

simply borrow the commonplaces, but fashioned new constructs out of them to bring about paradigm shifts in the thinking of the audience. For example, Paul took the original emancipation motif of the Sinai tradition and dramatically transformed it into a theme of enslavement. Also, he transformed the concept of atonement from a process initiated by humans through sacrifices and repentance into a process initiated by God through the sacrifice of his Son. The Hellenistic *topos* of reconciliation underwent similar changes at the hands of Paul, from being an appeal made by the offending party for a settlement and rapprochement to a grace settlement proffered by the offended party, which in this case was God. According to Fitzgerald, Paul was the first Jewish (Christian) person to bring together the ideas of atonement and reconciliation in a manner similar to Dionysus and Plato.

In his introductory essay ("Paul Beyond the Judaism/Hellenism Divide"), Engberg-Pedersen reveals and discusses the overall aim of the book, which is to put "a new program" of research (4) on the table for Pauline scholarship with the intention of replacing, for good, the misguided dualism of Hellenism and Judaism. As one makes one's way through the book, it becomes clear that, indeed, looking at Paul and Second Temple Judaism as subsets of Hellenism is not only a refreshing and fruitful interpretive approach, but an approach that is here to stay for quite a while. Nevertheless, the description given to the approach of the present work as a "new program" needs to be reconsidered, as it could give the false impression that the editor intends with these essays to put together a new *Schule* capable of bringing the entire Pauline scholarship on board, a feat that is no longer possible in our day.

Finally, one wonders whether looking at the NT through an outsider's perspective is necessarily a more accurate way of looking at history, unless, of course, one insists that history is an outsider's perspective, period. An urgent question is whether the insider's view of Paul, which, in my opinion, may be ultimately responsible for the dualism of Jewish particularism and Christian universalism (the nascent form of which has been pointed out in Barclay's essay), has any place in the current interpretive climate. If Paul, for example, formulated his gospel as a new interpretive possibility in the setting of the Jewish and Christian self-understanding that presupposed, rightly or wrongly, the dualism of Hellenism and Judaism, one wonders whether it is possible to understand Paul without referring to that dualism. In other words, one wonders whether the view of Paul offered in this volume, one which sees him primarily from an outsider's perspective, is not just as one-sided in the opposite direction as was the older view it seeks to replace.

Andrews University

P. RICHARD CHOI

Fletcher-Louis, Crispin H. T. *All the Glory of Adam: Liturgical Anthropology in the Dead Sea Scrolls*, Studies in the Texts of the Desert of Judah, ed. F. García Martínez, vol. 42. Leiden: Brill, 2002. xii + 546 pp. Hardcover, \$231.00.

In this work Crispin H. T. Fletcher-Louis mounts a full-fledged investigation into and reinterpretation of the anthropology of several significant Qumran

writings, in particular, the *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice* and the *War Scroll*. Fletcher-Louis, who received his D. Phil. in Theology from Oxford University, is currently Lecturer in New Testament in the Department of Theology at Nottingham University. He has previously published his dissertation (*Luke-Acts: Angels, Christology and Soteriology* [WUNT 2.94; Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 1997]), as well as a number of scholarly articles.

As Fletcher-Louis states in his preface, this work “is the development of a footnote” in his published dissertation (xi). He asks, “Has the liturgical *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice* from Qumran been misinterpreted, giving the wrong identification of the worshipping community it so rapturously speaks of?”

In chapter 1, Fletcher-Louis introduces the subject of angelomorphism in Late Second Temple Judaism, showing that this period took special interest in portraying Moses, kingship, and the priesthood with angelic characteristics. Chapter 2 is a case study devoted to pre- or proto-Essene traditions that speak of Noah in angelic and priestly terms, while chapter 3 further develops the conceptual background to an angelomorphic priesthood, with a focus on Sir 50. In chapters 4-7, he presents his understanding of how these concepts of a divine and angelic humanity and priestly angelomorphism are reflected in the Dead Sea Scrolls. Chapters 8-11 entail his detailed, focused, and revisionist reading of the *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice* (largely in opposition to a number of Carol A. Newsom’s earlier interpretations) in the light of his preceding discussion; he extends this approach to the *War Scroll* in chapter 12. A conclusion, bibliography, and series of three indices (authors, sources, subjects) round out the book.

Fletcher-Louis is to be commended for his comprehensive grasp of the primary literature of Second Temple Judaism, his attention to minute details, and his willingness to challenge scholarly opinion. His work is full of intriguing possibilities for a richer understanding of Second Temple Judaism. In spite of his attention to intricate details and his determination to squeeze every ounce he can out of the texts he examines, his work is readable and much easier to grasp than the subject material might suggest. Furthermore, his engaging style pulls the reader into the scholarly detective story he tells. I particularly appreciated his unexpected but fresh analogies to contemporary life (e.g., the temple cult as the “nearest equivalent to the modern fashion industry,” 59).

Fletcher-Louis’s work highlights the importance of the temple cult and its priesthood for understanding the theological anthropology of Second Temple Judaism—a stance he brings forcefully to the forefront (5). But he does not narrowly focus on just this particular issue, for he also deals with Jewish liturgy and the implications of understanding Jewish monotheism in reference to the veneration and worship of Jesus Christ. He is fully aware of the potential ramifications of his work on the latter topic (480), and I found myself looking forward to further work by him along these lines.

While the literary foundation of Fletcher-Louis’s study is the writings of Second Temple Judaism, he also refers to NT literature to provide parallels or further explicate his points. While one cannot do everything in a work like this,

on occasion I felt a need for more reference to NT material. For example, his comment on "the strong priestly orientation to prophecy" (56) reminded me of the matrix of priesthood and prophecy in Revelation (cf. Rev 1:3, 6; 5:10; 10:11; 19:10; 20:6; 22:9). In this case, such a comparison might well have been illuminating because the *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice* and Revelation have literary and conceptual parallels that occur nowhere else in Jewish and Christian literature through the end of the first century C.E.

It was around issues of methodology and conclusions, however, that I experienced my greatest frustration. A number of times, Fletcher-Louis found arguments from silence useful in supporting his interpretation of 4Q400 1 (281, 286-291). Yet to make a conclusion based on the lack of evidence, particularly when one is dealing with the extant yet fragmented copies of the Dead Sea Scrolls, is precarious in itself.

On the other hand, when there *was* evidence that did not support Fletcher-Louis's hypotheses and positions, it was sometimes downplayed: for instance, he discounts "meagre" evidence in support of "the sacrificial, atoning, [*sic*] activity of angels as a background to the material in the XIIIth Song" (359; cf. 360) and ultimately terms it "obscure" (261). But Rev 8:3-5—hardly an obscure text—refers to an angel offering incense in a golden censer at the altar in heaven, a fact which Fletcher-Louis recognizes. Nevertheless, he relegates it to a footnote, concluding that "its relevance for the *Sabbath Songs* is unclear since this [the altar of incense] is *not* one of the sacrificial items mentioned in the extant portion of Song XIII" (360, n. 8; emphasis original). This is, in my estimation, too narrow a restriction; however, it is an effective way to marginalize evidence of a potentially oppositional nature. Thus, one is left with two lingering questions: How much evidence does Fletcher-Louis need to temper his hypotheses? and What kind of evidence would he accept?

The dating of ancient Jewish and Christian sources is often a vexing issue. Fletcher-Louis exacerbates the problem by applying dating techniques inconsistently. On one hand, he is not averse to downgrading evidence because it is "from a later time (c. 100 A.D.)" (362 n. 15). On the other hand, a text such as the *Prayer of Joseph*, which he agrees can only "possibly" (28) be traced to the first century C.E., is used to illustrate beliefs about an angelic humanity (cf. 308). Similarly, while 2 *Enoch* is also problematical with regard to dating before 100 C.E., he gives it several pages in his discussion of the divine and priestly Noah (49-51).

Fletcher-Louis frequently tempers his conclusions, realizing that the often fragmentary and interpretively problematic evidence is not always clear, and for this he is to be commended. Nevertheless, over-optimistic confidence overtakes his caution at times in interpreting texts, resulting in overstatement. For instance, he is confident that there are "many texts in which 'orthodox' Jewish practice and belief did, it seems, believe it appropriate under certain circumstances to worship a human being" (100-101). Yet, the eleven texts he refers to besides Sir 50 (101 n. 39) do not carry the weight of "many" in light of the huge corpus of available literature. Further, the "fact" (193) that a human high priest is in view in 4Q468b

is at best a strong possibility. And the “several” other pseudepigraphical texts Fletcher-Louis adduces in support of the righteous having a heavenly throne in this life are only two in number (207-208).

Similarly, strong assertions are sometimes followed by qualified substantiation. A good example is his reference to 4Q 416 1, “in which the disparaging position given to flesh *is present*” (118; emphasis supplied). This is followed by only one sentence of substantiation, tempered by the terms “appears” and “possibly.” Later he says that he can “seal” his “claim” about the teaching function of 4Q400 1 i 17 by recalling that “the same constellation of ideas *seems* to be present in three other Qumran texts” (285; emphasis supplied). In another case, he concludes that angels dressed in the garments described in Exod 28 occur “[n]owhere” in Jewish literature contemporaneous with the Dead Sea Scrolls—and then footnotes the “one exception”—*Apocalypse of Abraham* 11:3 (362 n. 15). If it truly is an exception, the statement he has made is fallacious; if it is not an exception, the language of his footnote is at best injudicious.

At times, Fletcher-Louis utilizes evidence and methodology that he denies to others. For example, one of the reasons he criticizes John J. Collins’s interpretation of 4Q491 11 is because in “so relatively brief a portion of text a confident assessment of total anthropological perspective is precarious” (208). He makes this criticism, however, after he has discussed similarly brief texts, ones whose interpretations are likewise precarious or uncertain—by his own admission (cf. 4QAaron A [189-92]; 4Q468b [193-94]; 4Q513 [194-95]).

Because of the length and detailed nature of this work, one should not be surprised to find typographic or grammatical errors. I was nevertheless startled by the number of errors that I encountered—many of them obvious—particularly in a book that costs as much as this one does. The following list is *not* exhaustive and I produce it here because a book this costly deserves a higher standard of copy-editing (note: “line” refers to the line of text, *not* to the line of a chapter subtitle):

<i>Page Reference</i>	<i>What Needs Correction</i>	<i>Suggested Correction</i>
7, line 6	43:23f.	44:23f.
7, lines 9ff.	<i>unusual line breaks (particularly lines 9 and 22)</i>	<i>reformat lines</i>
27, line 24	“whmo”	“whom”
28, line 23	“pronounced”	“pronounce”
83, line 25	“that”	“than”
99, line 2	“14”	<i>Delete</i>
126, line 1	“rising”	“was rising”
126, line 2	“makes”	“making”
151, lines 4-5	“are they”	“is he”

194, line 1	“. . . line 6. Although the expression . . .”	“. . . line 6, although the expression . . .”
199, n. 148, line 2	“180-38”	“180-83”
205, n. 166, line 11	“now”	“no”
207, line 18	“places”	“place”
207, line 26	“chapter 4”	“chapter 5”
208, line 17 (see also the index on p. 533)	“4Q491 1 i”	“4Q491 11 i”
217, line 13	“non”	“none”
236, line 10	“light filled”	“light-filled”
236, line 12	“דְּבִירִי”	“דְּבִירִי,”
242, line 9	“pslamist”	“psalmist”
255, n. 8, line 5	“liturgy”	“liturgy,”
257, line 13	“described”	“describe”
267, last line	“architects”	“architect’s” or “architects”
282, line 11	“(Isa 27 verse 9)”	“(Isa 27:9)”
309, line 26	“is”	“are”
325, line 19	“assent”	“ascent”
331, line 12	“line 42”	“line 41”
332, n. 49, line 1	“. . . priests, if . . .”	“. . . priests. If . . .”
335, line 12	“effect”	“affect”
335, line 15	“her”	“here”
354, line 18	“Ezekeil”	“Ezekiel”
355, line 23	“humans”	“humans,”
362, line 3	“Dan 9:5”	“Dan 10:5”
367, line 18	“?”	“.”
380, last line	“‘approach the King’ (4Q405 23 ii 11)”	<i>The quote does not match the source</i>
399, line 8	“later”	“latter”
399, n. 11, line 1	“stills”	“still”
402, lines 1-3	“P.R. Davies has pointed . . .”	<i>Needs footnote</i>
410, line 28	“line 8 and line”	“lines 8 and 9”
430, line 14	“citation”	<i>Not a citation; at most an allusion</i>
435, line 16	“angles”	“angels”

460, line 7	"instances"	"instance"
461, line 8	"מטרה"	<i>Need for consistency; װ is sometimes pointed (e.g., cf. p. 460, line 3), sometimes unpointed (e.g., 460, lines 8, 9, 18, 20; 461, lines 1, 4, 5)</i>
474, lines 15-18	"Israel, . . . Israel, . . ."	<i>Both the punctuation and verb tenses need reexamination</i>
478, lines 18-19	". . . in the late Second Temple period. Though a couple of points . . ."	". . . in the late Second Temple period, though a couple of points . . ."

Furthermore, the word "community" is confusingly related to both "has" and "have" (97, lines 7-8). Some embedded parentheses are unbalanced (115, line 4; 354, line 27). The sentence beginning "The Aramaic probably . . ." (48, line 21) is nonsensical. Finally, with regard to the source index: (1) the reference on p. 528 to 4Q213b (4Q^AAramaic Levi^c) has been typeset incorrectly; (2) all the references to 4Q405 (4Q^{Shir}Shabb^e) 20 ii-21-22 (531) need to be reindexed; and (3) the references to 4Q541 (4Q^TLevi^d) 9 i and 24 ii (535) have been typeset incorrectly, yielding page numbers in the index that look like references to the Qumran text, while both 4Q541 24 ii and 24 ii 5-6 should be indexed *after* 4Q541 9 i 3-5, not before.

Despite the methodological concerns and typographical and grammatical errors described above, I have no hesitation in recommending Flether-Louis's book. Though costly, it is a goldmine of information and analysis of important literature found at Qumran, and the reader will be amply rewarded in studying his analyses. He raises provocative and important questions that deserve further study and dialogue. For example, can his view be sustained that the apparent interest of the Qumran community in the high-priestly breastpiece helps explain the name "Essenes," which has been the subject of so much discussion for decades? The dust has certainly not yet settled on his controversial, revisionist reading of the *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice*. Yet, if the general outlines of his understanding of liturgical anthropology end up remaining in force, such an understanding will have a significant effect not only on the interpretation of the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Qumran community, but also on the interpretation of the literature of the Second Temple and the NT.

Berrien Springs, Michigan

ROSS E. WINKLE

France, R. T. *The Gospel of Mark*, NIGTC. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002. 752 pp. Hardcover, \$55.00.

France's commentary on Mark follows a typical pattern for Gospel commentaries: foreword, list of abbreviations, bibliography, and introductory questions, followed by extensive commentary on the Greek text, with concluding indices. Following the Foreword and list of Abbreviations, the author provides a