

dealing with questions of knowledge, subjectivity, and ethics. In the process, it succeeds in convincing the reader of the ongoing necessity of opening up—and maintaining—some form of dialogue with the Other, and it poses some important challenges to both sides of the debate, showing on the one hand, that Lonergan is not the anti-hero par excellence of “postmodernity” and on the other hand, that despite occasional appearances to the contrary, Continental philosophy is not merely a wild set of deconstructionist practices that calls for the abandonment of all meaning and that settles for a relativist chaos. As such, there is much here to be learned for students of contemporary Western thought, not least for those whose concerns revolve around ethical, religious, or intersubjective dialogue.

David Kolozyc, *McGill University*

***Ethnography of the Gospel of Matthew: A Critical Assessment of the Use of the Honour and Shame Model in New Testament Studies.* By Louise Joy Lawrence. Tübingen: Paul Mohr Verlag, 2003. ISBN 3-1614-8084-8. Pp. 411.**

Louise Joy Lawrence writes an excellent summary and critique of social science criticism and its relation to the New Testament, though her title is a summary in itself: *An Ethnography of the Gospel of Matthew: A Critical Assessment of the Use of the Honour and Shame Model in New Testament Studies*. Although many view the bounds of social science criticism as limitless and applicable to each area of the New Testament, Lawrence questions the method, the application of the method, as well as its overall relevance to the New Testament. To achieve this goal, she employs the gospel of Matthew as a case study.

The first chapter introduces the reader to many of social science’s critical terms: anti-introspective self, agonistic interaction and challenge-riposte, limited good, dyadic personality, and sexual division of labour. With a focus on Malina and Neyrey, the book summarizes various approaches to these concepts and their common applications to New Testament texts. Providing the basis for the remainder of her work, Lawrence demonstrates in this chapter that current honour/shame models are deterministic (matching the evidence to fit the model), contain an outdated view of culture, and contain problems regarding “reification” (35).

Chapter Two focuses on the need for a return to the literary sources. Drawing upon the work of Mikhail Bakhtin, Lawrence focuses on three aspects of his theories regarding literary ethnography: “First it constitutes an attempt to be truly interdisciplinary, looking at various developments in anthropology as regards literary texts and transplanting those methods and insights into biblical study. Second, it provides an attempt to categorise the ways in which context and text can be interrelated . . . Third . . . it shows, in light of the developments within anthropological studies . . . that texts and social life itself cannot be simplified” (57–58).

The next six chapters are dedicated to identifying and exploring the weaknesses and shortcomings of the current honour/shame paradigm as applied to biblical studies. Regarding the anti-introspective self and power, it is concluded that “power need not be related to status or position. . . . Second, the political leaders’ primary motivation seems to be a concern for their public image. However, God is cast as the ultimate observing other of a person’s heart in Matthew’s world” (140). The challenge-riposte paradigm is examined, and Lawrence posits that many of the paradigms do not fit the “classic” model: i) claim to honour; ii) challenge to that claim; iii) riposte to the challenge; iv) public verdict by onlookers (144). Primarily, no challenge or audience exists to give a verdict in Matthew’s gospel. In defining the limited good, one finds that God’s grace is not limited; neither should one’s hospitality or generosity be perceived as limited. “It is relatively simple,” Lawrence writes, “to find instances of perception of certain limited goods in any culture, but it is harder to assess the relative importance of such instances and whether it warrants the context as a whole being defined as a limited good environment” (221). The idea of kinship is avoided in Matthew or even portrayed negatively: “Matthew, especially, subverts racial and ethnic privileges with greater weight being given to a concern for others. In marked contrast to an ideology that stresses ascribed honour from birth, those embracing Jesus’ call must reject boundaries that segregate and divide individuals, positing, in stark opposition to the amoral familism orientation, a universal or common collectivism with all people” (259). Regarding gender and social stratification, Lawrence summarizes as follows: “Recent theoretical reflections can help guard against assumptions regarding women’s association with the private sphere and men’s association with the public sphere simply as generalized realities. We are impelled to explore women’s roles in the dynamic exchanges between the private and public spheres” (293).

While insightful, it seems that Lawrence’s work disregards, on questionable grounds, certain sections of text that do fit the molds placed by Malina and others. One example is Matthew 15:1–20. Lawrence rejects this case as an example of challenge-riposte because “the leader’s reaction is not really symptomatic of challenge riposte and concern for honour, but rather a defense of the law” (164), or again “once more the religious leaders seem to speak in a legalistic, as opposed to agonistic tone” (165). Here, it seems that the author is arguing semantics. If the Pharisees are the keepers of the legal tradition and Jesus is working against this tradition, is this not a challenge wrapped in a legal framework? Must it be one or the other; can it not be both? With regard to kinship, the Matthean genealogy’s family ties are dismissed, for “it is not Jesus’ Davidic line, but rather his alliance with God which ultimately defines him” (235). Here again, the evidence is stretched. David is a significant figure, one who is mentioned three times in the genealogy itself. In fact, the gospel as a whole has a specific focus on Jesus as the Son of David (Lidija Novakovic, *Messiah, the Healer of the Sick*, 2003). These are but two instances among others regarding which this book can be criticized as falling into its own type of methodological determinism.

Lawrence's work strongly questions the restrictions that the honour/shame model has placed on biblical studies and pushes for a more sensitive, informed, and open approach using text and cultural studies as one lens to the past. George W. E Nickelsburg once said of social science criticism, "These theories may serve as useful models that help us to understand ancient texts, but primarily attention must be given to the documents themselves and to their peculiar contours. The model must not become a die that shapes the ancient materials or a filter that highlights or obliterates textual data in a predetermined way" ("Social Aspects of Palestinian Jewish Apocalypticism," *Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World and the Near East*, 1983, 648). Even though, at several points, Lawrence over-extends the reading of certain texts in order to support her paradigm, *An Ethnography of the Gospel of Matthew* presents a formidable and lucid critique of the currently accepted applications of social scientific theory to biblical texts.

Karl McDaniel, *McGill University*

***The Trinity Guide to Eschatology.* By William J. La Due. New York: Continuum, 2004. ISBN 0-8264-1608- X. Pp. ix + 166.**

The subject of eschatology has received an enormous amount of attention from theologians in recent decades, and there is certainly a need for critical and comparative surveys on the subject. This book by William J. La Due, a Roman Catholic scholar and the author of a number of studies, promises to help fill this need.

La Due's main purpose, as stated in his short introduction, is "to summarise the thought of twenty-one recent Christian theologians in the field, with a view to making their contributions more accessible to theological students and interested adults" (ix). He does this over seven chapters, but wisely begins with a long chapter on the biblical and historical foundations of eschatology. Eschatology is a broad field that includes such topics as the return of Christ, the resurrection of the dead, the last judgement, and the Kingdom of God. La Due, however, seemingly reflecting the traditional Roman Catholic perspective, gives the impression at the outset that eschatology is primarily about "life after death." He gives adequate attention to the New Testament theme of the second coming, but ignores the theme of the Kingdom of God despite the fact that it is central to the synoptic gospels.

The history of eschatology between the biblical era and the twentieth century is neatly sketched out over twenty pages, with a good balance between patristic, Reformation and Enlightenment influences. Chapter Two deals with the representatives of "Classic Protestant Approaches" to eschatology in