Commentarii Periodici Pontificii Instituti Biblici

BIBLICA

Vol. 94 Fasc. 2

RECENSIONES

Vetus Testamentum

Novum Testamentum

PONTIFICIUM INSTITUTUM BIBLICUM
PIB
Verbum Domini manet in aeternum

2013

RECENSIONES

Vetus Testamentum

Annette SCHELLENBERG, *Der Mensch als Bild Gottes?* Zum Gedanken einer Sonderstellung des Menschen im Alten Testament und in weiteren altorientalischen Quellen (ATANT 101). Zürich, Theologischer Verlag, 2011. 474 p. 16,5 × 24. €64.80

In ihrer Zürcher Habilitationsschrift befasst sich S. zwar besonders intensiv mit den im Detail immer noch kontrovers beurteilten Bild-Gottes-Aussagen der priesterschriftlichen Urgeschichte, sie bezieht aber, indem sie die Fragestellung auf die auch auf andere Weise ausgedrückte Sonderstellung des Menschen hin ausweitet, Psalm 8 und Genesis 2–3 ein. Diese drei viel behandelten Texte analysiert sie in sorgfältigster Auseinandersetzung mit der umfangreichen Sekundärliteratur unter dem dreifachen Aspekt: Verhältnis Mensch – Gott, Mensch – Tier, Mensch – Mensch noch einmal neu (Kap. 1-4). So gewinnt sie eine breite Palette von Gesichtspunkten und Formulierungsmustern. Entsprechend weit greift sie, ebenfalls unter diesem dreifachen Aspekt, im Vergleich mit der mesopotamischen und ägyptischen Literatur aus (Kap. 5). Als Gegenprobe stellt sie solche atl. und aor. Texte dagegen, die einerseits Tiere als dem Menschen überlegen oder in ihrer Geschöpflichkeit gleichrangig darstellen oder andererseits innerhalb der Gesamtmenschheit dem König, dem Weisen oder dem eigenen Volk eine Sonderstellung zuweisen (Kap. 6). Auf dem Hintergrund dieser Ergebnisse kehrt sie im kurzen letzten Kapitel noch einmal zur Priesterschrift zurück, die sie unter dem Aspekt der prinzipiellen Gleichheit aller Menschen innerhalb ihrer Sonderstellung gegenüber Gott und Tieren als im Alten Orient außergewöhnlich charakterisiert, und untersucht unter den Termini “Inklusivismus” und “Exklusivismus”, inwieweit die Priesterschrift im Fortgang nach der Urgeschichte die prinzipielle Gleichheit aller Israeliten und, trotz überwiegender Sonderstellung Israels, die aller Menschen in Ansätzen positiv andeutet oder wenigstens durch nicht-ausschließende Wendungen offenhält. Insgesamt enthält diese materialreiche, stets argumentative und sehr anregende, gelegentlich auch provozierende Habilitationsschrift viele neue Einsichten. Sie fördert nicht nur die innerexegetische Diskussion, sondern verdient Beachtung auch in den anderen theologischen Disziplinen.

Im Zentrum der Arbeit steht die Bild-Gottes-Aussage der P.S. legt eine hoch komplexe These vor, die in steile theologische Thesen mündet: Die

Metapher legt in Gen 1 das besondere Verhältnis des Menschen zu Gott primär auf seine Folgen für sein Verhältnis der Macht und der Verantwortung zu den Tieren aus; für sie ist er zum Stellvertreter Gottes bestellt. Nur das Dass, nicht das Wie der Herrschaft wird ausgesagt, dennoch wird sie als Aufrechterhaltung von Ordnung, Recht und Frieden charakterisiert. Gen 5 versteht die Metapher, wie bereits in Gen 1 angelegt, als Gestaltähnlichkeit im Sinn einer vererbbaren Familienähnlichkeit "im Aussehen… und im Wesen" (122), die aber aus einem adoptionsvergleichbaren Verhältnis resultiert. P präzisiert diese brisante Bestimmung allerdings nicht. "Das Schweigen ist Teil der Botschaft" (122). In Genesis 9 haben sich auf Grund des völligen Versagens des Menschen Stellvertretung Gottes und Herrschaftsauftrag erledigt und bezieht sich die Metapher nur noch auf die dennoch bleibende Würde und Vorrangstellung des Menschen. Gott wird nun die Sorge für Ordnung, Recht und Frieden ("wieder" 68) selbst übernehmen.

Die Bild-Gottes-Aussage überträgt, zumal der König in Israel nicht als Bild Gottes bezeichnet wird, nicht die vor allem aus Ägypten vertrauten Königsepitheta auf alle Menschen, sie und vielleicht auch die wenigen assyrischen Belege waren P wohl gar nicht bekannt, sondern sie erwächst allein aus der Analogie zu Kultbildern von Göttern und ist vielleicht von P aus Eigenem ohne Anregung durch altorientalische Vorbilder gebildet worden. Dennoch kann man wegen des Herrschaftsauftrags von Royalisierung des Menschen sprechen. Nach Ausweis von Genesis 9 wird der Mensch, der, den "Wunsch/Befehl Gottes" (73) "nicht erfüllen konnte oder wollte", "trotz seiner Natur" Bild Gottes genannt. Er ist Bild Gottes "nicht aufgrund seiner Qualitäten oder Aufgaben, sondern weil Gott ihn als dieses Bild erachtet. Darum kann die Bild-Gottes-Prädikation in 9,6 wiederholt werden, obwohl zu diesem Zeitpunkt Gott wie Leser wissen, dass der Mensch Gott nicht wirklich repräsentiert" (123-124).

S. betont zu Recht als Ergebnis der jüngeren Diskussion, dass eine scharfe Trennung zwischen Funktion und Wesen der priesterschriftlichen Konzeption der Bild-Gottes-Haftigkeit nicht entspricht. Aber dass S. nun in Schöpfungskontext mit radikaler Worttheologie und unter Verweis auf die "paulinisch-lutherische" Rechtfertigungslehre (124) einen Hiat zwischen der Natur des Menschen, der dem "Zuspruch/Anspruch" (394) Gottes mangels fehlender Qualitäten womöglich von Anfang an gar nicht gerecht werden "konnte", einerseits und der dennoch erhalten bleibenden Zuschreibung der Bild-Gottes-Haftigkeit "trotz seiner Natur" andererseits behauptet, will als Ausdeutung priesterschriftlicher Theologie noch weniger einleuchten.

Folgende für S.s komplexes Argument grundlegenden Elemente erscheinen diskussionswürdig: (1) Sie rückt die Bild-Gottes-Haftigkeit vom Herrschaftsanspruch möglichst weit ab. Entsprechend wertet sie die Abfolge Kohortativ – *w*=Präfixkonjugation in Gen 1,26 nicht als finale Verknüpfung, sondern übersetzt koordinierend: “Und sie sollen herrschen” (30). (2) Obwohl der Herrschaftsauftrag in Gen 1,28 gemäß der Eröffnung des Verses Teil des Segens ist, versteht sie ihn im Gegensatz zum Mehrungsauftrag nicht als seinsmäßige Befähigung, sondern als womöglich von vornherein die Natur des Menschen überfordernden Zuspruch/Anspruch. (3) In Gen 9,6 deutet sie das *Beth* als *Beth pretii* (“um des Menschen willen”), nicht als *Beth instrumenti*. Nur unter dieser Voraussetzung kann sie folgern, dass Gott nun selbst die Verantwortung für Ordnung und Frieden in seiner Schöpfung (mit welchem Ergebnis?) übernimmt. (4) Eine zentrale Rolle spielt das *argumentum e silentio*: Weil das Verb “herrschen” in 9,1-7 nicht mehr auftaucht, interpretiert sie die zum Segen Gen 1,28 (Befähigung, sich zu mehren und die Erde zu erfüllen – Auftrag, über die Tiere zu herrschen) parallele Segensabfolge 9,1-3 (Befähigung, sich zu mehren und die Erde zu füllen – Auslieferung der Tiere an den Menschen und Tötungserlaubnis zu Nahrungszwecken [in Abänderung der reinen Pflanzennahrung nach Gen 1,29]) nicht als mindernde bzw. realistischere Korrektur des Herrschaftsauftrags, sondern als Konsequenz der gänzlichen Aufhebung des Herrschaftsauftrags infolge des Versagens des Menschen, das zur Sintflut führte. Für den nachsintflutlichen Menschen gilt, “dass der Mensch den Tieren gegenüber an kein ‚Amtsethos‘ mehr gebunden ist, andererseits aber auch, dass er im Gott-Tier-Verhältnis keine Mittlerrolle mehr spielt” (68). Andernorts wendet sie das *argumentum e silentio* nicht so resolut an: Während der Segen in Genesis 1 dem männlich und weiblich realisierten Menschen gilt, segnet Gott in Gen 9,1 nur Noach und seine Söhne; in diesem Fall will S. zwar nicht ganz ausschließen, dass hierdurch eine Verschlechterung des Mann-Frau Verhältnisses angezeigt wird, aber es scheint ihr doch eher “wohl ein unbewusster Niederschlag der patriarchalischen Weltsicht des P-Verfassers” zu sein (134). (5) Der Versuch, dem priesterschriftlichen Autor die Kenntnis der sich in Bild-Gottes-Aussagen niederschlagenden altorientalischen Königsideologie abzusprechen, fordert eine breitere Untersuchung darüber, in welchem Umfang dieser Autor altorientalische Konzeptionen (kritisch) aufnimmt bzw. in seiner priesterlichen Lehrtradition vorfindet.

Zu Psalm 8 betont S. das Nebeneinander der universalen Perspektive bezüglich des Namens JHWHs und einer eingeschränkten Perspektive bezüglich der sprechenden “Wir”, die sich als JHWH-Gemeinde charakterisieren (“JHWH, unser Herrscher”; beides in 8,2+10); außerdem bleibt offen, ob die Aussagen über “den Menschen” auch die in 8,3 genannten Widersacher und Feinde einbeziehen. Mit Gen 1 verbindet die Tatsache, dass es um das “Dass”, nicht um das “Wie” der Ähnlichkeit zwischen Gott und Mensch geht. “Was das ‘Wenige’ ist, das ihm dazu noch fehlt, wird nicht ausgeführt”. Infolgedessen wird “auch offengelassen…, was das viele ist, das den Menschen so nahe an Gott heranrückt” (166-167). Am Verhältnis Mensch-Tier besteht in Psalm 8 über die Tatsache der herrschaftlichen Stellung des Menschen hinaus kein Interesse.

Im Gegensatz zu Psalm 8 wird Genesis 2–3 seltener mit der priesterschriftlichen Urgeschichte verglichen. S. erklärt sie für im Wesentlichen literarisch einheitlich und eher älter als P, wohl vorexilisch; P dürfte den Text gekannt haben, auch wenn Sicherheit nicht zu erlangen ist. Das Mensch-Tier-Verhältnis wird zwar im Sinn der Überordnung des Menschen geklärt, abgesehen vom Benennungsauftrag bleibt aber offen, worin seine Sonderstellung besteht. Die Gottähnlichkeit im Wissen um Gut und Böse, die den Menschen "wesenhaft (substantiell) mit Gott verbindet" (213), aber in der Folge zugleich von Gott distanziert, wird ebenfalls nicht weiter entfaltet und wirkt sich auf das Verhältnis Mensch-Tier nicht aus. In der Benennung der Frau durch den Mann deutet der Verfasser, ohne es zu beabsichtigen, an, dass die post-paradiesisch verhängte Herrschaft des Mannes über die Frau schon im Paradies angelegt ist. Diese Herrschaft wird weder in ihrer Eigenart geklärt noch zur Sonderstellung des Menschen in Beziehung gesetzt. Die Vorstellung von einem königlichen ersten Menschen gehörte zwar zu den Traditionsvorgaben, findet aber in der Paradieserzählung kein Interesse.

In ihrem breiten Vergleich mit außeralttestamentlichen altorientalischen Texten unterscheidet S. die überaus häufigen "impliziten" Zeugen einer Sonderstellung des Menschen, sei es gegenüber den Tieren, sei es gegenüber den Göttern, von den wenigen "(semi-)expliziten" Zeugen. Auch diese sprechen zwar allgemein von "dem Menschen", es fehlen aber im Gegensatz zur Priesterschrift eindeutige Hinweise, "dass die allgemeinen Aussagen auch tatsächlich universal gemeint sind, während häufiger von der Sonderstellung von Königen, Weisen oder des eigenen Volkes die Rede ist" (300).

Insofern billigt S. der Priesterschrift, die in der Urgeschichte explizit von der Sonderstellung der Menschheit vor allen Differenzierungen in Völker oder Ämter spricht, eine Sonderstellung zu. Auf der Suche nach Anzeichen eines entsprechenden "Inklusivismus" im Fortgang der Priesterschrift trotz eindeutiger Betonung der Sonderstellung Israels verweist S. vor allem auf die Offenheit der Priesterschrift gegenüber Fremden, die dauerhaft in Israel leben und sich deren Lebensweise anpassen. Die Gefahr der Überinterpretation ist freilich nicht zu übersehen. In Genesis 17 erhält Abraham die den Schöpfungssegen variierende Mehrungszusage als Bundesverheißung (17,1-6). In 17,7-9 hingegen verheißt JHWH ihm einen Bund mit ihm und "seinem Samen nach ihm". Da Abraham an der Zusage eines leiblichen Sohnes Isaak aus Sara zweifelt und den einzigen bisher existierenden Sohn Ismael in das Spiel bringt, verfügt JHWH in 17,19-21, er werde nur mit Isaak den Bund für "seinen Samen nach ihm" schließen, Ismael freilich auch segnen, und er schließt mit der nochmaligen Versicherung, seinen Bund schließe er nur mit Isaak. Man sollte meinen, das könne gar nicht eindeutiger formuliert werden. So muss folgendes Urteil irritieren, weil es die Aussage dieses zentralen Kapitels der Priesterschrift auf den Kopf stellt: So sehr JHWH bei seinem Bundesschluss mit Abraham den noch ungeborenen Isaak favorisiert, gehören nach Genesis 17 auch Ismael und alle anderen Nachkommen Abrahams zum Bund" (375). Als Nachweis der inklusiven Tendenz genügt, dass Ismael die variierte Form des nach der Sintflut wiederholten Schöpfungssegens in 17,20 erhält.

S. stellt das Theologumenon der Bild-Gottes-Haftigkeit des Menschen in weite Fragehorizonte, durch die Gegenproben bringt sie für das AT wie für den Alten Orient wichtige neue Akzente. Ihrer Habilitationsschrift ist eine intensive Auseinandersetzung zu wünschen.

Mallestraße, 24
D-72072 Tübingen

Walter GROSS

Kay WEISSFLOG, *Zeichen und Sinnbilder.* Die Kinder der Propheten Jesaja und Hosea (Arbeiten zur Bibel und ihrer Geschichte 36). Leipzig, Evangelische Verlagsanstalt 2011. 577 p. 16,5 × 23,5

This monograph is the author's doctoral dissertation accepted by the theology faculty of Universität Leipzig in 2009. As the title of the book suggests, this study analyzes the literary figuration and function of the children of the two prophets, Isaiah and Hosea, as well as the possible historical backgrounds and redactional developments in both texts. Accordingly, the primary focus lies on Isaiah 7–8 and Hosea 1–3, where these children play significant roles (cf. Isa 8,18) with regard to the fate of Israel and Judah vis-à-vis their symbolic, sociopolitical, and tradition-historical relationship with YHWH.

After a brief review of scholarship and introduction, Weißflog offers careful translations and text-critical examinations. The subsequent verse-by-verse close readings of each text take up the bulk of this study, each concluding with the summary analyses of Isaiah 7–8 and Hosea 1–3 on both synchronic and diachronic levels. What then follows might be the most important contribution, as Weißflog delineates the concepts of the children in Isaiah and Hosea in light of the pertinent ancient Near Eastern contexts and the tradition-historical progresses of the redactional layers. Equally innovatively, Weißflog further expounds the similarities and differences of the two texts, both reconceiving the unique meanings and functions of the children's names and exploring the literary interrelationship of the two compatible traditions.

In the recap of the text analysis on Isaiah 7–8, Weißflog presents insightful observations on the synchronic and diachronic levels. With regard to the synchronic dimension, amid the unified whole, Weißflog identifies two distinct genres: a foreign report, including the confrontation with Ahaz and the Davidic house (ch. 7), and an autobiographical report, which addresses the people as a whole (ch. 8). He then traces the tension and development of key themes in relation to the reciprocal juxtaposition of salvation and judgment oracles concerning Judah throughout these two chapters. Accordingly, the name *Shear-jashub* (7,3) denotes not only the demise of northern Israel and Aram (7,4-9) but also the resultant threat upon Judah by the expansion of the Assyrian invasion (7,14-25). At the same time, this name, along with *Immanuel* (7,14; 8,8.10), can allude to the positive escape of a few remnants of Judah. Such a tension between negative and positive meanings applies to the name *Maher-shalal-hash-baz* (8,1) as well.

Pertaining to the diachronic aspect, Weißflog critiques the reductionist tendency to consider the prophet exclusively as either judgmental or salvific. Such a tendency often leads to an incompatible approach. As it has been conventionally considered, either judgment oracles are preexilic and salvation oracles are exilic/postexilic; or, according to the recent proposals in light of the Neo-Assyrian documents of Esarhaddon and Ashurbanipal (7th century BCE), salvation oracles are original and thus judgment oracles were only retrospectively inserted into the preexilic salvific texts through the theological reflection of the exilic/postexilic time. Consequently, Weißflog proposes a criterion of the multi-step redactional process, rather than a linear one. For example, the names *Shear-jashub* and *Maher-shalal-hash-baz* originally and primarily may have functioned to underscore the negative warnings on the fate of southern Judah. It thus seems unlikely that the original notion of *Maher-shalal-hash-baz* contained the calamity announcements on northern Israel and Aram and salvific messages for southern Judah. Similarly, *Shear-jashub*, denoting the scarcity of population after the destruction and characteristically targeting northern Israel and Aram, enemies of Judah (Isa 7,4-9), may have originally denoted the warning of the Assyrian threat reaching southern Judah (8,6-8, 12-15). Such an original announcement of doom on the lack of faith in Ahaz and the royal house was then juxtaposed with the pronouncement of deliverance through the Immanuel texts, owing to the events of 701 BCE.

In summarizing the text-analysis on Hosea 1–3, Weißflog interprets the marriage metaphor in light of the ancient Near Eastern legal covenant stipulation. As a main thesis regarding the thematic threads in the synchronic and diachronic levels, Weißflog retrieves two distinct but interrelated levels in the analysis of the text: (1) the (auto)biographical-individual level and (2) the historical-theological-collective level. This interpretive axiom of two levels is taken to examine the thematic uniqueness and redactional development of Hosea 1–3, which consists of six direct speeches (1,2-3; 1,4-5; 1,6-7; 1,9–2,25; 3,1-2; 3,3-5).

Hos 2,4-15 is the core of Hosea 1–3 and the original corpus in the redactional development. This section depicts the people's lack of exclusive covenant fidelity to YHWH through the adultery of the wife and mother against the husband, along with the conditional announcement of disaster (placed after the anticipatory description of future salvific events of 1,1-9 and 2,1-3).

Next, Hosea 1 was written as a commentary on Hos 2,4-15. For example, Hos 1,2-3 is placed as the introduction to the two different levels, both associated with the motif of "harlotry": the biographical-individual level of Hosea's relationship with a wife and her children; the historical-theological-collective level of the relationship between YHWH and Israel.

The third redactional segments are Hos 2,1-3 [Eng. 1,10–2,1] and Hos 2,16-25 [Eng. 2,14-23], thereby constructing Hosea 2 in a pattern of positive (2,1-3), negative (2,4-15), and positive (2,16-25) oracles. On one side, 2,1-3 contains a proleptic view of future salvation for Israel and Judah. As a response to 1,2-9, which has primary concern over northern Israel, here the concern for the "sons of [northern] Israel" is conjoined with the "sons of Judah" (2,2) toward the theme of the reunification after the exile, discernible in words such as "the sons of the living El" (2,1) and "(my) people" (2,3). On the other side, 2,16-25 pronounces the ultimate restoration of the marriage with positive outcomes. Altogether, Hosea 2 forms a thesis concept through the statement on *(Lo) ammi*, projecting the future dispensation (2,1-3), loss (2,4-15), and recovery (2,16-25).

The final redactional layer is Hos 3,1-5. Unlike 1,2–2,25, Hosea 3 is described in the autobiographical perspective and lacks the distinction between the wife and the children. Alongside this, various shifts between Hosea 1–2 and Hosea 3 evidence the plausibility that Hosea 3 was either a redactional sequel to Hosea 1–2 or a parallel-account to Hosea 1 from another source.

In the next major section, with regard to the concepts of Isaiah, Weißflog delineates three distinct tradition-historical processes in Isaiah 7–8. The first, and the earliest, stage contains the warnings directed to Judah only (e.g., 7,3; 8,3). Weißflog argues that the two "iconic signs" in the names, *Shear-jashub* and *Maher-shalal-hash-baz*, point to the same event of the military threat to Judah, in terms of the quantitative (only a few remnants) and qualitative (plundering the war spoils) aspects respectively around the Syro-Ephraimite coalition. The second stage points to the explicit announcement of punishment upon Aram and northern Israel (e.g., 7,16; 8,4), of the years 732 BCE and 722 BCE respectively, during the campaigns of Neo-Assyria. Consequently, together with the name *Immanuel* (7,14), the two names, whose original meaning alluded to the judgment on Judah, now construe a salvific perspective for Judah. The third stage encompasses the reversed positive connotation on the names of the two sons of Isaiah (e.g., 7,21-22; 8,9-10). In light of the tradition-historical event and theological interpretation of the year 701 BCE, both names are thus transformed from the negative to the positive aspect alongside Zion theology.

With regard to the concepts of Hosea, Weißflog expounds a further synthesis as well; i.e., a tradition-historical reconstruction of the multi-stage development of the key layers. Thus, 2,4-15, as the earliest core of the composition of Hosea 1–3, primarily focuses on the town of Samaria, with the roles of the "wife" and the "sons" on a biographical-individual level. Next, with 1,2 as a hinge, 1,3-9 expands the realm to the political-territorial level of northern Israel. Hos 2,1-3 then interrupts the original connection between 1,2-9 and 2,4-15 with the salvific motif of the future restoration of both Israel and Judah. Afterwards, 2,16-25 extends the restoration of the relationship toward unity onto the ethnic-religious level. Finally, 3,1-5 recapitulates the imagery of Israel as the "wife" of YHWH, but the "sons of Israel" refer back to the former northern Israel of Samaria, as the wayward wife who shall return to YHWH and the Davidic monarchy of Jerusalem.

The final section compares the two relevant books. Both Isaiah 7–8 and Hosea 1–3 illustrate the prophets' children as an overarching theme, along with the unique functions of their names. Yet, whereas Isaiah 7–8 tends to be closely associated with the historical-political issues, Hosea 1–3 is more oriented toward historical-theological underpinnings. Moreover, with regard to the relationship between the two books, beyond the common functions of the children's names and the customary expressions in Isa 8,3 and Hos 1,3.6.9, Weißflog asks whether it is feasible to consider an intentional literary connection between these two corpora. His answer is yes, asserting that the discourse of Hosea 1–3 fits smoothly with the structure of Isaiah 7–8. Elucidating considerable correlations, Weißflog further posits that even the names Isaiah and Hosea (which share a verbal root) may tradition-historically allude to one and the same prophet, hinting that the origins of the twelve minor prophets were not independent of those of the three major prophets.

This volume undoubtedly provides significant contributions. It judiciously delineates the pivotal functions and implications of the names of the children of the prophets as essential overtures in both books. It admirably links the meticulous investigations on the selected texts with thematic syntheses and redactional reconstructions. The follow-up explications on the tradition-historical layers reveal important insights and potential for further study. Overall, this work is creative, critical, and convincing.

However, even this voluminous monograph engenders a few questions. First of all, even though there have not been many extensive studies on the prophets' children in Isaiah and Hosea, it is strange that the author reviews only five, albeit deserving, works (G. Fohrer, B. Lang, S. Amsler, R. Hutton, and H. Liss). Considering that the topic covers two books, Isaiah and Hosea, with regard to the "Isaiah memoir" as well as the "husband-wife" and "parent-child" metaphors, one wonders whether other pertinent works should have been consulted more carefully, particularly those written in English (e.g.,

R. Clements, K. Darr, S. Moughtin-Mumby, J. Roberts, and H. Williamson). Similarly, especially as this study is predominantly diachronic in its approach, many recent scholarly works may need closer attention (e.g., J. Dearman, A. Macintosh, J. Nogalski, P. Redditt, A. Schart, etc.). Furthermore, as one of the most notable contributions of this study, Weißflog proposes the likelihood of the compositional and/or intertextual correlations between Isaiah 7–8 and Hosea 1–3. It is regrettable that such an observation takes up only a small segment of discussion. As a result, this cogent study reads like a collection of two separate works, on Isaiah and Hosea, without substantial interrelations. Interested readers would hope that more detailed analyses on both texts be available, both synchronically and diachronically.

This work clearly demonstrates a study of redactional analysis par excellence. It is replete with cutting-edge insights and innovative propositions. It certainly is a welcome contribution to the current prophetic literature scholarship.

Methodist Theological School in Ohio — Hyun Chul Paul KIM
3081 Columbus Pike
Delaware, Ohio 43015
USA

Donna Lee PETTER, *The Book of Ezekiel and Mesopotamian City Laments* (OBO 246). Fribourg, Academic Press – Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2011. xv-198 p. 15,5 × 23. SFr 58

This slightly revised dissertation, begun under the guidance of Brian Peckham at the University of Toronto and completed under Glen Taylor's supervision after Peckham's death, joins recent attempts to explain the unique literary coherence of the book of Ezekiel. Taking her cue from the present reviewer's contention that the book's design cannot be explained solely with reference to Israelite and Judean prophetic genres, Petter suggests that the Mesopotamian City Lament genre (MCL) "likely" explains a good many of the unusual and heretofore unexplained features of the Book of Ezekiel, including the prophet's muteness and "multifaceted portrayal," the book's "cohesion," the placement of the Oracles against the Nations, and, finally, its program of restoration (5).

Petter develops her argument in two parts. In the first two chapters, Petter first describes the basic features of the MCL, and then reports on recent scholarly work that has traced the influence of the MCL on Israelite and Judean literary traditions, including the prophetic literature. In the remainder of the book, Petter seeks to identify lament elements in the persona of Ezekiel, YHWH's divine anger and abandonment of Jerusalem, sin and judgment, and restoration. A concluding chapter presents a coherent reading of Ezekiel on the basis of her positing the presence of lament elements in Ezekiel.

In the chapter devoted to the Mesopotamian literature, Petter catalogues extant city laments, describes their probable cultic settings, traces the continuation of the MCL tradition into the first millennium by way of the *balag* and *eršemma* lament, and enumerates and describes nine specific features that can be said to constitute the genre. Of particular interest for Petter's analysis of Ezekiel is the last element, the restoration of the city. Not all MCLs develop this feature in any great detail, but Petter finds it particularly instructive that nearly half of the Nippur Lament (NL) is devoted to the city's restoration (29-31), which is explicitly presented as a reversal of the earlier destruction (30).

Unfortunately, it is the very uniqueness of the Nippur Lament that proves problematic. None of the other city laments develop the theme of restoration; and the theme is absent from the *balag and eršemma* laments which actually do survive into the first millennium. The absence of the restoration theme from first millennium materials is, in this reviewer's opinion, fatal for Petter's argument, which revolves around the persistence of a *genre* of lament tradition containing these nine elements. Yet this difficulty is obscured by the manner in which Petter outlines the nine characteristics of the lament genre. Moreover, if this element is unique to the Nippur Lament, one wonders how the theme of restoration can be said to be a generic element at all. Yet if I understand Petter correctly, only the Nippur Lament develops the theme of restoration as a *literary* element. Petter's inclusion of the theme of restoration as one of the elements of the MCL lasting into the first millenium is therefore somewhat disingenuous (29-32).

Other aspects of her treatment of genre are similarly problematic. For one thing, the list of features which are said to indicate the presence of the lament genre are not well suited to the argument she must put forward in order to demonstrate the presence of lament features in Ezekiel. Petter credits F. W. Dobbs Allsopp's ground-breaking study of Lamentations for this classification of the lament genre, but it must also be said that she adopts it somewhat uncritically and seeks to employ it to solve problems it was not designed to address. Particularly problematic is her lack of attention to other possible explanations for similar motifs. To take one example, the motif of divine abandonment. This motif is one of the nine characteristic features of the MCL tradition, but it is not unique to the lament tradition and can be found in other Mesopotamian genres, at least two of which have been proposed as parallels for Ezekiel (i.e., the Erra Epic, by Daniel Bodi, and Esarhaddon's Babylonian inscription, by the present reviewer). Given the prevailing mood of the Book of Ezekiel, which is anything but lament, Petter's argument would have been considerably stronger if she had provided a generic model for determining just how lament made its appearance in Ezekiel.

Such a theoretical proposal would have considerably strengthened what is by far the most intriguing proposal in the book: Petter's contention that many of the elements in Ezekiel's persona can be effectively interpreted in light of the MCL's motif of the weeping goddess. Through a close reading of the call narrative as well as an examination of the connections between what is known of mourning rites and Ezekiel's physical gestures, Petter suggests that by swallowing the scroll, Ezekiel takes on the role of the weeping goddess. Two points are especially interesting, if not finally persuasive. First, (following the present reviewer) Petter points out that that content of the scroll is not judgment but mourning and lament, and that in ingesting the scroll, Ezekiel *becomes* a mourner. The presence of laments on the scroll suggests, then, to Petter, that lament is a kind of submerged genre throughout the book. Second, Petter draws attention to the manner in which Ezekiel *becomes* the city of Jerusalem as he enacts the siege of Jerusalem in the symbolic acts of chapters 4–5. Here again, in identifying with the city of Jerusalem, the prophet takes on the role of the weeping goddess. Other previously unexplained features of the book, including the prophet's muteness, thus can be explained as the persistence of mourning as a "subgenre" in the book.

Yet Petter never adequately explains what a "subgenre" or "submerged genre" is. Here is where less dependence on Dobbs-Allsopp's proposal and a more rigorous development of a method that would allow her to trace the interaction of genres would have been desirable. There is abundant evidence in Ezekiel that exiles come to the prophet to protest the deity's actions. Some of these episodes, in particular chapters 16 and 20, can be construed as a divine refusal to hear human protest and could effectively be interpreted to show just how the mood of lament becomes submerged in an otherwise profoundly angry book. Rather than take up this challenge, Petter resorts to a somewhat facile attempt to demonstrate that such motifs as divine anger and sin and judgment "could" be interpreted in light of the MCL genre.

Despite these serious problems in her argument, Petter's proposal is inviting, not least because it encourages a more modulated and nuanced reading of the emotional tenor of Ezekiel, if not all of the prophetic books. For much of the past century, form critical assessments of the prophetic adaptation of nonprophetic genres, especially those associated with mourning, have assumed that such appropriations can only have been intended as a mockery of the victims. This reviewer suspects that such readings are a reflex of latent Christian supersessionism, an assumption that Israelite and Judean national religion could have had no common human feeling for the destruction of human beings, enemy or otherwise. Petter is to be commended for inviting us to hear the complex tenor of these nonprophetic, submerged genres. Mourning is mourning, and it has a way of being voiced whether we hear it or not. Not to heed the nuances Petter discerns would be to remain tone deaf to prophetic testimony to the passing of an era.

As inviting as her proposal is, however, it is not entirely persuasive. As interesting as it is, Petter's suggestion that Ezekiel is like the weeping goddess simply fails to convince. It is an interesting proposal, not least because it invites a consideration of the possibility of inverted gender roles. Unfortunately, the Book of Ezekiel itself provides other, more obvious explanations for Ezekiel's various roles. Within the call narrative itself, for example, Ezekiel is decidedly not appointed to function as a mourner. Quite in contrast with the weeping goddess who mourns the destruction of her city at the hand of a capricious deity, Ezekiel must conform his message and actions to the will of the Destroyer. And, while Petter is quite right to see a submerged tension between the destructive acts of YHWH and his appointment of Ezekiel as a sentinel to keep watch over those destined for destruction, the book makes it quite clear that the role of sentinel is form-critically at home in the context of war (cf. 33,1-10), not a lament tradition of either Mesopotamian or Judean stripe. In other words, even if Ezekiel is like the weeping goddess, he most decidedly would not be recognized as such by those who read his book.

St. Olaf College M.S. ODELL
Northfield, MN 55057
USA

Andrew T. GLICKSMAN, *Wisdom of Solomon 10.* A Jewish Hellenistic Reinterpretation of Early Israelite History through Sapiential Lenses (Deuterocanonical and Cognate Literature Studies 9). Berlin – New York, Walter de Gruyter, 2011. xiv-243 p. 16 × 23,5. €99,95

Voici la première monographie publiée sur ce chapitre. Rien qu'à ce titre, elle mérite attention. Le propos de G. est principalement de déterminer le genre littéraire (ch. 4) et la méthode herméneutique (ch. 6) de Sg 10,1–11,1. Entre ces deux chapitres, il propose une exégèse de ce texte (ch. 5) et, avant d'aborder la question du genre littéraire, il offre une étude consacrée à la structure littéraire du livre et du texte retenu, ainsi qu'à cette autre question: s'agit-il de prose rythmique ou de poésie? (ch. 3). Un chapitre préliminaire fait le point sur les problèmes généraux concernant le livre (ch. 2).

Ce chapitre préliminaire rappelle l'état de la recherche. Ces pages (6-31) montrent simplement que G. est au courant de cette recherche. Je note en particulier qu'il maintient la thèse courante aujourd'hui de l'unité de composition du livre (11); ma question sera, en fin de compte, de savoir comment il la comprend ou, plus exactement, comment, à ses yeux, Sg

11–19 apporte du sens à Sg 1–11; sur ce point, le silence de G. m'étonne. Je relève aussi quelques détails. Il tient encore qu'en Sg 8,19, il est question de la préexistence de l'âme (10, n.18; 13, n. 26; 165: "possible"; cf., par contre, mon étude dans *La Sagesse de Salomon.* The Wisdom of Solomon [AnBib 189; Rome 2011] 346-353). Pourquoi citer en latin (et sans l'interrogatif *cur*) le *Contre Apion* de Flavius Josèphe (16, n. 36)? G. date Sg entre 30 av. J.-C. et 41 ap. J.-C. (24 et 30): ce n'est pas faux du tout, mais en Sg 6,3, le mot κράτησις est proprement augustéen; on le sait depuis G. Scarpat (1967) et G. n'en tient pas compte (24-25): cf. mon analyse dans *La Sagesse de Salomon*, 124-129. À la p. 25, n. 71, on pourra ajouter l'article de D. Volgger, "Die Adressaten Weisheitbuches", *Bib* 82 (2001) 153-177. Enfin, G. considère que manque l'évidence pour dire que Sg s'adresse à la jeunesse juive hellénisée —position de J.M. Reese, comme il le note— mais alors pourquoi Sg 7,1-22a et 8,2-21 évoquent-ils la jeunesse de Salomon? Il me semble que, dans ce chapitre préliminaire, G. aurait pu s'attacher davantage aux travaux récents.

Le chapitre 3 (32-63) entre vraiment dans la problématique de Sg 10. Il s'agit tout d'abord de présenter le texte de Sg 10,1–11,1, de le traduire, puis de le situer à l'intérieur de la structure littéraire du livre et d'en proposer la structure propre (32-38). Pour le texte grec de Sg 10,1–11,1, G. suit celui de J. Ziegler (1962, ^{2}1980), dont il reprend certaines notes de critique textuelle; pourtant, dans sa présentation du texte grec et de sa traduction, il distingue déjà cinq strophes (34-38), qu'il ne justifiera qu'à la fin du chapitre (56-60). Je note en passant que ce n'est pas Jérôme qui a constitué la Vulgate (33). Quant à la structure de l'ensemble de Sg, G. suit la proposition de A.G. Wright (1967) qui divise le livre en deux parties : Sg 1,1–11,1 et 11,1–19,22: je ne connais aucun commentateur important de Sg qui ait repris récemment cette division bipartite, d'autant qu'à la suite de Reese (1965), Wright reconnaissait une structure concentrique en Sg 1–6 et 7–8, ce que G. mentionne simplement sans y insister (40). Le point en discussion concerne en fait les limites de Sg 10,1–11,1 (43-47); ici G. ne suit pas A. Schmitt (1977) — et je crois qu'il a raison — qui proposait de lire Sg 9,18 avec ce qui suit. Ensuite, G. considère que Sg 10 se termine en fait en Sg 11,1, pour la raison que le mot σοφία disparaît dans la suite du livre, sauf en 14,2 (la sagesse artisanale) et 14,5 ("les œuvres de ta Sagesse"). Cet argument suffit-il? J'ai proposé naguère de mettre en continuité Sg 10,1–11,1 et 19,10–22, ensembles constitués l'un et l'autre par des listes. G. trouve ma proposition "accurate and convincing in general" (49), quitte à la rejeter finalement (49-50), mais pour la raison principale qu'il place Sg 10 dans la première partie du livre (50): en logique, cela s'appelle un *latius hos.* Il en arrive tout de même à reconnaître que Sg 10,1–11,1 "is indeed a transitional section" (58), et là encore je suis d'accord, à condition d'en tirer les conséquences. Par ailleurs, recourir à l'idée d'un "nombre d'or", proposée encore par Wright

(1967) ne m'a jamais paru une bonne théorie, que pourtant G. accepte (48). On relèvera enfin l'effort de G. pour caractériser le style de Sg: prose ou poésie? (53-56 et l'*Appendix 1*, 185-195); ce genre d'études n'en est qu'à ses débuts et G. fait avancer la recherche, après la synthèse de C. Larcher, *Le Livre de la Sagesse ou la Sagesse de Salomon* (EtB n.s. 1; Paris 1983) 83-91, que G. connaît (55) sans trop l'apprécier. Bref, à mon avis, G. suit trop Wright. La question qui me reste est de savoir quel sera, selon G., le rapport entre Sg 10,1–11,1 et les chapitres suivants du livre, alors qu'il affirme l'unité de composition du livre.

On en arrive alors à l'étude du genre littéraire de Sg et, en particulier, de Sg 10,1–11,1 dans le contexte que G. lui attribue, à savoir Sg 6–10 (64-101). G. n'échappe pas à la question fondamentale, toujours débattue, du genre littéraire de Sg dans sa totalité. À la suite de J.M. Reese, *Hellenistic Influence on the Book of Wisdom and Its Consequences* (AnBib 41; Rome 1970) 117-121, il maintient que Sg est un protreptique, tandis qu'à la suite de P. Beauchamp, P. Bizzeti, *Il Libro della Sapienza. Struttura e genere letterario* (RivBSup 11; Brescia 1984) 113-180, moi-même dans "Sagesse de Salomon (ou Livre de la Sagesse)", *DBS* 11 (1986) 58-119, spéc. 77-87, et J. Vílchez Líndez, *Sabiduría* (NBE Sapienciales 5; Estella 1990) 38-39, considérons qu'il s'agit d'un *encomium*, d'un éloge à la manière des Grecs. Le vrai problème est de savoir si un discours protreptique peut se conclure par un long développement d'exemples tirés de l'histoire. Les protreptiques antiques qui nous sont parvenus n'en contiennent pas, mais, dira-t-on avec D. Winston, "A Century of Research on the Book of Wisdom", *The Book of Wisdom in Modern Research* (eds. A. Passaro – G. Bellia) (DCLY; Berlin – New York 2005) 5, rien ne prouve qu'ils n'aient pas existé. Pour G., l'auteur de Sg pourrait avoir ajouté à son protreptique la *synkrisis* de Sg 11–19 (69, n. 27). Je note tout de même que Winston (4) admet que "Bizzeti's close analysis considerably advances our understanding of the literary genre of Wis": je préfère cet avis à celui de G. qui se permet d'écrire: "to categorize the entire book as an encomium on Wisdom, as Beauchamp does, is a gross exaggeration" (69) et l'appui que G. pense trouver dans l'article peu convaincant de D. Aune, "Romans as Logos Protreptikos", *Paulus und das antike Judentum* (eds. M. Hengel – M. Heckel) (WUNT 58; Tübingen 1991) 91-121, n'est pas très solide. Mais peut-être sommes-nous en présence d'une querelle de mots. Je demanderais alors comment appeler les développements historiques qui achèvent quelques traités antiques, comme, par exemple, ceux de Philon, *Quod omnis probus*, 62-136, ou *De nobilitate,* 202-225, texte que G. présente, avec d'autres *Beispielreihen*, dans son *Appendix 2* (208), ou encore celui de Sénèque, *De clementia*, qui donne l'exemple d'Auguste. Il serait bon aussi de relire les théories des Anciens sur l'épidictique (cf. Bizzeti, *Il Libro*, 126-140, et mon article "Sagesse", 80-83). Curieusement, G. considère Sg 6–10 comme un *encomium* (82-89), quitte à avouer que "chapter 10 [...] was added later to supplement and serve as a transition to the next section" (89). Où est alors l'unité du livre au niveau de sa composition et, plus encore, au plan d'une pensée cohérente? L'hypothèse de Beauchamp n'a pas besoin de ces subterfuges de G.

Le chapitre 5 (102-148) est consacré à l'exégèse des cinq strophes de Sg 10,1–11,1, à savoir 10,1-5.6-9.10-12.13-14.15–11,1, le tout étant précédé d'un bref relevé de la littérature hellénistique et d'un autre sur Isis, en particulier dans son rapport à la Sagesse en Sg 10. Pour le dire tout net, G. donne une bonne exégèse de ces strophes et ses pages sont franchement très acceptables. Je ne relève ici que quelques notes de lecture. À propos de la solitude d'Adam (Sg 10,1b), j'aurais aimé une réaction à l'article de P. Beauchamp, "Épouser la Sagesse – ou n'épouser qu'elle? Une énigme du Livre de la Sagesse", *La Sagesse de l'Ancien Testament* (ed. M. Gilbert) (BETL 51; Leuven 1979, ²1990) 347-369, spéc. 360-369 (III. Adam seul avec la Sagesse). En outre, ne peut-on voir dans l'Adam de Sg 10,1 l'Adam primordial auquel quelques textes font allusion (Jb 15,7-8; Sir 49,16b; 1QS 4,22.23; CD-A 3,20 et 1QH^a 4,15; cf. E. Noffke, "Man of Glory or First Sinner? Adam in the Book of Sirach", *ZAW* 119 (2007) 618-624? Sur Sg 10,5, on verra à présent l'article de L. Mazzinghi, "La figura di Abramo in Sap 10,5: una rilettura della Scrittura tra giudaismo e ellenismo", *Sophia – Paideia. Sapienza e educazione (Sir 1,27).* FS M. Cimosa (eds. G. Bonney – R. Vicent) (Roma 2012) 351-364. La γνῶσις ἁγίων dont bénéficia Jacob à Béthel a été diversement interprétée et G. résume bien le problème; il montre aussi que sa traduction "of holy things", assez classique, n'exclut aucune des interprétations les plus courantes de ce passage.

Le chapitre 6 (149-179) est le plus original et il apporte, me semble-t-il, des nouveautés fort utiles pour comprendre Sg 10. G. montre, en effet, comment l'auteur de Sg interprète les textes bibliques antérieurs auxquels il se réfère. Pour ce faire, G. retient quatre domaines: 1. le vocabulaire et l'imagerie; 2. les détails sélectionnés par l'auteur de Sg; 3. l'arrangement des épisodes propre à l'auteur de Sg; 4. l'application à son auditoire, ou l'actualisation du texte biblique antérieur (149-158). Puis il compare l'utilisation de ces procédés en Sg 10 avec leur utilisation dans les autres parties du livre: Sg 1,1–6,21; 6,22–9,18; 11,2–19,22 (159-177). On retiendra surtout que partout les personnages sont présentés comme des types idéalisés, soit des justes, soit des impies, sans les nuances qu'apporte, en particulier, le Pentateuque. En outre, l'actualisation, déjà présente en Sg 10,7, se retrouve en 18,8 (170-171), mais G. ne mentionne pas Sg 19,22, texte pourtant capital, puisqu'il clôt le livre. Je relève encore quelques points sur lesquels G. aurait pu être plus nuancé. Comme le pluriel de βασιλεύς en Sg 10,16b se lit non seulement au Ps 104,30 LXX, mais encore en Sir 45,3, G. considère que le livre du Siracide était, pour l'auteur de Sg, "authoritative" (153-154); c'est aller trop vite en besogne, car je ne pense pas qu'on puisse prouver que l'auteur de Sg ait utilisé le Siracide. Parmi les citations bibliques implicites en Sg 1–6, il faut ajouter Pr 1,7d repris en Sg 3,11a (160). Par contre, la solitude d'Adam, en Sg 10,1b, reçoit une explication qui se rapproche de celle de Beauchamp (155). En Sg 10, on ne trouve aucune allusion aux alliances avec Noé, Abraham et Moïse et G. explique fort bien qu'un sage universalise (156). Enfin, à propos de Sg 19,18 et de la comparaison avec la musique, on verra aussi les pages de R. Pistone, "The Lyre and the Creation. Music Theory and Persuasive Strategy in Wisdom 19", *The Book of Wisdom in Modern Research*, 195-217.

G. donne donc une analyse précise de Sg 10,1–11,1 qui nous manquait encore. Mes objections ne visent que ses pages sur la structure et le genre littéraire du livre pris dans sa totalité (39-43, 47-53 et 66-73). Il me paraît aussi que ces pages relèvent du proverbe: "Qui trop embrasse mal étreint": elles ne sont pas absolument nécessaires à l'étude précise de Sg 10, étude qui, elle, est excellente et ne manquera pas d'être retenue.

Avenue Gaston Diderich, 25 Maurice GILBERT
L - 1420 Luxembourg

Novum Testamentum

Matthew S. Rindge, *Jesus' Parable of the Rich Fool*. Luke 12:13-34 among Ancient Conversations on Death and Possessions (Early Christianity and its Literature 6). Atlanta, Society of Biblical Literature, 2011. xix-299 p. 15 × 23. $29.95

In this revised version of the doctoral dissertation he completed in 2008 at Emory University under the direction of Gail O'Day, Rindge argues that the Parable of the Rich Fool (Lk 12,16-21) should be viewed as an integral part of a larger "sapiential narrative" whose principal concerns are at once existential, ethical, and theological: to expose the folly of any attempt to retain control of material goods for selfish ends, and to promote, instead, the giving of alms as a meaningful action that not only brings benefit to others but also enhances the relational life of the giver and thereby renders that person rich toward God.

In the first chapter, R. situates his study within the history of scholarship. He points out that the traditional reading of this parable as a fairly uncomplicated "example story" (*Beispielerzählung*) that warns against the dangers of avarice has given way in recent years to new interpretations based on perceived affinities between the Lucan parable and parallel texts selected either from the treatises of Greco-Roman moralists (as proposed by F. Danker, A. Malherbe, and R. Hock), or from the sapiential writings of various Jewish authors (as suggested by G. Eichholz, E. Seng, and B. B. Scott). While endorsing the validity of this comparative approach, R. insists that prior scholarship has failed to recognize the truly distinctive feature of the parable, which also provides the key to its interpretation: the interplay between death and the proper use of possessions as made explicit in the divine intervention of v. 20. This claim provides the basis for a new reading strategy that situates the Lucan parable in the context of other ancient writings in which reflections on human mortality are combined with recommendations about the proper and meaningful use of material possessions.

In the next three chapters, R. examines a series of Jewish and Hellenistic texts that he considers especially relevant and illuminating. Special attention is given to certain passages in the writings of Qoheleth and Ben Sira (chap. 2). While both authors hold a similar perception of death as an inevitable and yet unpredictable event, they come to sharply divergent conclusions about the proper use of possessions. Faced with the disturbing fact that all human beings, just and unjust, must suffer in death the same total loss of existence, Qoheleth recommends that the one meaningful option is to enjoy in the present those goods that one has received as divine gifts. In contrast, Ben Sira's belief that a person's ultimate fate is determined by the moral choices made in life prompts him to offer more constructive options for the use of possessions: material goods are valued as divine gifts, to be received with gratitude, to be enjoyed with moderation, and to be shared generously with the poor (through the giving of alms) and with one's rightful heirs (through the making of a will). The conclusions drawn from the reading of Qoheleth and Ben Sira are then used as a lens for discerning and assessing related concerns resident in *1 Enoch* and the *Testament of Abraham* (chap. 3) and in selected writings of Lucian of Samosata and Seneca (chap. 4). For the author of *1 Enoch*, according to R., death represents the passage to a postmortem judgment in which the law of retribution is strictly upheld. In the moral exhortations that follow, material wealth is viewed not as a divine blessing to be enjoyed and shared with others but as the unfailing source of culpable moral corruption. In the *Testament of Abraham*, R. argues, the author offers in the narrative portrayal of Abraham an exemplary model of the virtuous person whose generosity in offering hospitality to strangers and in providing for his heirs secures the blessing of God's favor, in life and in death. In the writings of Lucian and Seneca, on the other hand, references to the fear and anxiety commonly provoked by the prospect of death lead to reflections not so much on the meaningful use of possessions but rather on the need to cultivate an interior freedom by avoiding excessive attachment to material goods. While the stated goal of these chapters is to expound, through "an inductive close reading" of the text (45), the principal concerns of each author, R.'s investigation is clearly guided by an *a priori* interest in presenting the authors as participants in what he considers to be a continuous and cross-cultural "conversation" regarding the interplay of death and possessions.

In chap. 5, R. takes up the task of interpreting the Parable of the Rich Fool in light of the evidence uncovered in the preceding investigation of parallel texts. On the basis of the similarities and differences that emerge from his comparative analysis, R. concludes that the parable participates in this larger sapiential conversation by offering the depiction of a man with a "limited imagination" (194) who ignores all the common recommendations regarding the proper use of possessions. In devising a plan for the future that disregards his own mortality and that fails to consider his material goods as divine gifts to be enjoyed in the present, or to be passed on to rightful heirs, or to be shared generously with those in need, the rich man displays a "folly" that is promptly confirmed and censured by the divine voice. Rindge then adopts a more literary approach in chap. 6, where he examines the immediate literary context in search of further indications of how Luke intends the parable to be understood. Special emphasis is given to the explicit warning against avarice in v. 15, which not only concludes Jesus' response to the request for help in resolving a disputed inheritance but also prepares the way for understanding the parable that follows as a narrative illustration of the same moral admonition. Of even greater importance, according to R., is the apparently transitional statement in v. 21, which evaluates the rich man's folly in theological terms ("not rich toward God") and thereby sets the stage for the presentation in vv. 22-34 of Jesus' new, God-centered wisdom. The parable, therefore, is framed by two verses that help to clarify its intended function within the surrounding narrative. In contrast with the folly of trying to secure an inheritance (vv. 13-15) or of seeking to accumulate an abundance of material goods for some future enjoyment (vv. 16-21), Jesus proposes a radical alternative: a trustful imitation of God's provident generosity (vv. 22-31) in the concrete act of selling one's possessions and giving alms to the poor (vv. 32-34). The discussion continues in chap. 7 with a study of two ways in which Luke also reconfigures the sapiential conversation regarding death and possessions. First, the depiction of the man's justly acquired surplus serves to broaden the rhetorical impact of the parable. Second, anxiety about the future is introduced as the key existential problem at the root of all futile attempts to control one's life and possessions. In response, Jesus proposes as the only effective solution a greater trust in God's providence, actualized in specific acts of generosity and service. In chap. 9, a comparison with the much simpler version of the parable in *Gospel of Thomas* 63 provides further evidence to confirm the distinctive formulation and contextualization of the Lucan parable. At the very end, R. gives a brief summary of his conclusions and then makes a final appeal for a new approach to the study of Lucan parables that gives greater attention to their sapiential character and rhetorical function. An extensive bibliography is included, along with indices of ancient sources and modern authors.

While many will consider largely successful R.'s efforts to offer a "more textured and nuanced" (42, 230, 240) interpretation of this parable, some of the conclusions reached through the proposed reading strategy will not fail to provoke certain valid reservations. More convincing are the results of R.'s literary analysis of the parable within its immediate context. Of particular value is the insightful discussion of vv. 22-34 as a sapiential discourse that comments on the meaning of the preceding parable (203-209). As for the further attempt to read the parable in concert with a larger sapiential conversation, many unresolved ambiguities place in doubt the validity of this approach. The heuristic notion of a "conversation" is problematic in this case, since the textual evidence, by R.'s own admission (79, 93-34, 161), gives no clear indication of a conversational give and take, or hearing and response, on the part of the authors concerned. Furthermore, it is very difficult to accept as valid R.'s reconstruction of the central issue allegedly addressed in the selected parallels. None of the authors, with the possible exception of Qoheleth, offers anything close to a reflection on the inevitability and uncertain timing of death as the basis for recommendations concerning the proper use of possessions. In the case of 1 Enoch, for example, it is not the uncertainties of life and death but the certainty of a postmortem judgment that provokes the author's ethical exhortations. The coincidence in the same text of references to death and to the proper use of possessions does not, in itself, imply that the author is making some logical or existential connection between these two concerns, and R.'s analysis of the selected texts, although carefully researched and thoughtfully considered, fails to uncover sufficient evidence to support his hypothesis of a conversation among ancient authors about the interplay of death and possessions. It may be added that the exegetical discussion in the second half of the book does not always follow an orderly progression. The study of the parable in light of external parallels in chap. 5 includes a discussion of the parable's literary context that anticipates the reading strategy to be employed in chap. 6. Likewise, chap. 6 includes at the end a treatment of evidence from parallel texts, which properly belongs in chap. 5. These critical remarks notwithstanding, the author is to be commended for having advanced our understanding of this Lucan parable with a study that examines rigorously and creatively those features of the text that invite a potentially fruitful comparison with the Jewish and pagan literatures of the time.

Via della Pilotta 25 Dean BÉCHARD
I – 00187 Roma

Ben WITHERINGTON III, *Paul's Letter to the Philippians. A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary*. Grand Rapids, Michigan – Cambridge, U. K., William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2011. xxix-321 p. 16 × 23,5. $ 38.00 – £ 25.99

Ben Witherington, qui enseigne à l'Asbury Theological Seminary à Wilmore dans le Kentucky, s'est spécialisé dans l'analyse socio-rhétorique (qui, comme son nom l'indique, joint les méthodes de l'histoire sociale et celles de l'analyse rhétorique) et après des commentaires sur les Actes, sur les épîtres aux Galates, aux Thessaloniciens et aux Romains, il propose ici une lecture de l'épître aux Philippiens.

L'introduction à son commentaire donne clairement le cadre dans lequel il entend travailler. Il commence par réfuter l'opinion, devenue de règle depuis une quarantaine d'années, selon laquelle la lettre proviendrait d'une captivité à Éphèse (9-11). Arguant en effet qu'une telle captivité n'est pas documentée, que Paul ne dit pas être en prison mais dans les chaînes (ce qui suggère qu'il était enchaîné à un soldat ou assigné à résidence), que la mention des οἱ ἐκ τῆς Καίσαρος οἰκίας (Ph 4,22) n'est vraisemblable qu'à Rome, que la collecte qui semble être l'obsession de Paul lors de son séjour éphésien a disparu de ses préoccupations, il renoue avec l'option traditionnelle d'une épître de captivité romaine, qu'il date de 62.

Ensuite, se fondant sur l'unité de ton et la continuité des arguments de la lettre, il réfute toutes les théories de partition de la lettre. Une série d'arguments empruntés à la critique textuelle renforce l'argument: l'absence de toute variante textuelle significative, qui implique une grande unité de transmission; l'existence du P^{46} qui suggère qu'à une haute époque le texte était d'une seule venue ; l'absence d'allusions patristiques tendant à penser qu'il y aurait eu plus d'une lettre en circulation.

En outre, revenant sur son analyse précédente (développée dans son commentaire *Friendship and Finances in Philippi : The Letter of Paul to the Philippians* [NT in Context Commentaries; London 1994]), il démontre que l'écrit ne ressortit pas au genre de la lettre philophronétique (ou lettre d'amitié, *friendship letter*) qui a pour but d'unir un supérieur à un groupe d'inférieurs très souvent dans le but de les consoler, mais bien à la lettre familière (*family letter*) qui unit des personnes de statut équivalent. En effet, on peut remarquer l'absence totale du langage de l'amitié (φίλος ou φίλια) alors qu'abondent les termes qui suggèrent la réciprocité (17-21). Cela n'exclut pas l'usage de la rhétorique: Ben Witherington caractérise la lettre de «discours délibératif avec des traits épidictiques» (25). Pour lui, elle était destinée à être lue à la communauté, et valait donc comme discours.

Enfin, Witherington développe sa théorie sociologique, tournant autour du concept d'identité sociale. Il distingue ainsi entre une identité sociale primaire (fondée sur l'origine géographique ou l'extraction) qui ne change pas au cours de la vie et une identité sociale secondaire modelée au cours des conversions qui peut recouvrir l'identité primaire. Paul possède, selon lui, l'identité primaire d'être juif de Tarse, et l'identité secondaire d'être «en Christ». Sans faire mine de s'en apercevoir (même s'il parle du *parting of the Ways* montrant qu'il sait parfaitement ce qu'il fait), il prend ici une option historique extrêmement forte en estimant que Paul et sa communauté sont plus «chrétiens» que juifs ou païens. Il peut donc conclure: *Well before Paul wrote Philippians, Christian already has a distinguishable new social identity, distinguishable from those of both Jews and Pagans [...]. This theory has much promise to help us understand the parting of the ways between Judaism and Christianity, and how Paul in Philippians is helping his converts make their secondary identity in Christ their primary identity* (35).

Fort de cette certitude, Witherington fait alors un nouveau pas, qui mériterait, lui aussi, qu'on en discute. Remarquant en effet qu'il n'y a quasiment aucune référence à l'Ancien Testament dans la lettre, il en conclut que ses destinataires ne sont pas juifs. Non seulement son commentaire dément cette assertion puisqu'il se sert très largement d'Isaïe et des écrits intertestamentaires pour commenter l'hymne du chapitre 2, mais affirmer que l'absence de référence juive signe à tout coup une audience païenne demande à être démontré. Peut-on dire que *Joseph et Aséneth* qui ne fait quasiment aucune référence au contexte juif était destiné à un lectorat de non-juifs? Et que dire de toute la littérature sapientielle, qui ne fait pas plus référence à la Torah que Philippiens?

Le soi-disant paganisme de la communauté de Philippes étant acquis, Witherington peut développer l'axe de lecture de son commentaire: Paul qui, comme chacun sait, se fait tout à tous, n'argumente pas à partir des cadres juifs, mais parle «à la romaine», en utilisant des concepts purement latins, afin de se concilier la communauté d'une ville qui avait le statut de colonie et qui était même «une miniature de Rome» (5). Ainsi est justifiée l'utilisation de la rhétorique pour appuyer le propos de Paul et l'appel extensif que fait Witherington aux réalités sociales *romaines*. Il pourra ainsi, par la suite, expliquer les déclarations de Paul du chapitre 3 non pas comme une polémique intra-juive sur la circoncision, mais bien comme un abandon un peu opportuniste de la pratique légale: Paul s'en serait plus ou moins débarrassé pour éviter de heurter les sensibilités gréco-romaines de ses auditeurs pour qui se faire circoncire équivalait à une castration (194).

Le plan qu'il suit pour commenter la lettre est fondé sur son analyse rhétorique. Après la suscription épistolaire (1,1-2) et l'exorde (1,3-11), il distingue les temps classiques de la rhétorique délibérative. La *narratio* (1,12-26) décrit le progrès de la proclamation de l'Évangile. La *propositio*, ou thèse du discours (1,27-30), est l'appel à vivre une vie digne de cet Évangile. La *probatio* (2,1–4,3) se fait grâce à quatre arguments qui sont quatre modèles à imiter: le premier est le Christ (2,1-18, on reconnaît le fameux hymne); le second est le modèle du partenariat qu'entretient l'apôtre avec sa communauté (2,19-30); le troisième est l'exemple de Paul (3,1–4,1) et enfin le quatrième est le modèle des leaders de la communauté (4,2-3). La *peroratio* (4,4-9) exalte la vertu et la joie en Jésus. Les versets 4,10-20 n'entrent pas dans cette *dispositio*, aussi Witherington les qualifie-t-il de *post-scriptum* en les titrant «Donner et recevoir». Enfin viennent les salutations finales (4,21-23).

Il est impossible de résumer un commentaire. Notons simplement que Witherington reprend la pratique mise en œuvre dans les commentaires précédents d'intercaler des parenthèses intitulées *a closer look* pour examiner les éléments clés du monde gréco-romain: on notera ainsi une sorte de portrait de Timothée, «bras droit» de Paul (43-50), un état de l'art sur l'hymne aux Philippiens (132-164) ou une intéressante comparaison entre la morale paulinienne et la morale antique (249-259). De même, sous le titre *bridging the horizons* l'auteur offre de fréquentes actualisations des propos de Paul destinées à «combler les horizons» c'est-à-dire à faire de la pastorale: Ph 1,27-20 sert à réfléchir sur le 11 septembre 2001 (107-109), des idées pour la prédication sont suggérées (voir par exemple page 68: *Certainly it is true that a whole series of good sermons could be derived from a detailed study of how Paul uses the language of joy, especially here in Philippians.*).

Pour conclure, on notera que l'intérêt de la lecture de Witherington est sa cohérence méthodologique. En partant de l'analyse sociologique et des *realia* historiques, l'auteur propose une grille de lecture homogène. Bien entendu, celle-ci est plus à l'aise dans certains passages que dans d'autres. On relèvera ainsi l'intéressante discussion sur 4,10-20 dans lequel Paul, gêné d'inscrire le don qu'il a reçu des Philippiens dans une relation patron-client (dans laquelle il serait le client…) propose un autre modèle, fondé sur les relations familiales. On relèvera en revanche que l'analyse peine à commenter l'hymne du chapitre 2: le passage, très théologique, résiste … Délaissant alors un temps sa manière habituelle, le commentateur se raccroche alors aux Pères qu'il ne cite quasiment pas par ailleurs: Marius Victorinus, Jean Chrysostome, Augustin, Cyrille d'Alexandrie sont promptement convoqués lorsqu'il s'agit d'élucider les difficultés.

Faculté de Théologie Régis BURNET
B-1340 Louvain-la-Neuve

Eun-Geol LYU, *Sünde und Rechtfertigung bei Paulus.* Eine exegetische Untersuchung zum paulinischen Sündenverständis aus soteriologischer Sicht (WUNT II, 318), Mohr Siebeck, 2011. xv-405 p. 15 × 23. €84

The Korean author of this study has been professor in New Testament theology at the Hoseo University in Cheonan (South Korea) since 2010. This book is a somewhat abbreviated and reworked version of his dissertation which was accepted at the Ruprecht-Karls Universität of Heidelberg in 2007.

After the introductory chapters which consist of a brief overview of authors who deal with Paul's conception of sin (beginning with P. Wernle in 1917 and ending with T.L Carter in 2002), as well as an analysis of the conception of sin in the Old Testament and Greek tradition, the work contains three major parts: I. Sin and Paul's theology of expiation ("Sühnungstheologie"), II. Sin and Paul's theology of 'not-reckoning' ("Nichtanrechnungstheologie": sin is not reckoned as sin), and III. Sin and Paul's theology of liberation or of setting free ("Befreiungstheologie"). A final chapter resumes the central position in Paul's theology of sin and justification and also briefly discusses other soteriological metaphors such as reconciliation and participation. An extended bibliography and three indices ("Stellenregister", authors, and "Sachregister") appropriately close the book.

In Part I Lyu distinguishes between the 'diachronic' Paul and his 'synchronic' letters. According to Lyu, the historical critical method, which is used in gospel studies to separate redaction from tradition, can hardly be applied to Paul's letters. Lyu is therefore constrained to invent a different method of 'inner criteria' in order to detect and distinguish the pre-Pauline and Pauline original kerygma, the "Protokerygma" (ch. 4). Strictly speaking Jesus' death is not a cultic sacrifice nor is it simply a substitute vicarious death. Yet already before Paul, Jesus' death was understood as an expiation: Christ died for our sins (ch. 5). Although the expression 'righteousness of God' is known before Paul, the interpretation of Jesus' death as 'God's justification of sinners' is genuinely Pauline (ch. 6). Unlike the Jews who through the law knew sin, the Gentiles, through their conscience, also realized their sinfulness and the need of expiation (ch.7). Lyu is then able to reconstruct the nucleus of the Pauline protokerygma valid for both Jews and Gentiles: through Jesus' death God justified sinners. God's wrath, the basic condition of faith, and the promise of eternal life for believers constitute a "Sühnungstheologie" (ch. 8).

In Part II Lyu first examines the historical place of Paul's critical position over against the law. Already in the Pauline protokerygma the law had lost its supreme importance (ch. 9). Yet only in the letter to the Galatians does it become evident that the conflict with the Galatian opponents brought Paul to develop his critical position on the law. Justification comes through faith in Christ, not through the works of the law. The law cannot save; it only brings the knowledge of sin (ch. 10). Many pages of this book are devoted to Paul's "Gesetzespolemik", resulting in the exegesis first of a number of passages of Galatians, then of numerous sections of the Letter to the Romans. Lyu calls Paul's new conviction his "Nichtanrechnungstheologie" (ch. 11). As a conclusion of this second Part, Lyu critically analyses how "the New Perspective on Paul" evaluates boasting, the law and sin. Good insights of this new perspective should not, however, overlook the fact that it neglects to recognize the sinfulness of the Gentiles as the foundation of the early Christian mission (ch. 12).

In Part III Lyu considers the personification of sin by Paul. He begins by demonstrating that this personification is at home only in Romans. It functions as an answer to a double misunderstanding, first of Paul's theology of expiation (the more sin, the more forgiving grace), second of his not-reckoning theology (law is radically overthrown by faith) (ch. 13). Personified sin enslaves the sinners; only the Spirit can set them free (see Romans 8). Paul sets the victorious dominion of justification over against the dominion of sin (see Rom 5,14-21). Over against the enslavement to sin, Paul places the new reality of being slaves to righteousness through grace (see Rom 6,6b-23). Only the Spirit can again set free those Christians who want to save themselves through works of the law and thus find themselves in a hopeless situation (see Romans 7) (ch. 14). The synchronic letter to the Romans thus enables us to see the diachronic way Paul's theology of justification of sinners eventually followed: from the theology of expiation to the not-reckoning theology with its criticism of legalism, to the theology of setting free from enslaving sin in order to refute a double misunderstanding (ch. 15).

The numerous qualities of this dissertation should be recognized and duly mentioned. Lyu applies his methodological approach quite logically: first putting forward an insight, which then is proved by close exegetical discussions and, finally, resumed in a clear conclusion ("Fazit"). We have before us a solid and impressive piece of work; a great number of Pauline texts are thoroughly explained. Moreover, the main thesis of the author appears to be correct. Paul begins his theology by his conviction that all, Jews alike with Gentiles, are sinners and therefore in need of forgiveness and expiation. Paul refers to this process in his own specific way: "The justification of the sinner by faith".

My critical remarks will be limited to three major considerations. The first question touches the title of Part II: "Nichtanrechnungstheologie". Only here, not in Part I nor Part III, is the chosen title negative. Why? The meaning is that sins are not reckoned; this means that they are not taken into account and are forgiven. By this not-reckoning theology Paul explains further his theology of expiation (Part I) and defines it more precisely. However, the only passage in Paul's letters where this mode of expression is used, Rom 4,8, is part of the citation of Ps 31,1-2 which speaks of the sins of David: "Blessed is the one to whom the Lord will not reckon sin" (the deponent verb *logizètai*, moreover, is active in meaning). This manner of speaking is hardly typical for Paul. Would a title that is derived from "God justifies the sinner by faith, not by works of the law" (Gal 2,16; cf. Rom 3,19) not have been preferable?

It is unfortunate that the discussion of Gal 2,15 does not treat this verse as part of Paul's discourse which begins in 2,14b and ends with 2,21 (see 189-192). For Lyu, incorrectly it would seem, 2,15 is a nominal clause and refers to the position of the Galatian opponents. It is not part of the lengthy sentence which continues in v. 16. Therefore, according to him, verse 15 should not be understood concessively: "Although it is true that we are Jews by birth and not Gentile sinners". The emphatic "we" at the beginning does not point to Paul and Peter (cf. however v. 14b). The connection with the Antioch incident (1,11-14a) is, I think, not taken into account sufficiently. It should be noted, however, that Lyu's interpretation of *dia nomou* in 2,19 may be correct: "because of (not observing the whole of) the law" (see 103-104).

Perhaps one of the most problematic items in this book is Lyu's explanation of Romans 7, not so much in the conclusion that the "I" of 7,8-25 refers to Christians as in the way that he defends this understanding (see 322-331). In his discussion there is no mention of 7:5, a verse that precedes almost immediately the "I"-passage and clearly deals with the pre-Christian situation. Furthermore one can hardly agree with the author's view that the "I" passage begins with 7,8, not with 7,7. It is also difficult to understand how the Adam story, definitely present as the background of 7,8, cannot explain 7,9: "I was once alive apart from the law, but when the commandment came, sin (= the serpent) revived". An application to the pre-Christian situation occurs as it were automatically. Lyu's interpretation that the coming of the commandment indicates how the "I" shows "einen Christen vor seinem Wandel im Geist" (331) and how this Christian considers the law again as needed for salvation is hardly convincing.

More critical questions could be raised concerning, e.g., Lyu's negative exegesis of Rom 2,14-16 (see 235) or his claim that for the Galatian opponents circumcision (a "Kulthandlung) and Jesus' "Sühnetod" are closely connected (see 189-199 and 208). Yet notwithstanding my serious and manifold disagreements in detail, this study, I think, should be considered as a sound defence of Paul's "Sühnungstheologie" with general sinfulness as its anthropological "Kernpunkt".

Waversebaan, 220 Jan LAMBRECHT
B-3001Leuven (Heverlee)