

(\aleph and C; see above)? Or did the original read “our love for you”? The second reading was adopted by the committee (with a D rating, now changed to a C rating.) The reason as stated in the Textual Commentary (581) was “because it is the more difficult reading.” The Textual Commentary further says that the first reading is “superficially more appropriate in the context.” However, they give no indication as to how they see this as superficial. Clearly, in a list of items which describe the Corinthians, only “your love for us” is appropriate and makes sense, because it describes the Corinthians. There is no way the Corinthians could excel in “our love for you.” “Rejoice” maybe, but not “excel/about”. The scribal error which introduced the reading “our love for you” or more literally “the love from us to/in/among you” may be caused by a misunderstanding of the preposition *en* which normally means “in/among”, but in this context means “to”. With the meaning “in/among”, the pronoun “you” might be expected, but with the meaning “to”, the pronoun “us” is seen as correct.

The English translations are almost unanimous in disregarding the reading adopted by the UBS Greek text and in adopting the variant reading in order to make sense of the text. The NRSV is almost alone in following the UBS text. Translators would be better advised to follow RSV, NIV, TEV and NLT (New Living Translation)¹.

The majority of commentaries support “your love for us” although some attempt to tread a middle ground by saying “the love we inspired in you.”² However, I prefer to adopt the reading which makes sense in the context rather than adopt a reading which does not make sense and then try to twist the meaning of the words in order to make some sense out of them. It is basically a matter of choosing between the principle of the harder reading and the principle that a text is expected to make good sense.

Reviews

Ciampa, Roy E.: **The Presence and Function of Scripture in Galatians 1 and 2.** Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2. Reihe, 102. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck) 1998. xiii + 449 pp, DM128. ISBN 3 16 146895 3.

The Presence and Function of Scripture in Galatians 1 and 2, which began as Roy Ciampa’s doctoral dissertation (University of Aberdeen, Scotland, 1996, under the supervision of Dr. Brian Rosner), is an extremely important and original evaluation of Paul’s use of the OT. Building on recent works that have begun to consider the phenomenon of intertextuality in the NT’s relationship with the OT, Ciampa takes us beyond explicit quotations into the less well-charted territory of symbolic worlds and Scriptural allusion. If Ciampa is correct, the function of OT Scripture within Pauline writing cannot be understood simply as the source of the apostle’s religious vocabulary and of the occasional proof text; it functions rather to provide an interpretive framework, a narrative, a plot within which Paul seeks to make sense

1 Holy Bible, New Living Translation, Tyndale House Publishers: Wheaton, Illinois 1996.

2 Martin translates: “The love we have aroused in you” (259) and “The love I have inspired in you” (261).

of his own ministry and explicate this for his readers. The plausibility of these conclusions is demonstrated throughout by careful and thorough examination of the language of Galatians 1 and 2, the whole of which is based on a complete analysis of the semantic and rhetorical structure of Galatians (Appendix, 297-373). Despite limiting the study to Galatians 1-2, Ciampa explores the implications of his findings for the whole of the letter. The author's treatment is lucid and readable. The work is fully indexed and includes an extensive bibliography.

The study proceeds in two main stages. Following an Introduction which surveys the literature and sets out the need for and scope of the project (1-33), Part One identifies the presence of Scripture in the first two chapters of the letter and assesses the way in which it functions. This part is carried out in six chapters that move through the six sections of this part of the letter isolated by Ciampa's semantic analysis (Appendix). In each chapter, the arguments for the presence of OT allusion and echo are clearly and carefully made in dialogue with the important current and past scholarship. At this point, the author's painstaking observation combines with sensible conclusions to bring to light numerous fresh linkages with the OT story (esp. in the LXX) that enlarge our understanding of the message of Galatians. This latter aspect is largely the task of the second part of each chapter.

Having identified the presence of Scripture, Ciampa then asks in the second part of each chapter how it functions. This dimension of the study takes us beyond the limited concern of Scripture citation to the whole area of intertextuality that has been developing in various disciplines with fruits being applied most recently within biblical studies. The author's conviction is that discourses, such as Paul's, are never independent entities but are always created "in the context of prior discourse" that is necessarily alluded to in the construction and communication of a message. In this case, the focus is on the way in which Paul addresses the Galatian situation through the dominant and distinctive cultural-religious narrative of the Jewish people in the OT Scriptures; but Ciampa also points out that Paul's intertextual connections are also with the discourse of his social reality. Without going into specifics at this point, intertextual cues shed additional light on several aspects of the letter's functions.

Paul's Status: by evoking the biblical story as he does, Paul fortifies his status and authority, leaving no doubt in his readers' minds as to his place as an apostle in the OT prophetic line.

Rhetorical motivation and theological assessment: the way in which Paul motivated his readers to make an appropriate response is often the result of his assessment of the situation that is drawn out of the OT story. Moreover, the rhetorical purpose to which his discourse is devoted sometimes parallels that of the OT narrative that he echoes (cf Gal 1.8-9; Deuteronomy 13; 83-95).

Structure: in certain cases the OT Scripture with which Paul establishes contact determines the structure of his discourse.

On the whole, Ciampa succeeds convincingly in demonstrating the intertextual play between Galatians and the OT Scriptures. The results and implications of this strategy that begin to emerge in Part One are reassembled for more extensive consideration in Part Two (221-294). This part divides into chs 7-9. Ch 7 considers essentially the way in which Scripture, utilized as Paul has done, functions as a tool for placing the Galatian situation within the broader OT narrative of God's story,

and gives Paul access to the particular (“Apocalyptic-Restorationist”) theological lens through which he sees the Galatian situation. Ch 8 looks more specifically at this use of Scripture as a way of characterizing his opponents and his own role and status within the framework of the OT discourse, and then asks what Paul’s technique tells us about the implied readers of the letter. Finally, Ch 9 draws out the implications of the study for our understanding of the way Paul used the Scriptures and of the meaning of Galatians itself. A Summary of the whole study (295-296) provides a recap of the major results.

This study is no exception in being open to serious exegetical challenge at many points. But readers of Ciampa’s work will need no guidance or encouragement at this point to engage the author in this way. What might be useful is to make a few comments on the importance of this study. Of course any study that is capable of shedding light on the structure and execution of a biblical author’s message is a potentially useful tool for those engaged in interpretation and translation. And the author’s interaction with both text and scholarship is carried out in such a way that his discussions of the text are easy to access. Out of a number of significant questions the study raises, we will have to be content here to point out two that relate to translation of the NT text and the matter of the source text of OT allusions. First, to put it simply, if Ciampa is right in what he (and others) argue about Paul’s conscious intertextual “play” with the OT Scriptures, then the meaning of the NT text is not complete unless its intertextuality is somehow appropriately accounted for: the allusions were intentional (to focus just on the intentional ones here), his readers were meant to apprehend them, and apart from them the full sense of his message is not communicated. Translations or interpretations that are insensitive to these echoes are therefore delivering less than the full order. Even granting that the presence of intentional intertextuality such as Ciampa discovers may sometimes be questionable, it is beyond question that he and others pursuing similar lines of inquiry have demonstrated the phenomenon to be a real dimension of the biblical writings. But how can a translation of, for example, Galatians deliver the goods without becoming a commentary on the text? Second, as Ciampa shows, many of Paul’s allusions are to a Greek translation of the OT (conveniently identified as the LXX). But it is standard in many modern translations to base the OT on the MT. Consequently, assuming an allusion to the OT Scriptures is identified in a Pauline letter, there is no guarantee that turning to the OT text in a given translation will yield anything like the intertextual connection Paul originally intended.

These are challenges with no easy solutions; suffice it to say that Ciampa’s study is one of several serving notice of the need for the translation guild to rethink its task. His argument is especially well executed and will repay careful consideration. This being the case, it is unfortunate that the price of a WUNT monograph makes its purchase by those who could most benefit from it so unlikely.

PHILIP H. TOWNER

Culpepper, R. Alan: **The Gospel and Letters of John**. Nashville, Tennessee: Abingdon Press 1998. 327pp, \$19.95. ISBN 0-687-00851-4.

Publishers’ blurbs are so often crazy that one hesitates to refer to them, but the testimonial of Robert Fortna on the back cover of this book expresses my own reaction so exactly that I cannot resist quoting it: “Not just one more excellent study