Although Spencer acknowledges that the third gospel often imposes a disconcerting silence on women, he intentionally makes no place for the notion of a Jewish remnant and the Jewish rejection of the Christian movement. In Schafer's interpretation, Paul, on the one hand, distinguished between Gentiles within Christian circles and with the increasing Jewish rejection of the Christian movement. In Schafer's interpretation, Paul, on the one hand, distinguished between Abraham as the father of the promise and Moses as the lawgiver; Paul therefore emphasized that a remnant of Jewish people would receive eschatological fulfillment of the promises to Abraham. Luke, on the other hand, drew no distinction between Abraham and Moses; Luke therefore made no place for the notion of a Jewish remnant and expected only that the church should remain open to receptive Jews. The volume is richly nuanced and deserves the attention of both Pauline and Lukian scholars. Some readers will sense, however, that several of the most significant recent American contributions to the discussion have not received the attention they deserve.
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This revised dissertation (Catholic Theology Faculty, Tübingen) was written in conscious dialogue with the Vatican II documents on Jewish and Christian relations. Still, the volume has value for all scholars seeking more clearly to understand the Lukian and Pauline perspectives on the future of Israel. Schafer argues that both Paul and Luke, like most Jewish writers of their time, were deeply influenced by Deuteronomistic theology on the abiding, but conditional, nature of God's covenant with Israel. According to Schafer, both Luke and Paul regarded the initial presence of a core group of Jewish believers within early Christianity as essential for establishing Christianity's legitimacy, but both writers then struggled with the growing prevalence of Gentiles within Christian circles and with the increasing Jewish rejection of the Christian movement. In Schafer's interpretation, Paul, on the one hand, distinguished between Abraham as the father of the promise and Moses as the lawgiver; Paul therefore emphasized that a remnant of Jewish people would receive eschatological fulfillment of the promises to Abraham. Luke, on the other hand, drew no distinction between Abraham and Moses; Luke therefore made no place for the notion of a Jewish remnant and expected only that the church should remain open to receptive Jews. The volume is richly nuanced and deserves the attention of both Pauline and Lukian scholars. Some readers will sense, however, that several of the most significant recent American contributions to the discussion have not received the attention they deserve.
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Spencer, a leading interpreter of Luke-Acts, takes on the role of an “FBI” agent (“Feminist Biblical Interpreter”) and investigates the portrayals of women in Luke’s Gospel. His introductory chapter surveys the work of three leading (and representative) feminist interpreters of Luke: Jane Schaberg with her interpretation of Luke’s Gospel as “dangerous ground” for women; Turid Karlsen Seim with her interpretation of Luke’s Gospel as containing a “double message” regarding women; and Barbara Reid’s interpretation of Luke as emphasizing the “better part” for women. Although Spencer acknowledges that the third gospel often imposes a disconcerting silence on women, he intentionally seeks readings of the gospel that promote the status and role of women in the church and in the larger community. The volume’s primary concerns are the role of Mary (Luke 1–2); the woman with a lost coin (15:8–10); the historical Joanna (8:1–3; 24:10); Mary and Martha (10:38–42); various foreign women (4:25–26; 11:31; 17:32); and the widow who persisted against the unjust judge (18:1–8). The volume is strongly recommended; the readings are fresh and the scholarship is solid.
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Von Wahlde provides an engaging three-volume work presenting a three-strata theory for the Gospel’s composition with extensive implications for understanding the development of key Johannine theological themes and with impressive historical considerations. Volume 1 explains his composition theory positing three different authors and strata. The first edition (c. 55–65 CE) reflects knowledge of Palestine and refers to Jesus’s miracles as signs. Jesus’s dialogues are with Pharisees, chief priests, and rulers, while belief in Jesus is more widespread. Christology is connected with Jewish categories of messianic expectation, such as...
Elijah the Prophet. Second-edition material (c. 60–65 CE) refers to Jesus’ miracles as “works,” and the “fear of the Jews” becomes palpable. Belief is based on witnesses while Christology emphasizes God as Jesus’s Father as well as Jesus’s equality with God. The third-edition material (c. 90–95 CE) refers to Jesus as Lord and the term brother refers to community members not to siblings. Apocalyptic ideology abounds, and signs-faith is critiqued as less than adequate. Von Wahlde determines his diachronic sources consistently on the basis of criteria including differences in language and emphasis, repetitions, breaks in sequence, theological terms and differences, and differing terms for religious authorities. Volume 2 offers commentary on the Gospel of John itself, dividing the text into 60 sections. Each section is treated in three parts: composition, interpretation, and its role within the rest of the Gospel. Several sections include addenda to address critical issues. Eleven theological motifs provide a framework: developments in understandings of Christology, signs, pneumatology, eternal life, eschatology, knowing God, soteriology, ethics, anthropology, ecclesiology, and material reality. The crux of the diachronic approach is von Wahlde’s assignment of nearly 300 units to his three strata. Volume 3 provides commentary on the Letters of John (ca. 65–70 CE), which von Wahlde argues were written prior to the final edition of the Gospel. He largely follows Brown and others in his inferences regarding the crisis facing the community—opponents believing they had received the Holy Spirit are incorrigible regarding inadequate views on faith and practice. Von Wahlde views the Elder and the Beloved Disciple as the same person—an eyewitness to Jesus’s ministry, but not the son of Zebedee, whose influence on the Johannine tradition cannot nonetheless be ruled out. Von Wahlde’s analysis of the Johannine Gospel and Letters integrates historical, literary, and theological assessments. One beneficial contribution is the discussion of archaeological and historical evidence related to the ministry of Jesus. Whether or not one agrees with particulars of his intricate theory of composition, his insights into a multiplicity of Johannine dialectical processes are certainly worth considering for interpretation over the next generation or more of Johannine scholarship.
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While a number of scholars have written that the prologue in 1 John is a confusing, awkward mess, Brickie argues these conclusions result from reliance on what scholars see rather than on what they hear. Positing that the prologue was read aloud to an audience in its original context, any examination of its literary artistry requires a similar setting; one must listen for its cues, not dissect it visually. Brickie illustrates how the prologue’s aural design and coherence become noticeable when read aloud; its original literary artistry is clearly “visible” to the ear, even if not always visible to the eye. A revised dissertation, the study begins by examining what we can see in the prologue, past viewpoints, and how to move from the visual to the aural. The book has one major and one minor linchpin that make this thesis compelling. The minor linchpin is the idea of sound mapping, the theory of discerning aural qualities, promoted by M. Lee and B. Scott. The major linchpin is Brickie’s use of Historical Greek Pronunciation (HGP) instead of Erasmian, as promoted by C. Caragounis among others. HGP makes Brickie’s argument stronger. The book makes an excellent case for the coherence of the prologue of 1 John, and serves as a reminder of the importance of alternate approaches to a text (such as sound mapping and HGP). Aural Design is highly recommend for research libraries.
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Scholarly interest in the Apocalypse of John has boomed over the past two decades. This collection of essays from a similarly titled 2008 symposium held at the University of Munich surveys recent research concerning Revelation’s historical context, theological concepts, and textual reception. Following Tóth’s footnote-dense introductory survey, the twenty-one contributions address a wide array of familiar topics, such as dating, John’s interaction with imperial cultic systems, use of Jewish scriptures, the influence of Jewish apocalyptic texts, literary composition, martyrdom, eschatology, liturgical afterlife, and subsequent use by theologians and artists. The breadth of coverage results in relatively limited interaction between essays, granting greater focus at the expense of cross-references. Although the scope of the project is wide, the collective authors provide an effective investigation and analysis of the burgeoning research on Revelation. The volume lacks a composite bibliography; however, the footnotes provide ample material for scholars seeking current resources on Revelation in German and English. Die Johannesapokalypse is certainly a worthy purchase for research libraries and suitable for specialists; it contains four extensive indices of textual citations (Scriptural, Jewish, Greco-Roman), modern authors, specific topics, and Greek vocabulary.
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