most detailed, rigorous, and convincing presentation of argument to date. I can imagine Tom Wright’s smile after reading this chapter!

The fifth chapter, “King and Justice,” focuses on an aspect of ancient kingship ideology which conceives of the good king as a righteous one, the embodiment of righteousness, and the person divinely granted to establish a just cosmos for his people. Josh demonstrates that this theme in ancient kingship ideology around the Mediterranean and in the Ancient Near East was widespread. What’s more, and importantly, Josh argues that in Romans Paul’s dik-language is best understood in the context of this kingship ideology.

In conclusion, this chapter alone demonstrates the thoroughgoing nature of Paul’s Davidic Christology. Both in this chapter and throughout the book, Jipp has shown the significant resource Davidic Messianism is for unlocking infamous Gordian theological knots in Paul’s thinking. Whatever work I may do in the future on Davidic Christology, this book will be a starting point for Paul.

Joel Willitts
North Park University


In this lightly revised University of Edinburgh doctoral dissertation, Derek Brown seeks to discuss “how and why does Paul refer to the figure of Satan in his letters” (p. 15), setting Paul into the context of Second Temple Jewish thought. In his 20-page introduction, Brown makes clear that “his letters” for practical reasons includes the seven undisputed letters, although he does not see any great disjunction between those letters and the disputed Pauline letters. He also indicates that he is not considering any theoretical Pauline thought that is not documented in the letters and for which the letters do not provide context.

The project, then, naturally starts with 40 pages on “Images of Satan in Biblical and Second Temple Jewish Tradition.” The interest in biblical tradition is not in what the original authors may have thought, but in how these writings were understood by a hypothetical typical first century Jew. The study of context continues with 12 pages on “Apocalyptic and Satan in Pauline Theology,” in which Brown accepts Christiaan Beker’s view of an apocalyptic Paul, and 28 pages on “Paul’s Apostleship and His Churches.” Thus Paul picks up the then-current apocalyptic view of Satan as the opponent of God’s people (rather than all humanity) and particularly of its leaders. This figure, whose end is in God’s judgment, in the present overlap of the ages opposes the gospel and therefore Paul as its agent, for the gospel announces the judgment of all apocalyptic figures. Since his churches were central to Paul’s mission, Satan’s opposition to those churches is a critical concern for Paul.

With the context laid out, Brown turns to exploring the Pauline texts themselves. This begins with 28 pages on one passage each in Romans and 1 Thessalonians. It continues with 66 pages on “Paul’s References to Satan in 1 and 2 Corinthians,” discussing 7 references. Finally, the work ends with an 8-page “Conclusion,” followed by 20 pages of bibliography and 21 pages of indexes.
Brown concludes that Paul does not pick up the pre-Pauline idea of Satan as a heavenly adversary or the idea of Satan as the origin of evil. Paul does not place Satan into a hierarchy of angelic or demonic powers. What he does pick up is Satan as the apocalyptic opponent of Israel, proleptically defeated in the death and resurrection of Jesus, whose ultimate doom is therefore certain. Since Paul’s apostleship plays a key role in this apocalyptic scenario and since the establishment and nurturing of his churches is central to Paul’s apostolic role, Satan therefore seeks to hinder Paul and attack his churches.

Brown’s work is very readable, having excellent summaries, and clear conclusions. But he himself argues that while the book fills in an empty niche in both Pauline studies and those of Satan, it is limited. How is this role of Satan the same as or different than the Satan of the Synoptics? What about the disputed Pauline letters? What difference would it make if this or that one were considered genuine? Do those letters as a whole display differences from the view of Satan painted here or are they “more of the same?” In other words, how much has the particular selection of literature shaped the function of Satan (and, by implication, Paul’s use of Second Temple sources)? In summary, this work is a good read and a contribution to Pauline thought, but it leaves one with a lot of unanswered questions.

Peter H. Davids
Houston Graduate School of Theology


This volume contains a collection of essays by David L. Balch, who has specialized throughout his career on NT background. Fourteen of these essays were previously published. Six are new. They are divided into two distinct sections. The first part (“Luke–Acts”) has 11 chapters dealing with the Lukan corpus in the context of an increasingly diverse Roman Empire. The second part (“Roman Art and the New Testament”), comprised of seven chapters, deals with Roman domestic art and its cultural significance, especially as it relates to NT themes. There are introductory chapters (1, 12) to each part. Finally, two book reviews round out the volume (described below). A CD is included with the volume containing images of the artwork discussed in part two.

In Balch’s own words, the first 11 essays “interpret the contested, political, plural ethnic origins of Christianity as narrated by Luke–Acts in the context of political debates around the citizenship of multiple ethnic cities in the early Roman empire” (p. 1). Most of the essays here concern themes within Luke–Acts that find precedent in Greco-Roman writers—especially related to diversity and outsiders. Balch engages primarily with the writings of Greek historian and rhetorician, Dionysius of Halicarnassus (born ca. 60 BC). Chapter 2 (“Two apologetic encomia”), for example, compares the apologetic work of Josephus in Contra Apion with his predecessor Dionysius to show how they similarly navigate controversial issues related to the acceptance of foreigners. Chapter 4 seeks to show that the Lukan themes of economic ethics—the coming reversal of fortunes of rich and poor, proud and humble—have their primary source not