

8 traces the transition from the New Testament period to later generations as the Christian movement began to acquire a much higher profile.

The book is skillfully arranged into three distinct parts: matrix (chaps. 1–3), ministry (chap. 4), and mission (chaps. 5–8). While written with a “broader readership” in mind (2), the volume’s language, style, and methodologies presume that, to fully appreciate the book’s sophistication and presuppositions, the reader has more than a basic knowledge of the New Testament world. Graduate students willing to plow through this 355-page volume, in a small font, will surely acquire a comprehensive knowledge of Galilee and the early Jesus movement and mission.

vanThanh Nguyen, S.V.D.
Catholic Theological Union, Chicago

Luke–Acts and Jewish Historiography: A Study on the Theology, Literature, and Ideology of Luke–Acts. By Samson Uytanlet. *Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament* 2/366. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014. Pp. xviii + 327. €84.

This revision of a 2013 London School of Theology dissertation seeks to demonstrate that Jewish writings, particularly Israel’s Scriptures, rather than Greco-Roman works, have pervasively shaped the theology, literary presentation, and ideology of Luke–Acts (22). After surveying the history of scholarship on the relation of history and theology in Luke–Acts, Uytanlet undertakes a three-part study to compare the respective views of Greco-Roman authors, Jewish writers, and Luke on three topics: divine involvement in human history (chaps. 2–4), the use of literary parallels (chaps. 5–7), and conceptions of divine rule over land and territories (chaps. 8–10).

In the first comparative exercise, U. devotes a mere four pages of text to *theopraxis* (i.e., divine acts) in Greco-Roman histories, concluding that “for ancient Greco-Roman historians, *history is theology*” (33, emphasis original). He presents little more than a surface reading of some texts with no theoretical analysis. When he turns to divine involvement in Jewish historical accounts, it quickly becomes clear that “Jewish historians” in this study primarily intends “the authors of the Bible’s ‘historical books.’” Here, in about six pages of text, with some 100 OT references, U. “sketch[s] how Jewish historians wove the story of Israel’s God into the nation’s historical accounts” (41). He assumes throughout, without discussion, that these biblical authors, no less than Luke himself, are historians. Readers who expected that the “Jewish historiography” of the book’s title signaled nonbiblical Jewish authors of the Greco-Roman period have by this point adjusted their expectations. In the final chapter of the first comparative exercise, U. devotes some 15 pages of text to divine involvement in Luke–Acts, highlighting the latter’s “greater similarity with Jewish narratives” (44), that is to say, biblical narratives. Among his summary conclusions to the chapters on divine involvement in human history, U. urges that the “common distinction” between history and theology “in Lukan [and biblical] studies . . . be laid to rest” (68–69). But Lukan scholars have known for a long time that Luke’s “history” is driven by his theology, and U.’s analysis, which essentially paraphrases the biblical texts (in an overly unified,

canonical conception) and does not distinguish the perspectives of the biblical authors from that of God (e.g., 49), does little to further our perception on this topic.

In his second comparative section (chaps. 5–7), after a discussion of parallels in Luke–Acts, U. treats literary parallels and succession narratives in Greco-Roman and Jewish historical accounts, respectively, and then proposes that parallels between Jesus in the Gospel and Peter and Paul in Acts resemble the Deuteronomic historian’s portrayals of succession in the cases of Moses–Joshua and Elijah–Elisha. Various elements of U.’s argument appear tenuous. For example, he views Jesus’ statement about preaching in “other cities also” (Lk 4:43) as pointing to the later itinerant missions of Peter (Acts 9:39) and Paul (Acts 13–21) (124–29). Further, U. takes the conflict with religious leaders in Luke 20:1 and Acts 4:5–6 to indicate that Peter in the latter passage is “the ‘new Jesus,’ a successor who continues Jesus’ task” (135). No one would deny the extensive, intentional parallels between Jesus and Peter or Paul. U.’s insistence, however, that Peter and Paul not only replicate and continue Jesus’ activities (as has long been recognized) but also alone succeed him ignores the broader Lukan conception of the task of the apostles (explicit at Acts 1:8; cf. Lk 24:44–49) and suggests a predecessor–successor equivalency that arguably overstates the Lukan correspondence.

The final set of comparisons (chaps. 8–10) concerns the place of land, genealogies, and the reign of the gods/God in Greco-Roman and Jewish historical accounts, respectively, and what these themes signify in Luke–Acts. U. suggests that geographical movement in Luke–Acts announces the territorial sovereignty of the God of Israel over against earthly rulers, notably the Roman emperor. One strand of his argument holds that Jesus’ baptism, genealogy, and temptation in Lk 3:21–4:13 portrays “Jesus as the legitimate heir and rightful possessor of his Father’s territories” (205). U.’s evidence for this construal depends in part on information he derives from the larger contexts of scriptural quotes or allusions in Luke’s text (i.e., material *not* cited by Luke). A variety of additional arguments are proffered but fail to secure the plausibility of U.’s reading. He nowhere asks about the viability of such a literary-theological construction in the period after 70 CE, when the reality of Jerusalem’s destruction by Rome would seemingly render such an obscure vision of God’s territorial supremacy an odd exercise in theodicy.

While U. displays a commendable grasp of recent scholarship and demonstrates broad knowledge of the extensive possibilities for Luke’s intertextual recourse to Israel’s Scriptures, the particular patterns and emphases he detects largely appear to be an overinterpretation of Luke’s text.

Christopher R. Matthews

Boston College School of Theology and Ministry

Practices of Power: Revisiting the Principality and Powers in the Pauline Letters. By Robert Ewusie Moses. Emerging Scholars Series. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2014. Pp. xi + 293. \$59.

In this revised dissertation, Moses proposes “practice” as a category for understanding and analyzing the world of spiritual powers presumed in the Pauline letters. These