Introduction

Pentecostal scholarship is at an exciting time. In many areas of theological enquiry, it is in the formative stages of (critical) reflection. Specifically on Pentecostal hermeneutics, Pentecostals have been writing in this area (formally) at least since the mid-1970s and highlighting important, necessary distinctions between the way Pentecostals exegete and understand Scripture and the approaches of other Christian brothers and sisters. As those of us within the tradition continue to assess the relationship between the various substrata of the theological enterprise and Pentecostal theology, we should continue to seek out informative, engaging and challenging dialogue partners/books. One work worthy of such dialogue is Matthew in History by Ulrich Luz, Professor of New Testament Studies at the University of Bern, Switzerland.

† Professor Luz has graciously agreed to serve as the dialogue partner for the current issue of JPT in order to extend the discussion on this particular aspect of his voluminous work.
* Emerson B. Powery (PhD candidate, Duke University) is Instructor of New Testament at Lee University.

This review seeks to acquaint the readers of JPT with Luz's monograph, highlighting especially the method, offering a critical evaluation of the contents, and suggesting some implications for a Pentecostal hermeneutic.

**Description**

The 1990 Sprunt Lectures at Union Theological Seminary, Richmond, Virginia, form the basis of Luz's first book originally published in English. After a brief introduction, Luz presents a critique of the historical-critical method. In Chapters 2–4, Luz explains his method, called the 'history of effects', offering one of the more engaging contributions to biblical studies and hermeneutics since the shift of the methodological sands, from the historical-critical method to methods less concerned with 'pure' historical, 'objective', positivistic interests. The intention of this method is to focus on 'the kind of role the biblical texts played in the historical process of the confessional diversification of the churches' (p. 3). Finally, in Chapter 5, Luz addresses the question of truth, which his method inevitably raises. Most of my effort will be spent describing the middle three chapters, since critiques of the historical-critical method are prominent these days. The description section will end with a brief explanation of the question of truth, which will be discussed further in the critique section.

**Critique of the Historical-Critical Method**

The historical-critical method had its origins in eighteenth- to nineteenth-century German scholarship. Its goal in Luz's words was 'to reconstruct the original communication between the author and his first

3. *Matthew in History: Interpretation, Influence, and Effects* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1994). Most of his work has been published in German. The present work will be cited in the body of the text with the appropriate page number.

4. Translated from the German word *Wirkungsgeschichte*, which Luz himself recognizes is 'one of those marvelous German words that is almost untranslatable into other languages'. For the origins of the term and its placement within the larger, philosophical concerns of hermeneutics, see Hans Georg Gadamer's *Truth and Method* (trans. J. Weisenheimer and D.G. Marshall; New York: Crossroad, 1982). Wilhelm Linss has offered another translation for this term, 'history of influence', in his translation of the first volume of Luz's commentary, *Matthew 1–7: A Continental Commentary* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1989). In this volume, Luz uses 'effect' and 'influence' interchangeably.