Streeter retraces much familiar ground in citing the exemplary women of the Johannine Gospel but concludes that the Book of Revelation gives the final word in the Scriptures, one that demonizes the great whore of Babylon and celebrates those who have “not defiled themselves with women” as deserving of God’s blessings (Rev 14:4).

A final chapter considers the “Humiliation of Wisdom” in the rabbinic legend of Beruriah and in the gradual marginalization of Mary Magdalene in Christian tradition, while gnostic writings by contrast are shown to embrace an openness to female wisdom.

Streeter has really presented nothing new in these pages but has gathered and restated a now familiar feminist theme. She has argued her case well and given her audience much to ponder in a readable, clear format.

Barbara E. Bowe
Catholic Theological Union
Chicago, Illinois


A revised dissertation written under Graham Stanton at King’s College in London, Sim’s book has three parts: a discussion of methodological issues (“apocalyptic eschatology and apocalypticism”), a redaction-critical study of Matthew’s eschatological passages, and the implications for defining “the social setting of the Matthean community.” His thesis is that, compared with Mark and Q, Matthew’s greater emphasis on apocalyptic eschatology points to a social setting after the fall of Jerusalem (70 C.E.) in which the Matthean community experienced greater conflict with Jews, Gentiles, and other Christians. The author is critical of G. Bornkamm and D. Marquerat who explore only the paraenetic functions of Matthew’s “judgemental material.” Building on the shorter studies of D. A. Hagner, O. L. Cope, and G. N. Stanton, Sim treats Matthew’s eschatology and social setting in a more comprehensive monograph (p. 14).

Sim defines eight characteristics of apocalyptic eschatology: dualism, determinism, eschatological woes, the arrival of the savior figure, the judgment, the fate of the wicked, the fate of the righteous, and the imminence of the end. The five chapters of part two offer a detailed analysis of these eight features in Matthew which are more prominent than in the other NT Gospels. Despite numerous stimulating insights, Sim’s redactional analysis overestimates these characteristics’ significance for understanding the whole of Matthew. For example, an author who had adopted “a completely dualistic perspective” analogous to that of the Qumran community or John’s Gospel (p. 91; cf. pp. 84-85) would never have included a passage like Mt 5:43-48 (esp. 45b).

Two points neglected by Sim call for caution and further reflection regarding what eschatological passages may reveal about Matthew’s social setting. First, numerous minor Matthean adaptations of and additions to Mark do not significantly change the eschatological legacy left by Mark. Second, since Conzelmann’s classic study of Luke (ET: The Theology of Saint Luke, 1960; not listed in Sim’s select bibliography), scholars have recognized that Luke toned down Mark’s more imminent eschatology. The only basis for comparing the use of Q in Matthew is Q/Luke. It is thus far from certain that Matthew’s more eschatological Q passages stem from the experiences of a post-70 community and not earlier traditions closer to those found in Mark.

James A. Kelhoffer
The University of Chicago
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