

---

Review of Stanley E. Porter and Christopher D. Stanley, eds., *As It is Written: Studying Paul's Use of Scripture*. SBLSS 50. Leiden: Brill, 2008.

**Michael F. Bird, Bible College of Queensland**

---

This volume represents a collection of essays originally presented at the Paul and Scripture Seminar of the Society of Biblical Literature over 2006-7 with additional chapters in parts 1 and 2 written specifically for this volume. The goal of the project was to “provide readers with a useful overview of current scholarly study of Paul’s use of Scripture” (p. vii).

The opening essay, “Paul and Scripture: Charting the Course” by Christopher D. Stanley, provides a brief history of the study of Paul’s use of Scripture. He then presents a taxonomy of approaches to Paul’s use of Scripture defined by theological, historical, literary, and rhetorical/socio-scientific interests. Stanley then charts the six questions that the Paul and Scripture seminar were attempting to address, including:

What do we mean by Paul’s “use” of Scripture?

What kinds of data yield the best understanding of Paul’s engagement with the text of Scripture?

How does one recognize references to Scripture in Paul’s letters?

How do Paul’s references to the Jewish Scriptures relate to their original contexts?

What can we presume about the biblical literacy of Paul’s audiences?

What role does Scripture play in Paul’s theology and rhetoric?

Part 2 of the book tackles directly the subject of Paul’s engagement with Scripture. Steve Moyise examines the form and function of Paul’s “quotations” and contentious issues surrounding this topic. Moyise addresses debates about the way quotations operate in Paul, whether Paul respected the original context of his quotations, and whether Paul expected his readers to know the original context of a text that he quoted. For Moyise, there are several polarities in the scholarship surrounding Paul’s use of scriptural quotations including: agonistic vs. embedded approaches to the validity of context in intertextuality, emic vs. etic explanations, and diachronic vs. synchronic perspectives on where the focus of a quotations lies.

Stanley E. Porter’s piece, “Allusion and Echoes”, examines the definition of the key terms in the study of Paul’s use of the Old Testament. Porter is critical of those who do not distinguish sufficiently between allusion and echo (e.g., Richard Hays). Porter differentiates the two thus: “Whereas allusion invokes a specific person, place, or literary work, the notion of echo may be used for the invocation by means of thematically related language of some more general notion or concept” (p. 39). He also advocates that both concepts seem to simply an intentional use by the author of a particular text based on common knowledge with shared readers (though echo can still be present even if the recipients fail to acknowledge its presence).

Roy E. Ciampa engages the topic of “Scriptural Language and Ideas”, where he maintains that all texts represent a dialogical engagement with other texts. Ciampa then identifies a criterion by which one can establish whether Paul’s language derives from Scripture or from some other source (e.g., Greco-Roman influences): (a) If Paul and/or other early Jewish/Christian authors associate them with scriptural quotations, allusions, or echoes; (b) If they have a distinctive background in the Jewish Scriptures and are typical of Jewish/Christian discourse; (c) If they are dissimilar to Greco-Roman

ideas, while also demonstrating a similarity to distinctive Jewish ideas rooted in Scripture; (d) if they are dissimilar to Greco-Roman ideas and Jewish ideas, but are explicable in terms of new interpretations inspired by Jesus or by the context of the early church especially where explicit support is appealed to in Scripture (p. 48).

Steven DiMattei in “Biblical Narratives”, contests the view that Paul’s use of Old Testament narratives is best described as typological. DiMattei believes in typology as a legitimate hermeneutical approach, but he maintains that it also developed as a particular Christian approach to interpreting the Old Testament that was more apologetically than hermeneutically driven. DiMattei proposes that Paul’s use of Old Testament narratives is better understood as a form of *peshet* as found in the Qumran scrolls, *paradeigma* as in deliberative rhetoric, and *haftarah* from Rabbinic traditions that combine Pentateuchal and Prophetic texts.

I think DiMattei’s critique of typology as a christianized hermeneutic is largely valid, but overplayed. First, he rejects the idea of typology in 1 Cor 10:4 where Paul says that the “rock was Christ” (p. 81 n. 69). My understanding of typology is that it identifies in a text anticipatory symbols of something or someone later and I am at a loss as to how the verb “to be” (“was”) requires a literal rather than typological sense for “the rock was Christ”. Second, while I concur that many readers view Paul through the lens of post-Pauline hermeneutical practices often meant to absolve Paul of employing allegory or midrash (p. 75), we still have to ask if Paul himself influenced or generated subsequent interpretations through his own use of the Old Testament. In this case, the line between “Pauline” and “post-Pauline” may be fluid depending on the author and subject we are discussing. Third, DiMattei recognizes the interdependence of Paul’s christology and hermeneutics (p. 77), but he flattens out the confluence between the two in Paul’s discourse at the meta-narrative and hermeneutical levels. What DiMattei is successful in showing is that it will take more than a footnote to Leonhard Goppelt to establish the legitimacy of Pauline typology.

In Part 3 on Paul and his Audience, Stanley Porter touches on the subject of “Paul and His Bible: His Education and Access to the Scriptures of Israel”, where he canvasses topics as diverse as education in antiquity, book culture in the ancient world, the phenomenon of reading, and the process by which the Old Testament became Pauline citations. He thinks it likely that Paul was a product of the Greco-Roman educational system in Tarsus. Books and writing materials were available across all cultural and ethnic groups of the first century. Greco-Roman culture was increasingly literate including those who read both aloud and silently. Paul’s citations of the Old Testament did not derive from a portable Septuagint codex, but Paul relied on memory, manuscripts of entire books, and also on anthologies of Scripture used as liturgical, doctrinal, and compositional tools. In sum, Porter sees Paul as experiencing elements of Greco-Roman and Jewish education and this accounts for both the material that he cites and the way that he cites it.

Christopher Stanley’s second essay is “Paul’s ‘Use’ of Scripture: Why the Audience Matters” and it calls for a more audience-centred approach for understanding Pauline intertextuality. Stanley questions whether, sociologically, Paul’s readers can be expected to be literate and conversant with the wider context of the Old Testament passages that Paul cites. He further asserts that Paul’s rhetorical handling of Scripture is self-contained and was constructed in such a way that illiterate members of his audience could have grasped his essential points.

Bruce Fisk questions the notion of widespread illiteracy among Paul’s audiences in his study on “Synagogue Influence and Scriptural Knowledge Among the Christians of Rome”. Fisk spends much time on the context of Christianity in Rome (esp. the historical occasion and impact of the Claudius edict upon Jewish and Gentile Christian relationships in Rome in the 50s CE). His main contribution is the view that prevailing patterns of synagogue worship, including public reading of the Torah and its exposition, would have shaped the understanding of Scripture by Gentile adherents to Judaism in Rome, which in turn would have shaped the literary culture of Christianity in Rome.

Part 4 centres on Paul's intertextual backgrounds and the first essay here is by Douglas A. Campbell on "The Meaning of *Dikaiosyne Theou* in Romans: An Intertextual Suggestion", where Campbell notes the influence of Ps 98:2-3 on Paul's remarks about righteousness and salvation in Rom 1:17. He concludes that in Paul's discourse, the "righteousness of God" in Romans is "an intertextually mediated reference to the deliverance of God" (p. 211). Neil Elliott looks at intertextual discourse at the cultural level in his study on "'Blasphemed Among the Nations': Pursuing an Anti-Imperial 'Intertextuality' in Romans". There Elliott reads Romans 2-3 against an anti-imperial rhetoric where there is an implicit contrast between God's mercy and the Roman Emperor's clemency. Mark Given is occupied with the topic of "Paul and Writing" where he describes Paul's religion as a form of "apocalyptic logocentrism" that creates an ambiguous attitude towards writing by Paul since Paul pits letter against the Spirit. Jeremy Punt tackles the subject of "Paul and Postcolonial Hermeneutics" to understand the discourse of power in Paul's letters. Punt focuses on 2 Corinthians 10-13 and he detects in Paul a subtle challenge to the Roman Empire, though Paul himself is implicated in his own discourse of power that substantiates his own claims to position and authority among the churches. Finally, Kathy Ehrensperger discusses "Paul and the Authority of Scripture: A Feminist Perception" focusing also on 2 Corinthians. Ehrensperger contends that Paul does not simply cite Scripture to be an imposed authority over believers, rather, Paul's use of Scripture functions as a means of empowerment of believers.

The book contains a diverse range of topics and approaches, but is suitably unified by the concern of all contributors to discuss how Paul handled "Scripture", what Paul thought "Scripture" was, and what authority and function he attributed to it. This is a valuable contribution to a growing area of New Testament studies and a useful introduction to the current state of scholarship.