conjectures (p. 421). Is the protreptic model a procrustean bed? Doubt clouding that, how sustainable is the case for 5–8 as the letter's nub?

If Rom 1:16–17 is the topic sentence for just 1:18–4:25 (p. 394), where is a comparable thesis for the alleged main section (chaps. 5–8)? Given that Paul conducts a running dialogue with Jewish (-Christian) concerns in Romans 1–4, does it follow that he is merely agreeing with his readers? Has he here nothing fresh to break to them, to prove? Longenecker has an eye for "patterns of distribution." The NT concordance associates the complex of "justification" language especially with Paul. Might its very frequency in precisely these chapters, where after all Paul first mentions "my gospel" (2:16)—as well as in Galatians 2–3 ("the gospel I preach," Gal 2:2)—indicate Paul built "his" gospel around this word group as its keynote? The density of prooftexts in Romans 1–4 and 9–11 suggests Paul establishes his platform in these sections.

Do the units 5:1–11 and 8:31–39 with their shared vocabulary and motifs really form bookends that set off a structural *inclusio* (p. 403)—or is not 5:1–11 a summary of the present consequences of justification, and the Adam/Christ schema in 5:12–21 an elegant synthesis of 1:18—5:11? On the face of it, Romans 6–7 looks like Paul's replies to a series of possible objections to what he has laid down (6:1, 15; 7:7, 13), with 8:1 ("therefore … no condemnation") resuming the thread from 5:18–19. Might the paucity of biblical quotations and the direct address here (p. 369) mean Paul is fencing off misunderstandings, rather than launching into a specimen of his essential proclamation?

Introducing Romans is, true to its author, bold and independent, erudite and informative, never less than challenging even where we cannot concur, and everywhere warmly evangelical and pastoral.

Paul A. Rainbow
Sioux Falls Seminary, Sioux Falls, SD

A Jew to the Jews: Jewish Contours of Pauline Flexibility in 1 Corinthians 9:19–23.) By David J. Rudolph. WUNT 2/304. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011. xii + 290 pp., €69.00.

This monograph is an updated version of David Rudolph's doctoral thesis at Cambridge University in 2007, which won the Franz Delitzsch Prize from the Freie Theologische Akademie. In 1 Cor 9:19–23, Paul seems to regard his Jewishness as a cloak, which can be put on or taken off as the situation demands. His claims such as "I became like a Jew, to win the Jews" and "I became like one not having the law" sound to most Western ears like one who had abandoned a Law-observant life. Furthermore, this interpretation is often used as a hermeneutical key to explain Paul's more Jewish actions (e.g. Timothy's circumcision; Acts 16) as momentary expedience rather than abiding conviction. Rudolph argues in his monograph that this consensus reading of Paul can no longer bear the weight that interpreters have placed on it and that in fact "scholars overstate their case when they use 1 Cor 9:19–23 as incontrovertible evidence that Paul was not Torah observant" (p. 18).

He also provides an alternative interpretation of the passage demonstrating how it "can be read as the discourse of a Jew who remained within the bounds of pluriform Second Temple Judaism" (p. 19).

His first and major concern in part 1 (chaps. 2–4) is to challenge the current consensus that Paul had burst the bounds of first-century Judaism. Chapter 2 begins with a broad survey of major texts in the Pauline corpus and Acts thought to be supportive of the consensus view. Rudolph systematically challenges the typical reading of these passages and, by offering other biblical and first-century parallels, makes the case that the traditional view is not irrefutable. In regard to Paul's erasure language such as "circumcision is nothing" (1 Cor 7:19; Gal 5:6; 6:15) or "no longer Jew or Greek" (Gal 3:28), he argues that by comparison these things are less important than being in Christ. In salvation, the unity that is found in Christ is more important than, but does not preclude or erase, the diversity of the constituent parts (male/female, Jew/Gentile). Paul's "former way of life" in Judaism (Gal 1:13) could easily refer to a right-wing form of Pharisaic Judaism wherein he violently persecuted the church of God. In addition, he argues that language such as "live like a Gentile and not like a Jew" (Gal 2:14) should be seen as intra-Jewish sectarian language (p. 51). He then examines other key texts (Acts 21:17–26; 1 Cor 7:17–24), which suggest that Paul viewed his Jewishness as an abiding calling in Christ, rather than an expedient move to assuage public perception.

Chapter 3 focuses on contextual issues in Corinthians, specifically Paul's stance on food offered to idols in 1 Cor 8:1–11:1. The traditional view understands Paul's loose stance on eating idol food as an abandonment of his Jewish lifestyle. Rudolph argues compellingly that Paul in fact could have worked within Jewish contours of flexibility to respond to the issue of idol food in Corinth (p. 109). He sees Paul's approach to idol food as consistent with the apostolic decree of Acts 15 even if it was a more contextualized application of the principle (p. 108). He argues that Paul's teaching is not as original or un-Jewish as scholars often assume because early rabbis adopted a similar approach by focusing upon the intention of the person rather than the intrinsic impurity of the food. He shows that Diaspora Jews participated in table fellowship with their Gentile neighbors and that there is no evidence that all Jews avoided *macellum* food. This would seem to suggest that Diaspora Jews other than Paul maintained some degree of halakhic flexibility when it came to indeterminate food (pp. 93–103).

Chapter 4 engages the setting and language of 9:19–23. Given Paul's use of Jewish sources and nomistic language in 1 Corinthians 8–10, Rudolph argues that the setting of Paul's "all things to all men" teaching is the first-century Jewish practice of accommodation in table fellowship. A variety of views existed with regard to proper table fellowship in Jesus' and Paul's day consisting of at least three categories: the strict Pharisee, the average Jew, and the less strict "sinners." He gives ample evidence of Jewish people being willing to associate with and share meals with others without compromising their own ritual purity. He then offers an interpretation of the most critical language from this perspective ("free," "I became as," "under the law," "without the law," "though I am not without the Law of

God," "in Christ's Law," "win," and "weak"). For example, when Paul says he is not "under the law," he does not speak abstractly about abrogation in general as though he had left the bounds of the Mosaic Law but rather specifically, with regard to table fellowship, he does not live "under it" as "a strict Pharisee" would have. Again, when he says he is "under the law of Christ" he means that he is interpreting the Mosaic laws of table fellowship as understood and practiced by the Messiah, Jesus.

By the end of chapter 4, he has actually made his first point, and in chapter 5 he sets forth his alternative understanding of 9:19–23. Paul is not a free radical but merely a Torah-observant Jew who has taken his cues from Jesus' own practice. With the food-related context of 1 Corinthians 8–10, and Paul's reference to dominical sayings that point back to Jesus' example and rule of adaptation "eat what is set before you" (1 Cor 9:14; 10:27/Luke 10:7–8), it is argued that 1 Cor 9:19–23 reflects Paul's imitation of Christ's accommodation and open table fellowship. It is well documented that the Pharisees often found fault with the ritual purity of Jesus' disciples and yet Jesus frequently shared table fellowship with Pharisees and with common Jewish people and also tax collectors and sinners. When Paul says he "became like a Jew" this means nothing more than that he was the ideal guest in Jewish culture and received the hospitality of a variety of Jewish hosts. As Jesus became all things to all people through eating at the tables of ordinary Jews, Pharisees, and sinners, Paul became "all things to all people" through eating with ordinary Jews, strict Jews (those "under the law"), and Gentile sinners.

Ultimately, I believe Rudolph has succeeded at his primary objective: he has destabilized the consensus reading that 1 Cor 9:19–23 necessarily precludes a Torah-observant Paul (p. 209). While not all will agree with Rudolph's conclusions, his reassessment of the traditional view in chapters 2–4 still stands as a significant and original contribution to scholarship. Exegetes should not merely presume that 1 Corinthians 9 is a hermeneutical key that interprets other Pauline texts and actions as those of a supersessionist. He has built his case by carefully reading these texts with the help of first-century halakhah, so that we can hear Paul as a first-century Corinthian might have. A second contribution is the correlation of Paul's lifestyle with the portrait of Jesus' accommodation in the Gospels. Paul's references to the dominical sayings (Luke 10:7–8) strengthen his claim to "Follow my example, as I follow the example of Christ" (11:1).

In his final thoughts Rudolph muses, "Did Paul value Jewish continuity?" (p. 211). He does so because the trajectory of the monograph leads in this direction. Rudolph's sketch of the apostle in the pages of this work is that of a more consistent Paul whose letters seem to match his actions without undue explanation. He proposes a Paul who remains true to his calling as a Torah-observant Jew (his "rule in all the churches"; 1 Cor 7:17–20) but who does not require the same of Gentiles even as he preaches and argues for their equal standing among God's people. He has correlated the passages dealing with social interaction (1 Corinthians 8–10; Romans 14–15, Acts 15, 21) with this portrait of a Jewish Paul, but what remains to be done is to reconcile and relate the more soteriological passages where Paul often expresses a negative view of the place and destiny of the law in the salvation story. Until this work is done those musings must remain tenuous.

Chris Miller
Cedarville University, Cedarville, OH

Galatians: A Commentary. By Martinus C. de Boer. NTL. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2011, xxxiv + 461 pp., $50.00.

Martinus C. de Boer, Professor of New Testament at VU University Amsterdam, offers a new commentary on Galatians in The New Testament Library series. The structure of the commentary is fairly intuitive, but it can be difficult to navigate through when trying to isolate individual verses since it is organized around paragraphs. In addition, it includes nineteen supplementary excurses addressing various interpretive issues along the way. For this review of the commentary, I will focus on the major themes and emphases of de Boer's interpretation of Galatians rather than atomistically address the exegesis of selective passages.

In a manner similar to J. Louis Martyn's famous Anchor Bible commentary, de Boer argues that the key to understanding Galatians is to recognize Paul's apocalyptic language. Taking this approach, de Boer provides a unique analysis with many surprising interpretations along the way, and so this commentary is not a mere repackaging of Martyn. For de Boer, Galatians is an "apocalyptic sermon" (p. 71). Certainly, there is no denying that there are apocalyptic elements in Galatians. For instance, the letter begins with a strong statement of temporal dualism ("the present evil age" in Gal 1:4). There is also a contrast between "the present Jerusalem" and "the Jerusalem above" (Gal 4:25–26), and Galatians contains key apocalyptic vocabulary (e.g. ἀποκάλυψις and ἀποκαλύπτω in Gal 1:12, 16; 2:2; 3:23).

However, when reading de Boer's commentary one wonders how historical his presentation of apocalyptic actually is. For one, de Boer mistakenly assumes that apocalyptic carries strong connotations of discontinuity. The "fullness of time" when Christ was born (Gal 4:4) marks the "end" of that time; "a clean break with the past" (p. 262). One can see a glimpse into the nature of de Boer's emphasis on discontinuity in his comments on Gal 1:16 where Paul states that the Son was *revealed* (ἀποκαλύψαι) "in me." Rather than interpreting "in me" as implying "to me" or "through me," as most commentators do, de Boer offers the idiosyncratic interpretation: "in my former manner of life" (p. 93). For de Boer, Paul personifies the discontinuity between the ages; his former manner of life was brought to an end. The emphasis on radical discontinuity in de Boer's commentary is likewise expressed through the language of "divine inbreaking" when describing certain apocalyptic acts of God in Galatians. For instance, commenting on the reference to "faith" in Gal 3:23, de Boer calls this an "eschatological *novum*" because it has "invaded the human cosmos from outside" (p. 239; cf. n. 353). Likewise, he refers to the presence of the Spirit as part of God's "invasive" activity (p. 266). De Boer's language here is far too dualistic to represent a Jewish worldview that did not make

JOURNAL OF THE EVANGELICAL THEOLOGICAL SOCIETY
2825 Lexington Rd., Box 927
Louisville, KY 40280-0001

JOURNAL OF THE EVANGELICAL THEOLOGICAL SOCIETY • Volume 55, No. 2

JETS

JOURNAL OF THE EVANGELICAL THEOLOGICAL SOCIETY

CONTENTS

Volume 55, No. 2 June