

While the prose is scholarly in style, I have that found both graduates and undergraduates without Hebrew language knowledge have appreciated chapters. Even a bright and curious teenager dipping into this book would find many burning questions tackled biblically. Davidson is to be commended for an OT biblical theology of sexuality which is fearless, deep and comprehensive—almost encyclopaedic. With 142 pages of bibliography, it offers a rich mine of scholarly material and, running to a hefty xxix + 844 pages, this profound volume could double as a barbell for the home gym.

In an age when culture-shaping sexual questions are often discussed everywhere except church—when in too many pulpits traditional silences are allowed to gag scripture, or fashionable ideology dictates the agenda, or idealistic denial excludes real people's needs, or knee-jerk moral outrage replaces pastoral care—Davidson's work offers not only valuable biblical information but permission and example to encourage teachers and preachers. Church and society need this kind of grace-based biblical teaching on sexual issues, revealing God as the Source of all that is good and the Redeemer of love and sex, and calling people in a fast-changing culture to the timeless logic of biblical principles.

Grenville Kent

Wesley Theological College, Sydney, AUSTRALIA

---

*The Tenants in the Vineyard: Ideology, Economics, and Agrarian Conflict in Jewish Palestine*, by John S. Kloppenborg. WUNT 195. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006. Pp. xxix + 651. ISBN 978-3-16-148908-2. Hardcover. €149.00.

John S. Kloppenborg, Professor and Chair of the Department and Centre for the Study of Religion at the University of Toronto and well-known for his works on Q and early Christianity, seeks in this book to peel back the layers of interpretative tradition that have adhered to the parable of the Tenants in the Vineyard (Mark 12:1–12 parr). The book consists of a six-page introduction, followed by nine chapters, an epilogue, two appendices, extensive bibliography, and three indexes (modern authors, ancient texts, and subjects/terminology).

Chapter one describes how the parable has been used throughout Christian history to reinforce the dominance of socio-political powers. Kloppenborg begins with its use in the *Book of Common Prayer* by Charles II who established January 30 of 1662 (the anniversary of the death of Charles I) as a national fast and penitential observance for the crime of regicide. Then follows a fairly lucid description of ideological theory drawn principally from Raymond Geuss, but also utilizing insights from Marx and Engels regarding the use of ideology for social domination. Kloppenborg asserts that one

way "ideology embedded in a text can be rendered visible" is through a comparison of similar texts used in different ideological environments (p. 16). Rather than presenting a comprehensive history of the parable's interpretation, Kloppenborg illustrates how interpreters have tended to utilize the parable to justify the dominant social order. His order of presentation seems haphazard, moving from a nineteenth-century colonialist reading of the parable, backwards to the salvation-historical readings of Irenaeus and Eusebius, forward to Luther's anti-papal use of the parable, back again to allegorical readings of the parable likening the believer to a vineyard (termed by Kloppenborg "anagogical" because he labels the traditional interpretation "historical allegory"), forward again to Aquinas and Calvin who advocated both historical and anagogical interpretations. Kloppenborg finds an interpretative sameness based on dominance. Understanding of the parable has focused on "mastery of the forces of resistance, rebellion, and dissent, whether those forces are external and political [historical allegory] or forces residing in the human soul [anagogical]" (p. 28, brackets mine). Kloppenborg finds this kind of reading already ensconced in Mark, despite being framed as a parable spoken against Israel's social and political elite. He explains this consistency of interpretation on the basis of the parable's U-shaped plot (order-disruption-order reestablished) which favors an ideology of legitimate domination over revolution (p. 29). Of course, one could observe that the biblical narrative generally fits this plot form and that the ideology of much of Western civilization has been based on this. One need not take the version of the parable in *Thomas*, which treats the owner of the vineyard negatively and leaves his son's death unavenged, as necessarily closest to the Jesus tradition simply because from our standpoint it might seem to be more relevant to "the marginalized corners of the ancient world" (p. 30).

Chapter two applies the ideological analysis introduced in chapter one (distinct from redaction analysis which focuses on editorial differences) to the form of the parable in the Synoptics (esp. Mark) and *Thomas*. After outlining the literary differences between Mark and *Thomas*, Kloppenborg analyzes each ideologically and finds them to be poles apart: "Thomas' narrative does not sustain the owner's claim to his land and its produce; inheritance and its mechanisms are put into doubt; and there is no application of force" (p. 44). Also, while status displays appear in both, they are ineffective in *Thomas*. Kloppenborg uses the parable of the rich fool (*Thomas* 63) to illustrate this point (p. 44), although this parable is found also in the Synoptics (Luke 12:16-21). While in Luke it is not closely connected with the vineyard parable as in *Thomas*, from an ideological standpoint this should not matter. Its presence there would seem to undermine his case that ideologically *Thomas* stands apart from the Synoptics on the basis of its criticism of status

displays. Kloppenborg's method seems unclear in definition and slippery in its application, allowing important Synoptic evidence to be overlooked when it suits the argument as in this case and at other times to be brought forward in support (pp. 45–48). His finding that the Synoptic version of the parable "is remarkably out of keeping with that of other sectors of the early Jesus tradition" (p. 48) depends very much on one's reading of that tradition. At the same time, the attempt to go beneath the surface to the ideological texture of texts may find more acceptance in the literary critic's toolbox if a way can be found to place enough distance between the reader/interpreter and the text. It would have been useful for Kloppenborg to define and explain his ideological method in more detail and to give more references to works dealing with ideological criticism of the biblical text in terms of theory or application (*Semeia* 59 [1992] has some of both; Barbara E. Reid's study of Matthew's parables is cited [p. 28 n. 55] but nothing specifically on Mark).

Chapters three through five examine modern approaches to this parable and, by necessity, to parabolic interpretation more generally. Chapter three examines the criticism that the parable cannot be authentic because allegorical features traceable to the early church are inseparable from it. Kloppenborg points out that *Thomas'* version, which omits the allegorical elements seen as most problematic, has not been taken into account and its existence proves that a non-allegorical form of the parable is possible. Chapter four examines the views of those who argue that Jesus could have spoken allegorically about his death in this parable and that some later additions to the parable have been made. Kloppenborg understandably directs most of his attention to the question of whether allusions to Isa 5:1–7 would have been heard by a first-century Judean audience as an indictment of the temple authorities. In examining the relevant texts from Qumran, the *To-sefta*, and the *Isaiah Targum*, he grants that there was a trajectory in Second Temple Judaism linking Isaiah's parable with the temple, but argues that the most negative allusions are found only in the *Targum* (vv. 5b–6) which appear to preserve post A.D. 70 reflections and are therefore unlikely to have been current at the time of Jesus. But whether all of the relevant interpretative phrases of Isaiah's *Targum* related to the temple can be so neatly excluded is doubtful. Kloppenborg also finds no Christian interpreters before Origen linking Isa 5:1–7 to the temple (p. 100). This latter point, however, cannot be used to exclude the possibility of such a connection in the Jesus tradition itself. Why should it seem improbable that Jesus, in close proximity to his demonstration *in the temple complex*, could tell a parable about a vineyard using allusions to Isaiah's vineyard parable in order to make clear (at least to some) that his own vineyard parable also had a bearing on the temple? Chapter five examines attempts to uncover the original

form of Jesus' parable by stripping away its allegorical features. Despite the diversity of opinions here, Kloppenborg has succeeded in neatly schematizing them in terms of plot with the help of four diagrams depicting the options for understanding the parable's narrative structure. In concluding this three-chapter sequence, Kloppenborg isolates four key questions determinative of interpretation: (1) is the owner a positive or a negative figure? (2) is *Thomas* dependent or independent of the synoptic version? (3) what is the original form of the parable? (4) how crucial is verisimilitude to the parable's authenticity?

Chapter six constitutes a lightly revised version of the article "Egyptian Viticultural Practices and the Citation of Isa 5:1-7 in Mark 12:1-9" (*NovT* 44 [2002]: 134-59) in which Kloppenborg examines the MT and LXX of Isa 5:1-7 and compares these texts with Mark's parable. His main contention is that Mark never agrees with the MT against the LXX but rather reconceptualizes Jesus' parable along Septuagintal lines (p. 168, similarly on p. 151 and p. 171). Three arguments are presented in support: (1) Mark's parable, like the LXX of Isa 5, depicts the situation of rural Palestine prevailing in Hellenistic times rather than the earlier period depicted in the MT; (2) the parable assigns the vineyard's failure to neglect by the tenants (suggested also in the LXX by its reference to thorns) rather than to a defect in the vines themselves; (3) the parable employs terminology which he argues reflects distinctively Egyptian viticultural practices (principally the reference to a "palisade" φραγμόν in v. 1b). While Kloppenborg's reading of the Markan parable deserves further consideration, particularly in view of the extremely valuable comparative material which he sets forth in Appendix 1, his position is certainly not the only way to interpret the textual evidence. For example, the pronoun agreement in Mark 12:1 *with* the MT and *against* the LXX is dismissed as being "without source-critical significance" (p. 169) while at the same time admitting that the Septuagintal change of pronouns significantly alters the juridical setting of Isaiah (pp. 157-58). Ignored in this connection is the fact that a juridical setting is present also in Mark. Often Kloppenborg's argument rests on gratuitous assumptions. For example, Mark's use of ὑπολήνιον, obviously closer to the idea suggested by the MT's נק, is dismissed as an attempt to avoid the rarer Septuagintal προλήνιον (p. 169).

In chapter seven, Kloppenborg purportedly allows for a non-Markan version of the parable to have influenced Matthew or Luke but seems not to take this possibility too seriously. Throughout the chapter, the two document hypothesis remains the guiding principle for decisions on redaction. And while the odd reference in Mark to "parables" (12:1) when Mark has only one parable could be taken as a summarizing statement in view of Matthew's series of three parables, Kloppenborg finds Matthew improving

on Mark (p. 175). The assumed relationship among the Synoptics also means that Luke's account is never compared with *Thomas'*, despite the fact that they exhibit many similar features. (For an attempt at a more neutral synoptic comparison of a different pericope, see my *Jesus and the Impurity of Spirits in the Synoptic Gospels* [WUNT 2/185; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004], 179–85.) These criticisms notwithstanding, the chapter has much of value in its close comparison of Mark with the other Synoptics.

The final two chapters of the book are the longest and the most important. Chapter eight compares the Markan version of the parable with that of *Thomas*. Indispensable to Kloppenborg's argument is the exclusion of any role for Isa 5:2, 5 in the original parable. Having dispensed with this in chapter six, he further argues that the parable in Mark is inextricably related to the narrative's plot, is dissimilar to most other parables safely ascribed to Jesus, and exhibits a Deuteronomistic pattern found principally in certain NT epistles and Acts. However, none of these assertions are compelling. The parable is tightly integrated into Mark's temple narrative but, as I have suggested elsewhere, the complex intercalations of 11:1–12:12 are unique in Mark and more likely derive from pre-Markan oral tradition, including the acted parable of cursing the fig tree with its temple connection which is most comprehensible within a specifically Jewish context (see Clinton Wahlen, "The Temple in Mark and Contested Authority," *BibInt* 15 [2007]: 248–67). As for the Deuteronomistic pattern of God sending prophets to Israel only for them to meet with rejection, a similar idea appears in Q 6:23 and Q 11:47–51 (though for Kloppenborg key elements stem from the Q community rather than from Jesus himself—see his *Excavating Q: The History and Setting of the Sayings Gospel* [Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 2000], 149–50) and its role in this particular parable makes sense in connection with Jesus' final prophet-like confrontation of the temple/religious authorities. This is not the place for a point by point analysis of the details of Kloppenborg's redactional analysis of Mark but one crucial element should be mentioned. While 12:1a and 12:12 contain clear elements of Markan redaction, this is not so of the parable itself which should be understood to include the interpretative quotation of Ps 118:22–23 in vv. 10–11. Despite the fact that the quotation in its present setting conforms to the Septuagint and early Christian apologetic (Acts 4:10–11), there are linguistic and conceptual ties with v. 1b forming an inclusio for the unit (to name just a few: use of οἰκοδομέω in v. 10 which appears elsewhere only in 14:58 and 15:29 also in connection with the temple, and everywhere in Mark is found only on the lips of Jesus; stone imagery; Ps 118's likely liturgical background is the temple, linking it closely with the temple confrontation that begins in 11:27 as well as the entry into Jerusalem/temple from the east in 11:9 which features a quotation of Ps 118:26). Kloppenborg begins his analysis of Thomasine

redaction with a defense of that Gospel's independence from the Synoptics in the course of which several good points are made. However, it seems rather strange to defend *Thomas'* independence of the Synoptics on the basis of order (p. 243), as one might then just as readily suppose Matthew's independence from Luke's form of Q. More seriously, Kloppenborg's suggestion that no evidence can be brought forward for *Thomas'* dependence on the Synoptics that is not amenable to a counter-explanation on redactional grounds (*ibid.*) threatens to remove the Q hypothesis and Synoptic studies (at least with respect to *Thomas*) from the realm of scientific discourse altogether. Regarding the sayings in *Thomas* specifically mentioned in defense of its independence, the form of saying 33 seems nearer to Matt 10:27 than Luke 12:2 (which p. 244 n. 86 explains on the basis that Matthew here accurately reflects Q) and 68 appears to harmonize or conflate Matt 5:11 and Luke 6:22 (cf. the further evidence for dependence on the Synoptics given by Christopher M. Tuckett, "*Thomas* and the Synoptics," *NovT* 30 [1988]: 132-57, cited on p. 244 n. 88 and which Kloppenborg seems to question on the basis of its being extant only in Coptic). Also, the explanation that the agreement in *Thomas* 99 with Matthew in the use of "my father" is due to this being *Thomas'* "ordinary term for God" (p. 244 n. 86) belies the fact that only 4 of 27 Thomasine references to God use this expression (2 of which are in 99.2-3!). Kloppenborg's reduction of the case for dependence to demonstrably redactional elements of the Synoptists (p. 244) serves both to reduce substantially the evidence permitted for comparison and to relegate to conjecture any evidence that is permitted. Nevertheless, the use in *Thomas* 40 of ὁ πατήρ ὑμῶν ὁ οὐράνιος (in the NT only in Matt 5:48; 6:14, 26, 32; 15:13; 18:35; 23:9) seems to be a clear instance of the incorporation of Matthean redaction. Perhaps Kloppenborg would reply that where *Thomas* appears closer to Matthew, this stems from Matthew's formulation being also that of Q (*ibid.*) or that it represents "secondary (scribal) harmonization with the Synoptics" (p. 248) but such reasoning is circular. Laying the capstone for this amazing defense of Thomasine independence, Kloppenborg insists: "Unless one could show that the agreements are a matter of Q redaction, one cannot show that the *Gos. Thom.* is dependent upon Q either" (*ibid.*). The real value of this chapter lies in Kloppenborg's delineation of how *Thomas'* version of the parable has been interpreted and his own interpretation of it within its larger context (pp. 248-57), clarifying its role as the culmination of three parables which show the folly of pursuing wealth because "wealth [or its pursuit?] inevitably thwarts the pursuit of knowledge" (p. 257, brackets mine). The summary of Synoptic redaction of the parable (pp. 267-68) and the reconstruction of pre-Markan and Pre-Thomasine versions of the parable (p. 276) show Kloppenborg's view at a glance but could be improved by cross referencing the pages or sections of chapters seven

and eight from which his conclusions are presumably drawn. In general, however, there is good cross-referencing of the argument both backward and forward throughout the book and good summaries at critical junctures.

Chapter nine utilizes information on viticulture gleaned from the papyri of Appendix 1 in order to argue that the material which Mark and *Thomas* share reveal a realistic picture of land tenure in the first century C.E., that details peculiar to Mark make a realistic reading more difficult, and that Kloppenborg's reconstructed parable displays the kind of fortune reversal characteristic of Jesus' parables. Those who are able to follow Kloppenborg up to this point will probably agree with the conclusions reached here while others will find the argumentation tendentious and largely unconvincing. The epilogue draws together the strands of argumentation, concluding that *Thomas* represents the earliest form of the parable. Somewhat surprisingly the book lacks a clear explanation of the *Sitz im Leben Jesu* for the parable. The epilogue moves partly in this direction but appears designed primarily to show how Kloppenborg's interpretation of the parable fits alongside similar elements of the Jesus tradition; it does not really explain the parable's meaning within the context of the historical Jesus (p. 352). In fact, Kloppenborg's reading of the Thomasine version seems somewhat out of step with the references from the Jesus tradition commending benevolent uses of wealth (Luke 10:29–36; Q 14:16–24; Matt 20:14) and some reflection on any dissimilarities in *Thomas* to the Jesus tradition would seem appropriate at this juncture but are left unexplored. At the same time, Kloppenborg has done a tremendous service in bringing to light a wealth of information about ancient viticulture in Palestine, including the likelihood of substantial viticultural operations producing up to 1,500 hectoliters of wine annually much of it for export, the squeezing out of smallholders, and a shift toward tenant-based agriculture. The capital expenditure necessary even to initiate viticultural production relegated the activity to the wealthy few, which also included some female landholders. The historical shift in viticultural practice amply demonstrated by Kloppenborg to be reflected in the textual history of the parable from the MT to the LXX also illuminates our understanding of Jesus' parable (which reflects the realities of the first century and thereby places in doubt whether the Markan version can be shown definitively to stem directly from the LXX or simply to have been influenced by it in the course of the parable's transmission). Much of the legal, economic, and political realities connected with viticulture will be applicable in either case and in this sense underscores the lasting contribution made by the wealth of primary material set forth in the appendices. Appendix 1 (229 pages in length!) is especially significant. Its presentation of fifty-eight relevant papyri meticulously transcribed in Greek and translated into English with copious critical notes as well as dates and legal, political, and social

circumstances—even a comprehensive index of Greek and English terminology and subjects—more than justifies the rather substantial price of this book. Appendix 2 presents a list of vineyard leases chronologically from the third century B.C.E. to the seventh century C.E. Many of these are reproduced in Appendix 1, though not all, apparently because some were not considered pertinent to the study of this parable.

Overall, the book represents a significant contribution to the ongoing study of this parable and, more generally, to Jesus' parables. Not all will find the ideological approach palatable but it reflects a growing disposition within the scholarly community to distance itself from the typically Western approach to biblical interpretation in favor of more globally- and culturally-sensitive readings. For this reason and for others given above, Kloppenborg's book deserves a place on the shelf not just of university libraries but of every serious student of the gospel traditions and earliest Christianity. It constitutes a worthy addition to the WUNT series. The sturdy hardback binding and high quality paper used by Mohr Siebeck in the publication of the volumes in this series guarantee that the book will hold up well to the frequent use it will no doubt receive. Typographical mistakes, while a bit more frequent than might normally have been expected, are largely recognizable: a misplaced comma (p. 108, the first one in the seventh line from the bottom should stand before rather than after the word), words omitted ("that," p. 66 and p. 76; "in," p. 67), misspellings (pp. 24, 101 n. 107, 254, 281, 363 n. 4), the wrong word (p. 218) or form of a word (pp. 117, 118, 222, 291), words needing deletion ("the" God, p. 66; "to," p. 102; "as," p. 124), and a syntax problem (p. 178). In only one case is the sense substantially changed (ll. 5–6 from the bottom of p. 104 should probably read: "...the sending of the son is, "if not impossible, then at least *not* very reasonable"). Also, the word used in 3 Kgdms 20:15–16 is κληρονομέω not κληρονομία (p. 330 n. 193).

Clinton Wahlen

Biblical Research Institute, General Conference of SDA, Silver Spring, USA

---

*Logos Bible Software 3: Gold Edition*, by Logos Research Systems. Bellingham: Logos Research Systems, 2007. Windows compatible software. DVD or CD-ROM. US\$ 1,379.95.

In an age of multimedia, budding (quality) internet resources and a growing access to huge digital databases (both of texts and images), electronic resources are increasingly important. In the PC market *Logos Bible Software (LBS)*, now in version 3e, has always been a major player, together with the likes of *BibleWorks*, *Gramcord*, *Bibloi* (which used to be *Bible Windows* up to