

Der jüdische Messias Jesus und sein jüdischer Apostel Paulus. Edited by Armin D. Baum, Detlef Häusser, and Emmanuel L. Rehfeld. *Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2/425.* Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2016, viii + 417 pp., €94.00 paper.

Based on the recognition that early Christianity is deeply rooted in Judaism, this collection of essays examines the question of the relationship between Judaism and Christianity along three lines: (1) the relationship of Jesus and Paul to OT Scripture; (2) the relationship of Jesus and Paul to contemporary Judaism; and (3) the relationship between Pauline theology and Synoptic traditions about Jesus.

The volume gathers eleven papers originally delivered at a NT symposium at the Albrecht-Bengel-Haus in Tübingen in honor of Rainer Riesner's 65th birthday by students, colleagues, and friends (not all papers were included). Armin Baum (Professor of NT at the Freie Theologische Hochschule in Giessen), Detlef Häusser (Professor of NT at the Evangelische Hochschule Tabor in Marburg), and Emmanuel Rehfeld (Institut für Evangelische Theologie at TU Dortmund) served as editors.

The contributors are particularly interested in exploring the question of continuity between Jesus and Paul, respectively, and Judaism. The four essays in part 1 deal with Jesus and the Synoptics. The opening essay by Thomas Pola discusses the fact that the Messiah was widely expected to reconstitute Israel, to build an eschatological temple, and to effect end-time atonement. However, according to Matt 11:2–6, in a break with contemporary Jewish expectations, Jesus already inaugurated the new age even prior to the universal judgment.

Roland Deines argues that the early Christians' messianic conception was rooted in the teaching of Jesus who claimed to be a messianic interpreter and teacher of Scripture in the line of David. In contrast to other Jewish expectations, the early Christians believed in a Messiah—Jesus—who had already ascended to God's throne (Ps 110:1) and was going to return.

Emmanuel Rehfeld discusses the tension between the Synoptic portrayal of the pre-Easter proclamation of Jesus and of the post-Easter Christ *kerygma*. While written from a post-Easter vantage point, the Synoptics tap into pre-Easter traditions about the earthly Jesus. Paul's letters, the Fourth Gospel, and Acts serve as hermeneutical commentaries on the Synoptics. In this vein, Jesus is presented as Savior of both Israel and the Gentiles.

Armin Baum explores the role of memory in the formation of the Synoptic Gospels. As part of his investigation, he builds on psychological findings by Robert McIver and Marie Carroll who identified ten Synoptic texts that in their view exhibit a degree of correspondence that is so unusually high that it cannot be adequately accounted for by mere memory. Contra McIver and Carroll, however, Baum contends that results would be different in the case of individuals whose memory is highly trained. He concludes that there are no passages in the Synoptics that can be explained only by direct copying as part of a literary relationship. *Gedächtniskultur trumps Abschreibeverhältnis.*

Part 2 features seven essays on the Pauline corpus. Volker Gäckle discusses the continuity between the proclamation of the kingdom of God by Jesus and Paul. While central in Jesus's proclamation, God's kingdom occupies only a peripheral role in Paul. Rather than conceiving of the kingdom in terms of God's rule, kingdom may be understood in terms of a future place and time or a present gift (i.e. eternal life). The author finds two major affinities between Jesus and Paul: the kingdom as a future place as in Jewish thought and the kingdom as eternal life or salvation as in a Greco-Roman context.

Joel White tackles one of the most controversial aspects of N. T. Wright's proposal, namely the alleged implicit exile metanarrative underlying Paul's theology. In interaction with Wright, White raises several methodological and content-related questions. In terms of method, White contends that N. R. Petersen's sociological-narratological analysis is superior to Richard Hays's actantial analysis. In terms of content, White contends that Wright has thus far failed to demonstrate the existence of a permanent exile narrative underlying any specific Pauline text. In contrast, White shows that Paul, in Romans 9–11 and 15:14–20, by drawing on passages from Deuteronomy and Isaiah, assumes that the return from exile had commenced but remained yet incomplete.

Hanna Ruck, in a study of Romans 9–11, asks how Jewish believers in Jesus read and understood Paul who was himself Jewish. She adduced three messianic Jewish interpreters (Jechiel Lichtenstein, David Stern, and Joseph Shulam) who draw extensively on rabbinic literature. Ruck shows that these interpreters find more continuity between Judaism and Paul than many German interpreters. Jewish interpreters are also more familiar and comfortable with Paul's hermeneutic and style of argumentation than their German counterparts. Finally, Jewish interpreters categorically reject anti-Jewish types of interpretation. Unfortunately, however, such Jewish interpreters, who could enrich German interpretations, have been largely ignored.

Guido Baltes investigates the core tenet in Pauline teaching regarding freedom from the Law. He analyzes the key texts Romans 7–8, Gal 2:4; 3:22–25; 4:21–5:1 and concludes that none of these texts speaks of "freedom from the Law." Romans 7–8 speaks of freedom from "the law of sin and death" in contrast to allegiance to God's law. Gal 2:4 speaks of freedom from merely human requirements. Gal 3:22–25 refers not to a confining prison but to a protective fortress. The allegory of Sarah and Hagar in Galatians 4 does not contrast the Law and grace, or Judaism and Christianity, but the slavery of earthly existence and the freedom of heavenly existence. Thus "freedom from the Law" does not accurately describe Paul's teaching; phrases such as "freedom from the *curse* of the Law" or "freedom from the *judgment* of the Law" are more accurate.

Detlef Häusser studies Paul's mission in the context of the church in Philippi in contrast to ancient Judaism, which did not engage in mission understood as purposeful activity aimed at conversion. The Philippians participated actively in Paul's mission (Phil 1:5), proclaiming the gospel (Phil 2:15–16), sending Epaphroditus (Phil 2:25–30), and providing financial support (Phil 4:10–20).

Alexander Weiss proposes that Paul was not the only early Christian who possessed Roman citizenship, since a considerable portion of the population in Roman *coloniae* were Roman citizens. If one supposes that Christians constituted a representative segment of the population, such a conclusion is rendered plausible, even likely. In this regard, Weiss sides with E. A. Judge over against A. N. Sherwin-White. This is the context for Paul's teaching regarding a higher citizenship in Phil 3:20.

The final article was contributed by Michael Theobald who boldly challenges the honoree Rainer Riesner's thesis that Luke wrote the Pastoral Epistles soon after Paul's death. Rather than arguing for authenticity, Theobald argues for an even greater distance between Paul and the Pastorals considering its distance from Judaism, its adoption of Greco-Roman conceptualities, and its espousal of un-Pauline ways of thinking. Theobald also cites the combination of two or three nouns in Titus as syntactical evidence for the Pastorals' distance from Paul and finds several additional indications of their pseudepigraphic character.

All in all, this is a very interesting, at times even provocative, and well-conceived volume (see especially the contributions by Baum, Baltes, and Theobald). I particularly enjoyed the essays by White on Wright's exile motif (caution well taken!) and by Häusser on mission in Philippi (rightly affirming a discontinuity between Jewish and early Christian mission). While space does not permit detailed interaction and critique here (though I should say that Theobald's essay strikes me as unduly hostile to the Pauline authorship of the letters to Timothy and Titus), scholars working on the intersection between Judaism and Christianity and on the relationship between Jesus, the Synoptics, and Paul will do well to interact with the essays in this volume.

If there is one disappointment, it is with the fact that the Fourth Gospel is not included in the purview of this volume. Does John really have nothing to contribute to the biblical witness regarding "the Jewish Messiah"? This would be particularly pertinent to Roland Deines's essay which argues that the Gospels—but apparently not John—should be considered alongside other early Jewish messianic traditions. Emmanuel Rehfeld (p. 112 n. 25) at least attempts to justify the neglect of John's Gospel by arguing that in contrast to the Synoptics, John exclusively reflects post-Easter theology. I would suggest, however, that he and the other contributors read and ponder the article by D. A. Carson on "Understanding Misunderstandings in the Fourth Gospel" (*TynBul* 33 [1982]: 59–91) where Carson shows that John was very well capable of distinguishing between the vantage point of the earthly Jesus and that of the disciples following the resurrection. That said, the omission of John's Gospel in this volume is in keeping with Rainer Riesner's methodology in his magisterial, still untranslated volume *Jesus als Lehrer: Eine Untersuchung zum Ursprung der Evangelien-Überlieferung* (WUNT 2/7; Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 1981), which likewise covers only the Synoptics but not the Gospel of John.

Andreas J. Köstenberger
Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary, Wake Forest, NC