

---

Isaac MORENO SANZ, *Jesús y Moisés en diálogo*. Significado y función de la figura de Moisés en la obra lucana (Asociación Bíblica Española. Monografías Bíblicas 79; Verbo Divino, Madrid 2021). 479 pp. ISBN: 978-84-9073-710-1. € 31,35

The book of Isaac Moreno Sanz (from now on MS) is the publication of his dissertation which he defended at the Pontifical Gregorian University in Rome, in 2020.

In the introduction, MS starts with “Moses and the Lukan work”, and then presents the status quæstionis, the newness, the limits, the methodology and the outline of the book. Thereafter there are three parts which are elaborated in seven chapters. In the first part which is expanded in one chapter, MS presents the relationship between the Lukan work and the Scriptures of Israel. The introduction and the first part form a basis to the presentation of the second and the third parts. In the second part, MS studies first in three chapters the texts where Moses is mentioned and which are proper to Luke (Lk 2,21-24; 16,19-31; 24,1-53). Then, he deals in a single chapter with the other texts in the gospel, stemming from the triple tradition and mentioning the name of Moses (Lk 5,14; 9,30.33; 20,28.37). In the third part, MS studies in two chapters Jesus and Moses in the Acts of the Apostles (Ac 3,11-26; 6,8-15; 7,2-53; 13,16-41; 15,1-35; 21,15-26; 26,2-23; 28,16-31). General concluding observations are offered by MS at the end of his book.

In the introduction, the author places himself within the circle of biblical scholars who believe in the pragmalinguistic approach which he explains in a clear way (35-37).

In the first part, MS diligently studies the concept of “intertextuality”. As in all of his book, MS shows himself as a serious scholar, dialoguing with many other scholars. Having set the boundaries of the concepts “quotes”, “allusions”, “echoes” (though he acknowledges that scholars are far from agreeing on what is common between the “allusions” and the “echoes”), MS dedicates almost four pages (51-55) to set a basis for his work: the references to proper nouns as intertextual connection. He does so because the chosen texts in his book are the ones which mention Moses. MS considers that proper nouns are hinges which link the Scriptures of Israel to the Lukan work (55). Having studied the intertextuality in the Lukan work, MS asserts that his book proposes to read the texts of Luke-Acts in dialogue with the Scriptures of Israel, underlining the continuity of salvation history and conformity with the Scriptures of Israel (64). MS distinguishes his dialogic reading from typology. The latter implies the fulfillment of the old characters in the new; in the dialogic reading, one hears the voices and the texts of both Testaments (122-123). Thus, MS favors the concept of dialogue between texts and characters and gives each text and each character of the Old and New Testaments a value in itself. For MS, the reference to the Scriptures of Israel bears in Luke-Acts a narrative strategic role: the reader is called to go back and forth between the Jesus-Christ event and all biblical history, in order to grasp the coherence of the ways of God (70). At this very point of his argumentation, MS goes back to his method and considers that to correctly communicate, one should acquire a linguistic competence, but in order to efficiently communicate, a pragmalinguistic competence is required (72).

In the second and the third parts, MS analyzes the texts of the Gospel of Luke and the Acts of the Apostles which mention Moses. MS is very coherent and faithful to his way of presenting. In a general way, he starts by situating the text in its context, or explaining its background, he then sets the delimitation of the text, deals with textual problems, shows the textual cohesion, the dialogue raised between texts or charac-

ters, the communicative coherence and the pragmatic focalisation. Other titles and particular studies are included in some chapters, showing a dynamic argumentation fitting each text and context.

In the conclusion, MS firstly summarizes how Moses and Jesus are in dialogue. Then he deals with aspects of the dialogue between Moses, Jesus and the readers who want to enter in dialogue with the implied reader and who are called to interact with the text.

Noteworthy throughout his book is the highlight of a communication strategy which establishes a subtle dialogue through the intertextual connections, a dialogue open to a double meeting: from one side, between the author and the implied reader; from another side, between the Lukan text and the Scriptures of Israel (112). In many parts, like in 77-85, the author repeats traditional data in a very subtle way which prepares his argumentation. He goes from the traditional data to his common thread: the Old Testament in dialogue with the New Testament.

Even though MS shows the passage from the understanding of the message to its actualization in the current life of the reader in every time (116), he has the ability to remain faithful to the text. The gird of Redaction Criticism scholars would be satisfied with a big portion of his analysis.

In the final pages, as MS recalls a common thread in his book, he underlines the fact that both Jesus, who is mighty in words and deeds, and Moses, who accomplished signs and wonders, become types for understanding the mission of the disciples and the mission of the readers of the Lukan work. MS shows that the mission of the followers of Jesus, both the disciples and the readers of Luke, continues the mission of Moses, as well as of Jesus' (410).

According to MS, some inaccuracies in the text show that the main concern of the author is the communication of a theological message (115-116). MS continues that the Scriptures fundamentally have a dialogic structure, not only because they have two testaments in constant relation through their texts and characters, but also because the Scriptures propose a constant and unlimited meeting between God and the human being (212).

Reading the book of MS is a pleasant experience. He proves himself to be highly scientific, rigorous, and has the ability to create dialogue with a great number of scholars from different exegetical schools. His bibliography is particularly rich and stems from many European languages. The book is very well organized, and he makes his presentation in a serious way, without being distracted by unnecessary details. The size of each part, chapter and title is very reasonable, allowing for easier reading.

While recognizing all the above merits of MS, the reader is left with some questions and expectations.

It is true that the pragmalinguistic approach is gaining many followers from year to year. The evolution of methods, especially in the twentieth century and till now, has demonstrated the need to step back from a common trend in order to create another with some subtle differences. Nonetheless, one would question the followers

of a given approach about its real uniqueness. The pragmalinguistic approach is no exception in this regard. Reading the book of MS, one would like to draw the shared area between this approach and other ones, like reader-response criticism, canon criticism, redaction criticism and pastoral approach.

It is also true that MS relies on other scholars to distinguish between the Lukan *Sondergut* and other materials (33, n. 43). But to what extent can one justify such a distinction when considering the lengthy analysis granted by MS to the Lukan *Sondergut* in comparison to the triple tradition texts which are left with much less analysis? All the material that Luke presents, whether drawing from an unknown source, from Mark, from Q, from L, or from his own hand, is Lukan. Therefore, equal attention to all texts which mention Moses would have given equal importance to all of them, and consequently would have consolidated the good conclusions offered by MS.

The reader would also expect a broader justification of the choices made by MS on the delimitation of the analyzed texts. Why limit, for instance, the first text to Lk 2,21-24 (see also the role of 2,21 in 88-89) while the whole of Lk 24 is under scrutiny in the fourth chapter? The delimitation presented by MS of the analyzed texts is related specifically to those texts and is justified, while the harmony of the delimitations between all the texts needs more attention.

The content of the book seems to be larger than its title. MS is right in including the followers of Jesus in the dialogue with Moses. They continue biblical history, and their mission and rejection are in continuity with the mission of Moses and Jesus and their rejection (307-312). These attested facts would suggest a slight revision of the book's title in relation with its subtitle. The figure of Moses in the Lukan work would suggest a dialogue between Moses, Jesus and the disciples.

These questions and expectations do not affect the great and added value of MS' book. Every serious study on Lukan work would benefit from attentively reading this book which finds its well-deserved place in the scholarly realm of scientific Lukan studies.