1 *Kings* 11:29-32. As symbol of the twelve tribes divided into two kingdoms, the prophet Ahijah the Shilonite tears his garment into twelve, giving *ten* pieces to Jeroboam, future king of Israel. Yet, he speaks of only *one* tribe left for the Davidic dynasty ‘and for the sake of Jerusalem’, which is Judah. What happened to the other tribe? Could this folklore reflect the ambiguity of Benjamin? Weingart investigates with particular attention to the ‘pragmatics of the narrative’ (p. 135). The Benjamin under discussion, as Finkelstein clarifies, has been ‘the flat highland plateau between Jerusalem and Bethel’ (p. 33 n. 1), the contested socio-identity of which means that this zone cannot be fully aligned with the territory of the biblical tribe. This disjunction is the subject of the last two essays. Oded Lipschits (Tel Aviv) considers Benjamin’s biblical territory to be a post-exilic ‘aggregation of two distinct historical and geopolitical units’ (p. 5) serving to promote the Davidic dynasty at the expense of Saul. Erhard Blum of Tübingen, on the other hand, is optimistic that the biblical picture of tribal society *did* resemble Iron Age Israel’s socio-political structures. He refers to research on genealogies in tribal societies (pp. 203–06) and epigraphical evidence for the tribes of Manasseh (pp. 207-10) (eighth century) and Gad (210-13) (ninth century BCE).

This is an excellent and highly researched collection of essays bringing related disciplines into conversation, which is essential if any biblical exegesis is to be anchored in reality. Each paper is highly referenced with substantial bibliographies indicating how the conversation has led to this point. It is not, however, a book for beginners but rather a contribution to an ongoing scholarly debate which has been underway almost since archaeology emerged as a discipline in the nineteenth century CE. I would highly recommend these essays, but the non-specialist may want to read the biblical passages under discussion first (a practice to be endorsed anyway) and take note of the bibliographies for further reading in order to navigate the debate.

BRUNO CLIFTON OP
Blackfriars, Oxford

bruno.clifton@english.op.org

WORSHIPPING A CRUCIFIED MAN : CHRISTIANS, GRAECO-ROMANS AND SCRIPTURE IN THE SECOND CENTURY by Jeremy Hudson, *James Clarke & Co. Ltd,* Cambridge, 2021, pp.275, £22.50, pbk

Why did the Christian Apologists in the second century appeal to Jewish scriptures when they wanted to persuade Graeco-Roman audiences that

© 2022 Provincial Council of the English Province of the Order of Preachers.
https://doi.org/10.1111/nbfr.12770 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Christianity was true? If the crucifixion of Christ was already 'folly to Greeks' (1 *Cor* 1:23), it would seem *prima facie* that the Jewish scriptures, little known in the wider Hellenistic culture if not dismissed as 'barbarian' writings, would hardly avail to endear the novel Christian faith to educated Graeco-Romans. That is the question which Jeremy Hudson proposes to address in this careful analysis, originally a PhD thesis at the University of Cambridge, of apologetic treatises by three Greek-educated converts to Christianity: Justin Martyr's *First Apology*, Tatian's *Address to the Greeks*, and Theophilus of Antioch's *To Autolycus*.

After a substantial introduction (Chapter 1) laying out the terms of the debate and the existing scholarship, the three treatises get a chapter apiece (Chapters 2–4), before a brief Conclusion (Chapter 5). Hudson states clearly his aims and the limits of his project: the book considers how and why the Jewish scriptures were used in these three treatises, explicitly discounting references to the New Testament and avoiding digressions into the other works by Justin (Tatian and Theophilus have only left us a single work apiece). Strangely, perhaps, the Apologists made little or no explicit use of the New Testament and avoided referring to Jesus Christ.

But an explanation is at hand: the Apologists had to insist on the antiquity of their scriptures to rebut the damning accusation that their religion was a novelty. Graeco-Roman audiences were impressed by antiquity, and while Tacitus (*Histories* V) might admit the Jews had a long history, the Apologists had to argue forcefully that Jewish scriptures (now inherited as Christian) were ancient and therefore venerable. They adopted and developed the 'theft theory' from Jewish exegetes, suggesting that not only was Moses older even than Homer, but the wisdom of Greek philosophers like Plato was in fact derived (and distorted) from the Pentateuch and Mosaic traditions in Egypt. Thus the Apologists also went on the offensive: Greek culture was not just in debt to Jewish scripture, but also to other cultures for many of its cherished disciplines (Egyptian geometry and history, Phrygian music, Babylonian astronomy, and so on). Worse still, the Greeks revelled in mythologies about immoral gods and followed unconvincing philosophers. Tatian was proud to have said 'farewell to Roman arrogance, Athenian cold cleverness and the unintelligible dogmas of the Greeks' (p. 101; *Oratio* 35.2).

Hudson openly situates his work in the context of previous scholarship, notably Arthur Droge on the 'theft theory' and Frances Young on the 'battle of the literatures' waged between established Greek canons and emerging Christian ideas. While this scholarly debt is acknowledged, Hudson believes he goes much further by offering a close reading of the texts in question to explore exactly how each author approached the Jewish scriptures. For each Apologist, Hudson unpacks the similarities and differences in their approaches to Jewish scripture. Justin, for instance, leans heavily on the Septuagint legend for the authority of his Greek biblical text and quotes it abundantly for his 'proof from prophecy' that Christ fulfils the promises to ancient Israel. Unlike Graeco-Roman

© 2022 Provincial Council of the English Province of the Order of Preachers.
https://doi.org/10.1111/nbfr.12770 Published online by Cambridge University Press

sources, Justin combines rational argumentation with prophetic authorities. Tatian, by contrast, is the first Christian author to expound creation *ex nihilo* using *Genesis* 1 yet without explicit citation. Finally, Theophilus offers the first continuous commentary on Jewish scripture by a Christian, and also establishes a biblical chronology of the world up to the time of Cyrus before switching to a Roman source up to Marcus Aurelius (passing silently over the birth of Christ!).

Despite such informative analyses, the broad justification of this book's originality is harder to sustain. Hudson is at pains to stress the implausibility of the Apologists' strategy in appealing to Jewish scriptures. But the work of Young had already stated the simple reasons for this strategy. The double scandal of Christian appropriation of Jewish texts and the subversion of Hellenistic culture had a predictable solution: 'No wonder scripture figures so large in Apologies addressed to the pagan world' (*Biblical Exegesis and the Formation of Christian Culture*, 2002, p. 54).

A handful of smaller issues also come to mind. Without detracting from Hudson's argument that *1 Enoch* may underlie Tatian's reference to the fallen angels, his summary (p. 131–2) of the scholarly debate around *Or*. 20.3 ignores what I think is a more natural reading of the passage: Tatian is simply making a parallel between the fall of the angels and the fall of humanity, with *prōtoplastoi* a term for the first human beings (as in LXX *Wis* 7:1; 10:1) and not the first-created angels. Elsewhere, Hudson attempts an 'oversimplification' in describing Tatian as 'advancing a doctrine of a bipartite soul' (p. 128 n. 157), but this is hard to reconcile with Tatian himself saying that 'the human soul consists of many parts (*polumerēs esti*)' (*Or.* 15).

When Theophilus refers to 'our sacred writings' he is not merely conflating Jews and Christians, as Hudson suggests (p. 188), but more likely advancing a supersessionist position, as Husdon later reads him (with Jews seen as 'forerunners of present-day Christians', p. 197). At such moments, trespassing the self-imposed limits of this project with more glances sideways at works like Justin's *Dialogue with Trypho* could have been illuminating: 'these words', says Justin to the Jew Trypho, 'are contained in your Scriptures, or rather not yours, but ours. For we believe them; but you, though you read them, do not catch the spirit that is in them' (*Dial.* 29.2).

When discussing translations for *sumphōnos* to describe the 'consistency' of the scriptures according to Theophilus, it is a pity that the vocal (even musical) metaphor is missed, despite the footnotes citing Grant and Boccabello, who both rightly speak of 'harmony' (p. 161–2). The authors of scripture are literally 'symphonic' or 'concordant', according to the wonderful analogy developed further by Irenaeus (e.g. *Adv. Haer.* 2.28.3) and perhaps influenced by these very lines of Theophilus.

Hudson's conclusion is balanced as always. Having utilised JMG Barclay's threefold distinction of 'audiences' – declared, implied ('constructed'), and intended – throughout the book, he considers

© 2022 Provincial Council of the English Province of the Order of Preachers.

https://doi.org/10.1111/nbfr.12770 Published online by Cambridge University Press

it coherent and plausible to see all three Apologists as addressing real Graeco-Roman audiences, not just internal Christian communities. Tatian and perhaps also Theophilus could be seen as writing proptreptics, works intended to attract disciples for further instruction rather than explain everything up front.

Hudson suggests further research could make comparisons with second-century works addressed explicitly to Jews or Christians, or explore the reception of the Apologists' scriptural use in later Christian authors. Was there indeed a distinctive apologetic mode of scriptural interpretation? Hudson also wonders how Christian and Graeco-Roman audiences actually interacted, but it is an overstatement to call the Graeco-Roman reaction 'invisible' (p. 197), especially in the light of studies such as Robert Wilken, *The Christians as the Romans Saw Them* (Yale, 2nd ed. 2003). Finally, while PhD theses are not generally enjoyable to read in terms of style, the information and argument presented are worth the effort. One hopes this book will also encourage readers to dive (again) into the ever-fresh writings of the Apologists themselves, and more importantly to take on board Tatian's remark (*Or*. 12.4) that 'great lovers of God' are formed by studying the scriptures themselves.

MATTHEW JARVIS OP
Catholic University of Lyon France

matthew.jarvis@english.op.org

HABITS AND HOLINESS: ETHICS, THEOLOGY AND BIOPSYCHOLOGY by Ezra Sullivan, OP, *Catholic University of America Press*, Washington D.C., 2021, pp. 552, £36.50, pbk

Back in 1994, Stephen J. Pope in *The Evolution of Altruism and the Ordering of Love* cautiously advocated incorporating insights from behavioural biology into an Aristotelian/Thomistic account of human love. Pope observed how much twentieth century Catholic moral theology had either dispensed with the category of nature or reduced the role of nature in accounts of human agency. Not only did this represent a significant revision of Catholic moral theology, but it also left Catholic moral theologians with no common ground for engagement with the growing field of evolutionary ethics.

Since Pope's book we have witness something of a revival in the use of nature as a category in moral theology, but few works in moral theology have systematically incorporated insights from the behavioural sciences into a wider account of human agency. Ezra Sullivan's *Habits and*

© 2022 Provincial Council of the English Province of the Order of Preachers.
https://doi.org/10.1111/nbfr.12770 Published online by Cambridge University Press