

Alexander Samely and Philip Alexander, whose work (along with that of Samely's teacher Arnold Goldberg) she reviews on pp. 102-20. She commends Alexander for his efforts to identify more precisely the forms and methods of midrash, and she thinks that many of the exegetical techniques Samely identified (approximately 140 of them) effectively describe the mechanics of early Jewish interpretation.

Before applying their conclusions to Hebrews, however, D. must first determine the biblical text used by its author. She draws attention to evidence that several Greek translations of the Hebrew Bible were circulating in the ancient world. Such evidence includes variants in later Jewish editions along with differences in possible Hebrew exemplars as attested in the Dead Sea Scrolls. She also points out that "several contemporary scholars are persuaded of the antiquity and value of many readings" associated with the fourth-century Lucianic recension (p. 128). This hypothetical variety of texts allows her to conclude that, at least in Hebrews 1; 3; and 4, the author faithfully cites a written source.

Docherty then spends fifty-six pages examining the use of the OT in Hebrews 1; 3-4. She profitably brings some of Samely's descriptions to bear on the exegetical techniques manifested in these chapters. They include lifting a passage from its context and placing it in a new context so as to constrain its interpretation, "segmenting" a text in order to concentrate on discrete portions, and giving "heavy emphasis" to a particular word or phrase (p. 177). Here D. successfully demonstrates that the exegetical techniques of Hebrews reflect those of early Jewish interpretation. She concludes that, like the Jewish exegetes of the Second Temple period, the author of Hebrews believed that Israel's Scriptures are God's own speech. Each word is divinely inspired; each assertion is absolutely true. Together God's words form a coherent whole.

Docherty has aided researchers by pointing to the essentially Jewish characteristics of biblical interpretation in Hebrews. Surely a precise definition of early midrash—its general rules as well as its specific techniques—is necessary for understanding NT interpretation of Israel's Scriptures. I am less convinced, however, that variants in early Hebrew and late Greek editions permit us to state with confidence that the author of Hebrews made few alterations to the written source. In addition, D.'s assertion that the wider context of a cited passage plays a role in Jewish interpretation is neither well substantiated nor persuasively developed. She never reconciles it with the idea that the author of Hebrews interprets most of the citations apart from their original contexts.

Finally, the study seems somewhat imbalanced. D. gives nearly twice as much attention to other scholars' work as to her own. She contends that an analysis of Hebrews 5-10 will confirm her conclusions about chaps. 1; 3; and 4. I would have preferred to see those results, however, than to read a long review of previous research.

Jocelyn McWhirter, Albion College, Albion, MI 49224

ANDERS GERDMAR, *Roots of Theological Anti-Semitism: German Biblical Interpretation and the Jews, from Herder and Semler to Kittel and Bultmann* (Studies in Jewish History and Culture 20; Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2009). Pp. xviii + 677. \$240.

Anders Gerdmar's massive monograph characterizes itself as a comprehensive exploration of "how [Germanophone] exegetes from the beginning of modernity to the aftermath

of the Holocaust describe and theologise about Jews and Judaism and [of] the mechanisms between biblical interpretation and anti-Semitism” (p. 4). G. divides the compass of German Protestant academic NT exegesis and scholarship on Christian origins into four traditions that more or less succeed one another. First he examines what he characterizes as “Enlightenment exegesis” through discussions of Johann Salomo Semler, Johann Gottfried Herder, Friedrich D. E. Schleiermacher, W. M. L. de Wette, Ferdinand Christian Baur, David Friedrich Strauss, Albrecht Ritschl, and the history-of-religions school (Wilhelm Bousset, Hugo Gressmann, and Johannes Weiss). G. then addresses the group of “salvation-historical” exegetes, whose scholarly output initially overlaps somewhat with the last of his Enlightenment exegetes: Friedrich August Tholuck, Johannes Tobias Beck, Franz Delitzsch, Hermann L. Strack, and Adolf Schlatter. These discussions are followed by his treatment of their generational successors, the form critics Karl Ludwig Schmidt, Martin Dibelius, and Rudolf Bultmann. Finally, G. devotes extensive space to those critics’ younger colleagues, the “Nazi” exegetes Gerhard Kittel and Walter Grundmann. G. takes a three-pronged approach to each scholar’s representation(s) of *Judentum* (Jews, Judaism, and Jewishness) and its/their functions within each research tradition. He first examines how the historical (and geographical) characterizations of *Judentum* in the first century and earlier by the scholar sought to determine its continuity and/or discontinuity with early Christianity. Second, G. identifies the construction and positioning of the “Jew” within that scholar’s symbolic universe. Third, he examines how these historiographic and ideological constructions impacted that scholar’s relationship with contemporary *Judentum*, that is, whether his exegetical practice served to legitimate or delegitimize the discrimination against and persecution of Jews.

Gerdmar recognizes that “*exegetes were not detached from social questions*” (p. 593; italics in this and subsequent quotations are G.’s) nor outside the influence of “*culturally transmitted prejudice and stereotypes*” (p. 601); he acknowledges that they mentor subsequent exegetes and that exegesis has directly or indirectly legitimized oppression. Unfortunately, he all but ignores the role as educators of future ministers that these academics played and play in the formation and perpetuation of anti-Semitic subjectivities. For all of his talk of “fundamental patterns, structures and heuristic models” (as well as the briefly asserted whitewash of the “New Testament evidence” [p. 611]), theological anti-Semitism comes down for G. to “*the ethos of the individual scholar*” (p. 607). He thus calls “exegesis and theology to self-critical reflection” after Auschwitz (p. 610); as a consequence of this ethical invigoration of scholar and scholarship, I guess, the structural conditions for theological anti-Semitism will simply lapse into disuse.

Though extensively analyzing the pertinent primary texts of each exegete, G. rarely offers any insight—as he readily acknowledges—into the anti-Jewish content of their works that previous magisterial studies, such as Klaus M. Beckmann on Schleiermacher and other early-nineteenth-century theologians (*Die fremde Wurzel: Altes Testament und Judentum in der evangelischen Theologie des 19. Jahrhunderts* [Forschungen zur Kirchen- und Dogmengeschichte 85; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2002]) or Christian Wiese on Protestant exegetes in Wilhelmine Germany (*Wissenschaft des Judentums und protestantische Theologie im wilhelminischen Deutschland: Ein Schrei ins Leere?* [Schriftenreihe wissenschaftlicher Abhandlungen des Leo Baeck Instituts 61; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1999]), as well as other narrower monographs on individual scholars, and the growing schol-

arship on Nazi exegesis, have provided (e.g., Susannah Heschel, *The Aryan Jesus: Christian Theologians and the Bible in Nazi Germany* [Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2008]). Moreover, G. does not sufficiently examine the relationship between the scholars' anti-Jewish-laced texts and their other works in which Jewish representation plays an apparently less manifest role; hence, his work suffers from the same "compartmentalization" (p. 607) that he places among the roots of theological anti-Semitism.

The size of many a *Habilitationsschrift*, G.'s original manuscript could have used some rehabilitation before its publication. Had the extensive repetitiveness of the text, in part a function of its formulaic style of argument—statement, elaboration of statement, restatement—been subjected to a copyeditor's economic intervention prior to publication, G.'s chronicle would have provided a handy trot through the anti-Jewish trajectories of German biblical exegesis. What G. does offer, however, is the first English-language survey of German Protestant theology from the Enlightenment through the Third Reich that places emphasis on its anti-Jewish content rather than on its diverse claims about Christianity and theology.

Jay Geller, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, TN 37240

JOEL KENNEDY, *The Recapitulation of Israel: Use of Israel's History in Matthew 1:1–4:11* (WUNT 2/257; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008). Pp. x + 264. Paper €59.

Joel Kennedy's study examines Matthew's use of the history of Israel in the presentation of Jesus. Using primarily historical (particularly source) criticism and literary criticism, K. traces this retelling of Israel's history, or "recapitulation," through Matt 1:1–4:11.

In his detailed analysis of the genealogy (1:1–18), K. begins by describing the kinds of genealogies in the OT, concentrating on the teleological genealogy, which has a particular person as the goal (e.g., Ruth 4:18–22, which leads to King David). K. argues that Matthew's genealogy is a teleological genealogy and a "compressed narrative" that retells Israel's history from exodus to exile and return from exile. Its purpose is to demonstrate that Israel's story does not end with the disarray following the exile, but continues and culminates in the coming of Jesus Christ.

Drawing on genealogies from Genesis, Ruth, and 1 Chronicles, K. next describes how genealogies function as narrative summaries. He demonstrates that these three books are sources for Matthew's genealogy. The order of the names in Matt 1:2–6 is from Ruth 4:18–22, with the addition of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob and "his brothers." K. argues that "his brothers" is meant to recall the exodus from Egypt. Set in the time of the judges when Israel desperately needed a king, the genealogy in Ruth leads to David the king. Matthew's use of Ruth, K. argues, demonstrates that Israel is again in need of a king.

Kennedy argues that the names in Matt 1:1–13, except Ruth, appear also in 1 Chr 1:27–3:19, which provides the names for Matt 1:6b–11. He discusses the presence of the women in Matt 1:2–6, stating that Matthew draws them from 1 Chronicles and Ruth. He concludes that they are simply significant players in Israel's history and the lineage of Jesus. For K., other hypotheses for the presence of the women are subsidiary to this primary function. There are problems, however, with his conclusion. 1 Chronicles lists only Tamar and



Copyright and Use:

As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.

No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.