

a crucial contribution to the growing body of research on Augustine's *Enarrationes in Psalmos*, particularly with reference to the living milieu of Augustine's congregations and the North African Church.

Naoki Kamimura  
Tokyo Gakugei University

*Paul and the Trinity: Persons, Relations, and the Pauline Letters.* By Wesley Hill. Grand Rapids: MI: Eerdmans, 2015. Pp. xiv + 220. \$26.

Hill's exciting volume may prove to be the first-fruits of a trinitarian resurrection in biblical studies. While systematic theology has been enjoying a prolonged trinitarian renaissance, biblical scholars have been uncertain if and how they might speak of the Trinity in the Bible. H.'s way forward neither rejects historical-critical approaches nor allows the raw superimposition of later dogma. Rather H. uses the trinitarian conceptualizations of Nicaea and beyond to probe for a better historical exegesis of Paul's letters than is offered by recent studies.

H.'s overall aim is to demonstrate that "Pauline interpreters ought to return to the 'trinitarian' model when it comes to the task of explicating the identities of God, Jesus, and the Spirit" (1). In demonstrating this thesis, arguably H.'s most innovative and important contribution is his successful problematization of scholarship surrounding monotheism and Christology.

H. shows that the contemporary "low" and "high" christological discourse is predicated on questionable ideas about first-century monotheism. In his brief treatment of the history of scholarship, H. asserts that "monotheism" as a newly coined term in the modern period allowed interpreters a new possibility, "to articulate the dynamics of Pauline Christology and theology without having recourse to trinitarian categories" (24). Eventually this caused biblical scholars to treat Paul's ancestral Jewish monotheism as the fixed point around which Paul, after the Christ event, had to reconcile his new ideas about Jesus and the Spirit.

In making monotheism the fixed point, scholarship gravitated toward a vertical axis, chain-of-being model. God is at the top and material creation at the bottom of a sliding semi-divine scale. Accordingly scholars wonder: How far up the vertical axis does Jesus belong? When and how did he attain to that level? Thus "high" and "low" language is favored for delineating the degree of Jesus's divinity. But as H. points out, not only is monotheism a scholarly construct, so is the vertical axis. The early church preferred to speak of Father, Son, and Spirit in relational rather than vertical terms, so that we should think of God, Jesus, and Spirit as horizontally related or as webbed together.

To demonstrate that God, Jesus, and the Spirit are mutually defining for Paul so that none can be identified adequately alone, H. exegetes specific Pauline texts. He first shows that for Paul, God cannot ultimately be picked out, qua God, apart from his raising and sending of the Son (Rom 4:24; 8:11; Gal 1:1). That is, for Paul there is no procrustean God-known-apart-from-Jesus to which final appeal can be made. For

example, when Paul reads the story of Abraham and Sarah's barrenness, God brings life to the dead in light of Christ's resurrection. Similarly Jesus can only be known in relation to God (Phil 2:6–11; 1 Cor 8:6; 15:24–28); moreover, the Spirit "is who 'he' is only by virtue of his relations to God and Jesus" (136) (1 Cor 12:3; Gal 4:4–6; 2 Cor 3:17). I wonder, however, if H's "only" here and elsewhere (e.g., 165) overstates matters, since other relationships are also defining—for example, to humans, animals, and the world. In other words, H. successfully shows that Father, Son, and Spirit are inescapably mutually identifying, but is less successful in speaking as if they are exclusively so.

In exegeting H. uses not just the tools of biblical scholarship, but also the theological discourse of the Fathers and of systematic theologians in a first-rate fashion. For instance, he agilely analyzes correlative terminology in Paul's letters—for example, "Father" implies "Son" and vice versa. Personally I found his deployment of *redoublement* especially insightful—his demonstration that "persons" and "essence" serve different functions in trinitarian grammar, so that it is necessary to retread ground to articulate what is "common" and what is "proper" to the divine persons. This allows H. to show how divine persons exist for Paul in a relationship of "asymmetrical mutuality" that preserves subordination without compromising ontological unity or equality (133). One difficulty, however, is that throughout H. uses terms such as "identity" and "person" without explaining how this nomenclature can be historically situated for Paul. Occasionally collective persons are even termed the "divine identity" without clarifying what is truly being referenced. If H. were to delve into Paul's prosopological exegesis of Septuagintal dialogues (e.g., Rom 11:9–10; 15:3, 9; 2 Cor 4:13), he might find helpful implied grammar for Paul's "person" language, as well as additional data pertaining to Father–Son–Spirit relations. The exegetical portions of H.'s study were generally very convincing, although the construal of a few passages could be questioned (esp. of 2 Cor 3:17).

Excitingly fresh, unfailingly clear, exegetically stimulating, and theologically sophisticated—this is a marvelous book that is to be wholeheartedly recommended. It models how theological interpretation of Scripture should be done. This exceptionally important book deserves a wide audience.

Matthew W. Bates  
Quincy University, Illinois

*The Watchers in Jewish and Christian Traditions.* Edited by Angela Kim Harkins, Kelley Coblenz Bautch, and John C. Endres. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2014. Pp. xiii + 241. \$29.

As indicated by the title, this volume traces the Watchers traditions from their ancient Near Eastern antecedents to early Christian, midrashic, and targumic literature. While a substantial amount of scholarly literature already exists on the Watchers, the editors hope that this volume will "guide non-specialists in an exploration of many primary texts" and will provide "some discussion that each vantage had on later traditions" (3).