which simply confuses those two questions (die or \( \delta \epsilon i \)), and can therefore only con-
clude, tautologously, that "Jesus had to die because too many people, leaders both
Roman and Jewish, opposed the nature of his ministry" (p. 181). Of course. But legal
execution always indicates authoritative opposition. More to the point is this question:
Did Jesus oppose them and, if so, how and why? A historical answer demands that life
and death be considered together. That last chapter has, throughout it, a regular oscilla-
tion between "atonement theology" and "the salvific death of Jesus" (pp. 257 and 276,
for example). It shows very clearly that Anselm's understanding is only one interpreta-
tion of atonement, but is atonement itself only one interpretation of the salvific meaning
of Jesus' passion? A theological answer demands that life and death be considered
together. Whether in history or theology, then, should Jesus' life-and-death always be
considered together?

This book is about an absolutely valid subject called *The Theology of the Passion in
the New Testament*. It is not actually about *The Death of Jesus in Early Christianity.*
That unwritten book would also demand three parts. The first part would be about the
historicity of that life, that death, and why one led to the other. The second part would
be about sources and traditions concerning that execution, and about their origins, rela-
tionships, and purposes. The third part would be about the common faith and divergent
theologies born of interaction between those events and traditions. I criticize this pre-
sent book, not because it fails to be that other one, but because it claims that it is.

John Dominic Crossan
DePaul University, Chicago, IL 60604

$28.99.

This volume completes Hagner's impressive two-volume commentary on Matthew
(the first volume of which was reviewed by Amy-Jill Levine in *JBL* 115/2 [1996]
354–56). It more than holds its own next to the other commentaries that recent years
have given us. It is more readable than Robert H. Gundry's (1982), more critical than
Frederick Dale Bruner's (1987, 1990), and more detailed than the contributions of F.
and Augustine Stock (1994). Hagner's commentary reminds one of Joachim Gnilka's
(1986, 1988), not just because both occupy two volumes. The nuanced and mature
nature of the exegetical judgments are similar. All of which is to say: Hagner's commen-
tary is among the most comprehensive and useful in any language.

The format is as follows. Matthew is divided into pericopae or paragraphs. Chapter
21, for example, is separated into six units—the entry into Jerusalem, the Son of David
in the temple, the cursing of the fig tree, the question about Jesus' authority, the parable
of the two sons, and the parable of the rented vineyard. Each unit is introduced by a bib-
liography. (The bibliographies are excellent.) Then come Hagner's translation and tex-
tual notes, and then the commentary proper. This last consists first of a section called
"Form/Structure/Setting," which looks at a passage's relationship to the rest of the
Gospel, Matthew's editorial changes (Markan priority is assumed), structure, historicity, and other introductory matters. There follows a section called "Comment," which contains the verse-by-verse analysis. Finally there is the "Explanation," a sort of summarizing conclusion, often plainly theological. One guesses that pastors and theologians who use Hagner may want to start with the "Explanation" and move backward.

What impresses one most about the commentary is its depth and detail. There is more than a page—all of it small print—on the identity of the Zechariah of 23:35. Two pages—again of small print—are given over to the historicity of the events in 27:51b–53. And the discussion of 28:17, with its difficult reference to some doubting, covers portions of three pages. All too often one reaches for a commentary to learn about this or that point and discovers nothing on it. One will not often have this experience with Hagner's commentary.

Among the more noteworthy of Hagner's views are the following. Against Kingsbury and many since, 4:17 and 16:21 are not the structural keys to Matthew. Against John Meier, chapter 15, although it contains "a revolutionary understanding of the law" (p. 432), does not overthrow the law, even the ritual law. Neither does 19:1–12. Against Graham Stanton, 24:20 probably shows that Matthean Christians still observed the Jewish Sabbath. Against Anthony J. Saldarini (whose important 1994 book evidently appeared too late to be used; it is not cited), judgment has fallen upon Israel, and Israel has been replaced by the new people of God, the church, consisting of Jew and Gentile. Against most commentators, Matthew was probably written not after but before the destruction of the temple and Jerusalem in 70 CE.

Of these positions the last seems most vulnerable. In volume 1 Hagner wrote of his "inclination toward an early date" (p. lxxiv). But one detects more than an inclination here in volume 2. Hagner urges that the reference in 22:7 to the king sending troops to destroy "those murderers" and burn "their city" is not solid evidence for a date after 70 CE; that "a pre-70 date makes especially good sense" of 17:24—27; and that the "immediately" of 24:29 strongly suggests the early date (a point insisted upon long ago by Plummer).

Hagner is surely right that our dating of the Gospels is less certain than we like to imagine. There are, however, reasons for thinking that the long-standing consensus, which holds to a date in the last two decades of the first century, is correct. First, Matthew contains many materials that on any view were originally composed before 70 CE (such as all the authentic sayings of Jesus); so could not 5:23–24; 17:24–27 and 23:16–22 just reflect the traditional, that is, pre-70 nature of those materials? How indeed could one rewrite those passages, assuming their traditional nature, to make them reflect the destruction of the temple? Could one really expect a post-70 compiler to introduce awkward past tenses, or to insert some needless parenthetical comment—"(of course the temple was still then standing)"? Surely it was more natural to pass on such materials without much altering them. Second, post-70 Jewish literature is filled with present-tense speech about the temple. The temple remained a literary and theological reality long after it physically ceased to be. For the eternal Torah is filled with immutable laws about the temple; and those laws remain to be pondered and discussed notwithstanding all historical contingencies. Third, 22:7 remains an embarrassment for Hagner's theory. As he himself notes, the problem is that the details of the king's
destruction of murderers and their city just "seem rather farfetched for the story of the parable itself and, on the other hand, correspond remarkably to the destruction of Jerusalem in AD 70 so that it is easy (though hardly necessary) to see that event here." Hagner appeals to the studies of Rengstorf and Reicke, which do indeed show us that the motifs of 22:7 were conventional. But the question remains: Why insert those motifs precisely here?

There remains the problem of 24:29, but perhaps the verses immediately preceding were not thought applicable to the events surrounding 70 CE but rather to events yet to come. The objection that this leaves the question in 24:3 about the temple unanswered is not decisive. For (i) even in Mark there is no direct answer to the question of the temple's destruction. So one might think Matthew's apparent failure partly inherited. (ii) The temple's destruction was past and so the answer was known to all. What was not known was the eschatological future, so maybe that is why only that issue is addressed. (iii) Matthew elsewhere leaves narrative ends dangling (see, e.g., 14:1–13, which begins as a flashback but does not so end). (iv) The evangelist may nonetheless have expected the temple to be rebuilt again before the end (cf. Apoc. Elijah 4:3–6; b. Suk. 41a). (v) Perhaps he took Jesus' prophecy literally and knew that the site of the temple ruins still attracted pilgrims and devotion. A future desecration would then be thinkable. (vi) Then again, maybe Matthew already held the view Ephrem the Syrian reported: "It is said that he [Jesus] was speaking of the punishment in Jerusalem and at the same time referring to the end of this world" (Comm. Diat. 18:14). In this case the "immediately" might apply to the former but not the latter.

Aside from the inevitable disagreement on the meaning of this or that verse, I experienced only two minor disappointments when reading Hagner's second volume. The first is that Hagner interacts almost exclusively with the modern secondary literature. One usually looks in vain for what Origen or Jerome or Augustine or Chrysostom or Theophylact or Aquinas or Luther or Calvin made of Matthew's text. Luz's commentary has shown us how illuminating such Wirkungsgeschichte can be.

My second small disappointment is that Hagner does not offer sufficient justification for his expansive confidence in Matthew's historical value. He affirms the "probability" that there were two animals at the entry to Jerusalem (p. 594). He speaks of the possible "historicity of the core" of the story of the guard at the tomb (p. 862). He appears to affirm the essential authenticity of the great commissioning in 28:18–20 (p. 883; here I was surprised to learn that I myself believe the words rest upon something Jesus said; I do not and cannot discover what I wrote that would have misled someone to think so). Hagner writes that "it is an assumption of the present commentary that the miracles recorded by Matthew were historical events" (p. 417), and he goes on to ask, "If, as the Bible claims, God works in history and uniquely and supremely in Jesus Christ, may not such events have actually happened?" (p. 418). There seems, however, a limit: Hagner thinks that the story of the saints rising in 27:51–53 is "a piece of theology set forth as history" (p. 851)—although even here he believes there may have been an earthquake. In coming to this conclusion Hagner says, in effect, that although God can do anything, we must still ask the question "of historical plausibility" (p. 851). But why is this not the question when Jesus seemingly rides two donkeys, or when Pilate appoints guards to prevent proclamation of the resurrection, or when Jesus commands baptism in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit? I am not sure why the one
tradition is judged incredible but the others are not. For like 27:51–53 these last are
(i) full of theological or apologetical meaning, (ii) unattested in Mark, Luke, or John, and
(iii) not brimming with "historical plausibility."

In the end, however, my quibbles with Hagner are wholly outweighed by his com-
mentary's many virtues. He is kind enough in his preface to express regret that he did
not have the third volume of Davies-Allison when writing his second volume. I should
like here to voice my own regret that his first volume appeared after the first two vol-
umes of the ICC on Matthew had been published, and that his second was available only
after the third had been sent to the printer. My work is the poorer for it.

Dale C. Allison, Jr.
Friends University, Wichita, KS 67213

Luke and the Restoration of Israel, by David Ravens. JSNTSup 119. Sheffield: Sheffield

The work begins with an introduction that briefly presents the range of opinions
regarding Luke's audience and his attitude toward the Jews. On the first issue Ravens
concludes that Luke's audience was composed of former Jews, as well as Gentiles who
had at least enough familiarity with Judaism and especially the LXX that they could
understand and appreciate Luke's work. On the second issue Ravens discusses the stale-
mate between scholars who believe that Luke is negative toward Jews and those who
believe that he is positive. Ravens then lays out his own plan for showing that Luke's
idea of the restoration of Israel is the best way to understand his attitude toward the
Jews.

Chapter 1 discusses the portrayal of Israel in Luke's infancy narrative. It concludes
that the salvation of Israel and the continuity between Israel's past and the present
events of the Gospel are dominant themes throughout these two chapters. Particular
attention is paid to the role of John the Baptist and the temple.

Chapter 2 then discusses the portrayal of Israel's past in Stephen's speech (Acts
7:2-50). Ravens briefly reviews the source problems posed by the speech, concluding
that the speech as it now stands expresses Luke's own thought, regardless of its possible
sources. In the accusations against Stephen, Luke has continued to portray Jesus and his
followers as positively disposed toward the temple. These positive attitudes are present
even in Stephen's speech itself. Ravens believes any criticism contained in the speech is
directed toward the divisiveness and exclusivity of only some Israelites, most especially
Solomon, who is portrayed here as a Lukan villain or scapegoat.

review of the history of the Samaritans and their relations to the Jewish community. He
then analyzes in detail the treatment of the Samaritans in Luke-Acts, especially in the
central section of the Gospel (Luke 9:51–18:14) and in Stephen's speech. Ravens dis-
cusses the alleged Samaritanisms in Stephen's speech and finds the evidence inconclu-
sive, though suggestive. Whatever the source(s) of the Samaritan material in Luke-Acts,
Ravens concludes that it is consistent with and even essential to Luke's idea of the
restoration of Israel. Ravens believes that for Luke the Samaritans are the legitimate