power. One can only wish that the study will soon become available in a more affordable edition.

doi:10.1093/jts/flt057
Advance Access publication 13 July 2013

JACK BARENTSEN
Evangelische Theologische Faculteit in Leuven
jack.barentsen@etf.edu

1 and 2 Thessalonians through the Centuries. By ANTHONY C. THISELTON. Pp. xvi + 317. (Blackwell Bible Commentaries.) Chichester, West Sussex: Wiley-Blackwell, 2011. ISBN 978 1 4051 9682 6. £70.

WHEN a scholar like Anthony C. Thiselton, one of the world's leading experts of hermeneutics, publishes a commentary whose focus is on reception history it raises great expectations. Thiselton's model of reception history follows closely Hans Robert Jauss: he asks what is the 'horizon of expectation' of readers in a certain epoch and if their reading is an experience of surprise, innovation, or alienation that transformed their given horizon of expectation. Thiselton's special concern is what Jauss calls 'provocation' by the text. This is when the tension between the horizon of expectation of readers and the texts in a given period of the history of interpretation 'is sharp it may challenge the reader to rethink his or her expectations' (p. 4). An example of this is the emphasis on apocalyptic eschatology and the Last Judgement throughout the history of reception.

When one imagines Thiselton himself as a model reader for contemporary reception of 1 and 2 Thessalonians a question emerges. How has the reception history influenced his own reading? For me, as a reader of Thiselton's commentary, whose primary background is German scholarship, it was a surprise that for Thiselton 2 Thessalonians is an authentic Pauline letter. In German-speaking scholarship it is nowadays almost universally accepted that 2 Thessalonians is pseudepigraphical and Deuteropauline. But for Thiselton 2 Thessalonians is an authentic letter written by the apocalyptic theologian Paul to an audience that might be slightly different from that of 1 Thessalonians (p. 16). Is this the result of the reception history where naturally the authenticity of 2 Thessalonians was almost universally accepted? Why are Thiselton's most important exegetical fathers Gottfried Lünemann and Béda Rigaux, but not William Wrede

or Wolfgang Trilling? (Trilling's masterful study and his commentary seem to be unknown to Thiselton: Cf. Wolfgang Trilling, *Untersuchungen zum 2. Thessalonicherbrief* (Erfurter Theologische Studien, 27; Leipzig: St. Benno, 1972); id., *Der zweite Brief an die Thessalonicher* (EKK 14; Zürich: Benziger, and Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag, 1980.) Or is this an example of a general difference between German and Anglo-Saxon exegesis?

The commentary itself is clearly structured: an 'Introduction and overview' opens the comments on each section, followed by reception-historical surveys under the subtitles 'Patristic Era', 'Medieval Period', 'Reformation and Post-Reformation Eras', 'Eighteenth Century', and 'Nineteenth Century'. The twentieth century is not treated as part of the reception history; occasionally some main accents and shifts of the recent reception history are mentioned in the introductory sections. In his reception-historical surveys Thiselton has a list of 'consistently cited witnesses', among them Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, Origen, the Ambrosiaster, Theodore of Mopsuestia, John Chrysostom, Augustine, Bede, Rabanus Maurus, Thomas Aquinas, Luther, Calvin, Estius, Matthew Poole, John and Charles Wesley, Schleiermacher, Bengel, Olshausen, Lünemann, and James Denney. They are frequently cited. Other authors appear only occasionally, among them Bernard of Clairvaux, Dante Alighieri, Heinrich Bullinger, Arminius, John Milton, Shakespeare, John Bunyan, George Fox, William Blake, Edmund Burke, Charles Dickens, and Kierkegaard. The list shows that Thiselton's interests include not only exegetes and preachers, but also other key figures of Church history, philosophers, and writers. The disadvantage of such a comprehensive collection of testimonies from different epochs is naturally that a meta-reflection about the great lines of the reception history, the main focuses of each epoch, the shifts and discontinuities and the cultural settings and contextualities is rarely possible: the strength of this commentary lies in the presentation, not in the interpretation of the materials.

How is the relation between the exegetical and historical remarks in the introductions on one side and the 'testimonies' of the history of reception on the other? One of the strong parts of the book is the comments on 1Thess. 4:13–18: in the introduction Thiselton mentions 'six distinct issues (that) are raised by this passage' (p. 116), e.g. the relation of the text to other Pauline eschatological texts, the metaphor 'sleep', the locutionary and the illocutionary dimension of the text, or the open question if Paul himself will be alive at the time of the Parousia. This list

of 'issues' was a basis for the selection of the following testimonies of the reception history. And it is a guideline for Thiselton's readers. They will read them with the question: what do they contribute to these six main issues? But this is not always possible. In many other cases Thiselton simply presents a colourful bouquet of flowers of reception-historical testimonies, illuminating one or another aspect of the text, sometimes with a very clear and sometimes with a very loose connection with the biblical text.

A fundamental problem, not only of Thiselton's commentary, but of every reception-historical commentary on the New Testament letters can be illustrated by his 'note on the Antichrist' (pp. 213–17). This 'note' gives a brilliant survey over the different types of ideas about the Antichrist through the centuries and about their biblical roots. Again I think that it is one of the best parts of the commentary, because Thiselton concentrates on one single theological issue. But naturally this note does not summarize the reception history of 2 Thess 2:3 f., where even the word *ἀντίχριστος* is absent, but the reception history of *all* New Testament texts about the Antichrist or similar figures. The problem lying behind this is evident: should one write a reception history of specific New Testament texts such as verses or pericopes of the Thessalonian correspondence? Or would it be more productive to write about the reception history of key issues, motifs, or themes of the New Testament, such as 'conversion from the idols'; the triad 'faith, hope, love'; being 'with Christ'; rapture 'sanctification'; the imitation of the apostle or 'antichrist'? Normally they do go back to more than one single biblical text and became a thematic 'storm centre' of reception history only in post-biblical times. Especially in the letters of the New Testament the second possibility is often more adequate. But in a reception-oriented *commentary* on a biblical book the answer is predetermined by the *genre*: 'Storm centres' of reception history *have* to be connected with *one* single biblical text. As a result, many 'testimonies' of the reception history of 1–2 Thessalonians selected by Thiselton have only a very casual relation with their biblical basis text and could be mentioned equally well in the reception history of other New Testament texts.

Never mind: Thiselton had to write a commentary on a specific biblical text and he has done that in an excellent way. He has collected a very impressive number of testimonies for the reception history of Paul's letters to the Thessalonians. He has

summarized them concisely and identified them clearly. Therefore his commentary will be a great help for all future interpreters of the two letters.

doi:10.1093/jts/flt061

ULRICH LUZ
University of Bern
ulrich.luz@theol.unibe.ch

Atonement and the Logic of Resurrection in the Epistle to the Hebrews. By DAVID M. MOFFITT. Pp. xx + 340. (Supplements to Novum Testamentum, 141.) Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2011. ISBN 978 90 04 20651 9. €125.

DAVID MOFFITT'S published version of his doctoral dissertation (completed at Duke under Richard B. Hays in 2010) presents a robust case for a bold thesis: far from being an oversight or deliberate omission, the resurrection is an essential presupposition in the Letter to the Hebrews and is in particular logically central to the text's understanding of atonement.

The first chapter sets out the modern scholarly consensus that the resurrection is all but absent from Hebrews. Moffitt identifies a common assumption that Hebrews operates with a two-stage death/exaltation model based on the importance of these two moments in Yom Kippur; this misunderstanding of sacrifice is addressed in chapter 4.

Chapter 2 argues that Hebrews 1–2 presupposes the necessity of Jesus' resurrection. Moffitt understands Hebrews 1 as an enthronement scene, arguing at length for the meaning 'heavenly world' for *οἰκουμένη* in 1:6 (cf. 2:5). Moffitt's particular contribution here is to connect this with Jesus' humanity in Hebrews 2, not as a sort of proto-Chalcedonian balancing act, but as the 'requisite qualification' (p. 143) for Jesus' exaltation above the angels. Support for the plausibility of such a reading is found in Second Temple texts which place emphasis on the restoration of Adam. Moffitt's account explains why angels feature so prominently in Hebrews 1–2, without needing to posit angel veneration among the audience or Hebrews' polemic against this (hypotheses with no basis in the text).

Chapter 3 addresses the plausibility of a person entering heaven with a human body in Second Temple Judaism, and the presenting