

surrogacy” in white households as caretakers of children. She challenges the theological claim that “Jesus died on the cross in the place of humans” as the “ultimate surrogate” (208), who takes on sin to redeem humanity. This, she argues, renders surrogacy “sacred,” thereby “ignoring its structure of oppression” for black women (208), while also prompting them to interpret a sociopolitical evil, the crucifixion of Jesus, as sacred.

The book closes with a call for the church to rethink the priesthood sounded by Indian scholar Astrid Lobo Gajiwala. In her “The Passion of the Womb: Women Re-living the Eucharist” (323), she reflects on women providing family meals as eucharistic bonding in “the intense moment of remembrance, thanksgiving and hope” (325) and proposes that the church has much to learn from women’s “recovery of the sacred” in everyday life (332).

More examples to illustrate the value of this collection could be cited. As with any collection of essays, not all are of equal quality. The book also would have been enriched by a brief biography of each author and fuller introductions of its four sections. Even with its modest shortcomings, I strongly recommend *The Strength of Her Witness* as a resource for graduate courses on Christology, feminist theology, and sociopolitical theology. I anticipate that many will share my gratitude to Elizabeth Johnson for her initiative in developing this essay collection.

ANNE M. CLIFFORD
Iowa State University

Jesus and the Temple: The Crucifixion in Its Jewish Context. By Simon J. Joseph. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016. xii + 329 pages. \$99.99.
doi: 10.1017/hor.2018.32

Joseph investigates the historical circumstances of first-century CE Palestine that led to Jesus’ execution. He proposes that Jesus’ opponents killed him ultimately because Jesus had rejected animal sacrifice. Joseph bases his proposal on Jesus’ restoration theology. He argues that the historical Jesus could not have considered his death as a substitutionary atoning sacrifice for the sins of the world, and asserts that the concept of atonement developed only out of Jesus’ followers’ post-Easter theological conviction. Joseph sees the historical Jesus as “the man who lived and died for his vision of a redeemed Israel living according to the original Torah of creation” (244).

Joseph introduces the topic of his study in chapter 1. He examines Jesus’ relationship to the Torah in the gospels in chapter 2 and concludes, “If we want to understand the historical Jesus in his original Jewish context, we are going to re-locate Jesus within the *inter*-Jewish sectarian conflict(s)

characteristic of Second Temple Judaism" (66). In chapter 3, Joseph surveys several biblical texts concerning the practice of ancient Israelite sacrifice (e.g., 1 Sam 15:22-23; Amos 5:21-24; Hos 6:6; Isa 1:11, 66:1-4; Jer 6:19-20, 7:21-22; Ezek 20:24-26, 44:6-9) and texts from the Dead Sea Scrolls, which portray the sectarian community as the Temple (e.g., 1QS 8.5-12; 1QS 9.1-5). Joseph suggests, "John and Jesus can be located along a social *continuum* of alternative-temple movements marked by deep undercurrents of suspicion and hostility toward the Temple's current administration" (104). He examines the New Testament portraits of Jesus' relationship to the Temple in chapter 4 and concludes, "The New Testament evidence for the historical Jesus' relationship to the Temple is inconsistent and ambiguous" (132). In chapter 5, Joseph suggests, "Jesus may indeed have envisioned himself 'rebuilding' a new temple-community in co-existence and competition with the present Temple. . . . It is this combination of opposition to the Temple cult, in conjunction with the formation of a new temple-community, which made Jesus' ministry a direct threat to the Temple establishment" (166). In chapter 6, Joseph highlights the seventh fragment of the *Gospel of Ebionites* (*Pan.* 30.16.4-5), where Jesus rejects animal sacrifice. Joseph argues, "The *Gospel of the Ebionites* may be a harmony, but we cannot rule out the possibility that it is *also* using *pre*-Synoptic sources or traditions." Joseph also lists the Pseudo-Clementine literature (the *Homilies* and the *Recognitions*), Epiphanius' reports on the "Ebionites," Elchasaite traditions, Hegesippus' references to James, and the *Didascalía* as the pieces of evidence that Jewish Christians rejected animal sacrifice (181-82). He claims, "The cumulative weight of the converging lines of evidence for our proposal [Jesus rejected animal sacrifice] *is* substantial" (207). He concludes in chapter 7, "Our earliest evidence for the sacrificial identification of Jesus' death is Paul, but the concept of vicarious atonement is alien to and forbidden in the Torah and Isaiah 53 is not a messianic prophecy. . . . Jesus' death can indeed be described as a 'sacrifice' in so far as he offered his life to God" (240-41).

Overall, this is an insightful and original study about the historical context of Jesus' death. On the one hand, I find Joseph's survey and investigation of background materials with respect to Jesus' attitude to the Torah (chapter 2) and the Temple (chapters 3-4) both comprehensive and convincing. On the other hand, Joseph's thesis that Jesus' rejection of animal sacrifice and vegetarianism ultimately caused his death (chapters 5-7) has some serious methodological difficulties, as the author himself admits. For example, he heavily relies on later historical sources, while dismissing earlier historical sources. The New Testament, despite its diversity, frequently identifies Jesus with the Servant of Isaiah 53 and his death as the atoning sacrifice for sins. This makes it difficult to suppose that Jesus' death as a substitutionary

atonement sacrifice for sins was only Paul's invention and had nothing to do with the historical Jesus himself. Nonetheless, this is an excellent scholarly work on the historical Jesus and an insightful resource for both undergraduate and graduate courses on the topic.

YONGBOM LEE
University of Bristol

Poverty and Wealth in Judaism, Christianity, and Islam. Edited by Nathan R. Kollar and Muhammad Shafiq. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2016. xxxii + 324 pages. \$109.00.

doi: 10.1017/hor.2018.36

It is always difficult to review a collection of essays. The easy way out is simply to write a few introductory words, a few concluding words, and sandwich between them the titles of each of the individual essays along with the names of their respective authors. Doing so in this case would not do justice to this rich collection of sixteen essays, the last of which is Kollar's conclusion. As the title of the volume suggests, the authors come from three different religious traditions, with Christianity represented by more than one Christian church. No author is responsible for more than one essay.

The collection grew out of an international conference on wealth and poverty held at Faith University, Istanbul, Turkey, in June 2014 under the aegis of the Hickey Center for Interfaith Studies and Dialogue, based at Nazareth College, in Rochester, New York. Its sixteen chapters are organized into four parts, "Personification of Poverty and Wealth," "Doctrines about Poverty and Wealth," "Spiritual Traditions about Poverty and Wealth," and "Sharing the Wealth."

The first part focuses on four heroes in the often-told stories of the Scriptures of the three Abrahamic faiths, two mythical and two historical. Readers of the Christian Bible are familiar with the story of Job and the Canticle of Mary, the Magnificat. Focusing on the frame of Job's story, they may be less familiar with Job's struggle with poverty, just as they may fail to grasp the challenge of Mary's canticle for today's Christian believer. They are undoubtedly less aware of the Qur'an's mythical story of the evil Qarum and the historical care of the poor in the vast area that was Islamic Hindustan during the course of several centuries.

"Doctrines about Poverty and Wealth" comprises three quite different essays. I found the first, "Socioeconomic and Gender Justice in the Quran: Modern Challenges," to be less than satisfying—only because Zainab Alwani tried to say too much in too few pages. It would have been preferable,