

[MJTM 13 (2011–2012)]

BOOK REVIEW

Steve Moyise. *Jesus and Scripture: Studying the New Testament Use of the Old Testament*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2011. viii + 147 pp. Pbk.

Having already written extensively on the New Testament's use of the Old Testament, Steve Moyise, Professor of New Testament at the University of Chichester (UK), offers another title. Designed primarily for students and pastors, *Jesus and Scripture* is an introduction to the topic rather than a detailed, technical investigation.

In the New Testament Gospels, Jesus quotes the Old Testament sixty times, and the book examines these specific instances. Moyise is not concerned with the manner in which the New Testament uses the Old Testament, but rather with the way Jesus is presented as having used the Old Testament within the four Gospels. The book is useful as a concise introduction to an often confusing topic. The author effectively frames the various interpretative approaches to Jesus' use of the Old Testament and evaluates the straightforward data found in the Gospels themselves. The author accepts the two-document hypothesis to the Synoptic problem and carries out his exegesis upon that premise.

The introductory nature of the work is evidenced by the words the author chooses to define. In more advanced works, authors often assume their audiences are familiar with pertinent terms and phrases. This is not the case here. For example, Moyise defines terms such as "Q," "M," "Synoptic," and even such critical aspects of interpretation as "the criterion of embarrassment."

In the introduction Moyise presents the data concerning Jesus' use of the Old Testament. He clearly believes it is the interpreter's job to analyze the way each of the four Gospels'

authors presents his Jesus as using the Old Testament. This differs from the usual practice of flattening the Gospels by simply asking, “How did Jesus use the Old Testament?”

Chapters 1–4 deal with the four Gospels respectively. The chapters share these headings: “Jesus and the Law,” “Jesus and the Prophets,” and “Jesus and the Writings.” The question of whether or not the Gospel writers present Jesus as the Suffering Servant of Isaiah 53 is given special attention in each of the first three chapters. For the Gospel of Mark, Moyise sides with Morna Hooker and argues that the issue of whether Mark portrays Jesus as Isaiah’s Servant is “ambiguous.” Matthew’s Gospel features many of the same Old Testament quotations, but instead of having composite quotations from Mal 3:1/Exod 23:20 and Isa 40:3 like Mark (1:3), Matthew uses these same quotations individually, with special attention given to Isaiah. Because Matthew uses the Malachi and Exodus passages differently than Mark, and because this episode is shared by Luke, scholars think it was likely found in Q and thus is important for understanding Jesus’ use of the Old Testament. For Matthew, Moyise demonstrates that Jesus is “unequivocally” identified as Isaiah’s Servant because of the quotations and references found in Matt 8:4–17. In 8:7, Matthew quotes Isa 53:4, and says that this (the healings) was to fulfill the words “He took our infirmities and bore our diseases.” Interestingly, the quotation does not follow the LXX, which speaks of “bearing our sins,” but rather follows the Hebrew (infirmities/sins). Moyise notes how the Isaiah passage in Matthew is applied to Jesus’ healing ministry, and in later Christian tradition (1 Pet 2:24) is applied to Jesus’ salvific death. As Moyise highlights, this whole episode raises another question for interpreters: What text of the LXX was known to Matthew? Where Matthew departs from the LXX, Moyise believes that he may be “modifying the text to make his point, or that perhaps he is quoting from memory, and so makes mistakes. However, at least in some instances it appears that he is quoting from a version of the LXX that differs from the principal manuscripts” (p. 43). In the case of Luke, Moyise argues that Jesus is again equated to the Suffering Servant through a quotation that comes from Jesus’ own mouth (Luke 22:35). Throughout the

course of study, Moyise expertly handles the complexities of the discussion of whether Jesus is identified as the Suffering Servant of Isaiah. In the end, the reader is left with a clearer picture of a difficult investigation.

Chapters 5–7 form the second section, devoted to examining how various scholars and strands of scholarship deal with the question under investigation. Moyise presents three contemporary options: minimalist, moderate, and maximalist. According to Moyise, the minimalist—as the title suggests—is one who accepts relatively little of what the Gospels posit and does not believe that Jesus made much use of the Old Testament. Moyise defines the moderate as one who accepts that the Gospel writers amended, added to, or ignored aspects of Jesus’ use of the Old Testament to shape their own redaction and literary aims. The maximalist is understood as one who, when faced with a variance between two Gospels’ renderings of a quotation from Jesus, assumes that the historical Jesus likely said both at one time or another, and thus that the Gospel writers were simply selective about what to use but still historically accurate in some sense or another.

Chapter 5 engages the major proponents of the minimalist movement. Scholars examined in this section include Jewish scholar Geza Vermes, John Dominic Crossan, and Marcus Borg. Moyise provides examples of their respective exegetical works and the arguments in favor of their position. The same can be said for chapter 6, which is entitled “Jesus and Scripture—Examining Moderate Views.” Moyise identifies James Dunn and Tom Wright in this camp. He notes, however, that Wright is somewhat of a bridge between the moderate and maximalist views. Chapter 7, devoted to the maximalist view, examines the works and arguments of Charles Kimball and Richard France. (It is interesting, however, that only one work by Kimball is mentioned in the two bibliographies provided.) For each of these three chapters, Moyise fairly and accurately examines the respective movements. However, he has already made it clear, by some of his forms of exegesis in chapters 1–4, that his own preference is within the moderate framework of interpretation.

After the conclusion, Moyise offers two appendices and two

bibliographies. The first appendix is a table of Jesus' use of the Old Testament in the Gospels; the second contains Jewish legal texts.

Although most of the book is concerned with presenting data and summarizing various scholarly views, the author's personal leanings can be seen in a few places. For example, Moyise points out that because of Luke's selective use of Isaiah 53 (omitting v. 10), "there is no indication that Jesus is contemplating a death that is 'on their behalf'" (p. 60). But is this warranted? In Acts 13, Paul's sermon is recorded as highlighting Jesus' death and resurrection, asserting to his listeners that "through this man forgiveness of sins is proclaimed to you." Here, and in many instances in Acts, Jesus death is linked to salvific consequences for his people and forgiveness of sins.

Overall, the purpose of Moyise's book is achieved. By engaging the relevant data and examining each Gospel individually, the author presents a large body of information in an accessible way. Additionally, by exploring three scholarly approaches to this topic and highlighting proponents of each view, Moyise introduces the reader to the field of Synoptic interpretation and to its major players. The book will be most useful for students and pastors interested in an introduction to Jesus' use of the Old Testament, but may also prove useful as a refresher for veterans. Teachers in both undergraduate and graduate settings may want to consider using this text in an academic course.

Deven K. MacDonald
Acadia Divinity College
Wolfville, NS