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why Stephen’s speech infuriated his hearers in Jerusalem (p. 43); whether Ananias and Jews in Damascus were aware of Saul’s prior spiritual experience on the road (p. 135); whether Saul was filled with the Holy Spirit prior to Antioch (p. 239); what the background of his name change from Saul to Paul suggests (p. 244); while the speeches “may be viewed retrospectively as representing the probable content of his earlier synagogue preaching” (p. 261), that Luke himself is the composer of Paul’s speeches at the synagogue in Pisidian Antioch and at the Jerusalem meeting on abstention from meat offered to idols, fornication, strangled food and blood (p. 363).

Macnamara finds that Luke’s gaps are constitutive of the characterization of Paul as one whose mission is predicted by Jesus. The preaching of Jesus’s name is central to Paul’s mission (p. 418). The gaps function as a predictive device, creating expectation in the first-time reader of what will be fulfilled later in the narrative of Acts. Gaps are the intervals, delays, and pauses in that fulfillment by God’s “chosen instrument” (p. 417).

Eloise M. Rosenblatt, Saratoga, CA 95070


In this published edition of his doctoral dissertation (Pontifical Gregorian University, 2011; supervised by Massimo Grilli), Mamić provides a primarily literary-linguistic analysis of the parable of the workers in the vineyard in the Gospel of Matthew. In the introductory chapter, M. declares that he does not deal with form or redaction criticism but instead interprets the parable in its present textual setting to explore its significance and function. This leads him to specify that the meaning of the parable in this study emerges primarily from the text itself and not from its historical environment. Apart from the question of its legitimacy or usefulness, such a stance is not unusual or rare in contemporary biblical scholarship, especially after the so-called linguistic turn in the twentieth century. M. adds, however, that once the literary analysis is done in its cotext he will also examine other parallels in the world outside the text to locate the Matthean parable in its plausible historical context. M. himself calls this incorporation of the rhetorical/communicative dimension of the text and the referential dimension of it a “holistic” approach (p. 26) and a “pluralistic” approach (p. 66). Such an attempt at employing both literary and historical methods in one study certainly has its merits, but it is not easily done. I am not sure the historical investigation part in this study is thorough enough to justify its inclusion in an otherwise clearly defined and thoroughgoing literary analysis.

In chap. 1, M. continues to elaborate on methodology. Borrowing various concepts and technical terms from the speech act theory of J. L. Austin, M. discusses the communicative functions of the parable and argues that the parables of Jesus enable the actual readers of the Gospel to identify with the implied reader so that they may reach a higher level of receptivity to its message. In chap. 2, M. deals with the Synoptic passages about the purpose of Jesus’s parables with a special attention to Matt 13:10-17. M.’s exegesis leads him to draw a conclusion that there are two preconditions in the Synoptics for the success-
ful communication of parabolic speech. First, the reader should belong to the group of Jesus's disciples. Second, the reader should be a practicing follower of Jesus. Especially in Matthew the ultimate rhetorical goal of the parables is to let the receptive reader have a deeper understanding of the realities of God's kingdom.

Chapter 3 is the central section, a detailed textual/literary analysis of the parable of the workers in terms of its structure, plot, motif, rhetorical devices, and so on, employing diverse techniques of speech act theory and reader-response criticism. The most important observation in this chapter seems to be that the perlocutionary intention of the particular structure of this parable, that is, the omission of the denouement, is to invite readers to reorient their perspective and to read the whole story from the new viewpoint of the householder and therefore to participate in "writing" the resolution of the parable in their own life. In chap. 4, M. expands the scope and discusses the cotext of the parable in the preceding and the following passages. M. argues that Matt 19:16–20:28 is one literary unit by identifying a clearly demarcated rhetorical frame and by finding multiple cohesive elements that unite the whole section. M. tries to demonstrate that each of the two "subsequences" (19:16–20:16 and 20:17-28) of this unit further develops and highlights the motif of reversal of the first and the last.

In chap. 5, M. takes a different direction and deals with the parable in its historical cotext. This is where one would expect M. to discuss the ancient parallels and the socio-historical contexts of the parable, as he promised in the introduction. Interestingly enough, M. continues with the primarily literary/textual analysis of the "Parable in Its Preceding Context (19:16–20:16)" (p. 196). I assume the word "context" here means "cotext" in M. 's own adopted vocabulary. The section does contain references to intertextual parallels of individual words and concepts, and it also deals with such historical questions as early Christian missionaries in the post-Easter community of Matthew. But it does not discuss any extrabiblical parallels of the parable per se, such as the similar rabbinitic parable cited in Harvey K. McArthur and Robert M. Johnston, They Also Taught in Parables: Rabbinic Parables from the First Centuries of the Christian Era (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1990). In addition, Amy-Jill Levine, Short Stories by Jesus: The Enigmatic Parables of a Controversial Rabbi (San Francisco: HarperOne, 2014), would have provided a good source of information for the Jewish milieu of the parables. A more serious issue is the lack of discussion of the socioeconomic conditions of the advanced agrarian society, which is in my opinion critically important to understanding the parables of Jesus in the Synoptics. In that regard, William R. Herzog II, Parables as Subversive Speech: Jesus as Pedagogue of the Oppressed (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1994) would have been a great help. This particular criticism would not have been raised if M. had limited his methodology to literary-linguistic approach. Yet, since he aims to be "holistic" in his methodology, including the investigation of the historical context of the parable, it stands out as a desideratum.

For what it purports to achieve through its primary methodology, that is, the literary/rhetorical interpretation of the parable as communication, this is a well-conceived, thoroughly researched, and methodically presented piece of research. As noted above, its employment of the secondary methodology, that is, the analysis of the historical context regarding the referential function of the parable, leaves much to be desired. M. deserves credit, however, for undertaking the daunting task of incorporating the two major methodological approaches—literary/linguistic and historical—in one study. One would hope that
this study will further motivate other scholars to pursue the same endeavor of interdisciplin-ary approaches even within the guild.

Eugene Eung-Chun Park, San Francisco Theological Seminary, San Anselmo, CA 94960


In this tour de force, Morgan steps outside the standard Augustinian treatment of Christian faith as fides quae and fides qua and engages the terms pistis and fides exhaustively across Greek, Roman, and Christian texts and cultural milieus.

Chapters 1–4 introduce the terminology and cultural maps in which pistis and fides take part. M. offers in chap. 1 an overview of research on pistis that has taken place in classics, NT, and theological studies. While accepting the propositional aspect that has been the main focus of studies to this point, M. seeks to highlight the relational characteristic of pistis/fides as nonpropositional trust within Greco-Roman culture, along intrahuman and divine–human relationships. In chaps. 2 and 3, M. supports the relational rendering of pistis/fides as trust across a bibliographically rich swath of sources in the Republic and early Principate within domestic, military, political, legal, and international relationships. To close this section, M. presents the relational aspects of trust in Greco-Roman religious texts, which also overlap with political and interpersonal relationships of trust: the gods are to be trusted because there is no other alternative to humanity’s understanding of the universe, or to humans’ interactions with one another in society.

In chaps. 5–10, M. discusses pistis in the LXX and NT texts. Regarding the LXX (chap. 5), M. emphasizes the use of pistis terminology in Genesis, Exodus, Job, Wisdom, and Sirach. Pistis is presented as relational trust and dynamic, able to grow or diminish over time between parties. For this reason, there is as much interest in maintaining the covenant as there is in making one between God and Israel. The law acts as a reification of Israel’s trust in God. M. emphasizes that the Jewish and Greco-Roman views of pistis are similar enough that they would be intelligible to members of each culture.

In chaps. 6 and 7, M. attends to the use of pistis in Paul’s letters, in which she finds that the apostle describes a “wigwam-shaped” divine–human community. Paul does not commend in his audiences a fideistic pistis that is an irrational leap of faith but rather a trust that is justifiably logical based on God’s faithfulness and the death and resurrection of Christ. While dikaiosyné and pistis are linked, M. cautions that nomos and pistis should be read as contrasts, not antitheses, in Galatians, Romans, and Philippians. This insightful nuance is paralleled in M.’s reading of Gal 2:20-21 and Rom 3:21-25, in which Jesus is portrayed as the nexus of divine–human relationships in which pistis Iesou is at once Jesus’s faithfulness toward humanity and the Father, and the Father’s and humanity’s trust in Jesus. The ambiguity in Paul’s grammar and lexicon around pistis may be strategic to engage effectively both Jewish and gentile audiences.

Chapter 8 consists of the Deutero-Pauline and general letters. Except for 2 Thessalonians, M. finds that the Deutero-Pauline letters move away from Paul’s sense of pistis based
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