

BOOK REVIEW

Chang-Wook Jung, *The Original Language of the Lukan Infancy Narrative* (JSNTSup, 267; New York: T. & T. Clark, 2004). xi + 249 pp. Hdbk. US\$140.00.

In *The Original Language of the Lukan Infancy Narrative*, Chang-Wook Jung attempts to determine whether Luke was dependant on a Greek or Hebrew source for his infancy narrative. In determining this, Jung also looks to decipher the translation or imitation model for this section. In order to determine the original language Jung evaluates quotations, allusions and phrases found in Luke 1–2. Jung posits that if it can be shown that Luke was primarily dependant on the LXX and other Greek texts, then the likelihood that Luke 1–2 was derived from a Semitic source is greatly diminished. If, however, it is revealed that most of Luke's phrases, allusions and quotations are derived from the MT, then it is more likely that the infancy narrative was translated by Luke into Greek from a non-Greek source.

In Chapter 1, Jung begins by evaluating the scholarly views regarding the Greek that Luke uses in chapters 3–24 of his Gospel. Beginning with the nineteenth century concept that the Greek of the New Testament was 'Holy Ghost' Greek, Jung summarizes the major schools of thought up until the 1990s. Of particular focus are the LXX pastiche theory, the translation theory and the vernacular Greek theory, championed by Deissmann, Most and Porter, respectively. Following this, Jung delineates in detail the translation theory and imitation theory along with some comments regarding their strengths and weaknesses. Although Jung is somewhat biased in his summary of these theories, he does develop the main points of each theory and introduces the reader to important ideas that will be discussed later in the book.

Chapter 2 attempts the difficult jobs of distinguishing and defining Semitisms, Septuagintalisms, Lukanisms and non-Lukanisms. To

initiate this chapter Jung cites the definitions of other scholars and evaluates their ability to differentiate in a productive and concrete manner. After this Jung defines Semitisms as Greek locutions in the New Testament that are ‘*un-Greek expressions and non-Septuagintalisms, and contain characteristics typical of Semitic Languages*’ (p. 57, italics his). Septuagintalisms represent syntactical peculiarities in the LXX that do not render *exactly* the Hebrew/Aramaic originals. Lukanisms are ‘*phrases and words in the infancy narrative of Luke which occur with regularity in the remainder of the Gospel and in Acts, regardless of whether or not they occur outside of Luke–Acts in the NT*’ (p. 58, italics his). Conversely, non-Lukanisms are words and phrases that are not found within the remainder of Luke or Acts for which corresponding Lukan expressions occur. In fairness to Jung, his definitions are more layered and detailed within the book and, consequently, better distinguish between the different groups. Overall, Jung’s definitions, despite being complex at times, are solid and adequately delineate the differences between the categories.

Chapter 3 is the largest part of the book and evaluates the two quotations and some of the allusions and phrases, as he defines them, which are found within Luke 1–2. Here Jung appraises these different categories to determine if they originate from the LXX, a Greek or a Semitic source. In evaluating the two quotations found in the infancy narrative Jung does an admirable job of attempting to establish the source of the verses. He determines, through comparing the verses in Luke with the LXX and MT, that Luke depended on the LXX for his quotations in 2.23, 24.

When examining the different allusions found within Luke 1–2, namely 1.15, 31 and 37, Jung seeks to find the corresponding verses to which these allusions refer. In doing this, Jung considers the differences between the LXX and the MT texts, and the syntax of the Lukan verses to determine which is the most likely progenitor. In addition to this, Jung also attempts to locate Luke’s compositional hand and his purpose for adapting the Old Testament verses to create an allusion. Associated with the study of allusion is the assessment of phraseology. Although Jung agrees that it is difficult to differentiate between the two categories, nevertheless, he distinguishes phrases from allusions by stating that allusions directly refer to specific passages, whereas phrases occur throughout a text and cannot be directly associated with a specific verse. In this section, Jung evaluates five phrases that have

been cited as Semitic in origin. In refuting these claims, Jung critically examines the MT and LXX as possible sources, and occasionally looks at other Hellenistic writers to determine if they are proper Greek constructions. After these evaluations, Jung concludes that Luke was dependant on the LXX for both his allusions and phraseology.

Although there are a number of strengths in this work, there are a few areas that could be improved. First, in defining Lukanisms and non-Lukanisms, Jung seems too rigid when he states that if there are less than three occurrences of a particular construction within Luke and Acts then it is a non-Lukanism. This does not take into account Luke's creative ability as a writer to vary his approach and style in his work. In addition, Luke–Acts is a rather limited corpus for which to make such hard-line criteria.

Secondly, in evaluating allusions and phraseology, Jung often overlooks the context from which the allusion or phrase develops. Instead, Jung focuses more on the different Greek constructions. Within this work, this was not really noticeable or seriously detracting from his assessment, however, it could possibly provide further support for his argument.

Thirdly, Jung spends a great deal of energy relating Luke to the MT and the LXX but there are only a few instances when the larger Hellenistic context is consulted. It seems that, on occasion, Jung only considers that particular constructions could be derived from the MT or the LXX and, consequently, the larger Greek context is ignored. Seeing that Luke is one of the most proficient writers in the New Testament, it is proper to consider that there might be other Greek influences on his writing style.

Finally, one of my main issues with this work is that Jung does not interact with the Benedictus or the Magnificat at all. This is intriguing seeing that a number of scholars have cited these sections as particularly Semitic in origin. Without addressing these sections the overall impact of Jung's argument is diminished.

Although there are a number of critiques, the value of this work should not be ignored. Jung presents important considerations when evaluating the nature of Luke's composition and the texts that influenced him. In addition, Jung makes an important contribution to the critical evaluation and defining of semitisms, septuagintalisms, Lukanisms and non-Lukanisms. Overall, *The Original Language of the Lukan Infancy Narrative* is a great resource for scholars who are

interested in Luke's relationship to the MT, LXX and Greek sources, particularly with regard to the infancy narrative.

Sean A. Adams
McMaster Divinity College