

τέρπειν μᾶλλον δυναμένοις. On p. 199 the expression “in detail” is erroneously followed by [ἔνεκεν ἀναμνησκει]; “in detail” seems a free translation added to Chrysostom’s question τίνας ἔνεκεν ἀναμνησκει τῆς ἱστορίας ταύτης ἡμᾶς ὁ εὐαγγελιστής; which means “why does the evangelist remind us of this story?” Yet, in spite of such details, this book with its wide scope deserves our hearty approval.

Riemer Roukema, Protestant Theological University, Amsterdam and Groningen, The Netherlands

TERENCE L. DONALDSON, *Gentile Christian Identity from Cornelius to Constantine: The Nations, the Parting of the Ways, and Roman Imperial Ideology* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2020). Pp. xvi + 560. \$50.

In this monograph Dr. Donaldson studies the construction of gentile Christian identity in the first few centuries of the Common Era. At the heart of the investigation are the Christian–Jewish parting of the ways and negotiation of Christian identity vis-à-vis the Roman Empire. At over five hundred pages with the indexes, the book provides ample room for a nuanced discussion, is logically structured, and delivers an informative analysis of its subject. The volume contains a good bibliography and indexes of names, passages, and subjects. D. uses transliteration for all Greek and Hebrew terms.

The book’s relaxed pace allows D. to begin the journey with contemplation of the big picture. This is accomplished in chap. 1 by way of a comparison of three orations from the period under consideration: Eusebius’s “On the Holy Sepulchre,” Aelius Aristides’s “Regarding Rome,” and the speech attributed to Paul in Acts 25:23–26:32. Luke and Eusebius capture the opposite ends of Christianity’s gentile trajectory, from its humble beginnings to its eventual triumph in the fourth century. Somewhere in the second century, Aristides, who does not belong to that trajectory, indirectly grounds it in his ode to the unprecedented success of Rome’s imperial program of uniting the nations. This three-way comparison provides the backdrop for the remainder of the book, sketching D.’s points of departure and arrival and offering insight into the crucial forces that will shape the story.

Chapter 2 functions as a *Forschungsbericht* for the book’s main research areas. The discussion is divided into three subsections, treating the Christian–Jewish parting of the ways, social-scientific investigation of ethnicity and social identity, and ancient ethnographical discourse. D. assesses notable works in each field but notes that his intention is not to offer a full discussion of these fields. Nevertheless, the surveys are thorough and provide the reader with a solid list of reference literature for further study.

In chaps. 3 and 4, D. examines the Greek term *ethnē* from two different perspectives: as an identity projected onto non-Jews (a) by Jews and (b) by Jewish Christ-believers. In chap. 3, D. offers a spectrum of evidence ranging from the Hellenistic Jewish authors to a number of nationalistic groups in the Greek and Roman period (see the list on p. 104 n. 2). In chap. 4, the discussion is situated against the chronologically arranged backdrop of Christianity’s development in the NT period. Here, D. analyzes three situational “identity types” (each with multiple subtypes), which can be abbreviated as follows: (1) believing gentiles brought into relationship with Israel as a whole; (2) believing gentiles brought into relationship with a remnant within Israel; and (3) believing gentiles brought into a new people that comprises Jews and gentiles without distinction. D. situates a number of Jewish

Christian writings from the NT period with these three categories. He discusses the undisputed Pauline Epistles; the hypothetical Synoptic source document Q; other probable pre-Gospel traditions; Matthew; the *Didache*; Revelation; traditions utilized in Acts; Colossians; Ephesians; and 1 Peter. Regardless of the extent of the agreement that this analysis will generate, the author is to be commended for attempting such a finely calibrated, precise classification.

After taking stock of the Roman imperial discourse and its attitude toward the nations in chap. 5, D. returns to Christian literature for the final two chapters. While chap. 4 dealt with the Jewish Christian writings, in chaps. 6 and 7 D. examines the gentile Christian contributions. The discussion is split into pre- and post-135 C.E. segments. No causal connection is implied between the Bar Kokhba revolt and the shift in the Christian use of *ethnē*, which D. detects occurring toward the middle of the second century (although D. leaves the possibility open [p. 313]). In chap. 6, D. analyzes the following literature: Luke-Acts; 1 and 2 Timothy; 1 and 2 Clement; the letters of Ignatius; the letter of Polycarp to the Philippians; *Barnabas*; the *Shepherd of Hermas*; and the *Apology* of Aristides. In chap. 7, D. directs attention to, among others, Justin Martyr, Celsus, Marcion, Cyprian, Tertullian, Irenaeus, and Origen. Even though Celsus was an opponent of Christianity, D. correctly recognizes the value of his assessment of it—filtered, of course, through later Christian refutations.

In his analysis of NT writings, D. must balance an enormous amount of scholarly literature. He follows the established, majority positions for each of the documents that receive attention in his study. Thus, he adopts the shared authorship of Luke-Acts; the Two-Document hypothesis in Synoptic studies; the conventional reconstruction of Q (International Q Project); the authentic character of only seven Pauline Epistles; and the pseud-epigraphical character of 1 Peter. He also prescinds from deciding on the nature of the *Didache*–Matthew relationship. These choices make the book valuable to the widest possible readership, grounding its carefully calibrated trajectory in nearly two centuries of critical scholarship and in hypotheses that have generated the widest assent. While D’s coordination of the NT traditions and writings (and the *Didache*) with the three identity types he proposes for Jewish Christian literature must be properly assessed elsewhere, I would like to make one observation here. D. avoids treatment of the story of the centurion (Matt 8:5–13; Luke 7:1–10; thus Q 7:1–10) in his analysis of Q. He saves that treatment for the story’s later appearance in the Gospels of Matthew and Luke. However, the presence of this story in Q (demanded by D.’s acceptance of the document’s conventional reconstruction) raises questions that could have serious implications for D.’s location of Q in the first of his three identity types proposed in chap. 4. This observation is only a foretaste of the discussion that this excellent book is bound to generate.

Olegs Andrejevs, Loyola University Chicago, Chicago, IL 60660

JUAN MANUEL GRANADOS ROJAS, *Why Do You Judge Your Brother? The Rhetorical Function of Apostrophizing in Rom 14:1–15:13* (AnBib: Studia 15; Rome: Gregorian & Biblical Press, 2020). Pp. xiv + 198. €24.

Who are the “weak” and the “strong” in Paul’s exhortation in Rom 14:1–15:13? Are they rival groups due to ethnic, religious, or sociological distinctions, as widely accepted? The rhetorical studies of Paul’s exhortation point the reader to new meanings regarding the

“weak” and the “strong” in the Roman community. In his investigation of the function of Paul’s apostrophizing in Rom 14:4, 10, Granados Rojas argues that Paul’s exhortation does not deal with identity markers. Rather, Paul deliberately defuses the labels “weak” and “strong.” This way of proceeding enables Paul to dissuade his audience from despising or passing judgment on others and, rather, to persuade them to embrace the notion of “brother” (ἀδελφός) as a new pathway to “welcome, mutuality, and unanimity” (p. 167). G.R. treats Rom 14:1–15:13 as a unified passage connected by the overarching purpose of introducing a new set of values that is ethical, as well as theological and christological (pp. 8–9).

He advances his thesis in three parts, bookended by an introduction and a conclusion. Part 1 concentrates on Rom 14:1–12. In chap. 1, G.R. interacts with other Pauline scholars to clarify the rhetorical arrangement and reasoning in these verses and to determine how “different literary features (e.g., *adiaphora*) and rhetorical devices (e.g., *apostrophe*) shape the train of thought in the passage” (p. 13). G.R. posits that Paul purposely leaves the identities of the “weak” and the “strong” ambiguous to eradicate the distinction between groups, dissuade judgment, and configure them into a communal “we.” In chap. 2, G.R. examines the singular referent αὐτόν in 14:3—“for God has welcomed him [αὐτόν],” suggesting that the referent is *everyone*: God’s welcoming reaches everyone (pp. 30, 41). Chapter 3 assesses the lexical and semantic links (e.g., the notion of “brother” and the rhetorical use of “we”) between Rom 14:1–12 and 1 Cor 8:1–13 and raises the question whether “love” (ἀγάπη) is the core of Paul’s paraenesis for welcoming and not judging others. Although love remains a general theme for the paraenesis, “it is reformulated in terms of welcoming [προσλαμβάνω] one another [ἀλλήλους]” (p. 59).

In part 2, G.R. highlights Paul’s rhetorical program in Rom 14:13–23 of changing the believer’s propensity to judge and despise others insofar as it concerns food and faith. He begins by studying the rhetorical function of v. 13, which he considers a transitioning verse between 14:1–12 and 14:14–23 (chap. 4). The analysis of the verb κρίνω (“to judge”) and the expression πρόσκομμα ἢ σκάνδαλον (“obstacle and stumbling block”) also points to Paul’s exhortation not to take God’s place in judging or not to be a moral stumbling block to the brother God has welcomed. G.R. continues with the analysis of the rhetorical arrangement of 14:13–23 (chap. 5). The correspondence between exhortations and rationales, arranged in a persuasive-dissuasive alternating pattern, encourages the audience, for the sake of peace and mutual edification, not to destroy the brother and the work of God. The last two chapters address the eschatological and ethical tensions in social relationships in connection with the “kingdom of God” in 14:17 (chap. 6) and some of the most significant exegetical issues regarding faith and food in 14:19–23, in which Paul exhorts the believers to engage in mutual upbuilding by acting (i.e., in self-restraint) for the sake of the “brother” (chap. 7).

Part 3 addresses Rom 15:1–13, highlighting Paul’s rhetorical program of effecting a change in the believer’s mind by creating a communal “we” and fostering mutual edification. In chap. 8, G.R. concentrates on the “sense and meaning” of the references to the “strong,” the “weak,” and the “neighbor” in vv. 1–6. Chapter 9 deals with the function of vv. 7–13, especially Paul’s use of Scripture to validate his reasoning for creating a communal “we” and fostering mutual edification.

Ideal for Pauline scholars and graduate students, this small book is packed with details and requires close and critical reading. Nonspecialists may find the study’s highly technical

language and discussions overwhelming. G.R. thoroughly assesses the traditional interpretations on every page and in every chapter, highlighting their merits and pitfalls and proposing alternative nuances. Although G.R. frequently engages with other scholars, his voice is not muzzled by these discussions, which augment the development of his argument. This meticulously researched and methodologically argued study is a fine contribution to the study of Pauline scholarship in general and Romans 14–15 in particular. G.R. pays close attention to internal textual clues and rhetorical structures and provides compelling analyses of Paul’s exhortation in Rom 14:1–15:13. He encourages a rethinking of the identities of the “weak” and the “strong” in the Roman community, Paul’s argumentation, and the rhetorical strategy employed. The book is a valuable resource for further research and discussion.

Vien V. Nguyen, SCJ, Sacred Heart Seminary and School of Theology, Hales Corners, WI 53132

NAJEEB T. HADDAD, *Paul, Politics, and New Creation: Reconsidering Paul and Empire* (Lanham, MD: Lexington Books/Fortress Academic, 2021). Pp. xiii + 213. \$100.

This volume, a revision of the author’s doctoral dissertation completed at Loyola University in Chicago (2018), critiques counterimperial interpretations of Paul. Haddad argues that Paul’s theological outlook and instructions in his letters demand a more nuanced description than being either “anti” or “pro” imperial (p. 3). The first two chapters consider the state of the question and examine arguments that Paul’s rhetoric was counterimperial. In a third chapter, H. explores the manner in which foreign cults existed within the Roman Empire. Haddad then describes, in chap. 4, the relationship of Paul’s assemblies to associations as they existed in the ancient Greco-Roman world. His final chapter articulates the thrust of Paul’s preaching, focusing on the distinction between *kosmos* (“cosmos”) and *kainē ktisis* (“new creation”) “and their cosmological and anthropological significance in Paul’s eschatological soteriology” (p. 139).

Haddad’s opening chapter describes the state of play in scholarship and highlights substantive criticisms put to those who argue for a counterimperial Paul. He notes the diversity of its forms throughout various regions to support his claim that “the imperial cult was not a sort of unified doctrine across the Roman Empire” (p. 7). Further, the manner in which the emperor was regarded as a deity is ambiguous, at the very least. That the emperor was “divine” was more of an honorific title than a recognition that he held a place among the gods (p. 9). Sacrifices and prayers were not made *to* emperors, but rather *on their behalf*. H. regards this as important in order to demonstrate that it is misguided to compare as competing claims the attribution of the title *divi filius* to Augustus and Paul’s reference to Jesus as “the Son of God.” These terms function differently in Roman ideology and Pauline christology.

In his second chapter, H. questions the claim that Paul’s letters contain “coded speech” meant to undermine the empire by exploring “figured speech” in ancient rhetoric: “a rhetorical device that communicates a covert message” (p. 43). He notes that ancient rhetoricians commonly referred to three forms of such speech: implied meaning, deflection, and