jesus is the dominant character in the narrative, (2) the message of Acts is consistent throughout the narrative, and (3) narrative critical approaches fill gaps left by dependence upon the historical-critical method (p. 3).

In chapter 1, Bauer addresses (1) the book's relationship to the Gospel of Luke (part of a two-volume work, independent yet interdependent) and (2) the genre of Acts (ancient historiography). He then describes his method of narrative criticism in chapter 2, providing a brief history of narrative interpretation. Here he uses the two-fold rubric of (1) the story (events, characters, and settings) and (2) the discourse (implied author, implied reader, narrator, and point of view) of the narrative.

Literary structure is the focus of chapter 3. It is a helpful bridge since it suggests the layout for the remaining four chapters. Bauer identifies two components of literary structure: (1) linear development and (2) dynamic

relationship of major themes or motifs (p. 49). He suggests that linear divisions are "of little assistance in relating the main units to one another and in discerning the overall movement of the book" (p. 50). He argues that the best way to understand the unfolding narrative is recognizing the "programmatic statement from Jesus just before his ascension in 1:8" (p. 51). He thus identifies three sections (seen in Fig. 3.1, p. 51): (1) The promise and the preparation (1:1–26); (2) The witness from Jerusalem through Judea and Samaria to Antioch (2:1–12:25); and (3) The witness from Antioch through Asia Minor and Europe to Rome (13:1–28:31). The author then gives brief descriptions of the dominant literary features Luke utilizes to organize the information.

The final four chapters comprise the narrative-critical analysis which Bauer addresses under headings that roughly correspond to the threefold outline: The Promise and the Preparation (Acts 1:1–26); The Witness to Jerusalem (Acts 2:1–8:1a); The Witness to All Judea and Samaria as Far as Antioch (8:1b–12:25); and The Witness to the Ends of the Earth (Acts 13:1–28:31).

Bauer does well to assert and defend Jesus as the main character of the narrative. Though some may balk at such a strong sentiment, he argues and shows that Luke presents Jesus working directly and actively in the early church's life (pp. 16–17). He demonstrates this assertion—as the consistent message of Acts—in the unfolding nature of its structure. Bauer's relation of the book's structure to Acts 1:8 as the programmatic statement for the narrative is especially persuasive (e.g., in Fig. 3.1). Other benefits of this work include a helpful explication of categories that aid interpretation (implied reader, author, etc.), a demonstration of the importance of reading narratives as narratives, and the suggestion that the book of Acts ends as it does because it is not about Paul or any other human, but rather about Jesus (p. 248).

Overall, this volume is helpful. However, I have some suggestions to strengthen the work. The first is the title's similarity with Jeannine Brown's *The Gospels as Stories* (2020, reviewed above). Though both books share a general concern with narrative approaches to the text, they diverge fundamentally, and it is incumbent upon the reader to attend to the subtitles. While Brown is concerned with *Narrative Approaches to Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John*, Bauer produces *A Narrative-Critical Study*. Each is helpful as a standalone work. However, the similarity in title of two books published less than a year apart, by the same publisher (Baker), might lead the reader to assume a stronger relationship between them than is indicated in either.

Bauer's volume would also improve with a better framework for the narrative-critical commentary (chapters 4–7). Chapter 7 spans eighty

pages with only two section headings. Further, a conclusion or epilogue to summarize the findings of the narrative-critical study, and especially the author's third aim, would enhance the work. As it stands, the narrative-critical study simply ends the book.

Despite such suggestions for improvement, this volume is of great value to readers of the Bible. It helpfully demonstrates the benefits of narrative approaches to understanding entire biblical books. Bauer strikes a balance between story and history that neither divorces the content of Acts from its historical context nor transcends the boundaries of its genre. In so doing, he has modeled an approach worthy of consideration by all who faithfully seek to understand the Bible.

Hayden S. Fleming
Franklinton, North Carolina

Gregg R. Allison and Andreas J. Köstenberger. *The Holy Spirit*. Theology for the People of God. Nashville: B&H Academic, 2020. xxxi + 543 pp. Hardback. ISBN 978-1462757749. $44.99.

Starting with a theological topic of significant interest to churches, Gregg Allison and Andreas Köstenberger have initiated the Theology for the People of God series with their writing on the Holy Spirit. The series is intended to strengthen evangelical churches in major doctrinal teachings and other realms of theological study. As the series introduction states, the authors of this series will operate from a "convictionally Baptist and warmly evangelical" perspective (pp. xxi–xxii). The authors of this first entry format their work as a two-part survey. Köstenberger lays the foundation for pneumatology discussions in the first half of the book via biblical theology before Allison pursues systematic construction in the latter half. Köstenberger's biblical theology appears intended as a basis for Allison's systematic discussion.

Köstenberger notes the citations about the Holy Spirit from each book, corpus, and Testament, and ultimately from the whole canon. Using the term *ruach*, Köstenberger traces the Old Testament authors' references to the Spirit or Spirit of God, excluding references to human spirit and references to wind. In summarizing each section, he presents charts that depict the functions or characteristics of the Spirit that each citation emphasizes. He includes observations about books that either do not cite the Spirit explicitly or only have oblique references to the Spirit. Jeremiah, for example, does not clearly reference the Spirit, though Köstenberger notes that some verses about wind may be an oblique reference to the

Spirit's role in judgment. Köstenberger's OT work envisions an understanding of the Spirit as one who plays key roles in creation and judgment, inspires authoritative revelation, will anoint the Messiah for life and ministry, will indwell the people of God in the New Covenant, and will gift them in various ways consistent with both his previous patterns and eschatological expectations.

Looking at the New Testament, with its greater density of references to the Spirit, Köstenberger first considers the Gospels and Acts according to their canonical order. Diverging from his previous organizational strategy, he then arranges the Pauline section on the Spirit according to his view of Paul's chronological ordering. Among the many references to *pneuma* or *pneumatikos* within Paul's writings, he notes the emphasis Paul assigns to the Spirit in Galatians, 1 Corinthians, Romans (especially chapter 8), and Ephesians. He afterward examines claims about the Spirit in the General Epistles, while omitting James for its lack of explicit references to the Spirit. Köstenberger then provides some basic insights and summaries from his biblical theology survey, closing with an appendix of every explicit scriptural citation of the Spirit.

Allison begins his half of the book by establishing parameters for his systematic introduction to pneumatology. He cites the following as presuppositions to his claims: a traditional Trinitarian orientation, canonical reading of Scripture, covenantal framework to theological formulation, focus on the metaphorical outpouring of the Holy Spirit, expected revitalizing experience of the Holy Spirit for the normal Christian life, thanksgiving-filled theology, and missional pneumatology. He also distinguishes between the concepts of a spiritual age, age of the Spirit, and spirit of the age. Within these parameters, Allison engages the reader in discussion about the person of the Spirit within the Triune Godhead.

He addresses essential discussions on pneumatology, while challenging even experienced students of theology to increase their understanding of the Spirit's person and work. Allison states his views on debated matters within pneumatology while allowing for disagreement within an evangelical framework. He aligns himself with Augustine by assigning the titles of Love and Gift to the Spirit, though he acknowledges there are issues with some of Augustine's exegesis. After speaking to pneumatology within the discussion of the Trinity, Allison connects the discussion of the Spirit to all other traditional areas of theology, with his chapters on revelation, Christ, and the church having the most scriptural and historical discussion points. Even if a reader disagrees with Allison on some of the finer points of his pneumatology, his workmanship allows for involved discussion and dialogue on the topics. He ends with a pastoral application of his theological construction, helping the church to attend to matters of

the Spirit.

The two authors succeed in laying the biblical foundations of pneumatology and in constructing a sound framework for a systematic theology of the Spirit. While the book is intended to bolster the church's theological foundations, it is a tool best suited for students or church leaders with at least an introductory knowledge of the two theological fields of study. Allison and Köstenberger have formed a theological survey that should increase current and future church leaders' understanding of the Holy Spirit, while also educating them on the important distinction of and relationship between biblical theology and systematic theology. This work has great potential benefit for churches seeking to strengthen their theological foundations and their response to the Holy Spirit.

Christopher J. Jones
Richmond, Virginia

John Piper. *Providence*. Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2020. 751 pp. Hardback. ISBN 978-1433568343. $39.99.

John Piper's *Providence* offers a comprehensive treatment of the providence of God in Scripture and human experience. In short, the author aims to saturate the reader with God's "pervasive providence" (p. 13). Though the book is scholarly in its theology and exegesis, all will benefit from reading this book. Piper works through passages of Scripture with exegetical precision and pastoral wisdom. His goal is to display God's sovereignty throughout the Bible, and he accomplishes this well.

The work is divided into three parts. After a brief introduction (pp. 13–25), Piper defines his use of providence and addresses a potential issue with God's self-exaltation (pp. 29–45). His combination of exegetical, theological, and confessional work here forms the underpinning of the rest of the book. In Part 2 (chapters 3–14), the author walks through the two Testaments and interacts with both direct and indirect teachings about God's providence. He succeeds in treating large sections of Scripture (e.g., the Exodus account) while connecting pertinent related passages. He then addresses God's providence as it relates to spiritual and physical reality in Part 3 (chapters 15–45). This is the largest portion of the book. Here he covers spiritual entities (i.e., Satan and demons), sin, common human ordeals, conversion, and the Christian life. Finally, he offers ten "effects" of "knowing and loving" God's providence, which provides a practical conclusion to the work (p. 694).

Piper contributes significantly to an understanding of God's providence in several ways. First, his overview of the Scriptures contemplating

God's working is impressive. Covering a total of 150 pages, he moves concisely through numerous passages, but with serious treatment. As an example, he effectively summarizes the twenty-one-chapter book of Judges in just four pages (pp. 125–28).

A second strength of this work is the pastoral wisdom Piper provides. Especially in Part 3, he demonstrates his long pastoral experience by vividly discussing the connection between God's overall purpose and his specific direction of human history and experience. Discussing life and death for instance, he effectively treats difficult texts (e.g., Ruth 1) within the framework of God's providence. While not diminishing the pain and suffering people encounter, he seeks to anchor human experience to the overarching theme of God's sovereignty, exercised for the good of his people.

Third, Piper's arguments are strengthened by his willingness to engage opposing and conflicting views. To illustrate, in his discussion of 2 Thess 2:11, he does not pass over the apparent conflict between God's truthful nature and his use of deception. He works through that passage and several others, engaging in the difficult task of reconciling apparently contradictory texts, aligning them with other, clearer readings (pp. 467–73).

A fourth strength of this work is the author's ability to connect the doctrine of God's providence with diverse subjects. For example, in addressing the process of the believer's transformation (i.e., sanctification), Piper presents the believer's gradual growth not as a failure of God's providential guidance, but as his divine tool, "to be magnified in the way [God's] people prefer him over what Satan offers" (p. 657).

Given these strengths, at least one issue could cause problems. It entails Piper's treatment of God's providence and human sin. Indeed, he acknowledges the difficulty of the subject, problems with language, and the potential for misunderstanding (e.g., pp. 411–12n1). However, the struggle lies not so much in the author's conclusions, but in the short journey he takes to reach them. He begins his reasoning with a treatment of the apparent contradictions between God's providence and human responsibility. He positions the Scriptures as the authority and moves on to a human understanding of sin. He addresses the "assumptions" often connected to human autonomy and responsibility and answers them carefully, though briefly (pp. 415–17). Scholars have disagreed and will disagree with the author's judgment though. This is, no doubt, due to significant differences in theological beliefs. It would strengthen Piper's conclusions if he interacted with this challenging issue as deeply as he does with other topics, and in a work spanning more than 700 pages, it seems odd that this serious discussion would be so brief.

In any event, *Providence* will prove a necessary resource for theological

studies and pastoral ministry. Its length may prove prohibitive for some, but for the disciplined reader it will yield much profit.

Bobby Howell
Gray Court, South Carolina

Khaled Anatolios. *Deification through the Cross: An Eastern Christian Theology of Salvation*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2020. xxii + 464 pp. Hardback. ISBN 978-0802877987. $50.00.

An "Eastern approach" to Christian theology is currently trending, and rightly so since faith in Christ first took root in an eastern Mediterranean setting. The tree of the Church finds its native soil in the East. Professor of theology at Notre Dame Khaled Anatolios capitalizes on this welcome trend with his recent volume *Deification through the Cross*. As a systematic account of soteriology, the book claims a distinctively Eastern outlook on the cross, lacing its argument with an ecumenical sensitivity to the entire Christian tradition. Indeed, Anatolios reveals his erudition in this text by directing a chorus of voices both ancient and modern, from East and West, to hymn the deep meaning of Christ's saving death.

The heart of the argument involves a concept Anatolios calls "doxological contrition." Combining the themes of *glory* and *repentance*, this rich notion defines the very shape of Christ's salvific activity as well as the nature of human participation therein. Anatolios describes this dynamic reality as "the recognition of estrangement from divine glory and the setting out on the path of return to that glory" (p. 95). Particularly in his suffering and death, Christ sinlessly performed an act of vicarious contrition (i.e., repentance, return) for all human sin. Christ's representative sorrow over sin is encompassed, however, by the larger impetus of his ministry: to fulfill humanity's forsaken calling to receive a deifying share in the Trinitarian glory (p. 32). Thus, the realities of doxology and contrition intermingle as believers take up their crosses to replicate the repentance of Christ, in communion with Christ, thereby being enfolded into the mutual glorification of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit.

While tracing the contours of his soteriological model, Anatolios rightly upholds Christian Scripture, ecclesial tradition, and the experience of Byzantine liturgy as benchmarks of (Eastern) theological normativity. These sources all advocate a doctrine of doxological contrition. Yet, the experience of salvation in liturgical worship takes a certain methodological precedence, for the liturgy embodies the Church's normative reading of Scripture. Anatolios thus begins with an exposition of the Byzantine

Paschal liturgies, which relentlessly assimilate "the worshiper to the disposition of repentance," an attitude "always enfolded within a doxological ambience" (p. 91). Christian contrition flows from the cross; repenting with Christ—who realized salvation through vicarious repentance—means dying with Christ. This co-crucifixion with Christ, however, is liturgically interwoven with a co-glorification of the worshiper, nesting the *sorrowful repentance* of sins in an atmosphere of *joyful celebration* in the risen and ascended Lord (p. 92).

After surveying the doctrine of doxological contrition in the Old and New Testaments, Anatolios concludes that Christ's life, death, and resurrection signify the means of humankind's "return" to and retrieval of divine glory (p. 166). A fascinating chapter on the Church's dogmatic tradition then reveals how the seven ecumenical councils in their Trinitarian and Christological pronouncements consistently assume a "soteriological grammar" of deification. The very reason the fathers fought hard for the full divinity of Son and Spirit, along with the full humanity of Christ, was to secure humanity's deifying union with God via the deified humanity of Christ. The upshot of Anatolios's insightful proposal is that divinizing participation in God's life and glory is the nonnegotiable core of any normative, conciliar Christian soteriology (p. 223).

Anatolios also seeks to systematize his liturgical, biblical, and dogmatic findings concerning the cross and salvation. He incorporates the thought of theologians from the West (e.g., Anslem, Aquinas, and Matthias Scheeben) and the East (e.g., Nicholas Cabasilas, Gregory Palamas, and Dumitru Staniloae). Many points of interest arise from this section, but an inconsistency does as well: Anatolios tends to integrate more Western theology than seems amiable for an "Eastern approach." He claims this integrative method builds upon a contemporary "emergent momentum" to overcome polemical divisions (pp. 38–39). Perhaps so, but then a better subtitle for the work may have been *An Ecumenical Theology of Salvation*, for Anatolios employs authors that teach concepts such as the *filioque*. The East has explicitly and consistently rejected this doctrine, making tendentious his claim to find an "excellent interpretation" of the *filioque* in the theology of Dumitru Staniloae (pp. 261–62).

Anatolios also refuses to integrate the essence/energy distinction of the East, rejecting any version of the Eastern tradition "narrowly defined" over against the West (p. 278). One wonders, though, what would become of Eastern theology if it freely embraced distinctly Western doctrines and downplayed its own. Such a theology *might* be good, but it would cease to be distinctly Eastern. Other critiques in this vein include the book's heavily rational approach instead of a more mystical (Eastern) tack that illu-

mines the heart and promotes prayer. The work's academic prolixity detracts from a deep perception of its stunning truths—realities that, ultimately, should be directly experienced. The headiness of the argument left this reviewer (ironically, considering the book's contents) with a withered sense of soul. Without reservation, the book is recommended to ecumenically minded academicians. However, those seeking inspiration for spiritual encounter with divine glory by sharing in Christ's cruciform contrition may find less benefit therein.

Owen Kelly
Wake Forest, North Carolina

John R. Franke. *Missional Theology: An Introduction*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2020. 192 pp. Paperback. ISBN 978-0801036354. $22.99.

Missional Theology is a significant work for both missiologists and theologians. The author, John R. Franke, notes that it brings together several of his previous writings with the goal of moving the discussion about mission "from the periphery to the center of biblical interpretation, theological construction, congregational life, spiritual formation, and ministerial praxis" (p. xi). For this reason, scholars from various disciplines should benefit from this volume, finding it a helpful resource for further research.

The book contains five chapters. Chapters 1 and 2 unpack the theological foundation for missional theology. In these chapters, Franke shows that the fundamental nature of God (chapter 1) and of the Church (chapter 2) is mission. The first opens with the observation that the "starting point for missional theology is the notion of a missionary God…. God is, by God's very nature, a missionary God" (p. 1). From this, the author follows a more traditional exposition by showing how the *missio Dei* conversation of the early part of the twentieth century established that mission is not simply an activity of the church. Instead, the church is a missionary body because it is both connected to God by his act of redemption and is sent by God into the world as his representative.

In this context Franke explores the details of mission as God's program and the ministry of the church. It is here that the book may frustrate many evangelicals. The author's interpretation, while using familiar language, seems to shift away from a prioritist understanding of mission. Concerning the mission of God, he writes:

> Peace and harmony in the world are central to the mission of God. For the church in the context of the ancient world, this meant peace between Jew and gentile. For the church in the context of Christian Europe, it meant peace among competing Christian communities. For the church at the outset of the third millennium, it means peace among the religions of the world. (p. 24)

Then later, as he summarizes the salvation Jesus brought into the world, Franke describes Jesus's ministry with no reference to the atoning nature of his death and resurrection (p. 33). His neglect of spiritual reconciliation and the substitutionary nature of the mission of God is disappointing and may undermine the entire project's usefulness.

Despite these concerns, Franke does provide a robust exploration of the foundational elements necessary for developing and implementing a theology of mission. Also, at the end of his chapter on the mission of the church, he includes a section entitled, "Mission after Christendom." The quick history and warnings he presents here are important and worth considering by anyone interested in missional theology or missionary praxis.

In chapter 3, the author observes that the challenge of the day is for the church to be transformed from "a church with a mission to a missional church" (p. 61) This movement, he notes, will require the development of a "truly missional conception of theology" (p. 62) This development is the goal of his text. Here he defines missional theology, followed by helpful guidelines for "doing missional theology." In sum, this chapter is the backbone of the book and is Franke's contribution to the ongoing conversation about missional theology.

The final two chapters unpack the necessity of doing missional theology as a dialogue across ethnic and cultural boundaries, while striving to maintain the church's unity. These dual priorities create the vessel from which the church's missional theology flows. On the one hand, we cannot pretend that any culture is the sole owner of the church's theological expression. The (diverse) universal scope of the church was first highlighted in Acts 2 at Pentecost and must be maintained. At the same time, this diversity must not be schismatic. The unity of the church is an equally important aspect of its mission. For these reasons, missional theology must strive to maintain both elements.

As noted earlier, this book deserves careful consideration. As a missiologist, I appreciate the theological work that Franke brings to the conversation: The text should help readers of both disciplines. However, as highlighted above, it also has areas of weakness and concern. It is thus the reader's responsibility to discern both its implications and limitations.

D. Scott Hildreth
Wake Forest, North Carolina

Ike Miller. *Seeing by the Light: Illumination in Augustine's and Barth's Readings of John.* Downers Grove: IVP Academic, 2020. xviii + 229 pp. Paperback. ISBN 978-0830848850. $35.00

This volume is the latest publication of IVP's Studies in Christian Doctrine and Scripture, including a series introduction from Daniel J. Treier and Kevin J. Vanhoozer. In this book, Ike Miller brings two Christian giants together in understanding the writings of John on illumination. Miller argues that illumination is essential in comprehending the nature of revelation and how one receives it. He contends for an effectual and progressive illumination, moving from effectual call to obedience.

Part 1 discusses the homilies of Augustine of Hippo (AD 354–430) on the writings of John. It includes the history and development of Augustine's method, his tendency to interpret allegorically, and his work in combatting heresy. These sections are vital, showing readers the growth of Augustine's thought on illumination. For Augustine, the Scripture is inspired, and its ministry is to communicate the salvation found in Christ. This Christocentric approach influences his exegesis in three stages, literal-historical, salvation-historical (which can also be typological), and rhetorical-historical. These multilevel readings of the text also make his interpretation of illumination multidimensional. Accordingly, illumination is intellectual (it enlightens the mind), moral (entailing one's walk in obedience to God), and spiritual (effecting communion with the divine light).

According to Miller, Augustine's doctrine of illumination has two dimensions: light and participation. The former is described in four ways: first, it is the means that brings clarity to fallen minds; second, this light is the truth; third, this light enables a person to understand the truth; and fourth, this light is the radiance of divine perfection. The latter dimension entails participation in the divine light. This is possible because of the goodness of God. However, it connotes ontological transformation too because it is only through our adoption that we can possess the light of God. Therefore, participation is a gift of God.

Part 2 focuses on the methodology of Karl Barth (1886–1968). This section includes Barth's interpretation of certain passages in the Gospel of John and his understanding of illumination in five stages. His first interpretive lens is historical-critical information. The second is the canonical context (i.e., the world of the text). The third is the dialectical relationship between the historical, grammatical, and literal senses, with a theological grid centered on one theme—the revelation of God in Jesus Christ. Barth's fourth interpretation of Scripture is catholic. That is, he dialogues with the church fathers, the Reformers, and the Chalcedonian

Creed. The last stage is application. Overall, Barth believes that theological interpretation is dynamic because humans cannot master God; it is the other way around.

Miller also meticulously presents Barth's understanding of John 1–9. As such, readers would see this work as a commentary on different pericopes. Barth's understanding of the prologue may serve as an example. Here, his engagement emphasizes the theme of the Word of God as life and light. It encompasses "the relationships of grace and truth, incarnation and illumination, reconciliation [or redemption] and revelation" (p. 89). For Barth, life and light are not ideas but Jesus Christ himself, the only exegete of the Father.

Part 3 concludes the book with a treatment of the Johannine account of illumination. It includes a discussion of what it means to "come to see the light" (of Christ). Also, Miller elucidates the work of the Trinity in the economy of illumination and the nature of "participation in the light."

The book's structure is well balanced and orderly. Moving on from its subtitle, readers can easily follow its trajectory in the table of contents and introduction. Also, the use of footnotes (rather than endnotes) is helpful, enabling readers to study Miller's sources conveniently.

In sum, this work is a major achievement on the topic of illumination. It differs from others that focus only on illumination's cognitive aspect. Particularly commendable is its constructive approach, which draws on Scripture, Augustine, and Barth. Evangelicals at large should find it helpful in enriching their understanding of formation. First, formation is a continuous event (the Barthian spin). Second, formation occurs not so much by inculcating ideas in a person but by aligning one's love and desires to God so that he or she can participate in the light (the Augustinian element). The book is thus an invaluable gift, contributing to the intellectual and pastoral life of the church.

On a final note, by juxtaposing two great theologians' understanding of an important doctrine, Miller also serves seminary students. He not only introduces the doctrine of illumination but also provides a prolegomenon to the work of Augustine and Barth. So, *Seeing by the Light* should certainly take its place on the shelf of all those who love those giants of the faith.

Francis Jr. S. Samdao
Baguio City, Philippines

Eric C. Smith. *Oliver Hart and the Rise of Baptist America*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2020. 348 pp. Hardback. ISBN 978-0197506325. $99.00.

Many Baptists are convinced they understand the roots of the Southern Baptist Convention as the convergence of two disparate traditions. The "Charleston Tradition" was characterized by church order, theological precision, and hesitancy toward revival, while the "Sandy Creek Tradition" was marked by spiritual ardor, confessional skepticism, and revivalism. Furthermore, many believe that understanding the alleged differences between Charleston and Sandy Creek somehow holds the key to understanding the diversity among contemporary Southern Baptists. Calvinist soteriology or a commitment to confessionalism? That is the Charleston Tradition. Contemporary worship music or a commitment to altar calls? That is the Sandy Creek Tradition.

William Lumpkin first advanced this thesis in *Baptist Foundations in the South* (1961), which was a study of the origins and early development of the Separate Baptists in the South. But it was Walter Shurden who popularized Lumpkin's thesis and applied it to then-contemporary Southern Baptist tensions in his widely discussed 1980 Carver-Barnes Lecture at Southeastern Seminary and the resulting article in *Baptist History and Heritage* (1981), "The Southern Baptist Synthesis: Is it Cracking?" The Lumpkin-Shurden thesis is considered a truism of Baptist history—one of those concepts that *everybody* knows to be true.

Despite its lingering influence, the Lumpkin-Shurden thesis is a collection of half-truths and outright myths that has been leveraged (and at times weaponized) in internecine Baptist debates about inerrancy, Calvinism, worship, and theological education. In *Oliver Hart and the Rise of Baptist America*, pastor and historian Eric Smith separates myth from reality while offering a new history of early Baptists in the South. As the title indicates, the narrative is structured around the life of Oliver Hart (1724–1795), the longtime pastor of First Baptist Church of Charleston, the "mother church" of Southern Baptists.

Following the insights of Thomas Kidd, Smith demonstrates that most Regular Baptists such as Hart were moderate revivalists who saw themselves as the colonial version of the English Particular Baptist movement. Their quarrel was not with revival per se but with perceived excesses such as alleged visions, claiming to know who was regenerate or not, and physical experiences such as jerking or fainting. The Separate Baptists were radical revivalists who were less concerned with the latter phenomena since they were an indigenous colonial Baptist movement

that was birthed from the First Great Awakening. In making this argument, Smith builds on his earlier monograph, *Order and Ardor: The Revival Spirituality of Oliver Hart and the Regular Baptists in Eighteenth-Century South Carolina* (2018).

From this foundation, Smith shows that there was significantly more interchange between Regular Baptists and Separate Baptists than is often assumed. Furthermore, their differences were more often a matter of style than substance, a reality recognized at the time by leaders in both movements. Over a generation, the two trajectories coalesced into a unified Baptist movement in the South around the turn of the nineteenth century, just in time to contribute to the formation of the Triennial Convention in 1814 and to later break away as the Southern Baptist Convention in 1845. Relationships were key in uniting pro-revival Calvinistic Baptists, and Smith argues that Hart was at the center of many of those relationships, rubbing shoulders with the leading Regular and Separate Baptists of the era.

Hart was nurtured in the Philadelphia Association, was the pioneering Baptist leader in the Coastal South, and spent time in New Jersey during the American Revolution. Along the way, he played an instrumental role in introducing the associational principle to the South with the formation of the Charleston Baptist Association, championing moderate revivalism, advocating for the importance of ministerial education, promoting evangelistic outreach and church planting, supporting the colonial side in the American Revolution, and establishing a common identity among nearly all Calvinistic Baptists along the Eastern Seaboard. Smith treats Hart as something of a Baptist Forrest Gump who was present for nearly every important historical turn prior to, and ultimately paving the way for, the American Baptist embrace of the modern missions movement and a more transregional denominational structure in the early 1800s.

Smith advances a helpful recontextualization of American Baptist history in the eighteenth century, with emphasis on developments in the South. He tells the story of emerging Baptist denominationalism in the Coastal South through the experiences of Hart, who was among the most influential players of the era. Smith also offers a window into everyday Baptist faith and practice through the eyes of Hart and the many leading ministers with whom he interacted. If there is one weakness to Smith's work, it suffers from exaggerating the importance of Hart to the exclusion of other key players, especially Morgan Edwards and John Gano, both of whose lives were contemporaneous with Hart. All three were Calvinistic moderate revivalists whose influence transcended any particular region, touched upon every aspect of Baptist development during the era, and who served as bridge-builders between different types of Baptists.

Overall, Smith has done an exemplary job of demonstrating Hart's seminal role in American Baptist development in the eighteenth century. One hopes for similar fresh studies of figures such as Edwards and Gano, as well as younger contemporaries such as Richard Furman, Thomas Baldwin, and John Leland. Embedded in their overlapping stories is the larger story of how Baptists in America evolved from backwater sectarians in 1715 to a national evangelical denomination by 1815.

Nathan A. Finn
Tigerville, South Carolina

Thomas Breimaier. *Tethered to the Cross: The Life and Preaching of C. H. Spurgeon*. Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 2020. xvi + 271 pp. Hardback. ISBN 978-0830853304. $35.00.

Thomas Breimaier has successfully contributed a fresh piece of scholarship to the field of research on Charles Haddon Spurgeon. In sum, he aims to identify and analyze Spurgeon's approach to biblical hermeneutics. He argues that Spurgeon read the entire Bible through the lens of the cross, always hoping to foster the conversion of his hearers and readers. Toward this aim, the author tracks Spurgeon's crucicentrism and conversionism. Simply put, he seeks to demonstrate that Spurgeon pursued the cross of Christ in every sermon he preached and in every work he wrote. Furthermore, he sought to preach and write in such a way that he could persuade people to convert to Christ by faith. Breimaier thus serves today's preachers through this helpful new analysis of Victorian preaching and hermeneutics.

In the first chapter, the author provides a biographical introduction to Spurgeon. He looks specifically into how Spurgeon was steered early in life toward the pursuit of a crucicentric and conversionistic ministry. He notes how Spurgeon enjoyed access to his grandfather's Puritan library. He also highlights how Spurgeon's moment of conversion in 1850 set him on a course of preaching Christ crucified. Having heard a lay preacher take the text of Isa 45:22 and exhort his hearers to look to Jesus, Spurgeon was turned to faith and called into a ministry where he would do the same—call his hearers to look to Jesus from every text in the Bible.

In the second chapter, Breimaier examines Spurgeon's early ministry. In particular, he notes how Spurgeon established a variety of ministry pursuits, including a college to train pastors, successful orphanage ministries, Bible distribution, and his magazine, *The Sword and the Trowel*. As he examines these ministry developments, he points out that Spurgeon demonstrated an acute focus on the cross with a call to conversion.

In the third and fourth chapters, Breimaier investigates Spurgeon's approach to Old Testament and New Testament interpretation, respectively. He begins by setting the stage of nineteenth-century historical-critical scholarship, acknowledging how Spurgeon maintained a high view of Scripture and a clear priority to preach the gospel. In these chapters, the author presents Spurgeon's interpretation of the various genres of Scripture, including the historical books, wisdom literature, prophetic books, Gospels, epistles, and apocalyptic literature. He repeatedly shows how Spurgeon, preaching from any portion of Scripture, aimed at the gospel.

In the fifth and sixth chapters, Breimaier reviews Spurgeon's ministry outside the pulpit, specifically in his later years. He provides more discussion on *The Sword and the Trowel* and explores how Spurgeon found himself in battle and controversy, particularly in what has become known as the Downgrade Controversy. Much of what motivated Spurgeon during these difficulties was his passion to preach the cross of Christ and call people to respond to the good news. Specifically, he asserts that "Spurgeon used his resources and influence to emphasize the cross of Christ and to encourage others to use the Bible for evangelistic ends" (p. 206).

The attentive reader can detect at times that this book began as the author's doctoral dissertation. He presents wave after wave of evidence, all focused on his singular thesis. The reader thus faces one example after another of Spurgeon's preaching, writing, and efforts, which Breimaier uses to show how Spurgeon points to the cross and pleads with people to turn to Christ.

The book, while not overly large, is very thorough. This reviewer particularly appreciates the author's provision of a significant amount of biographical information on Spurgeon. In addition to the biographical information, Breimaier showcases a wide array of Spurgeon's preaching and writing. He also effectively fits Spurgeon into the historical, evangelical, and scholarly context of the nineteenth century, with a keen emphasis on how Spurgeon interacted with the ongoing critical scholarship of that day. By looking at Spurgeon's Old Testament preaching, New Testament preaching, magazine publications, and other ministry efforts, the author provides significant evidence substantiating his thesis.

In conclusion, Breimaier's examination is well balanced. He admires Spurgeon's gospel focus and accomplishments strongly, but also provides moments of objective critique. *Tethered to the Cross* is recommended to all readers who want to excel in hermeneutics and preaching by looking at their craft through the eyes of this key champion of evangelicalism.

Michael Hull
Chapin, South Carolina

Esau McCaulley. *Reading While Black: African American Biblical Interpretation as an Exercise of Hope*. Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 2020. 198 pp. Paperback. ISBN 978-0830854868. $18.00.

Esau McCaulley is Assistant Professor of New Testament at Wheaton College and author of *Sharing in the Son's Inheritance: Davidic Messianism and Paul's Worldwide Interpretation of the Abrahamic Land Promise in Galatians* (T&T Clark, 2019). He is also a regular op-ed writer for *The New York Times* and *The Washington Post*. His *Reading While Black* introduces a "black ecclesial interpretation" that Black pastors and scholars of faith have discovered in the entire sweep of Black church life (pp. 4–5).

A black ecclesial interpretation includes theological commitments that stand in contradistinction to those of black liberationists, Anglo moderate and liberal biblical interpreters (who often inhabit the academy), and white evangelicals. The latter includes some evangelicals who insist that their interpretative practices are transcendent of contextual considerations.

To clarify, McCaulley positively employs David Bebbington's quadrilateral to elucidate the theological presuppositions of black ecclesial interpretation. This entails:

1. *Conversionism*: The belief that lives need to be transformed through a "born-again" experience and a lifelong process of following Jesus.
2. *Activism*: The expression and demonstration of the gospel in missionary and social reform efforts.
3. *Biblicism*: A high regard for and obedience to the Bible as the ultimate authority.
4. *Crucicentrism*: A stress on the sacrifice of Jesus Christ on the cross as making possible the redemption of humanity.

While McCaulley affirms Bebbington's marks of evangelicalism as appropriately foundational to black ecclesial interpretation, he highlights one of the latter's key theological presuppositions by insisting that "very few black churches would have a problem with what is included in the list. The problem is what is left out" (p. 10). Specific omissions for McCaulley are concern for injustice and the ethical outworking of the Christian faith.

Throughout the book, the author emphasizes a "hermeneutic of trust" (p. 20), relying on biblical authority to guide his introduction to a black ecclesial interpretation. He treads a fine line as he considers the reader's context which is nevertheless under the authority of the biblical text: "Although I believe we must engage in a dialogue with the text, I acknowledge that ultimately the Word of God speaks the final word" (p. 20). Context

matters, but the Word of God is ultimate. McCaulley elucidates:

> … just as their context spoke to the Bible, the Bible, as the Word of God, spoke back…. If our experiences pose particular and unique questions of the Scriptures, then the Scriptures also pose unique questions to us. Although there are some experiences that are common to humanity, there are some ways in which the Bible will pose particular challenges to African Americans. For example, the theme of forgiveness and the universal kinship of humanity are both a boon and a trial for Black Christians because of the historic and ongoing oppression of Black people in this country. (p. 20)

So, contextuality is not lorded over the biblical text. Rather, it must be considered to discern how Christ's lordship informs specific circumstances.

Thinking practically, the gap in the interpretative dialectic was clarified for McCaulley when he was asked a question while lecturing a group of Church of God in Christ pastors. He recounts:

> [A minister] said that he accepted my criticism of a complacent orthodoxy that doesn't advocate for the oppressed. But when he sends his clergy to colleges and seminaries that share his concern for the disinherited, too often that comes at the price of the theological beliefs that he holds dear…. The conversation distilled for me the growing sense of unease with elements of the Black progressive experience. I could nod my head during some of the social analysis, but some Black progressives shared the same disdain for traditional belief [i.e., Christian Orthodoxy] that I had witnessed among my mainline professors. (p. 14)

With this in mind, McCaulley explores a black ecclesial interpretative model. He does so by considering unconventional topics for biblical texts while maintaining his historically evangelical theological commitments. He thus includes chapters on policing (chapter 2), political protest (chapter 3), justice (chapter 4), ethnicity (chapter 5), black anger (chapter 6), and the relationship between the Bible and slavery (chapter 7).

The utility of this volume is vast. Thoughtful lay people, students, and scholars interested in the African American Christian tradition will be enriched by it. In addition, the book is beneficial to those interested in a biblical interpretation that champions the authority of Scripture but is not willfully blind to the considerations of those undertaking the interpretative process. McCaulley proves that contextual consideration is not cultural captivity. Rather, acknowledging unique contextual considerations under the authority of the biblical text is an exercise in hope.

In sum, *Reading While Black* is a key work on biblical interpretation in the early twenty-first century. It is particularly invaluable as it unveils the biblical underpinnings of a rigorously orthodox tradition of black faith in America.

Walter R. Strickland II
Wake Forest, North Carolina

Priscilla Pope-Levison. *Models of Evangelism*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2020. 208 pp. Paperback. ISBN 978-0801099496. $21.99.

In a climate where some Christians avoid evangelism, Priscilla Pope-Levison's *Models of Evangelism* offers a thoughtful and encouraging resource for churches reevaluating how to do it well. She presents a much-needed categorization of various methods of Christian evangelism across time, denominations, and cultures. She claims, "The history of evangelism is a diverse litany…. Evangelists come in all shapes and sizes" (p. 5). Pope-Levison argues that the future of evangelism is not found in mastery of one model but through a combination of models in a culturally appropriate way. She states, "A vital, promising future for evangelism will happen only as individual models combust [sic] to create a model uniquely suited to each particular context" (p. 9). By combining models, churches can create the greatest evangelistic impact for their community.

Pope-Levison presents eight models: personal evangelism, small group evangelism, visitation evangelism, liturgical evangelism, church growth evangelism, prophetic evangelism, revival evangelism, and media evangelism. Though she acknowledges the possibility of other models, she chooses these eight because of their longevity across history, the significant amount of literature available about them, and the number of their proponents (p. 7). She also chooses distinctly wide-ranging models to highlight the broad strokes of Christian evangelism throughout the ages.

As the author introduces each model, she describes its biblical bases, theological themes, historical examples, and practical implementation. She relies on the words and arguments of proponents of each model to do so. She then gives a brief appraisal, critiquing things such as pragmatism, an inward-focused small group spirituality, and the downplaying of the Holy Spirit. She also suggests multiple ways that Christians could combine the other models with the model under review for a fully orbed evangelistic effort. For example, she recommends coupling a revival model with visitation and prophetic models (pp. 153–54). In doing so, she provides practical ways in which churches can combine the various models

and gives glimpses of their combustible power.

Reflecting on all the models, Pope-Levison suggests that *good* evangelism across the ages includes five main ingredients: "hospitality, relationship, integrity, message bearing, and church rootedness" (p. 181). These comments about good evangelism challenge Christians who adhere to all types of models to pursue a fully expressed evangelism that Christians both proclaim and live. In sum, the models encourage intentionality, Christian charity, and bold proclamation.

The author also offers diverse views through diverse voices. Her examples include women, minorities, and leaders in the global church. She illuminates overall trends in evangelism across Christianity, a feat many authors have not attempted because of the plethora of denominational and practical distinctions. A Methodist professor, she analyzes evangelism models prevalent in other denominations fairly, including Catholic, Southern Baptist, non-denominational, and many others. Her historical examples often highlight seemingly unlikely bedfellows across time and geography. For example, her prophetic evangelism model includes Charles Finney, John Perkins, and Orlando Costas.

One of the most important contributions of Pope-Levison's book is the crucial link between evangelism and the church. Some models, such as the liturgical or church growth models, denote an obvious tie to the church; others do not. Yet, even in seemingly individualistic evangelism models such as personal evangelism, the author points to their connection to the body of Christ. For example, she states, "The church may not be on the edge of personal evangelism—that is the job of individuals—but it certainly provides sustenance and grounding and a community to bolster the evangelist" (p. 29). As noted above, she presents "church rootedness" as one of the five marks of good evangelism (pp. 189–90). Evangelism, no matter the model, is best done in the context of the church.

Because she explores models across denominations, some evangelists and professors might challenge some of Pope-Levison's models. First, she includes diverse biblical bases and theological themes that some Christians might contest. For example, her small group model is rooted theologically in the Social Trinity, which some Christians accept and others dispute (pp. 35–37). Second, she is intentionally ambiguous about her definition of evangelism and the gospel. She states, "No one definition of evangelism is universally accepted, yet common to those presented here is the promise of evangelism that issues invitations, forges relationships, relieves hunger, quenches thirst, restores fruitfulness and reconciles estranged parties" (p. 6). She includes "message bearing" as one of the factors required of good evangelism but leaves the reader to decide what that message should encompass (pp. 187–89). This ambiguity of terms allows

her to explore many diverse models but could lead to critiques by evangelists and evangelism teachers who desire stronger definitions or denominational distinctives.

In any event, Pope-Levison's *Models of Evangelism* demonstrates that churches do not need to discard or avoid evangelism. Instead, they can thoughtfully build a contextually relevant evangelism strategy based on several integrated methods and seasoned with the five flavors of good evangelism. Evangelism is not a relic of the past but an invigorating and life-giving part of today's church.

Anna Daub
Wake Forest, North Carolina

Carl R. Trueman. *The Rise and Triumph of the Modern Self: Cultural Amnesia, Expressive Individualism, and the Road to Sexual Revolution*. Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2020. 425 pp. Hardback. ISBN 978-1433556333. $34.99.

Esteemed historian Carl Trueman's timely work is aimed at Christian readers who ask, how did we get to a world where the idea of a woman trapped in a man's body is taken seriously? (p. 23) Tracing the contours of cultural change related to the sexual revolution, this volume is not a remedy for the cultural challenges Christianity faces. Instead, it is a work of history and philosophy. Analytical rather than polemical in nature, Trueman nevertheless highlights the rise of radicalism and the question of sexual and gender identity, writing as a Christian for Christians.

In Part 1, the book's framework takes shape, based on the work of three significant scholars: Philip Rieff, Charles Taylor, and Alasdair MacIntyre. Each of these figures contributes to Trueman's narrative of the development of human identity as psychological self-identity. The primary theme of the book, grounded in this collective framework, is that "psychological man and expressive individualism shape the dominant understanding of what it means to be a human self in this present age" (p. 64).

Trueman turns to a historical survey in the second and third parts. He begins with Rousseau as an advocate for the notion that society, with its shaping influence, corrupts individuals and individuality (p. 115). The rise of expressive individualism begins with this belief in the corrupting influence of society on the individual. Wordsworth, Shelley, and Blake then follow as examples of those who accepted this understanding and sought to express themselves outside the influence of society. Trueman next highlights Nietzsche's role in the rise of the modern view of self through

a conception of the world without God's imposition of identity (pp. 173–75). It thus becomes important to frame human existence outside of any conception of God's existence. Marx then emerges as one who posits human existence in economic and political terms. Finally, Darwin appears as the one who brings to culmination a world without God. Darwin's contribution is that "the world as we have it does not need a designer or divine architect" (p. 186).

In Part 3, Trueman turns to the "sexualization" of modern culture with an explanation of Freud's work associating human identity with sex: "sex is the real key to human existence, to what it means to be human" (p. 204). Freud is pivotal to Trueman's argument—as the figure who takes the individual expressionism he inherited and makes sex the basis for human identity (p. 221).

The final part is a series of case studies that demonstrate how the view of the human self from Rousseau to Freud has triumphed in modern culture. The first category of case studies is "The Triumph of the Erotic" (p. 271). The examples Trueman cites all relate to the pornification of culture, which is intent on "overturning a Western culture that was built on a Christian social ethic" (p. 298).

Next is the "Triumph of the Therapeutic," by which Trueman means "expressive individualism working out in the public sphere" (p. 302). Representative of the therapeutic are gay marriage, the decline of human exceptionalism, the incidence of abortion and infanticide, and free speech on college campuses. The consequence of the triumph of the therapeutic is that "cultural amnesia is the order of the day, a political imperative, a fundamental aspect of the social imaginary" (p. 337).

The final chapter in Part 4 is "The Triumph of the T," or Transgenderism (p. 339). The transgender community calls into question the identification of female existence with the female body or male existence with the male body (p. 374). For Trueman, the triumph of transgenderism means that human "identity is almost entirely internalized, so that in theory a parent does not necessarily know whether a particular child is a son or a daughter" (p. 377).

Trueman writes with gripping prose. As a contribution to the history of philosophy, *The Rise and Triumph of the Modern Self* carries the reader through times of significant upheaval with both care and confidence. Its conclusions are warranted by the narrative account.

Trueman's volume identifies significant matters of concern for Christians who desire to understand the world surrounding them. From the perspective of pastoral concern, the book helps readers navigate largely unfamiliar waters. Besides explaining the root causes of the highly politi-

cized and overtly sexualized world in which Christians live, the work allows for self-reflection. It provides a way for Christians to discover potential philosophical and psychological steps they have taken that have perhaps shaped their own way of thinking about sex, human identity, or even God. When human identity is centered in the desire to cast off the oppressive restraints of both God and a culture shaped by theism—to replace it with a world where meaning is related only to the individual and her or his personal expression—the outcome is what we now know.

Steven A. McKinion
Wake Forest, North Carolina

Sue Ellen Browder. *Sex and the Catholic Feminist: New Choices for a New Generation*. San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 2020, 152 pp. Paperback. ISBN 978-1950939039. $15.95.

Can a woman believe in God and be a feminist? In her book *Sex and the Catholic Feminist: New Choices for a New Generation*, Sue Ellen Browder challenges the contemporary idea that Christianity and feminism are incompatible. Browder is a writer, freelance journalist, and former pro-choice feminist whose career as a journalist for *Cosmopolitan* placed her on the front line of the hijacking of the American Women's Movement from a pro-life movement focused on personhood to a pro-choice movement seeking fulfillment in sexuality. As a professing Catholic pro-life feminist, Browder takes readers through a brief historical survey of the Women's Movement to argue for its underlying theme of personhood and its pro-life origins, before tracing its radical transformation into a pro-choice movement.

According to Browder, the first and second wave of the Women's Movement primarily focused on human dignity and held pro-life, anti-abortion, and pro-family views. To support this claim, Browder focuses on Alice Paul, a known Quaker who rooted her activism in her belief that "men and women have equal dignity in the eyes of God" (p. 25). Additionally, women such as Susan B. Anthony, Elizabeth Cady Stanton, and Margaret Sanger each held anti-abortion views. Browder notes these views as follows: "'They called it 'child-murder' (Susan B. Anthony), 'degrading to women' (Elizabeth Cady Stanton), 'most barbaric' (Margaret Sanger)'" (p. 30). Moreover, at the beginning of the second wave, Betty Friedan, that wave's pioneer, held a favorable view of marriage and motherhood but focused on the *something* she felt women were missing, which was work.

The shift began during the second wave of the movement, with the

help of the news media and books on sexuality. Publications by Alfred Kinsey titled *Sexual Behavior in the Human Male* and *Sexual Behavior in the Human Female*, Hugh Hefner's *Playboy Magazine*, and *Cosmo Magazine* each contributed to revolutionizing the concept of sexuality. Browder pays particular attention to her former boss, Helen Gurley Brown, the creator of *Cosmo Magazine*. Brown created the "Cosmo girl," a woman who utilized her femininity to secure sexual satisfaction, power, and fulfillment. Brown's goal was to persuade women to discard motherhood and marriage in exchange for sexual power, freedom, and autonomy.

By the 1960s, Friedan's friendship with notable pro-abortion advocates Dr. Lawrence Lader, whose abortion book was used in the *Roe v. Wade* proceedings, and Bernard Nathanson changed her feminist agenda. Friedan adopted Lader and Nathanson's pro-abortion views in hopes of decreasing discrimination toward women due to pregnancy. By the second annual National Organization for Women (NOW) conference in 1967, Friedan fully embraced the pro-choice agenda, dedicating two of eight articles of NOW's bill of rights, which focused on the special status of women, to repealing abortion laws. Friedan's influence was then supplanted by Kate Millet's *Sexual Politics* which entangled the term *patriarchy* with the feminist movement. Millet's anti-God sentiment included conflating Christianity with patriarchy and thus placing feminism in opposition to Christianity. As a result, the earlier movement was fully transformed into an anti-patriarchal, sexually freeing, pro-choice movement.

Browder showcases the pro-life values of early feminists, rejecting the notion that feminism has always been at odds with Christianity. By highlighting the activism of prominent first waver Alice Paul, she demonstrates that earlier Christians did not see their involvement in women's rights as conflicting with their Christian faith. Browder's discussion on notable publications, Helen Gurley Brown, and male abortion activists thus shows the intentionality directed towards reorienting women, to emphasize their sexuality and to encourage a move away from motherhood.

Though insightful, several weaknesses appear in Browder's argument. First, Browder presents conclusions on the Women's Movement based on just a few women. Ironically, Browder attempts to prove her thesis by following a methodology like the one she criticizes in her book, which is using the sentiments of a few to make a widespread assertion about an entire movement. Second, Browder's presentation of Margaret Sanger's anti-abortion conviction is misleading. It is true that Sanger spoke negatively about abortion, but she appears to be pro-woman and not pro-life. Sanger's writings scarcely mention the preservation of babies or their suffering during abortions. Instead, Sanger advocated for birth control because of her desire to alleviate abortion-induced suffering for women and

to provide low-income women with safer methods of pregnancy prevention. Third, Browder simplifies the complexity of the Women's Movement and does not discuss the nuances of issues surrounding women, sex, and their bodies, which paint the entirety of the later waves as antithetical to Christianity. Fourth, though Browder proves that some women were anti-abortion in the earlier movement, she fails to prove that the movement itself was pro-life or seeking personhood. Nonetheless, Browder shows Christians that feminism rooted in humility and the selfless pursuit of God-given human dignity, for every person, is truly Christian.

Sherelle Ducksworth
Wake Forest, North Carolina