Since the publication of *Bread from Heaven* in 1965, Peder Borgen has been recognized as a leading Scandinavian scholar in the field of New Testament studies. Eighteen of his colleagues and former students have registered their friendship and professional debt to Borgen in this Festschrift. The essays are clustered around the historical Jesus, Pauline studies, the Fourth Gospel, and Philo of Alexandria. The bulk of the essays are in the last three categories, where Borgen has made his contributions, especially in his arguments that the exegetical traditions found in Philo help to illuminate issues and texts in Paul and the Fourth Gospel.

The first unit contains two essays devoted to the historical Jesus. James D. G. Dunn opens his essay by listing fourteen different themes that constitute the core of “the context of expectation” or the framework in which Jesus’ audiences would have understood his proclamation of the kingdom. Based on these, Dunn argues that there is not a “grand narrative” that serves as a construct to unite the different themes in Jesus’ proclamation (contra J. D. Crossan and N. T. Wright). He suggests that Jesus worked in the prophetic/apocalyptic tradition that understood the partial fulfillment of a promise as the basis for a fresh articulation of hope rather than a nullification of it. Jesus’ kingdom language is metaphorical: it is calculated to evoke within us the impact of heaven’s
invasion of earth. The essay is a slightly fuller statement of Dunn’s later treatment of the same material in *Jesus Remembered* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003), 387–404.

In the second essay, James H. Charlesworth extends an earlier review of archaeological discoveries relating to Jesus research (*Jesus within Judaism: New Light from Exciting Archaeological Discoveries* [New York: Doubleday, 1988]). He summarizes publications since his work appeared and provides updates on the seven discoveries that he covered plus eight more. He then touches on three current debates: he thinks that the house in Capernaum that is traditionally known as Peter’s house may be authentic, argues that the Theodotian inscription is pre-70, and cautiously suggests that the theater in Sepphoris dates from the time of Jesus. While these debates remain open, Charlesworth’s essay is a useful survey of current archaeological work relevant to the historical Jesus up to the time that he wrote. Since then we have been presented with several sensational claims that have failed to pass scrutiny, such as the James ossuary.

The second section of the work is devoted to Pauline studies. Birger Gerhardsson argues against the view that the earliest accounts of the resurrection were brief formulaic statement that were later expanded into narratives and maintains that the list in 1 Cor 15:1–11 presupposes earlier narratives. He suggests that these were oral narratives: some may have been collected in a larger loose narrative, while others were independent. His case rests upon the nature of 1 Cor 15:3b–8a as a list and the argument that lists require fuller explanations. It would have been helpful if he could have offered an analogy from another list and set of narratives. Andrie B. du Toit works through the major texts that deal with homosexuality in Paul. He then tackles the hermeneutical question of their claim on modern gays and lesbians in Christianity. He posits a tension between Paul’s position and the experience of gays in the Christian community. This leads to a moral decision: “if a choice must be made between the biblical position on homosexuality and the love commandment—and such a choice is often inevitable—the latter must receive precedence” (107). Whether one agrees or disagrees with du Toit’s theology, his essay is one of the most sober and sensitive treatments that I have read.

Karl-Gustav Sandelin returns to a problem that he had worked on with Borgen in the Inter-Scandinavian Project on Hellenistic Judaism and Early Christianity. He now questions if it is possible to determine whether the Corinthians participated in banquets in temple precincts, an assumption that he once made and that Borgen argued for in a well-known essay. Sandelin argues that Paul forbade all participation in a pagan cult. The most important arguments that he makes are as follows. The conditional in 1 Cor 8:10 and the imperatives in 10:7 and 14 are different rhetorical strategies that Paul used to warn the Corinthians against participation in pagan cults, not a critique of their current practice or an acknowledgement that it is acceptable *de jure* to participate, although it may not be *de
facto. Paul did not make a distinction between temple precincts and a temple proper: the Corinthians should not enter pagan temple complexes. His case rests largely on Paul’s opposition to idolatry in 1 Cor 5:10–11; 6:9–10. Why would Paul condemn idolatry and then permit the Corinthians to enter a pagan temple? This leads him to ask where Paul drew the line. In a position that is reminiscent of Tertullian’s sharp lines in De idolatria, Sandelin thinks that Paul warned against eating food known to have been used in an idolatrous context in any setting, including a pagan home. Sandelin’s rethinking of this question is provocative; however, the sharp denunciations of idolatry in the lists of vices in 5:11 and 6:9 are very different from the detailed contextual comments of the apostle in chapters 8–10. I fail to see the tension that Sandelin posits between the two.

Morna Hooker tackles a famous crux interpretum: Does τέλος νόμου in Rom 10:4 mean that Christ is the fulfillment or the end of the law? She argues for the latter based on other Pauline statements but suggests that while Christ replaced the law for Paul, he did so in continuity with the ancient covenant that had been ratified anew in Christ.

David Helholm explores the use of three traditional baptismal formulae in pre-Pauline and Pauline settings: the name formula (1 Cor 1:13, 15; 6:11), the formulaic pronunciation over the baptized (Gal 3:26–28; 1 Cor 7:18–22; 12:13; Col 3:11; John 17:21), and the credo uttered by the baptized (1 Cor 15:3–5//Rom 6:3–4). Paul used all three traditional formulae to address specific needs in varying contexts: he used the name formula in 1 Corinthians to appeal to unity, the pronouncement formula in Galatians to emphasize the unity of Jews and Gentiles, and the credo in Romans to defeat the accusation of libertinism. Helholm’s essay is an exceptional piece of work. It would have been helpful if he would have asked whether there are examples of the Sitze im Leben that he posited for the formulae in the succeeding centuries.

The third part of the Festschrift is devoted to the Fourth Gospel, a text to which Borgen has made several noteworthy contributions. John Painter takes up Borgen’s thesis that the Prologue is based on exegetical traditions of Gen 1:1–5. More specifically, he accepts Borgen’s view that a targumic interpretation of Gen 1:1–5 stands behind John 1:1–5 that, in turn, was the basis for the elaboration in John 1:6–18. Painter departs from Borgen by questioning whether John 1:1–5 refers only to primordial time rather than time prior to the incarnation. He provides an important update by comparing Borgen’s analysis with those of Elaine Pagels and Arthur Droge, who have recently explored the relationship between the Prologue and the Gospel of Thomas in the light of Gen 1. Painter’s work is a fine summary of a view that deserves broad consideration. Two recent articles that move in similar but distinct lines are D. Boyarin, “The Gospel of the Memra: Jewish Binitarianism and the Prologue of John,” HTR 94 (2001): 243–84; and my, “‘Day One’:

Jarl Henning Urlichsen, one of the editors, offers a novel interpretation of the cleansing of the temple in John 2:13–22. He suggests that, instead of understanding the body of Jesus to be a replacement for the temple, we should understand the text as a defense against Jewish charges that Jesus spoke against the temple. Thus, just as the Synoptics handled the antitemple charge by claiming that the witnesses were false, the Fourth Evangelist deflected it by denying that Jesus spoke against it at all; rather, he spoke only of his body. Urlichsen may be correct that the text is intended to deflect a critique; however, I find it difficult to deny the play between different understandings of temple that fits in so naturally with Johannine symbolism and irony.

In another essay, Hans Kvalbein explores the references to the “kingdom” in John 3:3, 5 and 18:36. He argues against the prevailing view that *kingdom* has the functional significance of *reign* and contends that the “kingdom of God” in 3:3 and 5 refers to eschatological salvation understood locally, that is, the future sphere of life. He then suggests that the reference to Jesus’ kingdom in 18:36 is different: it has a functional meaning emphasizing Jesus’ position as king. On his reading, the references in 3:3, 5 and 18:36 cannot be collapsed into an overarching concept, such as Jesus is the king of the kingdom of God. Kvalbein’s argument is best when pushing the local versus the functional meaning of kingdom. I find his insistence on the future aspect of kingdom in 3:3 and 5 problematic. It is more likely, in my judgment, that this is another instance of the Fourth Evangelist’s reworking of a future concept into a present reality (e.g., 5:24–29).

D. Moody Smith looks at the way in which John and 1 John handle the traditions about Jesus. He suggests that the Gospel is concerned about the way in which Jesus can be present to the community and answers that Jesus is present via the Spirit. First John ignored this answer and argued that the present Jesus is subject to the past Jesus. The focus in the Gospel is therefore on the present, whereas in 1 John it is on the past. Moody Smith’s analysis is a very helpful way to frame the relationship of the Gospel and First Epistle to the traditions about Jesus.

Howard Clark Kee looks at the sociocultural dimensions of epistemology in John and the letters. He sketches the place of Jesus as the embodiment of truth, the Spirit as the inner presence of truth, and the human responses to truth. He devotes the bulk of the essay to eighteen images that emphasize the social nature of knowledge over against the individual orientation of an existential understanding. It is not entirely clear that all of the images that Kee provides must be understood communally; for example, does Jesus’ role
as light require a community? The man born blind responded as an individual, and there is no reference to his participation in a community. It would have been helpful for Kee to differentiate between images that are inherently communal as opposed to those that may be used by communities but are not inherently communal.

David Aune, another of the editors, contributes the final essay in this part. He challenges the common assumption that the dualism of the Fourth Gospel can be explained by the dualism in the Dead Sea Scrolls. He subjects the dualism of both to a careful analysis and finds very little in common. The ethical dualism expressed in categories of light versus darkness that is common to both probably stems from conversion experiences in Judaism and Christianity. The most impressive parallel is 1 John 4:4 and 1QS 3.17–20. These parallels constitute the only similarities that Aune could find. He therefore rejects both direct dependence of the Fourth Gospel on the scrolls or Essenes and indirect dependence through a common milieu. If Aune is correct—and he makes a very good case—John does not have as much in common with the scrolls from Qumran as many have assumed.

The fourth and final section of the Festschrift is devoted to Philonic studies, an area in which Borgen has established himself as a major figure. Ellen Birnbaum asks whether Jewish authors such as Pseudo-Aristeas, Aristobulus, and Philo used allegory to set out Jewish identity in relation to non-Jews. She works through the three authors and notes that allegorical interpretations may contribute to the understanding of the relation with non-Jews; for example, Pseudo-Aristeas emphasizes Jewish superiority. At the same time, it is essential to examine the full range of positions. Philo has interpretations that champion Jewish superiority, others that universalize particular Jewish practices, and others that are neutral. It would be foolish to ignore nonallegorical statements in these authors in constructions of “the other”; for example, Pseudo-Aristeas claims that the Greeks worship the same God as Jews. For these reasons it is impossible to agree with David Dawson that the Jews subordinated Greek culture to Jewish scripture through allegory; the situation is more complex, a conclusion that is solid even if it problematizes the material rather than simplifying it.

Like Birnbaum, David Hay is interested in Philo’s references to non-Jews; however, he restricts the scope of his investigation to De vita contemplativa. He notes the paradox that, while Philo is more likely to mention or summarize a pagan rather than a Jewish writing (Homer, bioi of Anaxagoras and Democritus, Hippocrates, Xenophon/Plato, and Chaeremon), his references to pagans tend to be negative. The references to other groups serve as foils to highlight the distinctive community beside Lake Mareotis. Based on these observations, Hay offers some very guarded conclusions about the audience. He thinks that it was likely mixed: the audience consisted of both Hellenistic Jews who were in danger of assimilation to the larger culture and needed to be reminded of the value of
Judaism as well as interested non-Jews who were attracted to Judaism. This explains the encomiastic nature of the treatise and its apologetic or protreptic nature. Readers interested in this treatise of Philo should now also consult J. E. Taylor, *Jewish Women Philosophers of First-Century Alexandria: Philo’s Therapeutae Reconsidered* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), which appeared after the completion of Hay’s essay.

Peder Borgen recently argued that *Legat.* 1–7 was composed in connection with the final treatises of Philo’s exposition of the law. David Runia devotes an essay to this remarkable text in which, in contrast to previous interpreters who have examined it largely as an independent unit, he attempts to understand it in light of the entire treatise. He is able to demonstrate how this most unusual opening relates to the treatise as a whole but, on his own admission, is not able to solve at least one conundrum, namely, how Philo combines the historical and the theological understandings of mental vision (ὄψις). The essay is a good example of how a specific text in Philo should be read.

Troels Endberg-Pedersen attempts to work out the place of paraenetic language and concepts in Philo’s scheme of the progress of the soul. Endberg-Pedersen challenges the common translation of παραίνειν and παραίνέσις as “exhort” and “exhortation” and argues that they should be rendered “advise” or “enjoin” and “advice” or “injunction.” He thinks that “exhort” and “exhortation” are proper translations of παρακαλεῖν and παράκλησις. He adds a third pair: προτρέπειν/προτρέσθαι and προτροπή and suggests that they should be rendered by “urge” or “incite” and “urging” or “incitement.” To make the list more complete, he adds νουθεσία and σωφρονισμός, which he translates as “admonition” and “correction.” The most intriguing aspect of his contribution is his effort to situate these terms on a line that measures the soul’s progress towards perfection. His line runs from πρόσταξις to παραίνεσις to προτροπή and culminates in the full possession of virtue. He thinks that νουθεσία and σωφρονισμός are the negative flipside of παραίνεσις and belong roughly below it on his line. Παράκλησις lacks the specificity of the other terms and serves as an umbrella term. Endberg-Pedersen’s essay reminds us that we should look carefully at paraenetic language. Whether Philo had a system as fully developed as Endberg-Pedersen reconstructs is less secure, although the absence of a full disclosure of such a system in Philo’s corpus does not mean that the Alexandrian lacked a systematic understanding. There are texts where the fine distinctions that Endberg-Pedersen posits appear to break down; for example, *Virt.* 69–70 use παραίνεω and παρακαλέω to refer to Moses’ charge to his successor.

The final essay is by a well-known student of Borgen who worked with him on the Norwegian Philo Concordance Project. Kare Fuglseth uses the database for this project to compare the vocabulary of Philo with New Testament authors. There are 5,426 different words in the New Testament that appear in 138,018 forms and 13,607 discrete words in
Philo that appear in 437,433 forms. The two share 3,114 words in common, or, to put it in percentages, 57.4 percent of the vocabulary of the New Testament is in Philo, while 22.89 percent of the vocabulary of Philo is in the New Testament. Fuglseth provides a list of the fifty-two most common nouns and verbs (406–7). He then compares Hebrews and Philo. In contrast to previous works (e.g., Williamson’s well-known work on Hebrews) that compared *hapax legomena* in an effort to determine literary relationships, he compares the entire vocabulary of Hebrews (1,023 words in 4,953 forms) to the total vocabulary of Philo. He found that Hebrews shares 81.04 percent of its nouns and verbs with Philo and only 15.27 percent with the New Testament. Fuglseth suggests that Williamson may have been premature in his conclusions. I found this work to be fascinating but still have questions. For such comparisons to be cogent, they need to contain significant comparative bodies. For example, what would be the percentage of agreement between Hebrews and Josephus? or between Hebrews and Plutarch? These are two other large corpuses that should be consulted. Fuglseth is guarded in his conclusions but has shown that computers can help us in our analyses.

The work concludes with a bibliography of Borgen’s published work from 1987 to 2001 that updates the earlier bibliography in *Essays in Honor of Peder Borgen* (1987), an earlier Festschrift.

Festschriften are often uneven and worth far more to the honoree than to other readers. While I am sure that Professor Borgen will be the most interested reader of this collection, he should not be the only reader. The general quality of these essays is quite good, and a number of them deserve wide reading. They are a worthy tribute not just to Professor Borgen but to his scholarship and the issues that he raised.