



Journal of the EVANGELICAL THEOLOGICAL SOCIETY

CONTENTS

Satan: God's Servant.....	449
Sydney H. T. Page	
The Public Reading of Scripture in Early Judaism	467
Michael Graves	
Goliath and the Exodus Giants: How Tall Were They?	489
Clyde E. Billington	
The Height of Goliath: A Response to Clyde Billington	509
J. Daniel Hays	
Proverbs 11:30: Soul-Winning or Wise Living?.....	517
Lee M. Fields	
Defining the Titles "Christ" and "Son of God" in Mark's Narrative Presentation of Jesus	537
Herbert W. Bateman IV	
Conditionality in John's Gospel: A Critique and Examination of Time and Reality as Classically Conceived in Conditional Constructions	561
Michael J. Thate	
Patriarchy and Domestic Violence: Challenging Common Misconceptions	573
Steven R. Tracy	
Book Reviews.....	595
Index of Book Reviews	671

their membership in the body of Christ. The key ingredient for believers to make the ethical transition is their acquisition of the "mind ($\nu\omicron\varsigma$) of Christ" (1 Cor 2:16), whereby God has allowed them to comprehend the new order of humanity instituted in Christ. Paul then follows another Stoic parallel in 1 Corinthians 13 in showing that "love," resulting from having the mind of Christ, is a "more excellent way" to conduct relationships and build up the body of Christ. In 1 Corinthians 14 Paul provides the corresponding precepts in the context of discussing the gifts of tongues and prophecy. Discussion reserved for chapter 14 is surprisingly brief, and the author is more ready to claim parallels between Stoic conceptions of $\epsilon\rho\omega\varsigma$ -love and friendship ($\phi\iota\lambda\iota\alpha$) with Paul's concept of $\alpha\gamma\acute{\alpha}\pi\eta$ -love in 1 Corinthians 13 than some readers might be.

One of the useful contributions of the book is Lee's analysis of the role of the "mind ($\nu\omicron\varsigma$) of Christ" referenced in 1 Cor 2:16. For the Stoics the $\nu\omicron\varsigma$ was the unique possession of humanity, which allowed it to comprehend the universal order and act appropriately. Lee argues that Paul's purpose in 1 Corinthians 1–2 is to change the Corinthians' "noetic disposition" so that they view their experiences according to the values of the cross instead of the world (p. 162). In other words, as a result of the presence of the Spirit, Paul calls for a cognitive transformation based on an understanding of the cross, which allows them to appropriate the values necessary to live in the eschatological age of the new humanity. However, while drawing out the Stoic similarities, Lee could have more directly engaged the striking dissimilarities in the same passage. The Stoic $\pi\upsilon\epsilon\delta\mu\alpha$ universally present in humanity is hardly similar to the divine active agent in Paul. Moreover, (as Lee admits) Stoic theological language is often ambiguous. If among Stoic writers "God" may be equated to mind (either $\nu\omicron\varsigma$ or $\lambda\omicron\gamma\omicron\varsigma$), spirit ($\pi\upsilon\epsilon\delta\mu\alpha$), soul, fate, providence, nature, governor, and the body of the universe itself, one wonders if Stoic pantheistic monism provides any valid parallel. Likewise, while the moral transformation for the Stoics is completely a process of cognitive recognition, Paul makes it clear that faith necessary for moral transformation is not accessible through human wisdom but depends on the power of God (1 Cor 2:5).

The contrasts that Lee offers between Paul and the Stoics are often more interesting than the similarities. While the Stoics used the body metaphor commonly to reinforce traditional hierarchy, Paul uses it to highlight a status reversal. The weak are indispensable, and the less honorable are given more respect. While this distinction has been observed before, Lee shows how it was not merely a differing principle of social ethics, but a fundamentally different way of comprehending reality. Likewise, in linking the "mind of Christ" with Paul's exhortation to "think" in the pattern of Christ in Phil 2:5, Lee also points out that the love exemplified by Christ in the Philippians passage stood in opposition to conventional Stoic standards of friendship. Thus for Paul, having the mind of Christ means to love as it is defined according to the order of the universe redefined through Christ's sacrifice. It is this type of love in 1 Corinthians 14 that then motivates Paul's surprising elevation of prophecy over tongues, despite the fact that in the ancient world tongues would have been regarded as the higher-status gift.

Overall, the examination of the body metaphor might have worked better as a study to compare and contrast Paul with the Stoics rather than to argue for an overt parallel. Nevertheless Lee's comparison of the Stoic teaching on the "mind" and the unity of universal humanity with Paul's exhortation to take on the "mind of Christ" as a call for unity in "a new humanity" is a worthwhile contribution.

Barry N. Danylak
Cambridge University, Cambridge, United Kingdom

Hebrews: A Commentary. By Luke Timothy Johnson. NTL. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2006, xxviii + 402 pp., \$49.95.

Hebrews: A Commentary is part of the New Testament Library series, which intends (according to the jacket sleeve of the commentary) to present readers with (1) "fresh translations based on the best available ancient manuscripts"; (2) "critical portrayals of the historical world in which the books were created"; (3) "careful attention to their literary design"; and (4) "a theologically perceptive exposition of the biblical text."

Johnson's contribution to the series begins with a lengthy and impressive list of commentaries, monographs, and important articles (pp. xvii–xxviii), followed by an introduction (pp. 1–60). The principal part of the book, "The Commentary" (pp. 63–359), divides into twenty-eight units, which are generally eight to twelve pages in length. Each unit has (1) a summary statement; (2) a translation; (3) a brief set of textual notes concerning alternative readings in major Greek manuscripts; and then (4) an easy-to-read, verse-by-verse exposition of the passage.

Interspersed throughout these units of thought are seven excursuses, which examine issues such as "Why the Angels" (pp. 82–84), "The Wilderness as Paradigm" (pp. 119–22), "Suffering and the Obedience of Faith" (pp. 149–52), "The Mysterious Melchizedek" (pp. 181–83), "Old and New Covenants" (pp. 210–15), "Sanctuaries Material and Ideal" (pp. 227–32), and "In Praise of Israel's Heroes" (pp. 310–12). The book ends with a set of indexes: an Ancient Sources Index (pp. 361–97), a Modern Authors Index (pp. 398–400), and a Subject Index, which appears to lack depth (pp. 401–2).

The introduction (pp. 1–60) is broken into four units. First, Johnson presents the place of "Hebrews in the Christian Tradition" (pp. 3–8), where he discusses the eventual acceptance of Hebrews into the NT canon. Second, he sketches the configuration of "Hebrews as a First-Century Composition" (pp. 8–32), in which he addresses the language, literary form, symbolic world, and argument of Hebrews. Of these subsections, Johnson's "symbolic world" is most important, because he avers, "The Platonism of Hebrews is real—and critical to understanding its argument—but it is a Platonism that is stretched and reshaped by engagement with Scripture, and above all, by the experience of a historical human savior whose death and resurrection affected all human bodies and earthly existence as a whole" (p. 21). Although much of his commentary focuses on how Hebrews quotes or interprets the OT (p. 24) and interacts with first-century Jewish works like those at Qumran, Johnson believes that "the sort of Hellenistic Judaism represented by Philo remains the best overall symbolic world within which to read Hebrews" (p. 28).

Third, and as we might suspect of any introduction, Johnson isolates the standard questions of introduction in the unit "The Circumstances of Composition" (pp. 32–44), where he focuses attention on the rhetorical situation, date (likely between AD 50 and 70), and authorship (favors Apollos over Barnabas as the best two options). Finally, Johnson includes a unit in which he sketches some of the distinctive theological dimensions of Hebrews that continue to challenge readers today (pp. 44–60). He discusses God and Scripture in Hebrews through Platonic eyes, the teaching about Jesus Christ in Hebrews, and discipleship in Hebrews, which involves loyalty, virtues, and suffering. He concludes that "Hebrews challenges present-day sensibilities most of all by seeing suffering as the very heart of discipleship." "Suffering," he muses, "is the inevitable concomitant of obedient faith itself. It is the sound of the human spirit opening itself to the presence and power of God. It is the very path by which humans become transformed, as was Jesus, into fully mature children of God" (p. 60).

Johnson's commentary on Hebrews (pp. 63–359) appears to be in keeping with the series for which it has been written. First, Johnson's translations are fresh and based

upon major textual evidence. He identifies regularly his exceptions to other translations of the Greek text, which tend to be set off in his exposition with the phrase "my translation . . ." (pp. 64, 274). Other times they are evident in the vast array of word studies and evaluations of Greek syntax. Unfortunately, only the transliteration of the Greek word or phrase appears in parentheses. Second, special attention is given to the world in which Hebrews was created. He underscores any conceivable echo of Platonic thought. He observes, "Hebrews shares the Platonic language that we find in Philo" (p. 19). "In Platonism," he avers, "the choice between one over the many is always resolved in favor of the one" (p. 65, cf. p. 244). Furthermore, poles of thinking in Hebrews, such as temporal/eternal (p. 235), external/internal (p. 235), real/more real (p. 243), visible/invisible (p. 277), material/invisible (p. 329, 335), what is human/what is divine (p. 331), are discussed to uphold Platonic influence. Finally, he provides the reader with a theologically perceptive exposition of the biblical text that highlights the importance of Scripture, the mature teaching about Christ, and discipleship, which resonates throughout the commentary on Hebrews. Thus these three aspects are well done and in keeping with objectives of the New Testament Library series. Yet careful attention to the literary design of Hebrews was disappointing in that Johnson provides no outline for Hebrews, which stands in contrast to other commentaries in this series (cf. M. Eugene Boring, *Mark: A Commentary*, pp. 4–6; Frank J. Matera, *II Corinthians: A Commentary*, pp. 3–9; Raymond F. Collins, *1 & 2 Timothy and Titus: A Commentary*, pp. 20, 186, 300).

Although similarities between Johnson's commentary on Hebrews and other recent commentaries have been identified above, Johnson's work has at least two unique features, one thematic, the other cultural. First, unlike Victor C. Pfitzner, who considers the predominant theme to be a theology of worship (*Hebrews* in the Abingdon New Testament Commentary series), Johnson argues for a theology of discipleship. Second, unlike recent commentators who contend with the possible influences of Gnosticism, Palestinian Judaism via Jewish writings, and Hellenistic Judaism via Philo (cf. Paul Ellingworth, *Hebrews* in the New International Greek Testament Commentary; Craig Koester, *Hebrews* in the Anchor Bible), Johnson appears to skirt these issues by emphasizing a Judaism influenced by a Platonic worldview (or perhaps a Platonic worldview influenced by Judaism). In either case, Johnson's propensity is to interpret Hebrews via Platonism. He does, however, recognize the parallels that reveal the author's two traditions: a Greek-speaking worldview via Plato and a Jewish-thinking Judaism via the OT (cf. Harold Attridge in the introduction to his commentary on Hebrews in the Hermeneia series, pp. 28–29).

Although this commentary offers a fresh interaction with the author's dual cultural influences and theological emphasis on discipleship, I sometimes questioned what appeared to be an overemphasis on the Platonic worldview over the author's Jewish religious and cultural influences. Nevertheless, Johnson's commentary is a worthy read and will be a useful work for anyone who wishes to grasp the possible Platonic worldview behind the book of Hebrews and the theological thrust of discipleship in Hebrews.

Herbert W. Bateman IV
Moody Bible Institute, Chicago IL

The Letters of 2 Peter and Jude. By Peter H. Davids. PNTC. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006, xxxii + 348 pp., \$34.00.

Though we have been well served in recent years with strong English language commentaries on 2 Peter and Jude, most of these appear in volumes that include studies

of 1 Peter (e.g. J. Daryl Charles, *1–2 Peter, Jude* [Scottsdale: Herald, 1999]; Thomas R. Schreiner, *1, 2 Peter, Jude* [Nashville: Broadman & Holman 2003]), or larger groupings of NT writings (e.g. Pheme Perkins, *First and Second Peter, James, and Jude* [Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1995]; Lewis R. Donelson, *From Hebrews to Revelation* [Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2001]). There are, however, relatively few book-length studies dedicated to the closely related Jude and 2 Peter alone, though of course there are notable exceptions (among them Jerome H. Neyrey, *2 Peter, Jude* [New York: Doubleday, 1993]; Douglas J. Moo, *2 Peter and Jude* [Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996]; Steven J. Kraftchick, *Jude, 2 Peter* [Nashville: Abingdon, 2002]). The publication of Peter H. Davids's major study of these somewhat overlooked epistles is welcome news. As he puts it, these short letters "are well worth a commentary of this size and even larger" (p. 3).

Davids's original reading of 2 Peter and Jude and careful evaluations of earlier scholarship are refreshing. I find his dialogue with the secondary literature particularly helpful as it frequently reenergizes some important conversations. For instance, his interaction with Richard Bauckham's 1983 commentary, which continues to cast a long shadow over Jude–2 Peter studies and remains among the most significant analyses of these letters to date, makes for some interesting reading (see Bauckham's *Jude, 2 Peter* [Waco, TX: Word, 1983]). His appreciation of Bauckham's work is obvious but not uncritical. For instance, he reappraises Bauckham's intriguing theory that the author of 2 Peter follows (at 3:10) a Jewish apocalyptic source that is also reflected in *1 Clem.* 23:3 and *2 Clem.* 11:2–4; 16:3 (pp. 264–65), an idea he finds "possible, but not proven" (p. 277).

Davids also revisits Bauckham's claim that 2 Peter is an example of a testamentary or farewell speech, a type of writing that was often pseudepigraphal. According to this hypothesis, Peter did not write this letter but clues indicating its testamentary character would have been so obvious to the original readers that the author is not guilty of fraudulent behaviour; the authorial claim of Petrine authorship was a transparent fiction. Though this theory remains compelling, Davids's review of Bauckham's thesis (esp. pp. 145–49) helpfully pushes the conversation forward. Among the significant questions he raises is whether 2 Peter resembles the Jewish examples of testamentary writing to the extent that Bauckham claims (p. 148), and consequently Davids's conclusions about authorship are far more cautious. Though he allows that it is "not unreasonable" to suggest that Peter did not write this letter, he finds that Bauckham's argument that "the pseudepigraphal character of 2 Peter [is] incontrovertible" pushes beyond what the evidence allows. He maintains "we do not know enough of Simon Peter's history to know whether or not he could have written 2 Peter" and "we . . . cannot know from historical investigation whether [the name Simon Peter in the salutation] is in some sense actual or is a pseudepigraphal attribution" (p. 149; italics his).

Davids's remarks about the authorship of Jude are equally thorough (pp. 8–28). Here he finds slightly more evidence supporting the traditional view, that Jude the brother of Jesus is the author of this text, pointing out that "none of the explanations why someone would use Jude as a pseudonym is convincing" (p. 28). However, he remains cautious on this point, too: "God alone knows, but the arguments against his authorship do not have the type of historical data needed to establish them" (p. 28).

Though Davids's dialogue with contemporary scholarship is a rich feature of this book, there are a few gaps. For instance, he has little to say about non-biblical Petrine pseudepigrapha, though some posit important links with 2 Peter (e.g. the early second-century *Apocalypse of Peter*). Furthermore, Davids does not discuss the possible existence of a kind of Petrine school or community, an idea occasionally introduced to the authorship debates. Donald P. Senior and Daniel J. Harrington, to give a recent example (*1 Peter/Jude and 2 Peter* [Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2003]), suggest such a community origin for the Petrine letters. They refer to this community as a group (pp. 5–6)