

semantics and himself taught a number of its premier exponents, Danove has applied an adapted method to the New Testament, developed the abstracted thematic roles, and shown specifically how a verb's 'licensing properties' can be inferred from its grammaticalization, and consequently has converted those properties into this syntactically elaborate guide for analysis of every instance of a New Testament verb of communication.

What remains to be seen with this (and other) theoretical syntactic volumes is the extent to which students of the language will be willing to wrestle with the intricacy and try to apply its inferential descriptions. Though the terminology is explained and illustrated, the technical shorthand is no small pill to swallow. It would have been helpful to have heard more from the author about why he finds CF analysis preferable to standard grammatical approaches and other theoretical frameworks, for as syntactic theory becomes increasingly complexified—as it has been doing by leaps and bounds since the advent of generative linguistics—its researchers may find themselves speaking mostly to each other while bypassing the majority of potentially interested followers who lack primary training in that particular theoretical tradition. Cognitive linguistics is a promising field, yet interested followers may need assistance getting onto the train before it departs from the station, leaving them standing on its traditional grammatical platform.

doi:10.1093/jts/flv094

Advance Access publication 7 July 2015

JONATHAN M. WATT
Geneva College
jwatt@geneva.edu

The Nonviolent Messiah: Jesus, Q, and the Enochic Tradition. By SIMON J. JOSEPH. Pp. xiv + 352. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2014. ISBN 978 1 4514 7219 6. Paper n.p.; e-book n.p.

IN *The Nonviolent Messiah*, Simon J. Joseph argues that the historical Jesus advocated non-violence, and he highlights the tensions between Jesus' non-violence and militant, Davidic messianic expectations. Joseph delineates a trajectory in Jewish apocalypticism of a peaceful, non-violent Adamic messianism. The Animal Apocalypse of the Book of Dreams (*1 Enoch* 83–90) and Daniel form the beginning of this trajectory, which he contends influences the Parables of Enoch, Q, Paul, and Gospel traditions.

The opening chapter contains Joseph's initial discussion of historical Jesus research, Q as the most important historical Jesus source, and the 'gospel' of Q as Jesus' proclamation of good news to the poor. In chapter 2, Joseph addresses three topics often considered to portray a violent Jesus: 'I have not come to bring peace but a sword' (Q 12.51), taxes to Caesar, and Jesus as a revolutionary. Regarding each of these topics, Joseph argues for Jesus' non-violence and advocacy of non-violence (p. 39), which he maintains should be privileged in authenticating Jesus traditions (pp. 47, 50).

Joseph begins chapter 3 by discussing the Hebrew Bible's presentation of God commanding and condoning warfare. He notes that the New Testament's presentation of Jesus as the face of the violent God and his role in eschatological judgement raise difficulties for viewing Jesus as non-violent. Thus, in chapter 4, Joseph challenges the prevailing view in historical Jesus scholarship that Jesus is an apocalyptic figure. While Joseph rightly indicates that imminent judgement is not the primary meaning of 'apocalyptic', he attempts to dissociate Jesus from the 'apocalyptic Jesus model' as 'the human face of [a]... violent Deity' and connect him with 'restorative eschatology' (i.e. not violent eschatological judgement) (pp. 88–9).

In chapters 5–9, Joseph argues for a trajectory of non-violent messianic expectation in Second Temple Judaism. His argument in chapter 5 is that Jesus, although non-violent, was understood to be the Messiah; Jesus was crucified as a royal messiah even though he failed to fulfil any militant Davidic expectations. Joseph makes a case in chapter 6 for a Christology of Q; however, 'Q both affirms and appropriates Jesus as "anointed" while it simultaneously qualifies and subverts traditional or popular messianic associations by reinterpreting them through the lens of eschatological reversal' (p. 123). Joseph continues his argument in chapter 7 with a discussion of the Markan Son of Man and suggests that Mark 'adapted this motif from the early Jesus tradition in Q' (p. 138). For Joseph, the Son of Man sayings in Q indicate the rejection of the Q community and represent their violent rhetoric against sectarian enemies. Joseph thus sees two streams of tradition in Q: Jesus' non-violent teaching of the kingdom and Jesus as the violent, apocalyptic judge from Dan. 7:13.

Chapter 8 contains Joseph's discussion of the Parables of Enoch (1 *Enoch* 37–71), which he argues influenced Q, Paul, and Matthew. He particularly notes the sapiential material in Q and the Parables and the usefulness of the Parables' conflation of

multiple messianic themes into one figure for early Christianity (pp. 159–60). He uses this Enochic connection to enter a discussion of the Animal Apocalypse (*1 Enoch* 85–90) in chapter 9, where he argues that the white bull in *1 En.* 90:37–8 represents a messianic new Adam responsible for eschatological restoration. Joseph contends that Daniel 7's 'one like a son of man' 'seems to have originated in the *Animal Apocalypse's* figure of a new Adam/humanity' (p. 175). He then highlights numerous texts concerning the royal standing of Adam/humanity as well as Paul's Adam Christology to argue for a Jewish apocalyptic trajectory of eschatological Adamic messianism that promotes the regeneration of humanity.

In chapter 10, Joseph addresses four aspects of Q that align Jesus' non-violence with this Adamic messianism: 'seek his kingdom', eschatological warning as eschatological reversal (Q 6.46), loving enemies (Q 6.27), and becoming sons of the Father (Q 6.35c–d). Joseph again notes Q's two streams of tradition, contending that the roles of 'end-time judge and the transforming Adamic messiah' are 'in certain respects thematically and theologically incompatible' (p. 226). The former is a '(mis)representation' of the historical Jesus (p. 228).

Simon Joseph has made an ambitious contribution to historical Jesus studies, particularly Jesus' non-violence, with which future scholarship must reckon. I would like to draw attention to four lingering questions, which suggest where his argument is susceptible to critique. First, can we privilege Q's 'Inaugural Sermon' over all else even claiming that Mark's Son of Man is dependent on early Q tradition? Second, can an Adamic messianic tradition primarily rest upon the white bull of *1 En.* 90:37–8, especially considering few agree on the identity of this figure and the various messiahs of Second Temple Judaism are generally Davidic? Third, can the white bull/messiah figure be exonerated from violence only because he appears after the eschatological judgement? Before he appears, the fallen angels, the 70 shepherds, and the blind sheep are thrown into the fiery abyss and burned (90:20–7), and the sheep whom the white bull leads are given a sword to kill the wild beasts (90:19; cf. 90:34). Can a messiah be considered non-violent if eschatological restoration follows eschatological judgement, especially if messiah figures often play some role in judgement (Isa. 11:4–5, 13; *1 Enoch* 62–3; *2 Baruch* 70–4)? Does saying such violent language is only metaphorical make these questions disappear? Fourth, if we find violent judgement and peaceful restoration together in numerous messianic traditions of early Judaism and early Christianity,

can we legitimately claim the incompatibility of these two streams in Q or in the teaching of the historical Jesus?

The breadth of material that Joseph addresses in his study of Jesus as a non-violent messiah is to be commended (the bibliography runs to 83 pages!). He has rightly noted the importance of *Urzeit und Endzeit* in messianic expectations and challenges current scholarship to consider that the historical Jesus is non-violent, not 'apocalyptic', and yet is still part of early Jewish messianic traditions.

doi:10.1093/jts/flv051

Advance Access publication 1 May 2015

BENJAMIN E. REYNOLDS
Tyndale University College,
Toronto
breynolds@tyndale.ca