

Lambert's assistance was required for Assyriological queries it was recorded (see p.89, fn. 9; when desirable, he sought the help of J.D. Ray on Egyptological matters, p.321, fn. 1). There likely were not five contemporaries of his in England who could have written chapter 2, 'The Hebrew Language'. It truly is an encyclopedic piece. The 'Hebrew Lexicography and Grammar' section (seven papers) reviews various opinions objectively before dismantling untenable theories and deductions (e.g., see chapter 6, 'A Further Consideration of D.W. Thomas' Theories about yādā'). In the section 'Textual Notes on the Old Testament' (15 essays) readers encounter analyses of an exquisite kind (e.g., Gen. 49; Isa. 6:13; Prov. 3:35; Jer. 13:22). Each of them is a detailed study, is rigorous and repays close reading.

Structurally, 'Hebrew and North-West Semitic Epigraphy' contains six essays that are similar in kind to the notes in the preceding section, except that these papers treat of specific Ugaritic epigraphic points and they examine various Near Eastern inscriptions. Likewise, nine chapters of topics that require broader treatment appear under the rubric 'Old Testament Issues'. In the paper on 'The Date of the Yahwist' (chapter 38) Emerton directs his attention to the so-called J text in the Graf-Wellhausen documentary hypothesis. In this model, 4 sources (JEDP) are suggested to lay behind the first five books of the Bible. This theory was founded in the work of Jean Astruc (1684-1766) and generally accepted by Hebraists in the first half of the 20th century. Skepticism regarding the Mosaic authorship of Genesis-Deuteronomy in Church history was not new. Samuel Ives Curtiss (1844-1904) proffered a chronological review of critical beliefs in several issues of *The Bibliotheca Sacra* (1884-1885) with his papers 'Sketches of Pentateuch Criticism'.

Emerton consented to the Graf-Wellhausen theory in part. But in his article, 'The Date of the Yahwist', he scrutinized Hermann Vörländer's (V) contentions about a later date for the JE documents. Formidable arguments are advanced; but V did not believe the text was pre-exilic because it goes unmentioned in other literature of that day. He claimed that Mesopotamian elements in the Pentateuch were there because of J's composition during the Babylonian exile. Emerton concluded "The case against a pre-exilic date for J is weak, because it fails to provide a satisfactory account of parts of the document. The stories of Jacob's dealings with Esau and Laban testify to a pre-exilic date" (p.569). Emerton, however, inferred a 9th-7th century BC date for the Yahwist document, which was a fairly standard view at the time.

Readers too will be fascinated by the six papers set under the heading 'New Testament and Early Christianity'. The paper 'The Problem of Vernacular

Hebrew in the First Century A.D. and the Language of Jesus' is a sane historical piece of scholarship. Numerous academics have argued excitedly for a predominance of Aramaic usage; others for Hebrew or Greek. Previously guarded about assertions on the vernacular use of Hebrew, the vast amount of evidence of ordinary conversations yet on record compelled Emerton to reflect further on the issue and to write "It now seems to me that they render very probable the hypothesis that Hebrew was used as a vernacular by some Jews in the first two centuries A.D." (p.629). In regard to the presence of Semiticisms in the Greek texts of the Gospels, he declares "The use of Semitic words in the Greek Gospels need not, therefore, imply dependence on written sources in Hebrew and Aramaic" (p.633). For some writers in the past it seems to have posed a problem to them that Jesus may have been multi-lingual, using whichever tongue suited him at the time. The Gospels do not signal the evidences of a chief idiom in the speeches and accounts chronicled. But Emerton concluded his paper by saying "Hebrew was probably used as a vernacular in Judaea in the time of Jesus, but Aramaic was also used there and was in more general use in Galilee" (loc. cit.).

In the 'Biography and History of Scholarship' section memoirs of S.R. Driver (1846-1914), G.R. Driver (who "received a knighthood in 1968", [p.655]), and a review of Abraham Kuenen's (1828-1891) academic study of the history of Israel, conclude the volume. There is a 13 paged 'Index of Biblical and Other Passages Discussed' at the book's end.

---

Paul H. Holloway, *Philippians*,  
ed. Adela Yarbro Collins, (Fortress 2017),  
pp.xxx, 256.

The Hermeneia commentary series "is designed for the serious student of the Bible" (p.ix), supplying data that are necessary for engaging with biblical texts critically. By applying to these texts a modern spirit of inquiry, readers can observe the directions in which scholarly winds are blowing. Everyone will not agree with the queries raised or with the conclusions given. Some may not believe that the modifications of thought conform to truth. None, however, can doubt the overall value of Hermeneia's deft examinations of biblical texts as they appear in the marketplace.

Holloway (H.) has written a valuable book; but its place in the Hermeneia series may be debated by reviewers. Its form resembles a doctoral dissertation. His doctoral research and this book both were supervised by his doctormutter, Adela Yarbro Collins. H.'s text empha-

sizes the consolatory factor in Paul's letter. The Introduction is clear and runs to 57 pages, the Commentary, pp.61-191. The Bibliography and indices are extensive, pp.193-254.

H. does credit to critical scholarship. He is acquainted with Greek and Roman views of ancient solace. H. regularly equates 'joy' and 'consolation'. His assumptions raise several questions. He concluded that "Joy is a key motif in Philippians, where in one form or another it appears sixteen times. The commentary tradition has yet to come to grips with Paul's use of this important term" (p.3). This statement is not entirely true. Is it not true that there have been popular and critical commentaries of the past century and a host of homiletic studies of Philippians that have stressed the prominence of joy in Paul's letter? The word 'joy' is mentioned frequently, but I am not sure that its many appearances regulate the whole of it's Pauline content. On account of this line of reasoning, the critical comments have some flaws, causing the project to fall short of the even-handed researches of other commentaries in the Hermeneia series. And by comparison it matches up badly to J. Reumann's *Philippians* Commentary in The Anchor Yale Bible Series.

From jail, Paul wrote a series of admonitions to the Philippians. Initially, his prayer for them was that they would 'abound' in knowledge (1:9). Further on, his objectives become known: his missive was composed to supply Christians there with a series of personal testimonies (1:12-21; 2:19-30; 3:4-19; 4:10-18), ones of divine insight that are needed in order for believers to live Christ's life to the fullest and to permit Christ to live fully through them (1:6, 27-28; 2:13-16; 3:2-3, 20-21; 4:4-9,19). In so doing, each of them would be able to reach a status of maturity in order to say like Paul, 'I have all and abound' (4:18). That summary outlines the broad spectrum of the epistle. My thesis does not detract from the general principle laid down by H that the text is consolatory. It enhances it.

H. says on p.42 that 'Paul's letters do not bear witness to a body of carefully defined "doctrines" but rather to a set of religious topoi or "places"... . In this regard Paul was not unlike a provincial orator with his collection of set themes'. His meaning, by his use of 'religious topoi', is vague. Rhetors or speech-specialists (e.g., Demosthenes or Lysias) for the most part dealt with political issues. Moreover, these same ancient Greek and Roman orators did not establish ecclesiae in ancient cities for religious purposes: their speeches were unlike the epistles of Paul. Paul's letters present carefully reasoned "doctrines" or "teachings" concerning the person of Jesus and the redemptive work to which he expected various disciples who were associated with him to adhere. The letter does much more

than console or treat of how to conquer grief. Guidelines for living the Christian life are set forth everywhere throughout. Were this not the case, he would not have felt the need to link his prayers (1.3-12) for their current blessings with the exhortation 'The Lord is at hand' (4.4), signifying the longed for return of Christ.

The expositions and notes to vv.1:1-3, 3:1-11 and 4:10-20 show inventiveness. H. writes "Paul's habit of beginning letters with an expression of thanks is paralleled in a handful of other ancient Greek letters ... . But the expression is not as common as has been assumed, and many of the texts cited are not parallels" (p.71). Consequently, one asks, does Seneca *Ep.* 107.1 really offer "a number of parallels to the progression of Paul's thought in Phil 1:9-10a." ? (p.79f). Paul's use of the term 'flesh' has derogatory nuances for sure; but to associate any of its Greek shades of meaning with the American swear-word, 'bullshit,' is not only nonsense but crass (p.153). The excursus on 'faith in Christ' or 'faith of Christ' is informative (p.165f). But at 4:12, should it be alleged that Paul intended to say through the phrase "I have found out how to be full and hunger" that his manner of learning or acquiring knowledge amid circumstances was similar to the way one is "initiated into the mysteries"?

I will single out for extended comment one peculiar philological doctrine, it is his treatment of Paul's so-called Christ Myth: the pericope at 2:5-11. It is illustrative of H.'s deductive method. H. abandoned the idea of previous scholars that 2:5-11 had been a prose hymn; but regrettably, in its place he supplies the notion that 2:6-11 is a metamorphic myth. The section Excursus: Metamorphosis in Greco-Roman and Jewish Myth (pp.121-123) is didactic but fails to settle the issue of Christ's assumption of flesh. The Greek word ὑπαγκμὸν at 2:6 is debated often. It is now translated with reference to 'equality with God' and now to 'something to be grasped'. H. writes (p.120), 'Strictly speaking, Christ is not "equal to God" either *before* his metamorphosis or *after* his exaltation. To interpret "equality with God" *sensu stricto* is therefore not an option' (italics his). H.'s lexical arguments are refined; arguing that what was lost in his appearance as a man in 2:6-8 is "reversed in 2:9-11 when Christ is restored to his angelic form" (p.121).

This example of exegesis highlights a feature that often appears in Hermeneia commentaries: the philological and historical studies are far-reaching, often displacing clear theological insights which seem to be of less importance to Hermeneia commentators as they pursue innovative lines of inquiry: e.g., cf. Paul's Metamorphic Myths (pp.48-52) where Christ is deemed by H. to be "a mighty angel who originally

existed in the form of God” (p.49). In the section, Postscript: Justification (pp.52-55), he offers a subtle twist on the New Perspective vis-à-vis how the justice of God is applied in this life and in the afterlife. Explaining “Paul’s theory of salvation”, he does so without any hint or reference to what a Christ-believer is saved from, i.e., sin; and if the word “saints” remains appropriate in a critical commentary, what is wrong with making frequent use of the word “Christians”?

In relation to Paul’s turn from Judaism to the acceptance of the Messiahship of Jesus, students should recall that Paul dispensed with obligations of circumcision upon Christians and with their subservience to Jewish jurisprudence. Indeed he repudiated the need for Jerusalem’s Temple priesthood and its sacrificial system for individual atonement. These types he felt were fulfilled and clarified by Jesus in his completed work of redemption as The Lamb of God. Regeneration by means of repentance, (which is a change of heart initiated by the grace of God), is fully explicated in accounts of Paul’s speeches and writings (e.g., Acts. 20:21; Eph. 2:1-13), but readers are confronted by the bewildering assertion, ‘It is debated whether Paul’s move to Christ-belief should be called a “conversion”’ (p.160:n.32).

In this book, readers have so many parallelisms from classical [non-canonical] texts thrown in their pathway that Pauline literary style is lost. Syntactic comparisons are made to a multitude of linguistic forms, most of which fall outside the Pauline corpus of writings. And Paul likely would be surprised to know that his letters allude to so much Pseudepigraphical literature. In my estimation the resemblances are all a bit overwrought: no case has been proven that in prison Paul wrote a coded missive to Jesus’ disciples in Philippi, which alluded to texts with which the majority of his hearers would have been unfamiliar. Albeit a few Greek texts were discovered in the districts of the Dead Sea, should we infer from Paul’s text that words in Qumran scrolls can throw any significant light on a letter written to Jewish and Gentile worshippers of Christ who were native to a Greco-Roman context?

On occasion Paul does cite non-biblical texts explicitly. These incidents are rare. Hellenists will marvel at the supposed relevance of the quotation from Euripides *Alc.* 2-7 to explain Christ’s condescension into manhood (p.119). As quoted above, H.’s exegesis on this passage seems to advocate a [Arian/Unitarian] viewpoint that is inconsistent with Pauline belief. Paul’s notion of Christ’s Sonship made Jesus equal to God in all aspects of eternity past and eternity future. At Colossians 1:15-17, to take one example, Paul affirms Jesus’ timeless role in the Godhead, even his superintendence over all created entities, including secular spheres of influence

and civic power. Readers, however, cannot learn these things in the commentary notes because they are being instructed about Pauline themes that are construed to represent allusions to Sophocles’ tragedies or to legends connected with Dionysus.

Since H. does not reconstruct for students the mindset of Jesus, particularly as it regards what he thought of himself and his deity (cf. Jn. 5:18), he endows Paul’s words with meanings which connote that Jesus ‘divested’ himself of his characteristic deity or never possessed equivalence with his Father in the past. Would Paul not have been aware of oral traditions in circulation in Palestine regarding how Jesus judged himself to be in relation to his Father? From a close scan of H.’s notes on this point, he seems to answer in the negative. I disagree. God the Son’s adoption of human flesh for redemptive purposes certainly disguised his deity to most persons; but it in no way disfigured the manifestation of his divine attributes to many persons during his career on earth.

In New Testament matters, perhaps H. does not control the theology of individual writers’ texts: e.g., as alleged by H., Paul nowhere maintained that “The spirit of Christ entered a believer at baptism” (p.47-48). In fact Paul did teach that regeneration was performed by the same Spirit who indwelt and filled the believers (see Acts 19:1-7; Eph. 5:18; Tit. 3:5), whose entrance was unrelated to a cleric’s dispensing of a rite of purification. In several places I was compelled to rethink conventional positions. Learning is an ongoing thing in all fields of research. Except, an academic’s preparation in a study differs widely from the foundations a pastor lays in his study. Scholars certainly will find rich resources in this volume. Clergypersons, on the other hand, will search hard for substance to propagate from pulpits that will grow the minds of their hearers. Liberal critical views prevail over plainly orthodox explanations. Few scholars with Low Church views are mentioned in the annotations. Their absence does not reduce the value of contributions that Evangelical academics are making in studies of the text of Philipians. By and large, this edition reflects conclusions extant in current critical scholarship.

Furthermore, it draws attention to Post-Modern tools of exegesis and shows why mainline denominations, whose constituency holds similar views, are incapable of impeding the mass exodus from their sects: the divergences from the claims of ancient biblical writers are considerable. The bottom-of-the-page notes prove the writer to be well-read. Future commentators will be glad to have at their disposal an apparatus so carefully assembled. The volume has much that is useful. Greek and Latin Patristic texts are cited. The notes constitute a veritable library of facts. H.’s renderings are lucid. At

a few places the translation is less felicitous. In text-critical sections he arranges before readers select information that is necessary for them to furnish their own reasonable solutions. He utilized the Nestle/Aland 28th edition, believing that “The text of Philippians is largely problem free” (p.55).

---

## Give Due regards to

Edd., M. Wallraf, J. Stutz, and N. Marinides *Gelasius of Caesarea: Ecclesiastical History, The Extant Fragments: with an Appendix containing the Fragments from Dogmatic Writings*, (De Gruyter 2018), pp.cxi, 294.

Forward looking scholars who seek to understand the motives and meanings of ancient historians have no easy task. Coming to grips with principle influences that lay behind a writer’s erstwhile convictions takes time. If authors laid claim to beliefs in fortune and fate or in blind luck and chance or in Providence or deity(s), a good dispassionate scholar would not berate their beliefs or misconceive how each perceived impulse revealed itself in the authors’ collective memories. He or she would cull private and public texts where these whims are referenced. Hence the positive study of history serves a civic good: it can improve civility, evolve the mind, and is useful for the development of mental culture.

Historians of old were selective in their recording of past events: primarily it seems, they wanted readers to learn from what went before. Usually events are woven into a larger narrative. Whatever contemporary readers may think about the “unconstructive” effects of Herodotus’ (c.484-425BC) documentation or of Thucydides’ (c.460-400BC) “critical” assessments, initiatory studies of the period begin with these two Greek writers. Each of them contributed facts and insights of which we would know much less without their treatises. Herodotus had been a traveler, Thucydides a soldier.

Presently, writers of all ethnicities in earlier periods are accused of partiality. This notion is one of many reasons used to justify the incessant need for contemporary research. At times the allegation has been proven to be true. A critical scholar who must face massive amounts of contrary facts tends to hold this view about people who differ from him, and about individuals who noted down tales and activities of which he or she would have avoided keeping count in our current hypercritical climate. Historians’ current moods induce different tastes. But writers of the past had

distinctive preferences. Assorted dialects coexisted in confined areas. Traveling was harder. Societies were separated and united by a mixture of affiliations. People were more or less curious about cultures unfamiliar to them, about the traditions of their civic systems and the intricacies of siege warfare. Chroniclers played an important part in the discovery, design, and sometimes the interpretation of disjointed extracts and orally transmitted quotations. As pieces of vast historical puzzles, they required arrangement and rearrangement. Each time this was done the past came alive once more.

Religious scenes did not go unnoticed. If Cicero (106BC-43) recorded philosophical features that were common to Roman readers, Arrian (c.AD86-160), too, recorded peculiar expressions of the spiritual life of Alexander the Great. By the second century it was no longer widely held by devotees of Christ that Greek and Latin writers must be the sole models for how to record and analyze the history of Christian sects. Techniques changed. In ecclesiastical studies, later Church historians constructed their treatises by noting doctrinal disputes (differences of opinion regarding a body of ideas), and the discipline proved itself to be one of the most fertile fields of research in antiquity. By ignoring Luke’s (d.80?) two treatise work on the Gospel and Acts, and by depreciating Papias’ (c.61-163AD) contribution to historical studies, it follows that Hegesippus (c.110-180AD) may have been the first Christian historian. He chronicled events in a multi-volume work entitled, Ὑπομνήματα (Remembrances).

Eusebius of Caesarea (c.259-339AD) is Christianity’s most famous historian. He was productive. His main views were Arian, but his Ἐκκλησιαστικὴ ἱστορία (Church history), was well received. His was more an account of the succession of Bishops of particular city-churches than a history of Christianity: he favored the prelacy. There are errors within it. Criticism of his claims continues, and is made today by classicist, theologian and historian alike. He alleged the Jewish Essenes were an order of Christian Monks; and despite his claims, there is no record the apostle Peter ever was in Rome. No wonder Scaliger (1540-1609) said “many are the hallucinations, many the errors of Eusebius.” And Burckhardt (1818-1897) thought him “the first thoroughly dishonest historian of antiquity”. Such is Eusebius’ testimony. Other church historians followed him.

Gelasius (d.390) was the nephew of Cyril of Jerusalem (315-387). Very little of Gelasius’ personal story is firmly reported. Nicaean in belief, he ascended to the office of the episcopate, likely appointed by his uncle. Gelasius was well placed at Caesarea. Anecdotal stories of the origin of the earliest Christian sects circulated in