

recent years. Questions of text form, tradition history, Jewish and Hellenistic parallels, underlying hermeneutical axioms, apocalyptic or doctrinal motives and audience criticism have generated a substantial stream of monographs focusing on New Testament books or corpora, blocks of Old Testament material commonly cited, or even on comprehensive themes. A new venture into the area therefore needs justification in terms of fresh aim, method or results. In a modest way, Bock offers all three.

A re-written form of a Ph.D. dissertation supervised by Professor I. Howard Marshall at the University of Aberdeen and successfully defended in 1982, this book begins with a comprehensive survey of recent study on Luke's use of the Old Testament. The breadth of opinion can be schematized by the polarized opposition between P. Schubert, who represents those who see a 'proof from prophecy' scheme, and M. Rese, who denies altogether the presence of any promise-fulfilment motif in Luke-Acts.

Bock aims, then, to assess these diverse conclusions in terms of his own fresh study of the texts. Methodologically, he examines the Old Testament citations in Luke-Acts in their sequential order of presentation by Luke to determine by redaction critical means if this order betrays the purpose and function of the Old Testament texts in their Lukan contexts. The study is slanted toward delineation of Luke's Christology. Bock concludes that Luke consciously takes the reader from a kingly, Messiah-Servant Christology to a presentation of Jesus as Lord of all. This conceptual development, springing from Luke's choice, ordering and treatment of Old Testament texts, is independent of any particular version: the same points could be made from the Hebrew text as easily as from the LXX. In detailed interaction with Rese, Bock seeks to refute his thesis that there is no promise-fulfilment theme in Luke's use of the Old Testament, and argues instead that the 'hermeneutical method' adopted by Luke in the treatment of the Old Testament can be labelled 'proclamation from prophecy and pattern', the latter understood along what are more commonly called typological lines. Granted the independence of Luke's treatment from any particular version, and the fact the the 'OT text and the Jesus event are in active interaction with one another', it follows that 'Luke's method may well reflect the influence of Jesus himself. Moreover, because the demonstration that Jesus is Lord of all, communicated by Luke's particular sequence of Old Testament Christological texts, is completed by Acts 10, it is not surprising that Old Testament Christology stops in Acts 13 (though of course not other uses of the Old Testament), where 'the focus shifts to the presentation of the Gentile mission by the church.'

There are many interesting and valuable suggestions in the work, such as, for example, Bock's explanation for τὰς ὀδῖνας in the LXX/Acts rendering of *heblê*, in the well-known conundrum of Psalms 16/Acts 2:24. He proposes an interpretive and conscious word-play in which the pain surrounding death is linked with a description about death encircling its victims. 'The key point is that the mixed metaphor could be formed in Greek as a conscious interpretive rendering of these Hebrew passages.'

**Proclamation from Prophecy and Pattern:  
Lucan Old Testament Theology**

by Darrell L. Bock

(JSNTSS 12; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1987. 413 pp. £10.50/\$15.94 [pbk],  
£25.00/\$37.50 [cloth] )

The use of the Old Testament in the New has been studied intensively in

The image emerges from the verbs in the Hebrew text and the context.' If so, the objection that a term rendered ὁδὶνας was not possible in the original Hebrew context can be set aside; in that case there is no need to appeal to a concept such as death giving birth, which in any case would be unique in the New Testament.

But hesitations at crucial points remain. In the same passage, for instance, Bock rightly outlines Peter's (Luke's) argument in Acts 2: Psa.16 could not have been referring to David since by dying and continuing undisturbed in the grave David failed to fulfil the promise that God's Holy One would not see corruption. The reference, then, must be to the Messiah. On this basis Bock rejects Rese's (later) view that Luke's use of Ps.16 does not belong to the category of prophecy and fulfilment but is simply a typological connection in which David embodies the person of the Messiah. But here (and repeatedly throughout the book), Bock may be rejecting too much. Granted that Rese's thesis is wrong, it is arguable that Bock is rejecting that wrong thesis for the wrong reasons. The New Testament writers do not treat what might be called 'verbal prophecy' and 'typological prophecy' as fundamentally different categories, as if the former involves prophecy and fulfilment and the latter does not. It could be argued rather that at least Luke, John, Paul, Matthew and the author of the epistle to the Hebrews saw the 'patterns' of the Old Testament as themselves fundamentally 'prophetic'. I'm not sure Bock has worked through such possibilities.

My second hesitation is that, typical of Ph.D. dissertations, this work focuses so narrowly on one set of texts within a corpus that it may overlook some crucial questions that a more wholistic approach to the corpus dare not fail to ask. Is Luke's Christology, or rather controlled change from Messiah-Servant Christology to 'Jesus is Lord of all' Christology, so powerful a control that it *determines* the selection and exegesis of Old Testament Christological texts? Might one not argue that other themes—such as the salvation-historical structure of Luke's thought, his self-conscious reflection on the hermeneutical process going on in Christian apologetic, the roughly chronological development of his story—have so shaped his Christology that the sequence of Old Testament quotations is almost predetermined? This is not to say Bock is wrong, but only that univocal explanations in a work as intertwined and complex as Luke-Acts can strike the reader as simplistic. Or again, is it not begging the issue to omit Acts 15:16–18 on the ground that it is theological and ecclesiological but not Christological? Surely the typological Christology is essential to the ecclesiological conclusions. And this passage falls *after* Acts 13 and reverts to a Christology rather different from 'Jesus is Lord of all', because of the issues being addressed at the Jerusalem Council, viz. the conditions of entrance to the people of God.

Finally, I am a little nervous about Bock's reading of some of his secondary literature. He has certainly misunderstood Turner at one or two points, and I think Rese as well. The reason, I suspect, is that his

own questions and agenda have occasionally prevented him from seeing that they are not everyone else's.

Trinity Evangelical Divinity School

D. A. CARSON