

temple, as well as the clear possibility that Christianity would become dominated by Gentiles in the near future—Matthew “hoped through his Gospel to help keep Jewish and Gentile Christians together” (723). Allison (it is apparent that this section is primarily his work—cf. his comments about himself in the first person, 698) makes the curious observation that Matthew’s silence on the subject of circumcision means that he takes the Pauline position that Gentiles do not have to become Jews to be saved, and furthermore claims that in his interpretation of the law, Matthew swims in the mainstream. This is certainly a more centrist reading of Matthew’s understanding of the law than is usually found in Matthean scholarship. It is all the more surprising that Allison considers Matthew’s position on the law “mainstream” when he traces the inheritors of Matthean Christianity to the Nazoraeanes, which fit the necessary profile, in that they were Jewish-Christians who accepted the Gentile mission.

How, then, should this massive work of scholarship be assessed? The three volumes stand as one of the major commentaries on the Gospel of Matthew in which all future interpreters of the Gospel will find a source of fruitful dialogue and helpful ideas. It is a “must have,” both in libraries and in footnotes. Davies and Allison are to be thoroughly commended on the fruits of their considerable toil.

Avondale College
Cooranbong, New South Wales, Australia

ROBERT K. MCIVER

Dawes, Gregory W. *The Body in Question: Metaphor and Meaning in the Interpretation of Ephesians 5:21-33*. Leiden/Boston/Koln: Brill, 1998. xiv + 264. \$85.50.

The Body in Question is a revision of a University of Otago Ph.D. dissertation, written under the supervision of Paul Trebilco and Brendan Byrne. Published in Brill’s “Biblical Interpretation Series,” this study provides a contribution to the debate surrounding the interpretation of Eph 5:32-33, which is a part of a larger discussion—mainly among conservative scholars—concerning male headship and female subordination in the NT.

In the introduction, Dawes offers a summary of the interpretive debate as he outlines four prevalent interpretations of the pericope: (a) a defense of patriarchal order (Clark, Knight), (b) a rejection of patriarchal order (Schüssler-Fiorenza), (c) reinterpretation of patriarchal passages (Mickelsen, Kroeger, Hardesty, Dawson), and (d) ambivalent evaluations (Witherington). His study builds on the work of Marlis Gielen which “anticipates some of the conclusions of the present study” (10). The book’s thesis is summed up in the conclusion: “Both the command to ‘be subordinate’ and the command to ‘love’ can and should be retained in any interpretation of the passage. . . . But a comprehensive and consistent reading of Eph 5:21-33, within the context of the letter as a whole, will redirect these injunctions, so that they apply to both partners” (232). The book is divided into three parts.

Part 1, “The Theory of Metaphor” (25-78), contains two chapters. Chapter 1 establishes “the functioning of metaphor” as Dawes examines the theories of I. A. Richards, Max Black, and Monroe Beardsley. He concludes that we can detect the presence of a metaphor when (a) the term(s) “which we suspect to be the ‘focus’ of a metaphor cannot be understood literally . . .” (55), and (b) “although the

words do not have their usual denotation, the meaning which emerges from their use on the occasion emerges from the model which the literal use of the term creates" (ibid.). Chapter 2 introduces the concept of "living" and "dead" metaphors, the latter being determined by its accepted use as a reference in a certain semantical context.

The four chapters in part 2, "An Analysis of Ephesians 5:21-33" (79-191), are dedicated to exegetical issues. Chapter 3 analyzes the argumentation of Eph 5:21-33, and concludes that there are two levels of argumentation: "the parenetic (wives and husbands) and the doctrinal (the Church and Christ), the second being at service of the first" (108). In chapter 4, Dawes attempts to clarify the relationship between analogy, metaphor, and model, and suggests that the terms *kephalē* and *sōma*, which are essential to the analogy, are derived from the same underlying model and should not be viewed as isolated metaphors (*contra* Yorke & Ridderbos). Chapter 5 offers a competent discussion of the *kephalē* metaphor with an evaluation of the "source" versus "overlord" debate, and an examination of its use in Greek medical writers and other sections of Ephesians. He concludes that it should be understood as "authority over" (134). In Ephesians, *kephalē* always appears in context with *sōma*. *Sōma*, the subject of chapter 6, is discovered to have two metaphorical understandings: "on some occasions . . . , the Church is described as a 'body' which stands in relationship to its 'head.' On other occasions, the Church is described simply as a 'body,' without any reference to its 'head'" (165). Only in 5:28 does *sōma* refer to a literal body. Chapter 7 evaluates the terms *mīa sarx* (one flesh) and *mysterion* (mystery). Dawes examines the first in light of the unity theme he detects in Ephesians, and concludes that whereas all references to unity are "horizontal" (believer and believer), *mīa sarx* in 5:31 also contains a "vertical" reference (Christ and church). This union is the *mysterion* mentioned in 5:32.

Just as one is about to forget the original theme of the study, the hermeneutical section is offered in Part 3, "A New Interpretation of Ephesians 5:21-33" (193-235). In chapter 8, Dawes suggests that while the plain reading of the text does call for female marital subordination, the actual intent of the author is to direct both parties "to imitate the example of Christ and the Church, with all that this implies" (198). He goes further to suggest that whereas in 5:22-24 the image of husband and wife in relation to *sōma* and *kephalē* is "partitive," in 25-31 the image is "unitive." Therefore, the rhetorical aim is to suggest a reversal of the commands. For example, "if the husband should love his wife because she is 'his own flesh,' the same may be said of the wives" (205). Seen in the light of 5:21 and other parenetic sections of the letter, the passage really calls for "mutual subordination." In an excursus, Dawes cautions that "mutual subordination" is not the same as "equal rights." He concludes in Chapter 9 with "The Interpretation of Ephesians 5:21-33." Here he hammers home the "mutual subordination" themes with his claim that the wives' "submission" and the husbands "love" are practically the same action. The book ends with an appendix on "Christ and the Church as 'Head' and 'Body'" (236-250).

Dawes has made a noble attempt to bridge some of the serious presuppositional gaps that have obscured the efforts at interpreting this much-debated passage. By approaching the text via the linguistic lenses of metaphor and meaning, he has alerted us to the fundamentals of both exegesis and hermeneutics. We cannot expect to understand texts if we ignore the way in which language

works. With his informed approach, Dawes skillfully analyzes the major arguments from both camps and offers common-sense responses that are sure to force opponents to agree that when it comes to metaphor, it may not always be "either/or" but it can be "both/and" (e.g. the possibility that *kephalē* can signify both "source" and "overlord.")

The weakness in this study is probably due to Dawes' desire to "eat his cake and have it too." While noble, the attempt at offering a both/and solution has failed. On a methodological level, Dawes must be chastised for his over-reliance on secondary literature. Only Aristotle is blessed among the rhetorical ancients to be included among the linguistic theorists Davies mentions. Should not a study on metaphor and analogy in ancient literature contain the insights of Cicero, Quintilian, Anaximenes, et al.?

More serious, though, are the exegetical flaws that undergird the eventual interpretation. Foundational to Dawes' argument is his assertion that our pericope calls for mutual subordination. With his suggestion that *sarx* and *sōma* are synonyms, and therefore, the husband is as much *sōma* as the wife, Dawes totally neglects the nature of analogical argumentation which demands that the images remain consistent throughout. The analogy demands that in the context of *sarx*, the husband remains *kephalē* and the wife *sōma*. What is also interesting to note is that *sōma* is not used of either the husband or the wife in 22-24. The extended analogy in 25-31 borrows from the image of Christ in 22-24, and is therefore "partitive" (and not "unitive" as Dawes claims).

Another problem derives from Dawes' assumption that 5:21 calls for the mutual submission of all Christians. He concludes from this that Paul's consequent parenesis contains "profound tensions" and should not be taken as a literal promotion of subordination of wives. Would Dawes have us believe that this mutual submission extends to the parent/children and slave/master relationships of 6:1-9? Further, is it not true that whereas the parenesis in 5:15-21 is ecclesiastical, 5:22-6:9 is sociological? And would it not make more sense to view 5:21 as a *transitus* rather than a *propositio*? Indeed, if it were a *propositio* would it not be immediately nullified by the *exhortatio* of 5:22-5:21-33? It seems to me that Dawes' conclusions would be radically different if he were to separate the obviously domestic from the implicit ecclesiastical pareneses.

Further, how can Dawes explain his claim that "It is nowhere demonstrated that . . . marriage and the union of Christ and the Church . . . are indeed analogous" (224)? This is an extremely important premise in the developing enthymematic argument. In order to support this charge, he would have to do some serious explaining about the relationship between Christ's love for the church (5:25) and the husband's love for his wife (5:25, 28). Again, I maintain that one cannot conduct rhetorical analyses on ancient literature without first engaging the rules of classical rhetoric. While Dawes has tackled the subject with an air of grace, I do not believe that he has established a firm enough foundation to presume that he has arrived at *the* interpretation of Ephesians.