

at least seven times in the NT (John 1:1, 18; 20:28; Rom 9:5; Titus 2:13; 1 Pet 1:1; Heb 1:8).

The Deity of Christ is rich in scriptural analysis. I do have a question on the exactitude that the book places on the creeds and on biblicism as opposed to the Christ of experience. On pp. 28 and 29, Nichols implies that the move to the modern popular Jesus was a move from confidence in the creeds to biblicism and to a contemporary Jesus removed from both the creeds and the whole of Scripture. While I believe in the dominance of Scripture and have respect for the historic creeds, I do not want to minimize the Christ of personal experience.

In the final chapter, J. Nelson Jennings explores world religions and Jesus Christ. While recognizing that God approaches and blesses many in non-Christian religions, he questions whether there can be salvation “apart from explicit faith in the Jesus Christ proclaimed in the good news of the gospel” (273). I also believe that Jesus Christ is the only way to salvation, but I question if that demands “explicit faith in Jesus Christ.” In the light of the Gentiles’ response to the unwritten law as given in Romans 2 and the universal justification that comes to all through Jesus Christ in Romans 5, I think the solution is more complex and ultimately lies in the realm of the mystery of God. For me, when the Holy Spirit impresses a heart, the triune God comes to that person. Christ is the Light that lightens every person who comes into the world (John 1:9). Ellen White agrees on the reality of salvation outside explicit faith in Jesus Christ among those who do not know him (*The Desire of Ages*, 638, see also 33, 35, 59, 239).

I would highly recommend *The Deity of Christ* as a useful addition to the reader’s library. It is pleasant reading and will prove a useful reference to the whole biblical subject of the deity of Jesus Christ.

Editor, *Signs of the Times*
Somerset West, South Africa

ERIC WEBSTER

Murphy-O’Connor, Jerome. *Keys to Second Corinthians: Revisiting the Major Issues*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010. x. + 203 pp. Hardback. \$110.00.

Keys to Second Corinthians is a collection of essays written by Jerome Murphy-O’Connor and published by the well-respected press at the University of Oxford. Murphy-O’Connor, an internationally recognized expert on the Corinthian correspondence and the study of Paul, is author of various books and articles on NT subjects and a professor of New Testament studies at the École Biblique et Archéologique Française, Jerusalem. Throughout this collection of twelve essays on 2 Corinthians, Murphy-O’Connor dialogues with the opinions of colleagues, responding to and building on their

observations and explaining in detail why certain solutions are viable even as others are implausible.

In the first essay, "Co-Authorship in Second Corinthians," Murphy-O'Connor argues that the apostle Paul shares authorship of 2 Corinthians with others. His main evidence is the interplay of "I" and "we," which has received much more attention than the similar usage of these possessive pronouns in 1 Corinthians. There are several positions regarding coauthorship: First, the justified presence of Timothy in the address of the letter naturally leads one to conclude that there is coauthorship. Second, others stay away from the issue of coauthorship and reduce the person of Timothy to irrelevance by stressing the polyvalence of the first person plural in 2 Corinthians. For instance, Heinrich Windisch acknowledges that the first person plural can include Timothy when he and the apostle Paul share particular experiences or when they are united against the Corinthians, but most often, he points out, it simply means "we apostles/missionaries" or "we Christians" (4). This classification was also adopted by Hans-Joseph Klauck, who, in contrast, draws attention to the difficulty of finding explicit examples of Paul receiving support from the Corinthians. On one hand, Klauck also claims that Timothy shared responsibility for the content of 2 Corinthians, while in no way being restricted to the first personal plural. On the other hand, according to Murphy-O'Connor, there are those who completely embrace the issue of coauthorship. Although he denies coauthorship to Sosthenes in 1 Corinthians, Gordon D. Fee is ready to agree to a role in the actual writing of 2 Corinthians to Timothy, but does not provide any evidence in support of his suggestion. Rudolph Bultmann, however, takes it for granted that Timothy is the coauthor, leading him to then ask about the magnitude of Timothy's contribution. Third, there are some scholars who fail to discern any patterns in the use of "we" and "I."

The second group of articles (essays 2-8) analyzes the theological aspect of the second epistle of Paul to the Corinthians. Of particular interest is Murphy-O'Connor's comparison of the new covenant in the epistle and the Essene documents. W. C. van Unnik and T. J. Deidun assert that the majority of scholars would agree with Victor P. Furnish's assertion that the concept of a "new covenant" is completely at home in the belief and theology of the apostle Paul. There were some at Corinth who were using the new-covenant concept in a sense that Paul could not accept. In contrast, Paul called them "letter-ministers."

The one text in which Paul himself mentions the concept is 2 Cor 3:6: "(God) who also made us sufficient as ministers of the new covenant, not of the letter but of the Spirit." Most interpreters treat this passage as if Paul's concern was to distinguish between a "covenant of the letter" and a "covenant of the Spirit." It is interesting the way in which Paul switches from the concept of the covenant to ministry. Given the present understanding of

2 Cor 3:6, this should have been perfectly acceptable to the apostle. In fact, however, it was not.

Murphy-O'Connor also addresses the issue of the "body in exile from the Lord" (2 Cor 5:6b). This is one of the most difficult texts in the Pauline epistles. Some interpreters avoid the problem by saying that Paul cannot have meant what he said and pass on to the following verses where the same verbs appear and where the thought conforms to Paul's habitual model. In addition, others struggle to give the verse an acceptable Pauline meaning. For instance, V. P. Furnish notes that Paul is uneasy with the formulation of v. 6b because it allows a false conclusion, namely, that life in the body is incompatible with life in Christ, and because the apostle changes the idea of location in v. 6b to one of direction in v. 8. The precise description, however, only serves to emphasize another aspect that up until now has received no consideration. Why does Paul break off his initial thought in v. 6a to say something so different from his regular attitude toward the body? A sufficient answer should also explain why Paul suddenly switches from the motifs of building and clothing in vv. 1-5 to a completely different image in v. 6, which he not only transforms in v. 8, but rejects in v. 9.

The final section of essays deals with several important issues such as "Philo and 2 Corinthians 6:14-7:1," "*Pneumatikoi* and 2 Corinthians," and "The Date of 2 Corinthians 10-14." Murphy-O'Connor notes that, in recent years, a number of important studies have argued in favor of the Pauline authenticity of 2 Cor 6:14-7:1. The structure of the section is clear. An essential 6:14a is supported by a series of rhetorical questions (6:14b-16a). It is a fact that Paul frequently uses rhetorical questions, seldom appearing in series (e.g., Rom 2:3-4), which are well endowed with Hellenistic-Jewish moral instruction (e.g., Sir 13: 2b; 17-18; Philo, *Ebr.* 57). In the essay "*Pneumatikoi* and 2 Corinthians," he points out that generally studies of Paul's opponents in 2 Corinthians ignore similar problems in 1 Corinthians. Furnish, for instance, made use of outside evidence rather than Paul's first epistle to the Corinthians in order to identify his opponents in 2 Corinthians.

Some scholars argue that Paul handles his opponents in 1 Corinthians so badly that it is unlikely that their anger and frustration would have dissipated in the year between the writings of the two epistles to the Corinthians. The main difficulty confronting Paul in 1 Corinthians was divisions in the community. The apostle deals with it first, devoting more time and space to this problem than to any other issue (1 Corinthians 1-4). Despite the fact that at the beginning he mentions four groups (1:12), it becomes clear that in reality Paul is concerned with only one group, whose religious position was very troublesome to the church at Corinth.

The essay "The Date of 2 Corinthians" addresses the question of whether or not 2 Corinthians 10-13 was originally part of an independent epistle. Approximately a century of scholarship passed before Adolf Hausrath would

agree that this passage should be dated before 2 Corinthians 1–9. Although several scholars agree with this theory, several others such as Bruce, Barrett, Furnish, and Martin, who follow the lead of Windisch, consider 2 Corinthians 10–13 to be an independent epistle, written later than 2 Corinthians 1–9. More recently, F. Watson asserts that 2 Corinthians 10–13 is equal to the “Severe Letter.” The main objection to identifying 2 Corinthians 10–13 with the “Severe Letter” is that the two do not deal with the same problem. 2 Corinthians 10–13 was occasioned by an attack on Paul’s apostolic authority by Judaizing intruders, a subject which is never suggested *apropos* the “Severe Letter.” Hence, 2 Cor 2:12–7:4 is the continuation of the subject matter of the earlier “Severe Letter.” The difference of opinion that eventually occasioned the “Letter of Tears” concerned Paul’s gospel, not his personal authority as an apostle.

This collection of essays will be welcomed by those who are interested in the study of Paul and 2 Corinthians. It is not necessary to agree with Murphy-O’Connor on every point to appreciate the valuable service he has performed in offering these comprehensive essays. The essays in *Keys to Second Corinthians* do not necessarily break new ground, but provide a valuable reexamination of some of the major issues in Paul’s second letter to the Corinthians. This is an excellent book that students, professors, and scholars of Paul and 2 Corinthians should find immensely helpful.

Silver Spring, Maryland

OTIS COUTSOUMPOS

O’Brien, Peter T. *The Letter to the Hebrews*. Pillar New Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010. xxxiii + 596 pp. Hardcover, \$50.00.

Peter O’Brien, a senior research professor in New Testament at Moore Theological College in Sydney, Australia, comes from the Anglican tradition. *The Letter to the Hebrews* is his second contribution to the Pillar New Testament Commentary series, following his commentary on Ephesians (1999). He also authored the NIGTC commentary on Philippians (1991).

O’Brien reaps the results of the scholarship of those who precede him in the study of the epistle to the Hebrews (xiii; F. F. Bruce, *The Epistle to the Hebrews*, NICNT [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1990]); Harold Attridge, *The Epistle to the Hebrews*, Hermeneia [Philadelphia: Fortress, 1989]; W. L. Lane, *Hebrews 1–8 and Hebrews 9–13*, WBC [Dallas: Word, 1991]; Paul Ellingworth, *The Epistle to the Hebrews*, NIGTC [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993]; Craig R. Koester, *Hebrews*, AB [New York: Doubleday, 2001]; and Luke T. Johnson, *Hebrews*, NTL [Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2006]). As for European literature in this area, O’Brien is not in discussion with scholars such as Otto Michel or Hans-Friedrich Weiss, although he acknowledges the works of scholars such as Frey, Grässer, and Hofius.