

and Luke the historian. If Krodel's concentration of compositional analysis suggests that the former is the more apt designation, the style of the commentary, especially for the nonspecialist audience, clouds the necessary distinction between literary composition and historical record. Thus, for example, the introduction to 4:1-22 (p. 108) leaves the impression that one is dealing with a historically correct sequence of events. Even the tenses utilized in the commentary contribute to this perception by giving the impression that an actual scene, speech, or incident lies in view: "the members of the council . . . *recognized* the boldness of the two apostles" (p. 111); "After demonstrating that Christ's resurrection fulfills Psalm 2 and the promise concerning David's seed, Paul *cited* two other Old Testament texts. . ." (p. 240). It would seem to prejudice the matter less to use the present tense, "they recognize," "Paul cites," which is more readily understandable as a comment on the flow of the author's narrative rather than an affirmation of some particular historical occurrence. It is certainly not the case that Krodel ignores the distinction between composition and history. Indeed most of his energies are devoted to an analysis of Luke's literary artistry. But this emphasis is not thoroughgoing enough to remove the potential for misunderstanding.

Christopher R. Matthews
Cambridge, MA 02138

The Mythmaker: Paul and the Invention of Christianity, by Hyam Maccoby.
New York: Harper & Row, 1986. Pp. xii+237. \$17.95.

Hyam Maccoby, a Talmudic scholar and Fellow of Leo Baeck College, having previously done a book on Jesus as a thoroughly Jewish Messiah of Pharisaic bent (*Revolution in Judea*, 1973, 1980), has now turned to consider Paul and his place in the development of early Christianity. Maccoby has produced a fascinating book, written for the nonspecialist, but based on critical historical methods. The thesis of this work is easily summarized. Paul is the great Hellenizing innovator who single-handedly invented the religion which became Christianity with its myth about Jesus as an incarnated heavenly Savior-God. Further, this Pauline packaged version of the faith has no roots in the Judaism of his day, in the historical circumstances of Jesus' career and teachings, or in the original Jerusalem church. And finally, this newly created religion of Paul is inherently anti-Semitic, and became the foundation of subsequent Christian anti-Semitism. Not only does Maccoby lay all of this at Paul's door, but he further argues that Paul was born a Gentile, was a later convert to Judaism, and, despite his claim to the contrary, was never even a Pharisee.

Of course, this view of Paul as a kind of "second founder" of Christianity is nothing new. Since the late 19th century Paul has been both praised and damned for such a role. It has certainly become clear in the late 20th century that the language of this discussion is highly loaded and the presuppositions are far from subtle. But the essential *historical* questions remain. How is it that Jesus of Nazareth, admittedly Jewish and by most accounts Torah observant, came to be seen by the early Christians as a pre-existent deity, a heavenly Savior and Lord, worthy of worship alongside God the Father? Where did the related notions of the sacrificial death of Jesus for the sins of all humankind, the participation in this death through baptism, and the ceremonial eating and drinking of his body and blood, come from? Are such notions and practices to be traced, even loosely, to Jesus, or to his early group of Jewish followers in Judea and Galilee?

Perhaps the most sensational, and therefore controversial, feature of Maccoby's book is his bold questioning and recasting of the standard biographical portrait of Paul's personal background and career. He denies Paul was born a Jew, that he was ever a Pharisee, and that he had any kind of Rabbinic training. Paul is a confused and frustrated convert, torn between his pagan background and his longing to be a Jew, suffering from failure and lack of self-esteem, and near mental breakdown. This extremely speculative and novelistic approach to the sources does weaken Maccoby's book as a balanced critical historical work. But Maccoby does squarely face the real and obvious problems in those very sources. Most of the evidence for the standard portrait is drawn from Acts, not from Paul's authentic letters: Saul of Tarsus, trained under Gamaliel, a leading Pharisee, with political authority, sent by the High Priest to Damascus to arrest Christians, a Roman citizen by birth, etc. Maccoby takes seriously the problems presented by the highly tendentious nature of this source. He recognizes, as do all historians, that among other things, Paul's own letters are pieces of religious propaganda, representing only one side of a controversial story. He then tries, through conjecture, to build his own "more likely story." Despite any specific weaknesses of Maccoby's reconstruction (such as his psychologizing about Paul's mental state), he is not to be criticized for his attempt to make sense of our complicated sources. Anyone who approaches them historically will have to face and attempt to solve the same nagging problems.

In my judgment there is a less sensational, but more serious and endemic weakness to Maccoby's book. He tends to oversimplify complex scholarly discussions and ignore important results that have been carefully worked out by the most competent historians. For example, he argues that Paul is not a "Jewish" thinker and certainly not a "Pharisee," that his religious system is at heart

"Hellenistic," and therefore "pagan," closely akin to "gnosticism." And there lies the problem—his static use of such highly loaded and value-laden terms: Jewish, Pharisee, pagan, Hellenistic, and gnosticism. If anything has emerged from the painstaking work of historians dealing with the religions of the ancient Mediterranean world (including those who deal with various forms of Judaism), it is a recognition of the utter ambiguity, and thus, essential uselessness, of such theological "buzz words." I have in mind the work of Nock, Scholem, Goodenough, M. Smith, Grant, Neusner, J.Z. Smith, to name a few. The Greco-Roman religious world does not divide so neatly into airtight compartments. The "Hellenistic" vs. "Judaic" debate is over. The use of the term "pagan" in contrast to "Jewish" belongs to religious apologetics. We cannot speak of a "normative" Judaism in Second Temple times. The texts of Classical Judaism must be read with historical-critical methods and can only with great difficulty be used to describe pre-70 C.E. Pharisaism. The contemporary Jewish sources we do have reflect a rich variety of Judaism(s), largely Torah observant, but replete with most of the elements Maccoby finds "foreign" in Paul: multiple heavens populated with hierarchies of angels and demons, powerful cosmic forces of evil, journeys to heaven and the underworld, magical-theurgic practices, exorcisms and charismatic healings, revelations of cosmic secrets, incarnations and epiphanies of divine beings, and a quest for apotheosis or immortality. As for gnostic texts of the period, we have few to none. The most basic questions of definition and origin are still largely unsolved. In a similar way Maccoby seems to brush aside the long and complicated effort by scholars to trace the development of the "christologies" (plural!) of the NT. It is not an easy question and it will not be solved by asserting that Paul sat down and invented it all. The highly fruitful results of over 40 years of redaction criticism of the gospels must be carefully brought into such a discussion. With regard to Paul himself, it is becoming increasingly unlikely, in the light of recent scholarship on the authentic letters (e.g., on crucial passages such as Phil 2:5-11), that Paul thought of Jesus as a pre-existent divine being, equal to God. Perhaps the single most important key to interpreting Paul is to understand how he works out of the world of Jewish apocalyptic. This Maccoby almost wholly ignores.

The book is well worth reading, is engrossing, and represents an important restatement of a position that deserves reexamination. Unfortunately, it is simply outdated. What is needed is the kind of treatment that takes account of the most recent critical scholarship on Judaism(s) in the Second Temple period

with full awareness of the dynamics of religious change that affected all groups, including Jews, in the Hellenistic period.

James D. Tabor

College of William and Mary, Williamsburg, VA 23185

Syntax Criticism of the Synoptic Gospels, by Raymond A. Martin. Studies in the Bible and Early Christianity, 10. Lewiston, NY/Queenston, Ontario: Edwin Mellen, 1987. Pp. ix+218. \$49.95.

In his 1974 book, *Syntactical Evidence of Semitic Sources in Greek Documents* (SBLSCS 3; Missoula: Society of Biblical Literature, 1974; cf. *JBL* 95 [1976] 156-57), Martin claimed to have identified seventeen criteria which distinguish original Greek from Greek which was translated from Hebrew or Aramaic. In his 1987 book, Martin has applied these seventeen criteria to the analysis of Mark 1-10, their Matthean and Lucan parallels, the Q material, and the special Matthean and Lucan material. Eight of these seventeen criteria are based on the number of occurrences of eight prepositions in a given unit of text as compared with the number of occurrences of the preposition *en* ("in") in that text. The other nine criteria are based on the occurrences of three categories of dependent genitives, two categories of attributive adjectives, *kai* ("and") used to coordinate main clauses, articles separated from their substantives, adverbial participles, and datives which are not objects of *en*.

After studying the frequencies of these seventeen linguistic usages in various portions of the LXX and various samples of original Greek, Martin argued that each of these usages has different ranges of frequencies for translation Greek and original Greek. When studying the occurrences of dependent genitive personal pronouns, for example, he found that all nineteen of the samples of translated works of the LXX which he studied have 5.7 or fewer lines of text for each such pronoun while all nine of the samples of original Greek which he examined have 10.3 or more lines of text for each such pronoun. He did not explain why he placed the threshold for translation Greek for these pronouns at 9.0 lines for each such pronoun rather than at some other number between 10.3 and 5.7. His ranges of translation frequencies for the preposition *eis* ("into") and for one of his categories of attributive adjectives are especially questionable; the frequencies for both of these criteria in the works of Epictetus fall within Martin's ranges of translation frequencies for these criteria, while the frequencies for both of these criteria in many of the translated books of the LXX fall outside his ranges of translation frequencies for these criteria. Martin did not respond to those scholars (especially Marius Reiser) who ques-