

BOOK REVIEWS

Handbook for the Study of the Historical Jesus. Edited by Tom Holmén and Stanley E. Porter. 4 vols. Leiden: Brill, 2011, xxi + 3652 pp., \$1,329.00.

Tom Holmén is Adjunct Professor of New Testament Exegesis at Helsinki University and Åbo Akademi University. He previously edited *Jesus from Judaism to Christianity: Continuum Approaches to the Historical Jesus* (London: T&T Clark, 2007) and *Jesus in Continuum* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012) and is the author of several other studies on the life and teachings of the historical Jesus. Stanley E. Porter is Professor of New Testament, president, and dean at McMaster Divinity College in Hamilton, Ontario. He is the author and editor of over 65 volumes on a range of subjects within NT studies and related fields, including *The Criteria for Authenticity in Historical-Jesus Research: Previous Discussion and New Proposals* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000; rev. ed.; London: T&T Clark, 2004). The editors' purpose in compiling these essays was to create a "summa historica" of Jesus studies through the "collaboration of a legio of the best minds from across many countries and cultures," especially given the abundance of Jesus studies today "that displays an almost overwhelming diversity of methods, approaches, hypotheses, assumptions, and results" (p. xv). The editors draw attention to the fact that historical Jesus studies have exploded, going off in many different directions with a variety of agendas. Nevertheless, they maintain, it is "vital to genuinely retain the concepts of historical Jesus and historical Jesus research around which the variegated conversation centers and revolves" (p. xvi). The *Handbook* (HSHJ) was designed as a "means of handling both the growing abundance and the increasing diversity of Jesus scholarship... . The HSHJ seeks to offer a convenient, even if still circuitous, route through the maze of current historical Jesus research, so that scholars and other interested parties can appreciate the broad and diverse spectrum of current opinion" (pp. xvi–xvii). The *Handbook* aims to be thorough and inclusive; is international in scope; and does not side with any particular ideology.

Volume 1, "How to Study the Historical Jesus" (pp. i–xxi, 1–851 [851pp.]), includes 27 essays. Part One: "Contemporary Methodological Approaches" (pp. 1–616) features 18 essays, and Part Two: "Various Aspects of Historical Jesus Methodology" (pp. 617–851) is made up of 9 additional essays. Volume 2, "The Study of Jesus" (pp. i–xxi, 852–1817 [965pp.]), consists of 30 essays, including 8 essays in Part One: "The Ongoing Quest for the Historical Jesus" (pp. 852–1102), and 11 essays each in Part Two: "Current Questions of Jesus Research" (pp. 1103–1438) and Part Three: "Persisting Issues Adjacent to the Jesus-Quest" (pp. 1439–1817). Volume 3: "The Historical Jesus" (pp. i–xxi, 1818–2909 [1091pp.]), contains 35 essays, of which 11 are in Part One: "Jesus Tradition in Individual Documents" (pp. 1819–2180), 13 in Part Two: "Fundamentally about Jesus" (pp. 2181–2571), and 11 in Part Three: "Jesus and the Legacy of Israel" (pp. 2573–2909). Volume 4,

“Individual Studies” (pp. i–xxi, 2910–3468; indices 3469–3652 [742pp.]), finally, includes 19 essays. This is followed by an Index of Ancient Sources (pp. 3469–3604) and an Index of Modern Authors (pp. 3605–52). The total number of essays is 111. The introduction says there are “approximately one-hundred contributors” (p. xviii; I counted 88, including Holmén and Porter) from “around twenty different countries” (p. xviii). There is no comprehensive list of contributors, countries of origin, and current positions. Nevertheless, it is obvious by reading the essays that the editors have achieved the diversity they were seeking, with an array of both conservative and progressive scholars, and many in between. On the part of the editors, Stanley Porter contributed four essays, and Tom Holmén three. Apart from the editors, the most prolific author in the set is Colin Brown, who also contributed three essays. A handful of authors wrote two essays, including James Charlesworth and James Robinson. A select list of other noted contributors includes Dale Allison, Peter Balla, Michael Bird, Darrell Bock, Samuel Byrskog, Bruce Chilton, John J. Collins, John Dominic Crossan, James Dunn, Craig Evans, Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza, Richard T. France, Joel Green, Donald Hagner, Harold Hoehner, Richard Horsley, David Instone-Brewer, Luke Timothy Johnson, Elizabeth Struthers Malbon, Bruce Malina, Scot McKnight, John P. Meier, Teresa Okure, Grant Osborne, Rainer Riesner, D. Moody Smith, Gerd Theissen, Marianne Meye Thompson, and David Wenham. The collection would have been improved further with contributions from other major figures in the field. For example, there is no contribution by N. T. Wright. Other omissions include Burton Mack, Robert Funk, and Marcus Borg, as well as Ben Witherington, Géza Vermes, and Peter Stuhlmacher, amongst others. Nevertheless, the volumes represent an impressive array of scholarly works, both in terms of depth and breadth.

Volume 1, “How to Study the Historical Jesus,” aims to offer “easier access than before to the range of methods currently at play in historical Jesus studies” (p. xix). Authors range from those with liberal/progressive ideologies such as John Dominic Crossan and Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza to those with more conservative, evangelical postures such as Grant Osborne and Rainer Riesner. The volume also includes the major scholars one would expect to hear from on this topic, such as James Charlesworth and James Dunn. Yet while there is certainly diversity among the methodologies, there is no attempt by the editors (no doubt in an effort to remain “neutral” toward the ideologies expressed) to categorize or trace the various methodologies. The contributors are merely organized in alphabetical order with no editorial bridge or categorization. Progressive or conservative, critical or constructive, the essays are mixed together with no overarching framework, mirroring the “explosion” of Jesus studies itself (cf. p. xvi). Perhaps it would have been helpful to provide some kind of roadmap to follow, such as, for example, a progression from authors who still use traditional methods—e.g. Charlesworth (pp. 91ff.), who defends the standard criteria for determining authenticity—to those who now challenge these criteria (e.g. Allison [pp. 3ff]). Bringing some type of organizational structure to the collection would have been more in keeping with the editors’ assertion that “the future of historical Jesus study rests with the community of scholars being able to harness ... chaotic

creativity to its service, and to create order out of a morass of growing detail” (p. xvi). As it stands, however, the essays continually oscillate between non-traditional and traditional or somewhere in between. By comparison, the essays in Part Two of Volume 1 appear more controlled by the editors, judging by the parallelism of most of the titles, the fact that the authors are not arranged in strict alphabetical order, and the presence of a very appropriate concluding essay for the entire volume, exploring the “burden of proof.” Similarly, the editors may have chosen to begin Volume 1 with John P. Meier’s excellent essay “Basic Methodology” (pp. 291ff). Besides serving as a natural starting point for the rest of the essays, Meier’s presentation of a philosophy of historical study and his summary of the relevant data would sufficiently acclimatize uninitiated readers to Jesus studies from the start. Instead, Meier is buried in the middle of the pile between the essays by Kloppenborg and Pokorný.

Holmén tries to make sense of the disarray of opinions and methodologies in an essay entitled “A Metalanguage for the Historical Jesus Methods” (pp. 589ff.), which appears at the end of Part One of the volume. It is the only piece by the editors in all four volumes that seeks to summarize or interpret the collection of essays. In this essay, Holmén offers a comprehensive summary of the vocabulary and approaches employed in the previous essays, hoping to illumine in some way the diverse methods featured in the volume. He examines the authors’ contexts, their sources and handling of sources, their organization, interpretation, and so forth. This is followed by an attempted demonstration of how the contributors progress from question to answer and a proposal that Holmén’s metalanguage be adopted by the scholarly community as a way of clarifying and better understanding the contours of the plethora of methods (p. 611). Yet, as a summary, I found Holmén’s essay to be in some ways just as bewildering as the disarray of methods he was trying to clarify, even with his two (rather complicated) appendices.

Several of the essays suggest that there has developed a fair amount of skepticism toward the notion that traditional methods can offer historical “truth.” Several representative examples from Volume 1 may be cited in this regard. Allison is skeptical regarding the criteria for judging the authenticity of Jesus’ works and sayings. Charlesworth contends that 200 years of Jesus studies have shown that we cannot really know much about the past. Dunn is dissatisfied with several presuppositions that have characterized the historical study of Jesus from its inception. Horsley finds it “necessary to question and often abandon some of the basic assumptions, methods, and concepts of standard theologically based New Testament scholarship” (p. 207). Porter, likewise, questions the usefulness of the standard criteria of authenticity (p. 713). On the whole, Volume 1 covers and recovers the historical Jesus landscape so that even one who is unaware of much of the history behind Jesus studies will be educated in this regard. At the same time, readers who are uninitiated in subjects such as the history of interpretation of historical Jesus research since the Enlightenment or the Jesus Seminar would benefit by familiarizing themselves with basic components of Jesus studies before beginning to wade through these sometimes complicated essays. For the scholar, however, the essays serve as a comprehensive overview of the state of Jesus studies

to date, and the editors are hopeful that some of the contributions will even break new ground for the future. One of the newer developments is that scholars seem to be calling for a “Fourth Quest” (e.g. Baasland and Charlesworth; see also Paul Anderson, who is not included in the set). Owing to the subject matter (historiography, philosophy, methodology), readers will probably find Volume 1 the most complicated. However, it is essential reading for those who want to be able to digest the essays in the remaining volumes.

The second volume of the set, “The Study of Jesus,” focuses on Jesus research itself, looking at the past, present, and future of the discipline (Parts One and Two) as well as probing ongoing issues (Part Three). Part One (“Ongoing Quest”) focuses primarily on the past and present, containing essays that compare the present with past quests. Part Two (“Current Questions”) “brings to the fore questions that are being asked in the contemporary climate of historical Jesus studies” (p. xx). The conclusions in these essays, taking their point of departure from the past and the present, often depart from current scholarship and hope to serve as programmatic signposts for future research. Part Three (“Persisting Issues”) are those “perennial topics” that must be addressed by anyone who wishes to have an informed conversation about historical Jesus research. On the whole, Volume 2 seems to be the most diverse and representative of the current state of Jesus studies. Clive Marsh’s essay, “Diverse Agendas,” aptly illustrates this point. Marsh faces the fact that the “Quest for the historical Jesus” has never been solely about finding Jesus, but about achieving historical objectivity. He notes that, in the face of so many competing ideologies, assumptions, and philosophies, objectivity has proven elusive. That said, Volume 2 is probably the most helpful in the set for those who want to study the current landscape of historical Jesus research and learn about the future of the discipline. The volume in this sense certainly lives up to its expectation set by the editors.

The third volume “brings Jesus himself as a historical figure directly into the discussion” (p. xx). In this volume, the methodologies and trends discussed in the first two volumes are put to work in an investigation of the historical Jesus. Part One contains essays that look at Jesus as he is presented in each of the primary sources: various portions of the Synoptics, Q, Luke-Acts, John, the canonical epistles, the Gospel of Thomas, other apocryphal gospels, the patristic writings, and classical and Jewish writings. The essays in Part Two compose a critical analysis of virtually every aspect of Jesus’ life and ministry: his existence, social and topographical location in Palestine, chronology, birth, death, resurrection, family, friends, enemies, language, self-understanding, miracles, and parables. Part Three relates Jesus to Israel and contains essays placing Jesus “firmly within his Jewish context” (p. xx). Accordingly, this last collection explores topics of “Third Quest” interest such as Jesus as he is related to God, the Sabbath, the Temple, the *Shema*, and the Holy Land. Interestingly, there seems to be a shift from a more critical and progressive flavor in Part One (on the “documents”) to a more conservative stance in Part Two (“about Jesus”). The topics in this portion of the set were assigned to the contributors by the editors. Consequently, many of the authors acknowledge that their essays are based upon their earlier work or constitute summaries of it.

There seems to be general agreement that the Third Quest pursued Jesus as a strictly historical figure, as he really existed in Palestine, not in isolation off in a world of his own. Also, the authors commonly distinguish the Third Quest from theological work. However, some contributors point out that this distinction is either not strictly true or virtually impossible. Although the essays in Volume 3 are at the heart of the conclusions of Jesus studies, there do not appear to be many (if any) fresh contributions. In the main, Volume 3 features solid essays presenting the current state of Jesus scholarship.

Volume 4, finally, features several individual studies that did not fit neatly into the first three volumes. The editors intended this volume to be a sort of “catch-all” for those essays that were important to include but did not fit anywhere else. However, it seems that several of them could have been included in Volume 3 or other places in the set. For example, “Flawed Heroes” on *Gos. Thom.* 97 (p. 3023) could have easily been paired with “The Thomas-Jesus Connection” on *Gos. Thom.* 82 (p. 2059) in the section on sources in Volume 3. “Jesus and the Synagogue” (pp. 3105ff.) would have gone well alongside “Jesus and the Temple” (pp. 2635ff.) in the section placing Jesus in his Jewish environment in Volume 3. There are other examples where material in Volume 4—essays covering Jesus’ birth, life, and teachings—could have been logically placed in Volume 3 or elsewhere. Perhaps the reality is that Volume 3 was becoming too large—as it is, it is the bulkiest in the set, over 100 pages longer than Volume 2—and the editors decided to come up with another category. However, it may have been better to organize the series in such a way that Volumes 3 and 4 would have been combined under the single rubric, “The Historical Jesus,” and to place the more esoteric topics (such as “Jesus as Moving Image,” pp. 3155ff.) in a separate subcategory. In any case, the title of Volume 4, “Individual Studies,” is somewhat vague and nondescript.

While it is tempting to list my favorite essays at the conclusion of this all too brief review, I will resist such a temptation, because space is lacking to defend any such judgments. As a humble token of my appreciation for his friendship and life work, I dedicate this review to the memory of the late Harold Hoehner, long-time Professor of New Testament and director of Ph.D. Studies at Dallas Theological Seminary, whose essay on the chronology of Jesus culminates a lifetime of painstaking research in the field. Harold was personally responsible for persuading me of an AD 33 date for Jesus’ crucifixion at one of the occasions at which our sabbaticals coincided at Tyndale House in Cambridge, England.

On the whole, the above-mentioned minor quibbles notwithstanding, the *HSHJ* is an amazing resource for historical Jesus studies. The essays are not married to current trends in Jesus studies and thus will not be passé in a few years. The contributions are thought-provoking reflections on the history of the discipline, with an eye toward the future. Both the breadth and the depth of the essays are quite remarkable. The amount of research, years of scholarly dialogue and experience, and erudite command of evidence represented in these four volumes are truly impressive. Holmén and Porter styled this collection after Schweitzer’s well-known attempt to gather “the bulk of the most important (mostly German) Jesus research done during the previous two centuries ... within one cover” (p. xv).

In one respect, at least, this collection even surpasses Schweitzer's work in that at this juncture in history there is far more research in the field than could possibly be included in one volume—or even in four!

Nevertheless, although this is a wonderful set, many will find it beyond their grasp in certain respects. To begin with, the \$1,329 list price puts it out of range for most budgets (although one can find the set at a better price; at the time of writing, Amazon sells it new for \$1,036.30 plus \$3.99 shipping). Second, the complexity of many of the essays will render their content difficult to digest for the non-specialist. Most (if not all) of the essays are written on the seminary-level or higher. Readers who plow their way through the essays will find that more than mere familiarity with the NT is often required to comprehend the material and to profit from these contributions. Readers will need to be familiar with the major figures in historical Jesus research and their contributions, historical criticism, redaction and form criticism, philosophies of historiography, methodological criteria, and so forth, and in one instance they must be able to read or translate German (Kuhn). For an interested reader who wants to explore Jesus studies for the first time, reading this set is like learning to swim in the deep end of the pool. I imagine the volumes will be almost exclusively purchased by academic libraries (and be owned by a handful of scholars who offer to write a review!) but not by the average pastor or seminarian.

Andreas J. Köstenberger
Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary, Wake Forest, NC

Hermeneutics: An Introduction to Interpretive Theory. By Stanley E. Porter and Jason C. Robinson. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2011, 308 pp., \$30.00 paper.

In the work *Hermeneutics: An Introduction to Interpretive Theory*, Stanley E. Porter has collaborated with his former student Jason C. Robinson to write an introduction to recent interpretive theory in a single volume. In doing so, they survey representative scholars chronologically from Friedrich Schleiermacher to contemporary scholars such as Kevin Vanhoozer and Alan Culpepper. Porter and Robinson skillfully demonstrate the interrelatedness of disparate theories. This is a clear strength of the book. Indeed, they achieve an expressed objective of not being “an inclusive survey that runs the risk of moving too quickly over the surface of admittedly complex issues and ideas, or a specialized volume on a single topic that lacks the kind of breadth require by the topic, but a volume that provides critical analysis of (admittedly restricted) major movements and figures in hermeneutics and interpretive theory in the modern era” (p. xvi).

In the first chapter, entitled “What Is Hermeneutics?,” the authors provide an informative introduction, and then, rather unnaturally, commit a full page to preview each subsequent chapter. While an overview is important for orienting the reader, more succinct summaries in chapter 1 would have provided more space later for explaining views that are challenging to grasp. Chapter 2 introduces the reader to Friedrich Schleiermacher and Wilhelm Dilthey, who revolutionized the

landscape of hermeneutics by demonstrating the importance of considering the text not in isolation but against the backdrop of the socio-historical context of the original author, as well as the reader's participation in the "hermeneutical circle." In chapter 2 and throughout the book, the authors begin with an introduction, followed by the scholar's life and influences, various aspects of his theory, a critical appraisal of his views, and a conclusion. The sections focusing on the life and influence of each scholar are well conceived and frequently draw out personal experiences outside academia that were formative in their worldview. One notable example highlights the influence of Paul Ricoeur's experience in prison camps as "foundational for his philosophical development" (p. 107). In half of the chapters (chaps. 2-3; 9-11), two prominent representatives from similar theoretical positions are considered together, while in the other half (chaps. 4-8), a single scholar is selected.

Chapter 3 surveys the phenomenological views of Edmund Husserl and Martin Heidegger, chapter 4 the philosophical hermeneutics of Hans-Georg Gadamer, chapter 5 the hermeneutic phenomenology of Paul Ricoeur, chapter 6 Jürgen Habermas's critical hermeneutics, chapter 7 the structuralism of Daniel Patte, chapter 8 deconstruction and Jacques Derrida, chapter 9 the dialectical theology of Karl Barth and Rudolf Bultmann, chapter 10 the theological hermeneutics of Anthony Thiselton and Kevin Vanhoozer, and chapter 11 the literary hermeneutics of Alan Culpepper and Stephen Moore, followed by a brief conclusion (ch. 12), reprising the question of chapter 1 ("What Is Hermeneutics?") with additional nuancing.

I want to mention two particularly noteworthy strengths of *Hermeneutics: An Introduction to Interpretive Theory*. First, it is beneficial to have an entire work committed to a survey of hermeneutical theory. Many introductory hermeneutics books do not adequately address theoretical perspectives, often favoring a hybrid approach of surveying key exegetes and theorists in a chapter on the history of interpretation. Accentuating this strength is Porter and Robinson's allowing the surveyed views to stand independently, reserving their brief evaluations until the conclusion of each chapter. Porter and Robinson exhibit integrity and respect for each scholar rather than presenting weak arguments which would be easily refuted. This commitment is especially evident when summarizing the views of scholars such as Jacques Derrida, whose "name still prompts strong opposition and antagonism from prominent scholars who think of him as little more than a dangerous intellectual prankster" (p. 192).

Second, *Hermeneutics* strikes a balance between breadth and depth. Porter and Robinson have purposely limited the scope of their survey, beginning with Friedrich Schleiermacher (born 1768) and concluding with contemporary scholars. They also wisely determined to focus on one or two representative scholars from each perspective, thus allowing for extended discussions. Indeed, they have done remarkably well at avoiding the limitations expressed in their own evaluations of Thiselton and Vanhoozer: "Thiselton is uncompromising in his attention to the sources compared to Vanhoozer, whose language is more engaging and less directly bound to his sources. Vanhoozer is also far more entertaining ... Thiselton

provides the more sober and rigorous exposition, while Vanhoozer provides a synthetic treatment of admittedly complex notions” (p. 269). *Hermeneutics* more approximates Vanhoozer’s approach than Thiselton’s. Indeed, the synthesizing of complex notions is the greatest strength of the book. Frequently, these syntheses are then skillfully correlated with other larger movements and schools of thought. Such insights are particularly observable in the synthesis of Derrida’s complex concepts. Summary statements are regularly interjected to aid the reader in tracing the flow of thought. Derrida’s abstract notions of “logocentrism” and “*différance*” are handled with exceptional skill while avoiding simplistic generalizations.

Nevertheless, the quality of synthesis and insights in *Hermeneutics* is somewhat uneven. Despite the authors’ intentions to be “collaborative in every sense of the word” (p. xvii), there are considerable differences between the authors in breadth of knowledge and in writing styles. While the chapters on Derrida (chap. 6), Habermas (chap. 8), and others are engaging, there are chapters that lack coherence and sufficient nuancing. For instance, technical terms are used for the first time where an understanding of the concept is presumed. In chapter 5, while explaining Paul Ricoeur’s opposition to structuralism (p. 113), virtually no explanation is provided of the concept, though it is not fully addressed until two chapters later. Two pages later, Aristotle’s notion of “*emplotment*” is noted devoid of explanation. On the following page, a quote by Ricoeur is offered concerning the “*aporias* of time brought to light by phenomenology” which also lacks an explanation of the concept (p. 116). This is in contrast to the same concept, “*aporia*,” being introduced in chapter 8, but with the aid of an explanation that “*aporia* represents ‘non-passage’ or that which is ‘impassable ...’” (p. 205). While each of these three examples alone would not warrant comment, the cumulative effect of such instances, coupled with quotations of complexities not adequately synthesized, results in confusion for the reader, particularly if the target audience includes undergraduates (p. xviii).

Despite the above limitations, *Hermeneutics* would be a valuable addition as a supplemental textbook for an advanced hermeneutics course. Overall, it achieves its goal of “bringing together recent hermeneutical and interpretive thought in a single critical introductory volume” (p. xvi). An exceptional grasp of broad influences is frequently demonstrated, yet portions lacking clarity are evident.

Andrew B. Mull

Columbia International University, Columbia, SC

How to Read the Bible through the Jesus Lens. By Michael Williams. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2012, 288 pp., \$18.99 paper.

Michael Williams has taught in seminaries all around the world, has written several books and articles on the OT, and is a member of the NIV Bible translation committee. At the moment Williams is Professor of OT at Calvin Theological Seminary and his primary goal, according to his profile on the Calvin Theological Seminary page, “is to equip students with knowledge of the Old Testament and its

languages so that they may grow in their comprehension and appreciation of redemptive history.”

Williams’s focus on helping to understand the redemptive history is also seen in his new book *How to Read the Bible through the Jesus Lens*. In a short introductory chapter, he states that the Bible is often seen only in jigsaw pieces and not as a whole picture. With his book, he wants to show how every single book in the Bible contributes to the whole picture of redemptive history, which is centered on Jesus Christ. This focus on Jesus Christ the author calls the “Jesus lens.” His purpose is not to do this in an “academically detached fashion” (p.9), but more related to contemporary life. Williams describes the goal of his book as parallel to what Jesus did with the disciples on the way to Emmaus when “he explained to them what was said in all the Scriptures concerning himself” (Luke 24:27).

In order to achieve this goal, Williams has included a chapter for each biblical book. The chapters are all of equal structure and similar length. Williams begins each chapter with a general introduction to the theme and content of the biblical book. Noteworthy in the introduction part are two sections/boxes: “Theme of the Book,” which gives the theme in an intuitive and brief sentence; and “Memory Passage,” which gives a matching Scripture memory passage from the biblical book.

After the general introduction, Williams continues with the part “The Jesus Lens” and gives a possibility how the theme and the content of the book relate to Jesus Christ. In the following part, “Contemporary Implications,” Williams shows how the results of the Jesus lens are connected to the lives of contemporary Christians. The last part, “Hook Questions,” contains questions that challenge the reader to apply the contemporary implications to personal life and to communicate them to other people. In the closing chapter, Williams has included a summary table that consists of the columns “Biblical Book,” “Theme,” “Christ-Focus,” “Implications,” and “Hook,” and gives basically a brief overview of the content of all chapters.

The “Jesus Lens” part is the core of each chapter. In this part, Williams basically connects the main theme of the biblical book with the ministry, the message, or the character of Jesus Christ. This connection is plain for the NT books as they are referring directly to Jesus. For the OT books, this connection is sometimes more challenging, and Williams takes different ways to establish it. Sometimes he shows how themes of OT books lay a foundation to understand the ministry of Jesus. He also parallels or contrasts the theme of OT books with the ministry or the life of Jesus, types in the OT books that point to Jesus, and OT promises that are fulfilled in Jesus.

Williams shows in a brief and effective way how every book in the Bible points to Jesus and contributes to the whole picture of redemptive history. The simple, consistent structure of each chapter helps readers to get a good overview. The contemporary implications and the hook questions make the whole book personal and connect the message of the Bible in a challenging way with personal life and faith.

Sometimes the simplicity and uniformity of the chapters is also a disadvantage. The chapters about Esther and Isaiah, for example, are of the same length, whereas

the latter contains much more contributions to the understanding of redemptive history. Therefore, some of the richness of Scripture is not visible in Williams's book, but it is acceptable as Williams's goal is to show the big picture in a brief and clear way.

In light of the above concern, the book's title is also somewhat misleading. The cover text indicates that it "covers every book of the Bible in the tradition of the bestselling *How to Read the Bible for All its Worth*." However, the content of Williams's book has little in common with the well-known book by Gordon Fee and Douglas Stuart. Fee and Stuart give basic guidelines for the interpretation of the different biblical genres and help to develop an exegetical and hermeneutical framework. Williams never mentions his underlying interpretive framework and gives merely examples of interpretations. Furthermore, Williams's title indicates the book is a "how to" book, but he never really explains the "how to" part. Williams could improve his book at this point by adding a chapter in which he develops or explains his exegetical framework in order to give some guidelines that help readers to apply the Jesus lens on their own, which is especially challenging in OT books.

Overall, Williams's book is helpful and easily comprehensible. It could be used for personal or church Bible study to get an understanding of the big picture of redemptive history or to get personally challenged. It could also be a good complement to academic OT and NT standard introductions at the beginner's level in biblical studies.

Joachim Schmid
Columbia International University, Columbia, SC

Living God's Word: Discovering Our Place in the Great Story of Scripture. By J. Scott Duvall and J. Daniel Hays. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2012, 317 pp., \$34.99.

Living God's Word is the fourth and most recent release of a series by Duvall and Hays designed to bring classroom and church into the same neighborhood, and to bring scholarship and transformation into the same sentence. Surveying the Bible not as a collection of individual books but as the Great Story of God, this book challenges readers to consider their part in God's story with unapologetic apologetics and toe-stepping content that also provides good scholarly insight. This textbook/Bible study monograph encapsulates the stages of God's story from Genesis to Revelation into interconnected puzzle-piece-like chapters that generate interest, disclose contemporary scholarly debates, and enlighten God's big picture for mankind.

As the introductory and concluding chapters of *Living God's Word* make clear, the value of "story" in communicating the gospel cannot be overestimated in any culture, especially in today's post-modern world. Stories are memorable, captivating, self-reflecting, and appeal to all ages, genders and educational levels. So "story" has become the vital *modus operandi* for evangelism and discipleship. All persons, whether consciously or not, believe in a guiding story, a metanarrative, by which they answer life's toughest questions. The goal of this book is not merely to tell

God's Great Story, but to convince readers that this biblical story is the most reasonable and life changing story ever told, worthy of adopting as one's own personal story. *Living God's Word* is an evangelistic textbook, and a rare find among its genre.

Each chapter title in *Living God's Word* features "C-word" titles (e.g. "Creation and Crisis," [chap. 1]; "Covenant" [chap.2]; "Calling Out" [chap. 3]) as an instructional help for connecting the stories together, and each chapter is purposefully repetitive in formatting, with standard subsections reinforcing comprehension and retention for the student's benefit. For example, "Enter Here" introduces each chapter's story with a personal story from the authors' lives that makes key principles of the biblical text real and alive. The section "The Story Continues" digs deep into the biblical text, not just telling the story, but unearthing cultural, archaeological, scientific, and theological treasures, of which only well-studied scholars might otherwise be aware. "Living the Story" is powerful, challenging readers to become part of the story by applying the learned principles to their lives. Finally, each chapter ends with "Wrapping Up," a summary of the chapter and how it connects to God's Great Story.

In chapter 1, "Creation and Crisis," the stage is set, the characters introduced, and the conflict that is to become the core of God's Great Story is initiated as readers journey through the beginning chapters of Genesis. Covenant, the main theme of chapter 2, actually receives prominence throughout the entirety of God's Great Story, for Duvall and Hays see the Abrahamic covenant (chap. 2), the Davidic covenant (chap. 6, "Creation of the Kingdom"), and the new covenant of Jer 31:31–34 (chap. 16, "Church: The Coming of the Spirit") as God's central instruments of grace throughout the OT, the underlying foundations beneath his every dealing with Israel. In contrast to these unilateral covenants, the authors present the Mosaic covenant not as an instrument of grace, but a covenant of "Commandments" (chap. 4), which purposed to show Israel her need for grace and the holy character of her God.

As the first nine chapters of *Living God's Word* tell the OT story, the author's emphasis on covenant at times comes across as forced. More inherent is the parallel theme the authors mention—that of God's repeated promise to Israel that Israel will be his people and he will be their God, and he will dwell among them. The covenants all pointed toward this promise, but the commandments could not fulfill it. The prophets anticipated its fulfillment, and as Duvall and Hays point out, they still do, for the Spirit of God never returned to the temple and there was no grand restoration of Israel after the exile. Thus, God's Great Story spanned four centuries of prophetic silence with expectancy toward the NT.

In the "Interlude" (chap. 10), the authors elucidate well how the intertestamental years may have been silent, but definitely not inactive. Nations were on the move. Judaism was in developmental flux. Times were changing as God prepared the world for Jesus—his Messiah, the one who would finally be "God with us."

With good balance between detail and brevity, Duvall and Hays skillfully journey through Christ's life from manger to crucifixion to ascension in chapters

11–15. The message of the kingdom, much like covenant in the OT, becomes the uniting thread that runs through all of Jesus' life and teachings. The authors do a praiseworthy job of transporting this theme, and its all-encompassing impact, from the first century to the twenty-first century. The content and organization of these chapters place the reader in the best of college classrooms studying the Gospels. Readers will find some of the best survey material written on the life of Christ in recent days, as well as discover expositional methods and word study procedures as they reflect on the personal challenges proposed in the "Living the Story" and "Assignments" sections of these chapters.

Chapters 16–19 tell how Jesus continues God's Great Story on earth by the power of the Holy Spirit, through his church. Using the book of Acts for the layout, the authors do a masterful work of intertwining the stories of the spread of the gospel from Jerusalem to Rome with the journeys of Peter and Paul and their letters. The chronological sequence of journeys and letters is well illustrated with excellent organizational charts, maps, and dialogue boxes. One finishes these chapters with a solid understanding of the chronology and dynamics involved in Christianity becoming a major world force within only forty years. God's Great Story reaches its "Consummation" (chap. 20) with the Revelation of Jesus given to John on Patmos, thus providing a future ending that calls for followers of God's story to live godly lives of worship, even in present times of trials and tribulation.

Living God's Word is unique among biblical survey textbooks in three significant aspects: (1) its far-reaching attempt to tell the story of not just the OT or the NT, but of the entire Bible; (2) its focus on communicating to a dual audience of academia and congregation; and (3) its purpose to educate both the reader's head and heart. While each of these aspects brings strength to the work, they also cause weakness. When the task is such a grand one, the scales tend to tip either one way or the other. For example, the authors are especially skillful in choreographing the life of Jesus and the writings of Paul to both scholarship and application, but if the same extensiveness of content reflected in the chapters on Jesus and Paul had been utilized throughout the earlier chapters of the book, the entire work would have been a stronger effort as a scholarly textbook. Again, while *Living God's Word* achieves the scholarly requirements of a college textbook, there are sections where the authors appear to be also reaching out to the postmodern churchgoer, and the language is more colloquial than professional. Where the content is more brief, it may need to be augmented with other sources in a classroom setting. Overall, *Living God's Word* is a unique, evangelistic textbook, well written and commendable for both classroom and congregation.

Peter A. Guinther
Columbia International University, Columbia SC

Exodus: An Exegetical Commentary. By Victor P. Hamilton. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2011, 721 pp., \$54.99.

Readers of the *Journal* have no doubt benefitted from Victor Hamilton's other works *Handbook on the Pentateuch* (Baker, 2d ed. 2005), and *Handbook on the Historical Books* (Baker, 2008). The appearance of his latest work, a full-length commentary on the book of Exodus, is thus a welcome sight.

Hamilton structures his commentary by dividing the book of Exodus into seven parts: "Part 1: Oppression in Egypt" (1:1–6:1); "Part 2: Liberation from Egypt" (6:2–15:21); "Part 3: Testing Time in the Wilderness" (15:22–18:27); "Part 4: Covenant and Law at Sinai" (19:1–24:18); "Part 5: How to Build the Tabernacle" (25:1–31:18); "Part 6: The Golden Calf and Covenant Renewal" (32:1–34:35); and "Part 7: Tabernacle Built, God's Glory Fills" (35:1–40:38). After a disappointingly short introduction (8 pages), he offers his own translation of the exegetical portion, followed by sections entitled "Grammatical and Lexical Notes" and "Commentary."

Hamilton's translation is careful and often preserves idiomatic expressions. "Grammatical and Lexical Notes," a treasure trove of detailed exegetical observations (printed in a small font, all in transliterated Hebrew), range freely among lexicography, grammar, syntax, literary observations (i.e. plays on words, irony, etc.), and parallels from the ancient Near East. The "Commentary" section proceeds verse by verse and offers wit, spiritual sensitivity, and careful interpretation. Hamilton consistently defends historicity, as in the details surrounding Moses' birth (he downplays the Moses/Sargon parallels) and the large numbers leaving Egypt. Hamilton's knowledge of the ancient Near East and its scholarship is impressive; his "Works Cited" list, though not exhaustive, numbers over 40 pages of small print. However, his attention to detail has a drawback. He is much better at analyzing the trees than he is at describing the forest; there are few comments devoted to how the book of Exodus hangs together and creates a theological narrative. For this, one should consult Enns (*Exodus*; NIV Application Commentary) or Fretheim (*Exodus*; Interpretation). Nevertheless, Hamilton's comments place Exodus squarely in the historical and linguistic setting of the ancient Near East, and in today's climate of literary commentary, which rarely leaves the "textual world," this is refreshing. The volume also has author, Scripture, and subject indexes.

Hamilton is at his best when he draws upon his vast knowledge of the ancient Near East and of the Hebrew Bible. His treatment of the slave laws in 21:1–11 illustrates both points. He first discusses scholarship that contrasts the Hebrew slave laws with slave laws in other legal corpora from the ancient Near East (e.g. the codes of Eshnunna and Hammurabi, the Hittite laws, and the Middle Assyrian laws). He disputes that the Hebrew slave laws are always more humane. But then, he argues, based on intercanonical allusions and parallels, that "the OT attempts, through its slave laws, to dissuade Israelites from the practice of slavery" (p. 372). He bases his argument on the slave law in Deut 23:15–16, where Israelites are not required to return a runaway slave to his owner; and (following Sternberg) on the

language used in the Exodus slave laws and the description of Joseph's experience of slavery in Egypt in the book of Genesis, that is, for an Israelite to own a slave puts him in the stigmatized position of being an Egyptian slave owner. Under these two conditions, the institution of slavery in ancient Israel cannot prosper. It is this kind of awareness in Hamilton's commentary, awareness of scholarship, ancient Near Eastern parallels, and of Hebrew vocabulary and syntax, that makes his work truly informative to read.

Several issues of interpretational importance in Exodus deserve special comment. First, how does Hamilton understand the concept of Yahweh hardening Pharaoh's heart? Throughout the narrative of Exodus 4–14, he carefully avoids making any comment on the issue, saving his thoughts for "An Excursus on Heart Hardening" (pp. 170–74). Here he addresses the topic squarely, acknowledging that both "electionists" and "voluntarists" would "like to make a watertight case ... from their reading of these Scriptures.... In my judgment, neither goal is possible" (p. 170). He follows with twelve of his own "observations" that I will summarize: (1) Moses does not react to God's statement that he will harden Pharaoh's heart. (2) The frequency of "hardness language" in Exodus 4–14 contrasts with its rarity elsewhere. He provides a helpful chart which contrasts the three main verbs, *kābēd*, *hāzaq* and *qāšā*, noting tense and subject. (3) God can also "move/stir" a person's heart. (4) In Exodus 4–14, Yahweh is the subject of the hardening language fifty percent of the time, and Pharaoh or Pharaoh's heart is the subject the other fifty percent. (5) Between God's intention to harden Pharaoh's heart (4:21) and God actually doing the hardening (9:12), the text describes Pharaoh hardening his own heart (8:15, 32). (6) After the Lord hardens Pharaoh's heart, Pharaoh is still able to harden his own heart, which implies the "ability to act of his own accord." (7) Some of the hardening passages mention that God can multiply signs and wonders in Egypt because of Pharaoh's refusals. (8) God (and/or Moses) is never fooled by Pharaoh. Their disposition always seems to be to give Pharaoh repeated opportunities to repent. (9) "We must not downplay the importance of divine sovereignty at work in this unit of Scripture" (p. 173). Hamilton acknowledges Paul's use of this concept in Romans 9–11 with regard to Israel, but argues in both instances that hardening is used redemptively. (10) One should not draw the inference that this is how God deals with everybody. (11) Hamilton makes a case, based especially on "if" language, for at least some measure of free will. (12) He lists seven ways in which God sought to soften Pharaoh's heart. In summary, Hamilton presents a careful, restrained, conservative Arminian reading of the hardening passages in Exodus. In this he contrasts with Fretheim's emphasis on divine openness and Enns's strong Reformed reading of the narrative.

Second, how does Hamilton understand the Christian's relationship to OT law? In his ten page introduction to the Ten Commandments, he does not address the issue. Instead, he deals with the importance of the Decalogue, the relationship between the Decalogue in Exodus and in Deuteronomy, Hebrew grammar and syntax, the characteristics of and differences between apodictic and casuistic law, who is addressed in the Decalogue, and the relationship between law and covenant. He wants to root God's commands in Creation as well as in Sinai, which sounds

like the beginnings of natural law. But I did not find a systematic discussion of how a NT believer should relate to OT law. His commentary on the individual commandments implies that they (the laws, not necessarily the punishments) apply to a new covenant believer with only minor adjustments.

Third, how does Hamilton deal with the details of the tabernacle? Most readers are probably familiar with the debate. At one end of the spectrum, some interpreters see typology at work in even insignificant details of the tabernacle (examples abound!); interpreters at the other end see fulfillment only in broad theological categories (Enns is an example). A mediating position might be those who are comfortable identifying details as symbolic or typological only if the NT writers also make the identification. In his brief introduction to the tabernacle section, Hamilton does not discuss this controversy. Instead, he places the tabernacle and its narrative in the context of the ancient Near East—for example, the temple instructions given by the god Ningirsu to Gudea, king of Lagash; Enlil's temple instructions to King Samsuiluna of Babylon; and the Ugaritic text in which Asherah, on behalf of Baal, asks El for permission to build a palace. He notes that most of those parallels come from the third and second millennia BC, though the tabernacle, by comparison, is a modest structure. But Hamilton is more interested in placing the tabernacle in its contextual and canonical context. Like Enns and Fretheim, Hamilton sees the tabernacle as an extension of the Sinai experience and as an echo of the creation narrative in Genesis. In terms of typology, he leads by example. Most of his comments explain or expand the minimal instructions given in the text. He does offer an extended discussion of the veil before the holy place, but that is because the Synoptic Gospels and Hebrews refer to it. I found almost no discussion of symbolism. Hamilton is an example of “restrained” tabernacle interpretation.

In summary, then, Hamilton has produced an informed and disciplined commentary on the book of Exodus that emphasizes the historical and linguistic contexts of the ancient Near East and the Hebrew Bible, and for these reasons, I recommend it.

John C. Crutchfield
Columbia International University, Columbia, SC

Ecclesiastes. By James Bollhagen. Concordia Commentary. St. Louis: Concordia, 2011, 475 pp., \$49.99.

Ecclesiastes is a book of the OT that has generated a variety of views on just about every issue related to the book, including the message of the book. Thus, writing a commentary on *Ecclesiastes* is difficult because one has to navigate so many different views. Moreover, reviewing a commentary on *Ecclesiastes* is also difficult because so many points of potential disagreement emerge. This particular commentary takes a conservative, confessional approach from a Lutheran perspective. It is a substantial commentary (over 400 pages); each section of the

text includes a translation, detailed comments on the Hebrew, and then commentary on the meaning of the text.

One of the difficulties in comprehending the message of Ecclesiastes is how to understand the negative, seemingly unorthodox statements in the book (1:17–18; 2:16–17; 3:19–21; 7:15–18; 8:17; 9:1–2). Bollhagen argues that Solomon, called Qohelet, wrote Ecclesiastes late in his life as a repentant old man who speaks of the time when he turned away from the wisdom of the fear of the Lord (1 Kings 11). By connecting the book to this period of Solomon's life, the negative statements of the book are emphasized to some degree. The key word *hebel* is understood to refer to the futility of human effort and is an assessment of life lived apart from God under the sun. The opening poem of the book (1:3–11) stresses the purposeless, monotonous activity of the natural elements described. There is also the recognition that Solomon's pursuit of pleasure (2:1–11) is entered into vigorously, but that it fails because Solomon was pursuing wisdom as a purely human endeavor apart from God. This type of wisdom is limited (2:12–17) and ultimately fails. In the first several chapters of the book, the world is described as if God was not in the picture. Thus, labor is examined from a secular perspective (2:18–22) and a strictly observational point of view leads to the conclusion that humans are no different than animals (3:19).

A change seems to occur beginning in chapter 5. Twice in the introduction to this section the author comments that “up to this point” (p. 187) or “all during the first four chapters” (p. 188), the issue has been what the world looks like apart from God. But chapter 5 shows that Solomon has also learned through repentance the true meaning of the fear of God (5:1–7). From this point on, there is a more positive assessment of passages that could also be understood negatively from an under the sun approach. For example, in 5:18–20, where Qohelet states that the limited benefits that come from labor are to keep a person preoccupied so he does not think about his purposeless life, Bollhagen understands the meaning to be that God gives people little problems to deal with so that God can take care of the bigger things in life. In 7:15–18, where Qohelet could be understood as denying the clear distinction of the two ways of righteousness and wickedness, Bollhagen comments that Qohelet is drawing practical conclusions concerning the everyday life of faith. In 9:1–6, where being in the hand of God does not really make any difference for the righteous because the same fate awaits both the righteous and the wicked, Bollhagen argues that the message is clear that people should put their trust in God for this life and the life to come. And in 9:10, where Qohelet denies that there is any activity after this earthly life is over, Bollhagen understands the text to mean that the person who looks forward to a life in heaven will make the most of this life out of gratitude to God. Thus the negative “under the sun” approach almost disappears after 5:1–7.

Although the negative approach to life without God is emphasized in the first part of the book of Ecclesiastes, there are also very positive statements—what might be called an “above the sun” perspective—mixed into the comments. Some of these come in quotes from the Church fathers. Sometimes an above the sun approach is appropriately given at the very end of a section, such as the comment

made at the end of 2:9–11: “Only when the very last ray of earthly hope has been abolished will he turn to the Hope above” (p. 99). Such positive statements, however, also begin to make their way into the discussion without distinguishing the original meaning of the text from the contrasting above the sun view. For example, the enigmatic phrase in 3:15, “God seeks out what has been chased away” is understood in terms of the law/gospel paradigm where the human heart is driven to repentance by the ugly things of life. These type of comments become stronger and more frequent after 5:1–7. Ecclesiastes 7:11 speaks of two kingdom theology, 8:15 speaks of justification by faith, and 9:8 produces a discussion of the sacraments and the theology of the cross. Although there is an attempt to identify discussions of theology with icons in the margin, this is not always consistent. The problem is not that these topics of theology are discussed, but that the impression is given that they are part of the original meaning of the text. A more conscious distinction between original meaning and modern meaning would bring clarity to the discussion.

The rationale for the division of the text is also not always clear. For example, instead of covering 8:10–17 as one unit, it is divided into 8:10–13 and 8:14–17, with the same heading “Weighing the Advantages of Wisdom Over Folly” covering both units, which are differentiated as Part 1 and Part 2. By separating 8:13 from 8:14, a positive understanding can be given to 8:10–13, with 8:12b–13 seen as a statement of faith affirmed by Qohelet. However, if 8:14 is added to 8:13, then the positive statements of 8:12b–13 do not win the day because they are followed by the negative perspective of 8:14. Thus the division of the text will affect one’s interpretation of the text.

A few other distinctions would also be helpful in analyzing the message of Ecclesiastes. For example, emphasizing the distinction between the third person narrative frame (1:1–11; 12:8–14) and the first-person discourse (1:12–12:7) opens up further discussions concerning the relationship of the epilogue to the rest of the book. The distinction between “profit” and “portion” shows that the calls to enjoyment, such as 2:24–26, are not the answer of faith but are the only “portion” one can expect in this life when there is no profit to labor (1:3; 2:10–11).

A final note is that not many in the academy will be convinced Solomon is the author unless the character of the Hebrew is addressed more substantially. However, “when all has been heard,” we can be thankful for a commentary that interacts with the Hebrew at such a deep level, that does not always gloss over the negative statements of the book, and that seeks to relate the book of Ecclesiastes to theology.

Richard P. Belcher, Jr.
Reformed Theological Seminary, Charlotte, NC

The Message of the Prophets. By J. Daniel Hays. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2010, 376 pp., \$44.99.

This was an easy book to read and it is even easier to recommend. Hays describes his work as “an introductory survey” whose “primary focus is on ... the *message* of the prophets” (p. 16, his emphasis). The volume is heavy, with thick glossy pages, beautiful full-color photographs, and many helpful sidebars. Each page has at least one pull-quote with a full-color scroll graphic in the outside margin, and most pages also have a photo, chart, sidebar, or other graphic. This gives each page a pleasing, textured look (though I didn’t care for the shadow font used in the sidebars). I found only seven two-page spreads that did not have a color photo or other graphic. One minor complaint: I wish publishers would place sidebars at naturally occurring breaks; this would allow a reader to read text and sidebars without interruption. Each of the twenty-seven chapters ends with a brief bibliography, discussion questions, and suggested writing assignments.

In Part 1 (“The Big Picture,” about 70 pages), Hays devotes five chapters to introductory matters. Chapter 1, “Prophets and Prophecy,” includes a helpful review of the controversy surrounding the authorship of prophetic books. Chapter 2, “The Prophets in History,” situates the ministries of the prophets in their ANE context as well as within the Bible’s storyline. Chapter 3, “The Literature of the Prophets,” surveys the genre and poetic features of the prophets’ language. Chapter 4 outlines the basic features of the prophetic message, noting the contributions of, and differences among, the standard and non-standard pre-exilic prophets, and the postexilic prophets and Daniel. Chapter 5 addresses the difficulties involved in interpreting the prophets, which include the land, the prophetic perspective, conditional prophecy, figurative language, Israel/Church issues, and the nature of the Kingdom. Hays concludes this chapter with a helpful review of the major eschatological interpretive systems.

In Part 2 (about 160 pages), Hays covers “The Major Prophets,” which include Isaiah and Jeremiah (four chapters each), Ezekiel (three chapters), and Daniel (two chapters). He begins his treatment of Isaiah with a discussion of authorship, noting that among non-evangelicals, the old three-author consensus has yielded to a new emphasis on the theological and literary unity of the book, and that among evangelicals, many remain divided between a single, eighth-century author or a gradual creation/revision process lasting several hundred years. He does not state his own opinion on the matter. He divides the book into three main parts: chapters 1–39; chapters 40–55; and chapters 56–66. His method is to move through the text in sections, summarizing the message as a whole and drawing attention to important features either in the main text or in sidebars. He understands chapters 1–39 as judgment with glimpses of deliverance; chapters 40–55 as deliverance and restoration (through the Servant) with glimpses of judgment; and chapters 56–66 as demanding righteous living from the Lord’s people. Helpful sidebars include “Theophany,” “Zion,” “NT Connection: The Virgin Birth,” “The Remnant,” “The New Exodus,” and “Who is the Servant of Yahweh?” (There appears to be a map missing on page 127.)

Jeremiah is well covered. Hays calls the book an anthology, and discusses the differences between the MT and LXX manuscripts. He admits to the common difficulty of outlining Jeremiah, and divides the book into four major sections: 1–29, 30–33, 34–45, and 46–51. He provides several excellent sidebars. One on the Hebrew verb *shuv* discusses the semantic range of this important verb in Jeremiah; another, a full two pages, answers the question, “What Happened to the Ark of the Covenant?” (Hays suggests it was captured and destroyed by the Babylonians.) Another discusses the chronology of Jeremiah’s “seventy years of exile.” A full-page chart demonstrates how the judgments of chapters 1–29 are reversed in chapters 30–33. He devotes an entire page to how Rachel’s weeping relates to Herod and the babies in Bethlehem. Two other important sidebars are devoted to Baruch the scribe and Ebed-melech, though I was disappointed not to find a sidebar devoted to Jeremiah’s “Confessions.” The last chapter on Jeremiah (chap. 13) also includes a brief discussion of the book of Lamentations.

Hays covers Ezekiel in the next three chapters. He notes Ezekiel’s emphasis on two themes: the sovereignty and glory of Yahweh (“that you may know that I am Yahweh”) and on the presence of Yahweh. He divides the book into three parts: chapters 1–24 (judgment with glimpses of deliverance); chapters 25–32 (oracles against the nations); and chapters 33–48 (the glorious restoration, especially the new temple). Important sidebars include: “Cherubim, Seraphim, and the Four Living Creatures”; the city of Tyre; “Shepherd Imagery in the Prophets”; “Who is Gog and Where in the World is Magog?”; and the new temple.

The book of Daniel easily divides into two parts: narrative (chaps. 1–6) and apocalyptic (chaps. 7–12). And this is how Hays treats the book as well. He accepts the sixth-century BC provenance, though he acknowledges that non-evangelical (and some evangelical) scholarship does not accept this conclusion. The central theme of chapters 1–6 is God’s superiority to the monarchs of Babylon and Persia; the central theme of chapters 7–12 is the future of God’s kingdom among the kingdoms of the world. An interesting sidebar is “Daniel 7 and the European Union?”

Part 3 (about 110 pages) covers the Book of the Twelve. Hays first introduces the concept of the “Minor Prophets” constituting a single “book,” and he summarizes some of the themes used to make this point. He concludes that the Book of the Twelve “should be read as a literary unit without denying the complex and varying devices that make this anthology hold together” (p. 263). Half of the prophets get their own chapter; Obadiah is treated with Jonah, Nahum with Habakkuk, and Haggai with Malachi. Hays discusses the structure, message, and distinctives of each prophet. Helpful sidebars include: “The Dangers of Syncretism” and “Hesed” (Hosea); “The Day of Yahweh” and “The Spirit of Yahweh” (Joel); “The Great Fish and Miracles in the Bible” (Jonah); and “NT Connection: Elijah, John the Baptist, and Jesus” (Malachi).

The only weakness of this volume concerns its lack of interaction with scholarship and the history of interpretation. There are few footnotes, only brief bibliographies, and little discussion of the major junctures in the history of the interpretation of the prophets. Readers interested in these topics should probably

consult Gordon McConville's *Exploring the Old Testament, Volume 4: A Guide to the Prophetic Books* (InterVarsity, 2002) or the new *Dictionary of the OT: Prophets* (InterVarsity, 2012). To be fair, this was not within Hays's stated purpose, but many of us who use books like this (in teaching) expect such things. Nevertheless, this relatively minor shortcoming should not deny the obvious: Hays effectively introduces the prophetic books, summarizes the structure, message, and distinctive characteristics of each prophet from an evangelical perspective, and pays attention to canonical issues, all in a very readable and visually stunning volume.

John C. Crutchfield
Columbia International University, Columbia, SC

Addiction and Virtue: Beyond the Models of Disease and Choice. By Kent Dunnington. Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 2011, 194 pp., \$30.00 paper.

In his relatively short book, Kent Dunnington gives us a serious and thoughtful new look at both addiction and virtue, leading to what he hopes will be a new model for both chemical dependency treatment and spiritual formation. Dunnington's book is unique in that it engages and critiques the dominant (medical) treatment paradigm from the vantage points of philosophy and theology—not psychology, psychiatry, or social work.

Drawing from Aristotle and Aquinas, Dunnington clearly lays out the concept of habit, showing how “addicts” progressively get themselves deeper and deeper into the practice of behaviors that are finally destructive. Dunnington argues that none of this is biologically determined, and that the “addict” is finally snared by the cumulative effect of his or her own sinful choices over time. Dunnington argues (pp. 61–81) that this progressive formation of powerful habits is a more accurate rendering of what is actually going on in the life of the “addict” than invoking a deterministic disease model (pp. 15–27).

By primarily relying on philosophical analysis, Dunnington sometimes gets so deeply involved in arguments of logical necessity and possibility that he misses some of the clinical realities of dealing with addicts and their addictions. Those who have worked in chemical dependency treatment centers will readily affirm that there are addictions, and then there are *addictions*.

For those who look to pornography, serial affairs, or gambling for a daily “spark,” a means of fulfillment for their day, Dunnington's model of progressive, increasingly powerful habit is helpful, and is indeed a more accurate rendering of what is actually occurring than a biological disease model. Given consistent help of God and others, these individuals can learn to make right turns toward the good, and repeatedly turn away from what is wrong and destructive. When these “addicts” consistently start making good choices, and thus begin developing virtues instead of vices, they can then get free and stay free of their “addictions” (bad habits).

However, Dunnington appears to miss that these behavioral “addictions” are in a different category from addicts who are sweating profusely and shaking

violently because they desperately need a “fix.” These sweating, shaking individuals really are *biologically addicted* to an opiate or some other substance, and will most likely need intensive medical treatment as a *first step* toward recovery. Some addictions radically change brain structures and chemistry (particularly dopamine channels and receptors). Crack babies are born addicted, and many individuals are born with the abnormal brain structure and chemistry that powerfully predispose them to an alcohol or substance addiction. Even light, casual use will likely cause them to become addicted.

Also, as Dunnington mentions, but merely touches upon several times in his book, there is the issue of personal trauma. In some major cities, up to 85% of all the young women who are in chemical dependency units have been sexually abused. To focus first or primarily upon their alcohol or chemical use is to miss the essence of what is occurring. The underlying trauma must be acknowledged and be treated—at least in a rudimentary way—before chemical dependency treatment (using anyone’s model) is likely to be successful.

Attempting to do some “conceptual ground clearing” (p. 16), Dunnington argues that not everyone’s experience conforms to the medical model, and that clinical outcomes are not always convincing, or the same (pp. 24–27). This is true, but the author over-extends his argument. Part of what he misses is that the social sciences do not primarily function on the basis of logical necessity or possibility, but on the basis of probability (e.g. statistical significance and confidence intervals: what is likely to occur 95% of the time or more). Most physicians and psychologists care less about satisfying philosophical arguments and more about clinical outcomes in the lives of their patients/clients. Those who are trained empirically will say, “Don’t *tell* me you have a better model; *show* me you have a better model through large-scale controlled research, with random assignment, clearly defined and monitored treatments, repeated and valid measurements.” If anyone can show better measurable outcomes over time, he or she usually has a large and eager audience. This is not to say Dunnington’s “habit” model could not stand up to an empirical challenge, at least for certain types of behavioral “addictions.” This caution flag is raised only to point out that the hard work of confirmation has yet to be done.

Having said that, it is important to affirm the substantive value of Dunnington’s main points: that there are very serious conceptual and practical flaws in the unbounded biological determinism of the medical model, as well as over-emphasizing the pure moral choice model (i.e. the notion that those who are addicted to anything are simply “morally depraved” individuals). We should be open to other models. The concept of *habit* derived from Aristotle and Aquinas is indeed helpful in understanding how we get from intentional voluntary action to compulsive behaviors in our lives. Many compulsive “sins” fit this pattern, as do “virtues” that are practiced consistently. We must never rule out rigorous medical treatment of true biologically-based addictions, but even after successful medical intervention, there remain the issues of daily life and habit formation to which we all must give attention. As Dunnington points out, humans are built to live by habit

much of the time; it is only a question as to how this inherent tendency will manifest itself across the span of our lives.

Dunnington writes that modern men and women are so prone to addiction precisely because they have lost their sense of the Transcendent. Quoting Augustine, Dunnington (p. 158) writes that we all yearn for the “ecstatic intoxication” that comes from union with God. Addictions are then merely empty, inadequate substitutes, leading to a false worship. In his final chapter, Dunnington (p. 178) writes that in the church we need to clearly distinguish between the false worship we see active in addictions and the true worship of God. Helping to persuade addicted believers to give up their *inordinate affections* and reorient themselves toward “the Lover of their souls” can help them develop the consistent motivation and strength they must have in order to form the new and better habits they obviously need.

For the believer, true, consistent, habitual worship of God is the answer to many things in life. It can ease our core loneliness and help give our lives purpose. It can help eliminate our bad habits, and it can even help us overcome biological addictions, once all necessary medical treatments are received, personal trauma is addressed, and social networks are rebuilt. We are indeed moral and spiritual beings, but we are also physical, mental/emotional, and social/relational beings. Holding all these in proper balance is a most challenging task for all of us who make our living teaching, helping, and treating human beings.

Stephen H. Farra

Columbia International University, Columbia, SC

Revisiting the Corruption of the New Testament: Manuscript, Patristic, and Apocryphal Evidence. Edited by Daniel B. Wallace. Text and Canon of the New Testament 1. Grand Rapids: Kregel, 2011, 284 pp., \$29.99 paper.

Representing the initial volume of a series on the text and canon of the NT, Wallace presents a collection of essays dealing specifically with textual criticism and addresses, directly or indirectly, issues raised in Bart Ehrman’s *The Orthodox Corruption of Scripture* (2d ed.; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011). Wallace includes the work of five of his former students from Dallas Theological Seminary. The collection is timely as it coincides with Ehrman’s updated edition of *Orthodox Corruption*.

In chapter 1 “Lost in Transmission,” Wallace begins the collection with a broad ranging essay. He starts by pointing out areas of agreement and disagreement with Ehrman over large-scale issues in NT textual criticism. His point of departure with Ehrman occurs with the interpretation of how variants arose and their significance. Warning against two extreme attitudes that are not helpful for the task—absolute certainty and total despair—Wallace frames the debate by asking three questions that drive the rest of his essay: What is the number of variants? What is the nature of variants? What theological issues are at stake? It is at this point that Wallace is at his strongest, as he indicates that text-critical scholars all

deal with the same data but interpret that data in different ways. As to the number of variants, Wallace shows that the seemingly high number of variants is the result of the large number of extant manuscripts. As to the nature of variants, Wallace demonstrates that variants that are both meaningful and viable total less than 1 percent. Lastly, Wallace concludes that the theological issues at stake are often overblown by Ehrman, who turns mere possibility into stark certainty. Wallace concludes his chapter by arguing that the process of copying was prone to changes due more to scribal harmonization than to the control and conspiracy model proposed by Ehrman in his more popular works.

Points of very minor critique may be offered for this overall convincing essay. First, Wallace often appeals to Ehrman's *Misquoting Jesus* (New York: HarperSanFrancisco, 2005) in his narrative footnotes in this essay. The reason for this emphasis no doubt stems from the non-specialist audience for whom this lecture was initially prepared, as Wallace admits in the preface. The essay, however, feels a little out of place as it revisits *Misquoting Jesus*. Second, Wallace spends nearly thirty pages *against* Ehrman and only five *for* the reliability of the NT. Once again, this emphasis more than likely stems from the fact that the original lecture was delivered in a point-counterpoint forum. This imbalance, however, gives the essay a reactionary feel that could benefit from more balance.

In chapter 2 "The Least Orthodox Reading Is To Be Preferred," Philip M. Miller devotes his essay to the oft-used but not formally adopted canon of textual criticism that the least orthodox reading is to be preferred, what he calls the "canon of unorthodoxy." Miller argues that while Ehrman denies the implicit canon's influence, his method and resulting textual decisions seem to indicate otherwise. After a survey of the historical backdrop of the canon of unorthodoxy, Miller examines Ehrman's method by looking at specific examples in-depth and others at a glance. In order to demonstrate Ehrman's use of the canon of unorthodoxy, Miller shows how Ehrman gives more weight to internal evidence even when external evidence seems determinative. Miller also shows how Ehrman defaults to the canon of unorthodoxy even when other simpler explanations for textual changes are present. Miller is strongest in his analysis of Heb 2:9b, in which he clearly exposes Ehrman's use of the canon of unorthodoxy. Miller concludes that the canon of unorthodoxy is not viable *by itself* for determining the preferred reading.

In chapter 3 "The Legacy of a Letter," Matthew P. Morgan brings the importance of knowledge of manuscripts to the forefront of his discussion on the absence or presence of the definite article in John 1:1c. Two eighth-century witnesses read καὶ ὁ θεὸς ἦν ὁ λόγος instead of καὶ θεὸς ἦν ὁ λόγος—L019 and W032^{sup}. Morgan convincingly demonstrates that these two manuscripts are unrelated genealogically. The addition of the article in these manuscripts thus represents a sub-singular reading. He also shows that the addition of the article in L019 was a scribal blunder, not a theologically motivated change against Sabellian claims. Turning from external evidence, Morgan concludes his analysis by showing how the addition of the article represents an extremely rare grammatical form. Morgan's strength in this essay is his ability to show how theological motivation is

not at play in this seemingly theologically loaded sub-singular reading. At a point in the text where a theologically motivated variant would be expected, scribal carelessness is the most compelling explanation for the variant reading.

In chapter 4 “Patristic Theology and Recension in Matthew 24:36,” Adam G. Messer takes on the “granddaddy of them all” in his chapter on Ehrman’s go-to variant to demonstrate orthodox corruption—Matt 24:36. External and internal considerations for reconstructing an “original” text leave room for argument for both the inclusion and exclusion of οὐδὲ ὁ υἱός. Messer, therefore, turns to patristic evidence to find some clarity. Messer finds no incontrovertible evidence that the Church fathers’ writings contained the omission of Matt 24:36 prior to AD 350. The omission, therefore, seems to have not existed in the Fathers’ writings prior to the Arian controversies. Further, Messer argues that if there were an orthodox corruption at this point in Matthew, the most logical change would be the removal of μόνος at the end of the verse, since this change would have guarded against all heresies at the time and would have kept the verse “harmonized” with the text of Mark 13:32. The removal of οὐδὲ ὁ υἱός could have aided Modalists. The strength of Messer’s essay lies in its offering of a more complete explanation of the historical circumstances surrounding this difficult variant.

Providing a brief respite from critique of Ehrman’s works, in chapter 5 “Tracking Thomas,” Tim Ricchuiti devotes his essay to an exhaustive comparison of the Greek fragments of the Gospel of Thomas to the Coptic manuscript containing a larger portion of the text. Using standard canons of NT textual criticism, his hope is to show that the Greek fragments represent an earlier textual strain than the Coptic and that changes between them represent a theological corruption of the text. Ricchuiti first compares P. Oxy. 654 against the Coptic, then P. Oxy. 1, and lastly P. Oxy. 655. Ricchuiti finds that both P. Oxy. 654 and 655 enjoy primacy in regard to the Coptic text. P. Oxy. 1, however, has a tendency toward expansion and represents a secondary strain in comparison to the Coptic text. Ricchuiti concludes that the Coptic scribe preferred secondary readings to theologically difficult readings and tended to alter the text to make it more desirable in its community. Ricchuiti’s essay demonstrates how useful NT textual criticism criteria can be when analyzing extra-biblical texts. Indeed he has possibly discovered a (Gnostic) orthodox corruption of the text of the Gospel of Thomas.

In the final essay of the collection, chapter 6 “Jesus as ΘΕΟΣ,” Brian J. Wright seeks an answer to the question of when the title θεός is first attributed to Jesus, as it is mostly absent in earliest Christianity. As such, he examines in detail the textual character of seven passages that possibly ascribe the title θεός to Jesus—John 1:1, 1:18, 20:28; Acts 20:28; Gal 2:20; Heb 1:8; and 2 Pet 1:1. John 20:28 serves as his primary example with the others directly or indirectly confirming the use of θεός as a title for Jesus. Wright concludes that the ascription of θεός to Jesus first occurred in the first century, not the fourth with Constantine, the third with the combating of Arianism, or even the second with possible subapostolic distortion of the apostolic *kerygma*.

The major strength of this work can be found in its demonstration of how Ehrman’s overarching thesis that the NT was intentionally changed by orthodox

scribes to make it both more appealing to orthodox groups and less appealing to heterodox groups may be found lacking when more detailed analysis is done. While Ehrman's work has driven the textual criticism discussion for years, alternate theories pushing back on the conspiracy and control model of Walter Bauer and Ehrman are certainly welcome. Theological motivation may be at play in changes to the text, but we must exhaust all possible explanations before we give the criterion consideration.

A possible weakness in the work stems from its reactionary feel. The essays mainly respond to and interact with Ehrman's scholarly and popular works. Ehrman has no doubt brought the discipline of NT textual criticism back from the depths of oblivion. At some point, however, evangelical scholarship needs to be driving the discussion and not simply react.

Matthew Solomon
New Orleans Baptist Theological Seminary, New Orleans, LA

Did Jesus Exist? The Historical Argument for Jesus of Nazareth. By Bart D. Ehrman. New York: HarperOne, 2012, vi + 361 pp., \$26.99.

In his extensive writings, lectures, and media appearances, Bart Ehrman has enthusiastically announced the unreliability of the New Testament to the general public. Yet according to Ehrman, some have misunderstood him. There is a small but loud group of people who believe Jesus is nothing but a myth ("mythicists"), and some within this group have tried to claim Ehrman as one of their own. *Did Jesus Exist?* is Ehrman's attempt to set the record straight: He is not a mythicist. Somewhat ironically, Ehrman is out to win over "seekers": "What I do hope is to convince seekers who really want to know how we know that Jesus did exist, as virtually every scholar in antiquity, of biblical studies, of classics, and of Christian origins in the country and, in fact, in the Western world agrees" (p. 4).

In part 1, Ehrman provides evidence for the historical Jesus. He begins by giving a brief introduction to the mythicists' views and their various arguments. He notes that most biblical scholars do not even take the mythicists serious enough to offer much of a response. However, Ehrman thinks the more competent mythicists (e.g. G. A. Wells and Robert Price) should be taken seriously. According to Ehrman, the more serious mythicist authors have been to some degree tarnished by the writings of mythicists who offer sensational claims and fail to get even some of the most basic facts correct. He provides several lists that note some of the more grievous errors.

After providing the reader with the basic contours of the mythicist argument, Ehrman surveys the early extrabiblical historical sources and the Gospels to argue for Jesus' existence. He reviews the standard early references to Jesus in extrabiblical literature: Pliny the Younger, Suetonius, Tacitus, Josephus, and Rabbinic sources.

As he turns to the Gospels, he argues that while they cannot be fully trusted, they contain material that is unquestionably historical. Ehrman also looks at the

evidence for Jesus from non-canonical Christian sources (e.g. Papias, Ignatius of Antioch, 1 Clement) and other canonical sources (e.g. Acts, 1 Timothy, 1 and 2 Peter, 1 John, Revelation, Hebrews). Finally, he argues from Paul's knowledge of Jesus, Paul's personal acquaintance with Peter and James, and Paul's acceptance of Jesus' death on the cross (not something a Jew would have any reason to make up concerning a would-be messiah) that Jesus certainly existed.

In part 2, Ehrman sets out to expose the problems in the mythicist argument. He takes on various mythicist claims such as the Gospels are highly problematic as historical sources, Nazareth did not exist, the non-historical Jesus is based on stories about divine men, the author of Mark invented the idea of the historical person of Jesus, and Jesus was invented as a personification of Jewish wisdom. In many cases, such as the claim that the Gospels are not reliable, Ehrman actually agrees with the mythicists. Yet for Ehrman, the problems in the Gospels or other NT writings have little to do with whether Jesus actually existed. In other words, simply because the NT is filled with historical errors (at least according to Ehrman), this does not mean that Jesus did not exist.

In part 3, Ehrman paints the picture of what he sees as the historical Jesus. He writes, "My goal instead is simply to explain why the majority of scholars who have dealt with these matters over the past century or so have concluded that the Jesus who existed is not the Jesus of the stained-glass window or the second-grade Sunday school class. The Jesus of popular imagination (there are actually a large number of Jesuses in various popular imaginations) is a 'myth' in the sense that mythicists use the term: he is not the Jesus of history. But there was a Jesus of history, and there is good evidence to suggest what he was like" (p. 263). For Ehrman, this Jesus of history was a failed apocalyptic Jewish prophet who thought the end of the world was very soon, but he was wrong and paid for the mistake with his life (i.e. similar to the view of Albert Schweitzer). It is worth noting that, in view of Ehrman's public skepticism towards the transmission of the NT in which he claims we have no way of knowing what the original writers actually wrote, it seems strange that his reconstruction of Jesus is based primarily on his interpretations of verses from the NT Gospels.

In his conclusion, Ehrman contends that mythicists have taken the wrong approach in response to Christians. Ehrman believes that the problem for Christians is not that Jesus is a myth, it is that Jesus is far too historical:

The problem then with Jesus is that he cannot be removed from his time and transplanted into our own without simply creating him anew. When we create him anew we no longer have the Jesus of history but the Jesus of our own imagination, a monstrous invention created to serve our own purposes. But Jesus is not so easily moved and changed. He is powerfully resistant. He remains always in his own time. As Jesus fads come and go, as new Jesuses come to take the place of the old, the real historical Jesus continues to exist, back there in the past. (p. 336)

Ehrman certainly has a point. Contemporary evangelical preaching and theology at times glosses over Jesus' historical context in a rush for proof-texts or contemporary application and in turn misses the Jesus that is actually there.

Nevertheless, Ehrman's rebuke should not only be projected onto evangelicals. Critical scholars themselves are known for creating Jesus in their own image to be used for their own purposes, which is why, as Ehrman himself notes, critical scholarship does not have one historical Jesus but a plethora of historical Jesuses. It is ironic that Ehrman speaks of the Jesus "fads" coming and going. One could argue that Ehrman has embraced a current Jesus "fad" within scholarship in the way he uses criteria of authenticity or his dismissal of miracles from real history.

Moreover, throughout this book Ehrman casts himself as the one without presuppositions. According to Ehrman, the mythicists do not like religion, so they just decided *a priori* that Jesus did not exist. On the other hand, evangelical scholars are fond of the Bible, so they decide *a priori* that the Jesus of the Bible is in fact true. By way of contrast, Ehrman presents himself as simply a scholar looking at the evidence with no biases. Yet in view of the gains in hermeneutics in recent years, is one really to believe that Ehrman is an unbiased interpreter? One could easily argue that Ehrman has much to gain from seeing Jesus as an apocalyptic prophet who was wrong about many things, especially that the end of the world would come within his lifetime. If Jesus is a failed prophet who has little to say to our world today, then the historical Jesus *should* be dissected under the scalpel of our modern critic; but this Jesus is *not* to be obeyed and certainly *not* to be worshiped. This domesticated Jesus could be an appealing conclusion for an agnostic NT scholar. Ehrman's potential biases do not prove that any of his conclusions are wrong (indeed, Jesus' outlook was likely Jewish, prophetic, and apocalyptic), but pointing out possible biases in others does not make their conclusions wrong either.

At times Ehrman's own presuppositions hamper his ability to provide an adequate historical explanation. For instance, he does well in refuting the common mythical argument that Christianity borrowed the idea of resurrection from surrounding pagans. However, he then goes on to say, "But then something else happened. Some of them began to say that God had intervened and brought him back from the dead. The story caught on, and some (or all—we don't know) of his closest followers came to think that in fact he had been raised" (p. 164). And again later, "For some reason, however, the followers of Jesus (or at least some of them) came to think he had been raised from the dead" (p. 233). Yet why would they make up such a thing? What is the historical explanation here? If one rejects Ehrman's anti-supernatural bias but accepts his critique of the mythicists, the answer attested to by all four Gospels becomes the most reasonable conclusion. Jesus' resurrection cannot so easily be dismissed from history. Ultimately, *Did Jesus Exist?* reads as a kind of apologetic defense of the historical Jesus in which evangelical scholars will, of course, agree with its major conclusion. However, because they will almost certainly disagree with a number of its arguments, anti-supernatural presuppositions, and overly skeptical approach, other books in defense of the historicity of Jesus will likely be more appealing.

Josh Chatraw
Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary, Wake Forest, NC

Jesus' Emotions in the Gospels. By Stephen Voorwinde. London: T&T Clark, 2011, xiv + 255 pp., \$34.95 paper.

Stephen Voorwinde's study on Jesus' emotions investigates one of the more interesting and yet enigmatic aspects of Jesus research. For this reason, it tends to be one of the most neglected. During an age when even understanding one's own emotional state is difficult, hoping to "put Jesus on the couch" seems impossible. Most Jesus historians refuse to discuss the personality or emotional state of Jesus due to the paucity of data. The claim is that it is impossible to know the person of Jesus at the emotional level. The complexity of emotions makes it difficult to pinpoint any fixed emotional state. As Voorwinde argues, emotions point to Jesus' humanity. However, Jesus scholarship tends to focus on Jesus' divinity, which underplays his emotions. Because of these reasons, Voorwinde's work fills a sparse field. He examines the various contexts in which the Gospel writers have portrayed Jesus' emotions. The driving question that Voorwinde raises is: Should Christians reflect the emotional state of Jesus?

Rather than considering this subject as a historical project, Voorwinde's study is redactional in nature. He looks at each Gospel as a "literary unit" or "literary whole," "in its own right," and with "its own story to tell" (p. 6). Each individual Gospel writer presents a complementary portrait of Jesus within his own Gospel. Comparison highlights particular emphases of each Gospel. Because of this Voorwinde treats the Fourth Gospel on the same footing as the Synoptic Gospels. This redactional approach is insightful, but omitting any discussion concerning the historical reliability of the Gospel accounts raises difficulty. It fails to make the connection between the situation of the Gospel writers and Jesus' actual situation that they describe. One could argue that describing the emotional state of Jesus thirty or forty years later might seem difficult or impossible. Jesus most likely portrayed a range of emotions not recorded in the Gospels, and the emotions that were recorded in the Gospels reflect the message of each individual writer. Voorwinde's study suggests a pattern in regards to Jesus' emotions and therefore may establish some level of historicity. However, the question of historicity should not be avoided. Nevertheless, Voorwinde's method is flawed in light of his lead question: should we emulate the emotions of Jesus? Perhaps it should read: should we emulate the emotions of Jesus as they are presented in the Gospels?

According to Voorwinde, the evangelists cluster Jesus' emotions around his miracles and the passion. Clearly, in the Synoptic Gospels his emotions revolve around the miracle stories and the passion, while in John's Gospel, in a similar way, his emotions revolve around the raising of Lazarus and the upper room discourse. Within the context of the miracle stories, Jesus is at times amazed, distressed, or compassionate. The passion narrative, on the other hand, is described in terms of sorrow. John also describes Jesus as having sorrow at the news of Lazarus's death. This largely raises the question of Jesus' foreknowledge: the Synoptic Gospels indicate that Jesus knew that he would be raised from the dead, and John indicates that he had a plan to raise Lazarus. If Jesus knew the outcome of the event, why was he under such stress? Voorwinde suggests that the emotional state reflects the

humanity of Jesus. Even though one may know the outcome of an event, it does not relieve the anguish of having to walk through it. Paul makes a similar note in regards to the spiritual life. The believer knows that redemption is coming, but in our weakness we groan for the day of its coming. Paul describes this with a metaphor of giving birth in Romans 8. We know what the outcome of labor pains should be, but it does not make them any less painful.

Jesus' emotions also fall within the overall theological and literary structure that each evangelist develops. His emotions in Matthew fall in line with the covenantal structure that Matthew develops in his Gospel. Jesus' compassion depicts the inauguration of the kingdom. Amazement at the faith of a Gentile highlights the theme of Gentile inclusion within the kingdom in Matthew. Mark's presentation of Jesus' emotions is more complex. The emotional depiction is more varied and dispersed. Similar to Matthew, Mark describes Jesus' emotions in light of the theological construction within the Gospel. Mark combines the picture of a Davidic king and suffering servant of Isaiah. In Mark's Gospel Jesus becomes angry with those around him who do not understand or who refuse to accept his message. Luke's Gospel presents Jesus both as a divine Son of God and human Son of David. He both rejoices when the mission is moved forward but reflects agony with regard to his coming sacrifice. John's Gospel reflects a deep love that Jesus has for the Father and his disciples. This is seen in his sacrifice on the cross. The significant contribution that Voorwinde makes in the book is showing how each Gospel writer uses the emotions of Jesus to move his Gospel forward.

This type of work raises the question: "What constitutes an emotion?" Voorwinde relies on explicit emotional categories upon which a consensus of psychologists has agreed. Nonetheless, the fact that Jesus "sternly warns" might be called into question as a legitimate emotion. Similarly, a large segment of the Voorwinde's emotional catalog is Jesus' love, which appears with more frequency in John's Gospel. Voorwinde notes that Jesus' love does not reflect his own humanity but rather his divine prerogative to save humanity and his obedience to the Father in John's Gospel. Love could be questioned as an emotion and characterized as an action or a choice. One's definition will either limit or expand the available data for this type of research and will change the results.

Finally, Voorwinde's driving question of whether Christians should seek to emulate the emotions of Jesus is welcomed. This type of work generally describes how Jesus may have acted but rarely pursues implications for practical theology. He concludes that Jesus' emotional state shows an interplay between his divinity and humanity. On the one hand, Christians should not try to emulate those emotions that reflect his divinity, but rather they should seek to reflect those emotions that are commanded. Yet can the two really be separated? This also begs the question of how one might reflect or manufacture an emotion. Voorwinde shows that Jesus' mission dictates how each Evangelist depicts his emotions. His emotions reveal the motivation of his actions within the narratives. Emotions cannot be manufactured, but Jesus' mission can be adopted. When the church begins to reflect Jesus' mission, then a similar pattern of emotions will emerge. Even though we know how the story will end, the church will rejoice when the mission moves forward

and mourn when it seems to be thwarted. The question should not be “Do we emulate the emotions of Jesus?” but “Do we emulate his mission?”

Benjamin I. Simpson

Dallas Theological Seminary, Houston, TX

Sermon on the Mount: Restoring Christ's Message to the Modern Church. By Charles Quarles. NAC Studies in Bible and Theology. Nashville: B & H, 2011, xv + 381 pp., \$29.99.

Charles Quarles (Ph.D., Mid-America Baptist Theological Seminary) is Vice President for Integration of Faith and Learning, Professor of New Testament and Greek, and Chair of the Division of Christian Studies at Louisiana College. In the preface, he describes the commentary's purpose as an attempt to chart a middle course between one that focuses primarily on scholarly interpretation and one that focuses primarily on application. He rightly notes some treatments relegate the Sermon on the Mount to an “impossible ethic” or dilute it to such a degree that little ethical application remains. Quarles states that few texts try to answer the question of whether or not Christians today might live by the Sermon on the Mount and if so how to do it. The purpose then of the work is to “fill that perceived gap” such that the “Lord's teaching may be restored to its proper place in the church” (p. xii).

Chapter 1 gives a brief survey of the history of the interpretation of the Sermon on the Mount, providing a critical context for any attempt at interpretation. This survey includes the views of the Didache, Chrysostom, Augustine, Aquinas, Luther, Calvin, the Anabaptists, Lewis Sperry Chafer, Charles Ryrie, and progressive dispensational views. Quarles points out that most early Christians felt that the Sermon applied to all believers (p. 4). It was not until the Middle Ages with Aquinas that certain “counsels” in the Sermon were not applicable as an obligation to all believers but only to those who voluntarily wished to obtain holiness by living a monastic life. Luther and Calvin tried to make the Sermon applicable to the Christian but tried to moderate the obligations either by distinguishing between secular and spiritual roles for the Christian (Luther) or by trying to respond to some Anabaptists who saw the Sermon as prohibiting oaths in courts of law, self-defense, military service, or, in some cases, even the possession of personal property (pp. 7–8). He points out that early dispensationalists such as Chafer saw the Sermon as only addressed to the Jew before the cross and for the future coming kingdom, while Ryrie and progressive dispensationalists have seen it as applicable in varying ways for the church age. While the selection of presented historical views is excellent, there were a few noticeable gaps that could have improved it. The first one was the gap between the Didache (AD 60–80) and Chrysostom (c. 347–407). One or two examples of teaching from the second-century and third-century apologists would have better satisfied the reader that they believed the Sermon was applicable to all Christians. Also, since Quarles provided modern dispensational interpretative approaches, perhaps some statement from the modern reformed perspective would have been good as well.

In chapter 2, Quarles handles the question of the relationship of the Sermon on the Mount (Matthew 5–7) to the Sermon on the Plain (Luke 6:17–49). Quarles concludes that the Sermon on the Mount is the same sermon as the Sermon on the Plain based on several points: both sermons have similar beginnings, almost all the contents of the Sermon on the Plain are found in the Sermon on the Mount, and both sermons are immediately followed by Jesus going to Capernaum and healing the centurion's servant (p. 12). These are persuasive arguments. He also views the Sermon on the Mount as an "original unit" and believes that the material from the Sermon on the Mount that occurs in Luke outside of the Sermon on the Plain was likely preached on more than one occasion (p. 13).

Chapter 3 addresses the structure of the Sermon on the Mount, stating that it is "carefully organized." Quarles looks at several attempts at analyzing the structure, including the "*inclusio* or literary bracketing" approach by Ulrich Luz and alternate approaches developed by Michael Goulder (Beatitudes as the key to the structure) and Günther Bornkamm (model prayer as the focus of the structure). However, he concludes that such theories break down under scrutiny and "create more problems than they solve" (p. 19). He does acknowledge clear structures within separate sections in the Sermon on the Mount and states it is better to follow "structural clues and catchwords" (p. 19). His overall outline, however, is a somewhat bland three-point structure: I. Introduction (5:1–16); II. Body of the Sermon: Superior Righteousness (5:17–7:12); and III. Conclusion (7:13–8:1). This basic outline serves his purpose but does not seem worthy of the magnificence of the Sermon on the Mount in terms of its structure and content (pp. 17–18).

Chapter 4 sets out the theological framework of the Sermon on the Mount in its Matthean context. Quarles sees three themes to help assure disciples of Jesus that they are able to fulfill the teaching of the Sermon on the Mount: (1) they are participants in the "new exodus"; (2) they are part of the "new creation"; and (3) they are "beneficiaries of the new covenant" (p. 21). Regarding the "new exodus," Quarles draws numerous parallels between Moses and Jesus (Deut 18:15–19). As Moses led the people of Israel out of Egypt from the bondage of slavery, so now Jesus is the one who delivers God's people out of bondage to sin. Regarding the new creation, he points to John the Baptist's message that the Messiah would baptize with the Holy Spirit and fire and that fruits were the good deeds done by the disciples as the manifestation of their repentance (Matt 3:11). The new covenant, as Quarles states, began with Jesus' death on the cross (Matt 26:28) and involved the inner transformation of God's people (pp. 31–32). While all of these themes have merit, the second one seems to have the most relevance. Jesus and John the Baptist both preached a message of fruit-bearing repentance (Matt 3:2; 4:17), but what does repentance look like? The Sermon on the Mount describes this. While making valid points in a broad sense, the first theme is a little too typological in some of the specifics in my view (e.g. Jesus going up on the mountain in Matt 5:1 as a parallel of Moses going up onto Mount Sinai; Exod 19:3). The third point of being a beneficiary of the new covenant seems somewhat out of the immediate historical context since it had not yet begun at the time of the giving of the Sermon on the Mount. Would this then imply that the disciples of Jesus could really not

practice the teachings of the Sermon on the Mount until after the death of Jesus when the new covenant was inaugurated?

Chapter 5 describes the introduction to the Sermon on the Mount in terms of its setting, the Beatitudes, and the Christian quality of being salt and light. A crucial interpretive point is made that the Sermon on the Mount is directed at disciples of Jesus. Thus its message is about discipleship and not evangelism. In the Beatitudes, Quarles makes the point that the translation that renders *makarios* as “happy” rather than “blessed” is misleading, since Jesus did not refer to feelings based on present pleasant circumstances (p. 42). Though the Beatitudes end with a statement on persecution for good works in the life of a disciple, the transition to the disciples being salt and light (Matt 5:13–16) indicates some will glorify the Father based on their righteous conduct (p. 77).

Chapter 6 is by far the longest in the book (pp. 89–308) and details the interpretation of the body of the Sermon on the Mount. In summary, Quarles views the body as a “description of the righteous conduct and character that motivate others to praise God” (p. 89). That Jesus came to “fulfill” the Law and the prophets includes not only Jesus’ prophetic fulfillments of the OT texts of the prophets mentioned in Matthew’s Gospel (e.g. Isa 7:14; Matt 1:22–23) but also the fulfillment of the Law primarily by fulfilling the promise of being a prophet like Moses (Deut 18:15–18; p. 93). The righteousness required by the Sermon on the Mount is not imputed forensic righteousness that earns admission into the kingdom but the righteousness that comes from a disciple of Jesus in obedience to God’s commands and one that must exceed that of the scribes and Pharisees (pp. 101, 104). The six antitheses (Matt 5:21–48) then give specific examples of this surpassing righteousness. Jesus’ teachings are contrasted with the law as interpreted by the scribes but also “transcend the literal demands of the law” (p. 106). Jesus addresses “sinful attitudes as well as sinful actions” (p. 106). Quarles states that the example of Jesus’ prohibition of oaths comes closest to challenging the OT, since the OT allowed but did not require oaths. In the practice of giving, praying, and fasting (Matt 6:1–18), the disciple must not be hypocritical and practice these things for self-glory but rather do them with proper motives (pp. 170–71). The exposition of the Lord’s prayer as a “model prayer” is extensive and worth a read just on its own (pp. 186–223). Quarles presents both traditional ethical interpretations of the phrases for the disciple and a more modern approach that interprets the petitions as primarily eschatological in their emphasis. His method is to examine each petition individually and examine the strengths and weaknesses of each approach. He is rightly cautious about removing ethical implications from the prayer, even from a statement like “Your kingdom come” (p. 201). The disciples must also have the right priorities (heavenly things and serving God), with the result that they can be free from worry about earthly things (Matt 6:19–34). Relationships to brothers, dogs and pigs (i.e. those who treat the gospel with contempt), and God the Father form the last teachings in the body of the Sermon (Matt 7:1–12). While one can and does occasionally find statements and positions to disagree or quibble with, the overall exposition in this chapter can only be described as outstanding.

The last chapter contains the conclusion to the Sermon, and Quarles notes the two stark antithetical response options. There are two roads and gates, two types of trees and fruit, two confessions, and two hearers and builders. Such descriptions argue that obedience to the Sermon on the Mount is expected and required.

While anyone would benefit from Quarles's work, one can see a particular value for pastors or Sunday school teachers planning to teach a series on the Sermon on the Mount. The work brings in important OT and other Jewish backgrounds, gleans insights from Greek vocabulary and grammar, and looks at interpretive options, all of which form the basis for reasoned applications in an understandable way. The main point that the Sermon on the Mount applies to any disciple of Jesus provides a refreshing look that draws one into the relevance of the Sermon for today. Because Jesus told the disciples in the Great Commission to teach the nations all that he had commanded them (Matt 28:18–20), it would seem that the Sermon on the Mount must be included in what is to be taught for the apostolic and church age. Quarles has captured the teaching of the Sermon on the Mount well, and now the church must travel the harder path of doing it.

James F. Davis
Capital Bible Seminary, Lanham, MD

Prophetic Jesus, Prophetic Church: The Challenge of Luke-Acts to Contemporary Christians. By Luke Timothy Johnson. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2011, viii + 198 pp., \$23.00 paper.

Luke Timothy Johnson has long been a leading voice within scholarship pertaining to Luke-Acts, having written extensively on Lukan theology and its implications for the contemporary church over the past several decades. In his new work, *Prophetic Jesus, Prophetic Church: The Challenge of Luke-Acts to Contemporary Christians*, Johnson seeks to make the fruits of his sustained engagement with the text of Luke-Acts available to a popular audience. Rigorously reasoned and refreshingly candid, the work represents a sharply focused distillation of the author's core convictions regarding Lukan Christology and ecclesiology and the challenge that they present to the church in any age. While one may not agree with Johnson at every turn, this new work is surely a helpful resource to those concerned with the witness of the church in the twenty first century.

The book can essentially be divided into two main parts. The first three chapters serve to establish the central significance of the theme of prophecy in Luke-Acts. Thus, in the first chapter, Johnson orients the reader to the literary shape of Luke-Acts, emphasizing the unity of Luke's two-volume work and arguing that the third evangelist has composed his narrative as an apologetic to Gentile Christians in defense of God's work in history. This first chapter provides an accessible introduction to the distinctive literary features of Luke-Acts, as it briefly addresses issues such as the Lukan redaction of the Synoptic tradition, the

Septuagintal style of Luke-Acts, the genre of Luke's work, and the importance of sequence for Luke's narrative.

In the second chapter, Johnson focuses upon the way in which the theme of prophecy serves as a unifying literary feature of Luke-Acts. One indication of the importance of prophecy in Luke-Acts is the prominence of the notion of fulfillment, and Johnson argues that Luke shows the fulfillment of Torah in several ways. Additionally, the prophetic nature of Jesus' ministry and the life of the early church can be seen by the way in which Luke has statements early in his narrative attain fulfillment at later points in the narrative. Moreover, Johnson calls attention to the prophetic characterization of Jesus and the leaders of the apostolic movement through titles and character descriptions. Finally, Johnson argues that the very structure of Luke-Acts is rooted in a concern to present the life of Jesus and the work of the apostles in prophetic terms according to the pattern of "the prophet like Moses" from Deuteronomy. Luke and Acts present two visitations of "the prophet like Moses" to Israel, and as such the narrative structure of Luke's work underscores the prophetic nature of the ministry of Jesus and the early church.

The third chapter sketches an outline of the character of a biblical prophet. Johnson's purpose in this chapter is to show that prophecy in the Bible is not merely conceived as prediction, but that it is also understood in terms of representation, a way of being in the world. Hence, Johnson identifies five traits of prophecy as a way of life, drawing upon the prophetic literature of the Hebrew Scriptures and the depiction of various prophets in the OT. A prophet (1) is led by the spirit of God; (2) speaks God's word to humans; (3) embodies God's word through symbolic acts; (4) enacts God's vision; and (5) bears witness amidst opposition.

These basic contours of the character of a biblical prophet then serve as the framework for the second part of Johnson's book, as the author attempts to demonstrate how each of these traits of biblical prophecy can be found in Luke's depiction of Jesus and the early church. Accordingly, chapters 4–8 of Johnson's work follow a consistent pattern. Each chapter analyzes how a different trait of biblical prophecy appears in the ministry of Jesus and then in the life of the early church. Johnson takes the canonical status of Luke-Acts and the continuity between the prophetic ministry of Jesus and the apostolic movement as indications that their example is normative for the contemporary church, so that each chapter in the second part of the book concludes with a consideration of the challenge that the model of Jesus and the early church might present to the church today. By contextualizing the model of Luke-Acts to the challenges facing today's church, Johnson believes that Luke's two-volume work can spur the church on toward a more faithful embodiment of the prophetic way of life that God intends for his church to possess.

Johnson's latest book confirms his mastery as an interpreter of Luke-Acts. Throughout the work, the author demonstrates an intimate acquaintance with the sequence and content of Luke's narrative. Johnson is constantly uncovering ties within the narrative, showing how passages in Acts build upon concepts and motifs established in the third Gospel. Indeed, the author possesses a rare ability to trace

themes over the course of Luke's account. Drawing together data from all over Luke-Acts, Johnson repeatedly succeeds in synthesizing a wide range of material in order to demonstrate the coherence of the narrative. As a result, the reader of Johnson's work is left with an increased appreciation for Luke's artistry as an author and his precision as a theologian.

Furthermore, Johnson's discussions of the contemporary application of Luke-Acts are a particular strength of his work. The author has clearly reflected carefully upon the implications of his interpretive conclusions, and Johnson's practical applications are marked by their candor and their concreteness. Johnson's own Catholic tradition is not above the author's criticism, and the book also displays a generosity toward traditions that differ from that of the author. The specific points of application are frequently quite insightful and thought-provoking, specific enough to be useful and yet adaptable enough to be contextualized appropriately within a variety of church and parachurch settings.

As this new book seeks to summarize much of what Johnson has developed more extensively elsewhere, there are certainly times in which it seems as though the readers are being called upon to take Johnson's word for some of his conclusions. For example, Johnson's brief exposition of the narrative structure of Luke-Acts in terms of "the prophet like Moses" motif is rather hurried, with the result that the proposed reading feels somewhat far-fetched based solely upon the argument set forth in this book. Nevertheless, if readers are willing to go along with Johnson in the trust that his conclusions are based upon more extensive analyses than the present work permits, they will find that the results are surely rewarding.

A second minor criticism concerns the possible overuse of prophetic categories. In the chapter on prophetic embodiment in Luke-Acts, for example, Johnson would like to say that the church ought to embody its message in its activity, and he sees this done in Luke-Acts through poverty, itinerancy, prayer, and servant leadership. Johnson's point is valid, but do these features of the practice of the early church really parallel the concept of prophetic embodiment as it has been defined by Johnson? Johnson defines prophetic embodiment in terms of the symbolic actions of the biblical prophets. Thus, prophets such as Hosea and Jeremiah performed symbolic acts as a vehicle for their message, but these acts were not supposed to be emulated, and there was nothing inherently virtuous or normative about the symbolic acts that they performed. By contrast, Johnson seems to suggest that the actions that he highlights in his corresponding chapter on Luke-Acts are exemplary for the contemporary church as it seeks to embody its prophetic witness today. They are less symbolic acts and more models to be contextualized and applied to the church of the twenty-first century. As such, the category of prophetic embodiment is a somewhat confusing label for these normative ideals in Luke-Acts, and the use of this prophetic category actually detracts from the point that Johnson would like to make.

These minor criticisms aside, *Prophetic Jesus, Prophetic Church* is a useful resource for the church today. In fact, as the work is directed primarily toward communal application, it would serve as ideal fodder for discussions among church leadership. Also, those teaching through the books of Luke and Acts will find this work to be

an abundant source of stimulating material for application points in sermons and Bible study lessons. For a twenty-first century church that has too often neglected its prophetic calling, Johnson's work is a needed tonic, urging the church to action.

Benjamin R. Wilson
University of Cambridge, Cambridge, United Kingdom

The Danielic Eschatological Hour in the Johannine Literature. By Stefanos Mihalios. Library of New Testament Studies 436. London: T&T Clark, 2011, xiii + 209 pp., \$120.00.

There was a time, less than one hundred years ago, when it was assumed that the most significant background influence on the Gospel of John was Greek philosophical thought of one variety or another. Rudolf Bultmann—along with his now-debunked theory of the influence of Mandaean Gnosticism on John's Gospel—is just one scholar of this stripe that comes to mind.

In recent years, however, the pendulum has swung in a different direction as numerous scholarly projects have sought to demonstrate, quite persuasively, just how influential the Hebrew Scriptures were as a background to the Fourth Gospel. Much of this shift in scholarship is a direct result of recapturing the occasion and purpose of John's Gospel in a more traditionalist light. For example, Andreas J. Köstenberger's important essay "The Destruction of the Second Temple and the Composition of the Fourth Gospel," published in a volume edited by John Lierman titled *Challenging Perspectives on the Gospel of John* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006), proposes that within ten years of the destruction of the temple in AD 70 John the apostle took the occasion of that devastating event in Jewish history to write an account of the life, death, and resurrection of Jesus in order to demonstrate how Jesus fulfilled all the hopes and dreams of the Hebrew Scriptures. In Köstenberger's view, then, the purpose statement in John's Gospel found in John 20:30–31 ("but these are written that you may believe that Jesus is the Christ") points, in part, to the Fourth Gospel functioning as an apologetic document meant to provoke post-AD 70 unbelieving Jews and Gentile God-fearers to faith in Jesus—the one who is the higher and deeper replacement of the major Jewish institutions and individuals found in the Hebrew Scriptures. It is in this historical context, then, that we can read important works like Paul Hoskins's *Jesus as the Fulfillment of the Temple in the Gospel of John* (Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2006). This study, if one follows Köstenberger's proposed narrative, explores John's apologetic for Jesus as the replacement and fulfillment of the temple addressed to a post-AD 70 unbelieving Jew or Gentile God-fearer audience. We might also add that it is in this historical context that we can read John Lierman's *The New Testament Moses: Christian Perceptions of Moses and Israel in the Setting of Jewish Religion* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004), which explores, in part, how it was that John the apostle presented Jesus as the replacement and fulfillment of Moses.

Stefanos Mihalios's published dissertation titled *The Danielic Eschatological Hour in the Johannine Literature* proves to be yet another work that demonstrates how

influential the Hebrew Scriptures were to the writer of the Gospel of John. Mihalios completed his dissertation at Wheaton College under the tutelage of G. K. Beale. Anyone familiar with the topic of the use of the OT in the NT is certainly familiar with Beale's work, and, specifically, with his work on the influence of the book of Daniel on John's Revelation. Beale's monumental commentary on *The Book of Revelation* in the NICNT series (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999) contains the culmination of his decades-long series of published works on the influence of Daniel on John's Revelation.

Mihalios's dissertation begins with the observation that John's Gospel places on the lips of Jesus the following statement, first found in the passage commonly referred to as the miracle at Cana: "My hour has not yet come" (John 2:4). Similar statements are made by Jesus subsequent to John 2, all of which reach a crescendo in John 12:23 when Jesus finally proclaims, "The hour has come for the Son of Man to be glorified." In addition, 1 John 2:18 includes the term "hour" in a way that appears to be very similar to its use in the Fourth Gospel.

After making this observation, Mihalios asks whether or not there might be an OT text (or texts) that stands behind the use of "hour" in the Johannine literature. Mihalios's thesis is that the apostle John (who was, himself, influenced by the teaching of Jesus on just this point) believed that the eschatological "hour," which had been predicted in texts like Daniel 12, was inaugurated in the life, death, resurrection, and ascension of Jesus and that this "hour" would be consummated at the second advent. In Mihalios's view, it is John's understanding of Daniel's eschatological "hour" that stands behind the use of "hour" in the Fourth Gospel and in his first letter. Essentially, Mihalios's published dissertation is his argument for this thesis.

Chapter 1 of the book serves as an introduction to the study. Included in this chapter is a very brief survey of literature on the topic of intertextuality and the categorization of appropriation language used in modern scholarship. For example, there is a discussion of the three categories often used in the literature to describe how one writer appropriates material from a previous writer: quotation, allusion, and echo. Going on from there, Mihalios offers methodological suggestions for determining the validity of his thesis.

Chapter 2 is an impressive survey on the topic of "The Use of Eschatological Hour in the OT." While there is special emphasis in this chapter on Daniel 8–12, other significant texts, such as Micah 4 and Jeremiah 23, 30, and 33, emerge as a focus of study. At the end of the chapter, Mihalios suggests that the eschatological "hour" as presented in Daniel 8–12 can be summarized in the following way: "in God's final hour, suffering is integral for deliverance to take place, a deliverance through judgment and resurrection" (p. 51). This summary is significant methodologically for Mihalios, since he will argue in subsequent chapters that the elements that make up that summary ought to be present in contexts where John uses the term "hour" in order to demonstrate a probable parallel with Daniel.

Chapter 3 is an incredibly interesting chapter which surveys the concept of the eschatological "hour" in Jewish literature. Methodologically, Mihalios is interested to show whether or not there is evidence in the intertestamental

literature for interpreting Daniel 8–12 in a way that predicts both judgment and restoration taking place simultaneously when the eschatological “hour” arrives.

Chapters 4–8 serve as the meat of the study. It is here that Mihalios focuses his attention on the context of what he determines to be key eschatological “hour” passages in the Gospel of John and in 1 John. Chapter 4 focuses on John 4:21, 23; chapter 5 on John 5:25, 28; chapter 6 explores John 12:23–27; chapter 7 investigates John 16:16–33; and chapter 8 focuses on 1 John 2:18. There are other passages in John’s Gospel, in particular (i.e. John 2:4), that contain the word “hour”; however Mihalios decides not to investigate those in detail since the immediate context of those texts do not give evidence of explicit eschatological discourse. These chosen texts from the Fourth Gospel and 1 John do, however, appear in such a context. In each of the texts explored in chapters 5–8, Mihalios discovers the key elements (cf. the quote from p. 51 above) that he uncovered in his examination of Daniel 8–12 regarding the eschatological “hour.”

Chapter 9, then, serves as a concluding chapter that both summarizes the results of his study and gives implications for hermeneutical approaches to the Gospel of John, for three areas of systematic theology (anthropology, Christology and eschatology), and for a biblical-theological approach to understanding salvation history. One of the more important and interesting suggestions in this section has to do with how John’s treatment of Daniel’s eschatological “hour” theme gives evidence of an already-but-not-yet understanding of inaugurated eschatology. Geerhardus Vos would be proud of Mihalios’s work in this regard, in that it confirms, to some degree, a Vosian approach to biblical theology.

I am impressed by Mihalios’s monograph. As one who teaches a course on the Gospel of John in an undergraduate setting in a way that emphasizes major themes, my students and I have wrestled with the Johannine “hour” trajectory. Together, we have often tied this theme into the larger idea of Jesus’ mission: the cross. What Mihalios has done, however, is to give us a broader understanding of Jesus’ mission; he has placed Jesus’ mission in the broader context of the eschatological “hour,” as predicted by Daniel, which includes judgment and restoration all in the context of resurrection.

There is at least one weakness in this study, which, however, does not at all detract from the soundness of Mihalios’s findings. Chapter 1 of this monograph offers much too brief of a survey of the pertinent literature on intertextuality. While the writer gives his necessary nod to the important work by Richard B. Hays on the topic, he fails to engage the subsequent criticism of Hays’s work. For example, he ignores J. Christian Beker’s work regarding the fuzziness of the category of “echo.” In addition, while the work of Stanley Porter is briefly cited, Mihalios fails to engage some of the significant criticisms that Porter has given with regard to the lack of unanimity of terminology that is often used by scholars when using terms such as “citation” and “allusion.”

Even with this one weakness, Mihalios’s monograph is a welcome addition to the study of Johannine literature. It serves to broaden the field’s understanding of the “hour” theme in the Gospel of John. In addition, it serves, once again, to highlight just how significant the OT is to the understanding of NT theology.

C. Scott Shidemantle
Geneva College, Beaver Falls, PA

Lord of the Entire World: Lord Jesus, A Challenge to Lord Caesar? By Joseph D. Fantin. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix, 2011, xxiii + 327 pp., \$120.00.

This volume is a revision of a dissertation that was originally completed in 2007 at University of Sheffield under the supervision of Loveday Alexander. The aim of the book is to identify the possibility of a polemic in proclaiming Jesus as Lord in contrast to Caesar as lord in the Greco-Roman world. In 1 Cor 8:5–6 is the proclamation that there is one God, the Father, and one Lord, Jesus Christ, which stands in contrast with a contemporaneous inscription establishing the domain of Nero: ὁ τοῦ παντὸς κόσμου κύριος Νέρων (SIG³ 814.31, IG VII.2713, PHI 146221). Fantin's work reconstructs the historical context of Paul's day to see if there were conflicting views of worship in these titulary statements—κύριος Νέρων and κύριος Ἰησοῦς, and whether a tension would mount among Christians who were faced with the dilemma of a polytheistic, syncretistic, and pluralistic worldview that heralded the imperial religion of Rome.

Fantin states that his historical reconstruction utilizes historical criticism and a linguistic study of the setting of first-century churches. According to his introduction, the historical-critical approach of study serves the purpose: “to understand emperor worship within a context of first-century Roman religion” (p. 21). The second part of his method, a linguistic study, examines the word κύριος in its association with the living Roman emperor along with the linguistic categories of *semantics* and *pragmatics* that are taken from modern communication theories (pp. 25–29). Fantin first revisits the line of scholarship that previously interacted with potential imperial references in Paul's writings: the Paul and Politics Seminar that consists of avid enthusiasts of Paul's anti-imperial stance (Horsley, Silberman, Stowers) and the movement's opponents (Kim, Burk, Miller). Fantin distinguishes his work from the rest by nuancing his position: Paul was not *primarily* anti-imperial but the Lordship of Christ is strongly suggestive of a definitive Lord who displaces all earthly rulers.

Following the introduction, the next two chapters contain more introductory material. Chapter 2 further discusses the identity of Paul, his writings, and instances of κύριος in his letters. This section begins with the authenticity and dating of Paul's letters, from which Fantin identifies five passages of concern—Rom 10:9; 1 Cor 8:5–6, 12:3; Phil 2:11; and Eph 4:5 (on p. 54, the author repeatedly cites Eph 4:3 but later on assesses 4:5 on p. 231); these passages are to be discussed in later chapters. The rest of the chapter is predominantly concerned with the historical sources, both literary (ancient authors) and non-literary (archaeology, inscriptions, papyri, coins), that will be used to further contextualize Paul within his world.

Chapter 3 is devoted to a general background on the ancient imperial cult. Fantin esteems classical scholarship as it compares to the efforts of NT scholars. Fantin also highlights the religious experience of the Romans, which included mystery religions. If I could make a critical remark at this point, more than half of

the dissertation is preliminary work that lays out what Fantin calls the “cognitive environment” of Paul, a composite picture drawn from the various historical sources that demonstrate the presence and experience of the imperial cult. Only the final two major chapters take on the real task that he purports to accomplish in his introduction.

Chapter 4 looks into the uses of the title κύριος and begins to answer the question regarding the possible exclusivity of the title for the Roman emperor. Two aspects of semantics are poignantly posited. First, κύριος is derived from the adjectival κύρος that denotes supremacy and authority. Fantin offers examples in classical, Jewish, and biblical literature to show extant evidence of human and divine referents of superiority, but at the same time, he differentiates the ancient and modern understanding of lord (lordship is almost always divine in modern usage). Second, Fantin evaluates the external factors related to κύριος, which he states to be the title’s (1) vocative usage; (2) synonyms; and (3) dynamic Latin equivalent.

Chapter 5 studies actual uses of κύριος for Caesar. Fantin reports the few instances of papyri and inscriptions, which mention κύριος in reference to each of the Julio-Claudian emperors. The author then states in his evaluation: “Although extant evidence of the title κύριος for the pre-Nero Julio-Claudian emperors is minimal, there is reason to conclude it was part of the cognitive environment of the areas in which Paul carried out his correspondence” (p. 205). The reasons are primarily in Rom 10:9; 1 Cor 8:5–6, 12:3; Phil 2:11; and Eph 4:5, which he examines. The evidence of Christ being “lord” does exist, but the scant evidence and Fantin’s assessments prove little more than that the “lord” titles existed. Fantin infers that Christians were likely to be pressured by this imperial lordship from the cognitive environment, but tension is hardly substantiated in this evidence, although experiences of persecution were recorded in later generations.

Regarding the method and approach, I am inclined to believe that Fantin is forcefully applying a theory of communication as a means of reconstructing the past as “perceived reality” (p. 17). In historical reconstructions, all reality is perceived with the *Sitz im Leben* critically drawn from primary and secondary sources. Hence, the ancient and modern historical accounts and their evidences need proper assessment. Although Fantin expresses his appreciation of classicists Price and Friesen, Fantin does not critically engage the content of their scholarship and has a tendency to accept many of the primary sources at face value without careful measures to consider the entirety of the writing. However, given that the fragmented nature of the artifact will not allow such considerations, in the least, the extensive inscription of Nero’s speech on the liberation of Greece (SIG³ 814) gives greater light to the Nero’s position as deity. For example, there is the patronage language. Fantin does in fact discuss the dynamic of patronage in Roman society in pp. 204–5 with κύριος being a relational term. Indeed, the emperor does function as lord, and Nero is clear about his place in the Roman world as he calls himself in lines 31–36 αὐτοκράτωρ μέγιστος (“Supreme Imperator”), πατήρ πατρίδος (Lat. Pater Patriae, “Father of the Land”), and προειρημένος εὐεργετῆν τὴν Ἑλλάδα (“designated to be benefactor of Greece”)—all patronal titles. An element of cultic

worship is hinted at in the text. The people are to inscribe on the altar of Zeus Savior: “To Zeus Liberator [Nero] Unto the Ages” (line 49). Nero and Zeus are one and the same. This correlation perhaps better suits Fantin’s study of lordship in the ancient world.

From the standpoint of Christians themselves, did they face pressures from the imperial cult system? That largely remains unclear in Fantin’s work. Romans 13 shows Paul’s positive view of earthly powers, but unfortunately, Fantin puts this passage aside to deal with a bifurcated view of lordship, where only Christ or Caesar can be *supreme lord*. The emperor was certainly *supreme lord* over all major areas of Roman life (pp. 210–11), but one has to ask how this supremacy of Caesar affected the daily living of Christians in both cultic rituals and reception of patronage. Perhaps helpful for Fantin’s discussion is the wider picture of *Pax Romana* and the imperial patronage that prevailed throughout the Roman Empire. The ideology of Roman peace impacted regions differently as provincial rule and pressures differed from the governance of the city of Rome. Regional differences persisted: expectations differed as economic viability varied from North Africa to Asia Minor. Since the Romans were pragmatic and economically driven, they were primarily concerned with authoritative rule, order, and taxation, and patronage was the principal constituent of the social dynamic as the lordship of the emperor plays a vital role in Roman imperialism. Fantin has demonstrated that a variety of lords existed. Christ being Lord is operating at a different level from Caesar being lord, at least during Paul’s time.

Did Paul intend κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστός to be a polemic against the emperor? Fantin’s supposed interlocutor Dunn and many others are unconvinced that such a contention existed in Paul’s time. On the other hand, the author believes so, even though the challenge is not explicit in Paul. The polemic is found through an inference of supremacy language, since it implied that, for Christians, there can be only one God, and Nero was not.

Donald H. Kim

Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, Fort Worth, TX

Moral Formation according to Paul: The Context and Coherence of Pauline Ethics. By James W. Thompson. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2011, xv + 256 pp., \$24.99 paper.

In this volume James Thompson aims to discover the manner in which Paul’s ethical vision holds together. For Thompson, moral transformation is at the heart of Paul’s ministry: “The central place of moral transformation for Paul is reflected in the shape of his letters, all of which contain instructions for appropriate conduct. Contrary to popular interpretation, this instruction is neither the appendix nor the application of Paul’s theological discourse, but his primary concern” (p. 3).

Coming to grips with the coherence of Paul’s agenda for moral transformation is a challenge for a number of reasons. First, Protestants have placed a high priority on justification by faith, the free acceptance of sinners by God apart from what they do. Speaking of Paul’s ethical demands, then, appears to

diminish the centrality of justification (pp. 4–5). Second, there is no comprehensive theory expounded by Paul upon which ethicists can draw to sketch “Paul’s ethics” (p. 5). Third, there appears to be little that is unique about Paul’s exhortations. Much of what he writes to his communities has parallels in antiquity (p. 6). Fourth, Paul appears to contradict himself with regard to the Mosaic law. He “insists that believers are not ‘under law’ (Rom. 6:14) and will not be vindicated by ‘works of the law’ (Gal. 2:16), yet instructs believers to ‘keep the commandments’ (1 Cor. 7:19)” (p. 6). Fifth, Paul has a dramatically dualistic conception of human ability to behave ethically. He is remarkably pessimistic about humanity’s ability to do good apart from Christ but demonstrates a striking optimism about believers’ ability to keep the commandments (p. 6).

Recognizing these tensions and challenges, Thompson sets himself to discover the coherence of Paul’s moral vision, placing his “instruction within the larger context of his role as pastor and theologian” (p. 6). Thompson approaches Paul’s ethics in terms of the paraenetic tradition of Diaspora Judaism. He notes that prior to Paul there “was a Greek-speaking Jewish tradition that had attempted to be loyal to the Jewish law while communicating it with the terminology of the Greek ethical tradition” (p. 15). Paul’s aim of establishing minority communities of Jesus-followers within larger cultures was to some extent “similar to that of his predecessors in Hellenistic Judaism” (p. 16). Noting that “[r]ecent study of the background of Paul’s ethics has not adequately examined Hellenistic Jewish texts and Paul’s appropriation of them,” Thompson proposes “that a study of Hellenistic Jewish ethics may provide the necessary background for the study of Paul’s ethics” (p. 16).

In his first chapter, Thompson surveys a number of Jewish texts that aimed at reinforcing Jewish identity in the Diaspora. The book of Tobit calls for commitment to the Jewish community, along with practices of social justice and the protection of sexual purity (pp. 22–23). The ethical vision of 4 Maccabees draws upon Jewish tradition but also demonstrates openness to Hellenistic influence. Reason (*logismos*) can help to prevent the passions from controlling the virtuous person and enable him to pursue brotherly love (pp. 24–30). Thompson also works through the Wisdom of Solomon and *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, concluding that these texts “urge readers to appropriate the identity of ancient Israel as the people set apart from their contemporaries and called to demonstrate their election by a shared standard of conduct” (p. 39). He claims that the Holiness Code (Leviticus 17–26) in general is the richest source for Hellenistic Jewish writers (p. 40).

Thompson turns in subsequent chapters to examine Paul’s vision for moral transformation. In the book’s second chapter, he discusses how Paul’s language forms his congregations as communities, uniting them and giving them a vision for ongoing moral transformation. Paul’s churches are minority groups in larger cultures, and one of the challenges is that they are not related by kinship. Paul uses the language of Israel’s unique identity to reinforce group identity over against the surrounding society. Thompson’s discussion of how Paul does this with the Corinthians in the two canonical letters is quite thorough. Paul identifies them with

Israel's election and holiness over-against the surrounding "gentiles" (pp. 46–56), a striking appellation, given that Paul is writing to non-Jews. In addition to this, Paul identifies his readers with the language of fictive kinship, speaking of them as God's new family in Christ (pp. 56–59). They are not free agents living "the moral life" as individuals, but members of a new community, a new family. The corporate dimensions of Israel's heritage and their new identity as family members shape their moral imaginations and become the basis for Paul's exhortations.

Thompson, in his third chapter, works through Paul's relationship with the Thessalonians, leading to his first letter, as a sort of model of how Paul moved from first encounter, through basic instruction, and then to exhortation through correspondence. First Thessalonians may come closest to the work of Paul's Hellenistic Jewish predecessors who were responsible for reinforcing the identity of those in the Diaspora who were claimed by the God of Israel and seeking to live faithfully in their surrounding contexts (p. 86).

Thompson takes on the problem of Paul's relationship to the Mosaic law in his fifth chapter. The problem arises from the fact that in a number of his letters Paul states that believers are no longer "under law," but, when he moves to make ethical exhortations, he does so largely on the basis of the Mosaic law. Thompson's discussion here is straightforward and comprehensive without becoming bogged down in recent discussions and debates about Paul, the law, and his Jewish heritage. He notes that Paul makes his negative statements about the law in the context of debates about the admission of Gentiles among the people of God: "Thus Paul is not making sweeping statements about the place of the law as a source of ethical reflection, but is focusing on the place of the gentiles within the family of God" (p. 113). The key to Paul's use of the law for ethical instruction is to note that "Paul teaches his congregations to read Scripture with the lenses of Christology (Rom. 15:3) and eschatology (1 Cor. 9:10; 10:11), demonstrating its role as example and moral guide" (p. 114).

Thompson deals with the battle to control human passions in his sixth chapter. Overcoming the passions is a significant theme among ancient ethicists, and Paul's discussions in Galatians and Romans resemble these to some extent. For the philosophical schools, the passions were to be overcome so that one could travel down the path of virtue (p. 138). Debates among various schools surrounded the manner in which this could be accomplished. In Jewish tradition, one overcame the passions through obedience to the law (p. 141). In Galatians, Paul may have been responding to opponents who had insisted that their conformity to the law was the pathway to overcoming their passions (p. 142). In response, Paul reflects his Jewish heritage by attributing sin to the power of desire—namely, the "desires of the flesh" (p. 143). Yet Paul is not entirely pessimistic about the human capacity to do good. This can be done by the power of the Spirit, as the new community in Christ seeks to bear its fruit (pp. 143–44).

Thompson's discussion of Paul's argument in Romans 7 is quite thorough and exegetically rigorous. Paul is not speaking autobiographically here, but is giving a "speech in character," referring to the human incapacity to do good and to "overcome the passions of lust" apart from God's empowering Spirit (p. 151).

Since the revolution in Pauline studies three decades ago, one could argue that a remaining unexplored arena of study is Paul's ethics. This is especially the case in evangelical biblical and theological scholarship, partially because of the obstacles Thompson enumerates at the beginning of his study. Thompson's work is a major contribution to the field. It is thorough in its historical inquiry, rigorous in its exegesis, and astute in its theologically-oriented ethical vision of Paul's task. Scholars and pastors will consult it with great benefit.

Timothy G. Gombis
Grand Rapids Theological Seminary, Grand Rapids, MI

Spirituality according to Paul: Imitating the Apostle of Christ. By Rodney Reeves. Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 2011, 253 pp., \$20.00 paper.

Working to answer the "So what?" question, Rodney Reeves has contributed to the field of Pauline studies by focusing on Paul's spirituality. He is Professor of Biblical Studies and Dean of the Courts Redford College of Theology and Ministry at Southwest Baptist University.

In this monograph, Reeves explores what it means to imitate Paul. While Paul rarely refers to Jesus' teaching or earthly ministry, it was the gospel itself that defined his life. Thus, Reeves argues, Paul believed his very life revealed the gospel and became the "gospel source" for his converts. For Reeves, this means that Paul was crucified with Christ, he was buried with Christ, and he was raised with Christ. This pattern becomes the template for Reeves's monograph. Part 1 explores what it means to be crucified with Christ, part 2 buried with Christ, and part 3 raised with Christ, each in four chapters.

Reeves starts with what it means to be crucified with Christ. In the first chapter of part 1, he addresses the foolishness of Christ's death. For Paul, it was the very weakness, shame, and humiliation of the cross that provided the paradigm for how to live truly. Beginning with his conversion, Paul would leave the law behind and define his life by the model of crucifixion. This was the basis for his bragging, his change in identity, the loss of his reputation, and his changed perspective. Humiliation leads to exaltation, suffering leads to glory, death gives life, loss becomes gain, and shame becomes honor (p. 35).

In chapter 2, using the metaphor of aroma (2 Cor 2:15–16), Reeves argues that Paul's life was a thorough picture of a living sacrifice. Yet for Paul it revealed the strength and power of the Lord. Paul's autobiographical passages reveal his understanding and belief that strength is perfected in weakness (2 Cor 12:9). His life itself and all his sufferings proved the "undeniable expression of the wisdom and power of God" (p. 49). Rather than hide these flaws, Paul revealed them.

Chapter 3 introduces the concept of living as holy temples and what it means to deny the flesh. Walking the fine line between asceticism and hedonism, Reeves argues for a balanced life that includes the appropriate denial of idolatrous thinking and behavior. At the heart of his argument is the idea that glory belongs to God, and idolatry is humanity's attempt to steal it (p. 59). The only way evil can exist is to

pervert what God has made; it does not exist by its own will. Using the topics of food and sex, Reeves demonstrates how the gifts of God can create glory or evil. As temples of the Holy Spirit, believers are responsible to use the gifts of God righteously, including denial when appropriate.

In chapter 4, Reeves wrestles through the tension between grace and obedience. He observes that Paul's tendency was to blame horrendous evil on our fallenness rather than on Satan, specifically on "the flesh" and the catalytic nature of the law. Using Romans 7 as a launching pad, Reeves sees both biographical and autobiographical dynamics. While it describes "everyman's" struggles, it also describes Paul's own experience. Reeves then contrasts this with the role of the Spirit as the only power by which believers overcome sin. This leads to the question of freedom in that Paul, when dealing with divisions, "refused to answer the questions in a way that would give credence to one side or the other" (p. 84). Freedom in Christ meant too much. Thus Paul presents himself as an "exemplar" of being led by the Spirit; he became all things to all people and sacrificed himself for others. For Reeves, the desire to serve others is a compulsion generated by the Spirit.

Part 2 is on the significance of being buried with Christ. In chapter 5 Reeves looks at what it means to hold one faith expressed in one body. Unfortunately, our Western culture has long defined church in terms of time and place. For Reeves, this is untenable. He argues that Paul saw and experienced church as home. It was not an activity separate from normal life. "Rather, for Paul and his converts, church was family" (p. 94). Using the practice of baptism, Paul referred to this practice when he was trying to help his converts learn how to live at peace with each other; it pictures our reliance on Christ as we depend on each other. It is in baptism that the church is made equal; the old things have passed away and new things have come.

Chapter 6 reflects on how worship is the primary action that unites the church. Singing is seen as subversive in that it exalts a man shamed through crucifixion. Claiming "Jesus is Lord" is the same as saying "Caesar is a fool" because he made the mistake of crucifying Christ. Thus, singing and communion reminds believers of their history and simultaneously creates their identity.

In chapter 7, Reeves argues that sacred community is clearly understood in terms of sex and marriage. Paul's launching point, 1 Corinthians 7, is primarily an eschatological discussion. His view on marriage was not primarily rooted in desires for companionship, love, and sexual satisfaction, nor was marriage the ultimate goal. Rather, he believed that Jesus was coming back soon and that marriage should be a lower priority. For Paul, church is family. Thus husbands and wives are to love each other precisely because they are brothers and sisters in Christ. Using the incest case in 1 Corinthians, Reeves demonstrates that sexual sin is a community issue; when leaders fall to immorality, the public at-large see it as a strike against the church. Therefore, the church should act like a sacred community.

Chapter 8 raises the question of how money relates to generous fellowship. Working from 2 Thess 3:10, Reeves argues that the simplest explanation to this verse is that some of the Thessalonians were taking advantage of the hospitality of

the church. This raises the question of when generosity leads to complacency or entitlement. For Paul, church was family. Thus, every member should work for the good of everyone else. Yet in our culture, “philanthropy is a term we reserve for the wealthy” (p. 156). Paul would not see it this way. The poor should be as generous as the wealthy. Paul predicated his argument on grace. Believers do not “earn” money; it is given to them because of grace. It is in generosity that we become God’s grace to each other.

Part 3 examines what it means to be raised with Christ. In chapter 9 Reeves analyzes Paul’s theme of “living in the present.” Paul believed he was already “participating in the resurrection of Christ” (p. 169). His “already/not yet” eschatology reveals that he did not hold a traditional view of time. Heaven and earth overlap. The new age has already broken into the present. From an earthly perspective this looks like death, weakness, and groaning. However, in reality, it also involves a renewed mind, encouraged heart, and satisfied soul. Therefore, redemption is for all time, past, present, and future.

Chapter 10 explores the paradox between bodies that are wasting away and the newness that comes from following Christ. Living a “resurrected life”—a new creation—means living in view of the blessed hope. It is this way of living, above all, through which God reveals his glory to this world. In the mirror of Christ’s resurrection, what is old and dying is actually very much alive.

Chapter 11 wrestles with the need for spiritual warfare when living a resurrected life. Relying heavily on Ephesians, Reeves argues that believers are no longer under the dominion of “hostile super-powers” because they are already raised with Christ (p. 205). Thus the armor of God reflects the fulfillment of Isa 59:15–19 where God shows up dressed in battle armor and defeats our enemies. The true enemy has already been defeated.

Finally, chapter 12 explores the question of the “mystical journey.” Because believers serve a living, transcendent God, the knowledge and voice of God speaks to all creation. Thus the revelation of God is for all generations and is transcultural. However, the tendency today is to rely on science and entertainment to “hear” God’s voice, rather than letting God speak for himself. For the believer, the spiritual life must include the mystical and the supernatural.

Reeves’s monograph is significant for several reasons. First, it is very readable in that he blends narrative with traditional NT subject areas including backgrounds, biblical theology, exegesis, introductory matters, and grammar. Second, he brings Paul to life in ways that are often absent in Pauline studies; Paul becomes a real person. The book is intended for all who are interested in Paul and who are developing a basic understanding of who he is, and, in this regard, Reeves has accomplished his purpose. It is recommended for scholars, pastors, students, and the untrained who are interested in this area and who desire a current scholarly yet readable and understandable approach that emphasizes the importance of demonstrating the gospel in every situation.

James M. Howard
 Denver Seminary, Littleton, CO
 American Pathways University, Denver, CO

Paul's Letter to the Romans: A Commentary. By Arland J. Hultgren. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2011, xxvii + 804 pp., \$60.00.

Expectations are understandably high when a Lutheran publishes a commentary on Romans in the current climate of Pauline studies, and even more so when the introductory pages promise “sustained attention to the theological claims of the letter” (p. ix). “Lutheran” approaches to the apostle Paul have been the object of sustained critique in the last few decades in the wake of new perspectives and methodologies.

An introduction to the letter and commentary fill three-fourths of the volume. The remaining two hundred pages consist of eight appendices, a forty-page bibliography, and indices. The discussions of individual units of the letter begin with a notated translation and “General Comment,” followed by more “Detailed Comment” and bibliography. Many of the entries in the individual bibliographies are duplications of entries in the main bibliography. Had that duplication been eliminated, substantial additional space would have been available for the commentary proper.

Hultgren’s Paul is summarizing his doctrine (p. 19) as he lays a foundation in Rome for his upcoming trip to Spain (p. 6). “Much” of the Jewish population had been expelled from Rome by Claudius (pp. 3–4, 16, 468–69). Paul writes to a mixed audience after the return of the Jewish Christians to the Roman congregations. In affirming multiple purposes behind the letter (pp. 13–15), Hultgren hopes to avoid the problems associated with advocating a single purpose behind Romans, but he nevertheless leaves himself vulnerable to the weaknesses of multiple proposals. For instance, as a summary of doctrine, Romans does not address many of the topics Paul treats elsewhere.

The assumption that “much” of Rome’s Jewish population had been expelled is unlikely. In contrast to the extensive record of Tiberius’s expulsion of four thousand draftable-age Jewish men, only Suetonius mentions Claudius’s expulsion. Dio Cassius is clear that Claudius *could not* expel the Jews because they were too numerous (est. 15–50,000). Suetonius, for his own part, may only be referring to those actually involved in the *Chrestus* dispute. Furthermore, Hultgren offers rather questionable evidence for a mixed audience in response to those scholars who insist on an exclusively Gentile-implied audience. He points to the Jewish Christian audience member addressed in 2:17–29 (p. 11, n. 52). That portion of the letter, however, does not appear to be addressed to a member of the Roman congregations. Paul is censuring a Jew who does *not* obey God’s Law and because of whom the name of God is blasphemed among the non-Jews. This is an individual who appears to be without God’s Spirit and who is shamed by the non-Jew who is circumcised in heart (2:27–29). Paul is not addressing the supposed Jewish Christian members of the Roman audience. Hultgren frequently assumes

that the mere use of scriptural citations must prove a Jewish Christian minority in Rome. While aware of Christopher Stanley's *Arguing with Scripture* (London: T&T Clark, 2004), Hultgren never responds to the counterargument that Paul does not assume in-depth knowledge of the Jewish Scriptures by the addressees. Hultgren, in fact, concedes that even Gentiles will be able to follow what Paul says to "those who know the Law" in 7:1–6 (p. 269). Hultgren dismisses an implied Gentile audience. He interprets 1:5–6 as indicating that the Romans live among the "nations" (not "Gentiles"). He then translates the same word as "Gentiles" in 1:13 and 11:13 and reverts to "nations" in 15:16–19. After recognizing that Paul highlights "*Gentile*" participation in God's salvation in 15:10–12, the translation of 15:16–19 as "nations" seems unlikely. Hultgren overlooks the pattern in 1:5–6, 1:13, 11:13, and 15:16–19: Paul refers to his own apostolic activity as encompassing the "Gentiles" and then includes the Romans within the sphere of that activity. He is not repeating the trite fact that the Romans are in the midst of the nations. He is including the Romans in the sphere of his apostolic labors to the *non-Jews*!

The economy of Hultgren's discussion is valuable, especially for the classroom, but it is also a liability. He regularly notes difficult exegetical issues but can only offer a brief rationale for his interpretive choices. That brevity may be frustrating in view of the extensive bibliography with the full range of modern scholarly work on the letter.

For instance, Hultgren assumes that *nomos* should be translated as "principle" in Rom 7:21: "I discover the principle that when I will to do good, evil is close at hand." Hultgren cites N. T. Wright's alternative translation, "This is what I find about the law/Torah" and merely claims that it "does not work syntactically" (p. 290, n. 247), despite the inclusion in the bibliography of Paul Meyer's extensive defense (among others) of a genitive of reference in 7:21. Furthermore, why cite Wright when these earlier, more extensive discussions are available? In denying a reference to the Mosaic Law in the hands of varying apocalyptic agents, Hultgren is forced to define *nomos* strangely as a "figure of speech that reflects what is typical (constant, regular)" (p. 290).

While on the topic of Romans 7, Hultgren identifies the "I" as Paul's paradigmatic past experience under the Law from his current, Christian perspective (p. 275). When Paul says "I was once alive apart from the Law" (Rom 7:9), Hultgren admits that "there is actually no time in the life of a Jewish male when he is not under obligation to observe the law" (p. 278). Nevertheless, Hultgren assumes that the Mishnah reflects Second Temple perspectives when it identifies thirteen years of age for the Jewish male to take on the commandments of the Law. Hultgren does not cite earlier witnesses. On the contrary, for Philo, Jews are instructed in the laws *even "from the cradle,"* from "the earliest years" (*Legat.* 16 §115; 31 §310; emphasis added). Josephus says that Jews have the laws engraved on their souls "from the first dawn of intelligence" (*Ag. Ap.* 2.18 §178). Second Temple authors considered even young boys to be "under" the Torah. Paul's "I" who is "alive apart from the Law" does not likely refer to Jews.

Those looking for a "theological reading" of the letter from a Lutheran exegete's perspective may be disappointed. Hultgren adopts the traditional

understanding of “works of the Law” as observance of the Law irrespective of boundary markers (pp. 170–72) but with little discussion of where and how the “new perspective” fails. Although he identifies the key exegetical issues of the letter, Hultgren devotes little space to the major theological problems. One notable exception, not surprisingly for Hultgren, is a forty-page appendix justifying his translation of “faith in Christ.” The summary of the faith in/of Christ discussion does not, however, pave new ground. In another longer appendix, Hultgren faults the traditional Lutheran forensic approach to righteousness, which “misses the dynamic of Paul’s concept.” Hultgren identifies God’s righteousness as God’s saving activity (pp. 75–76, 605–15, esp. 613). Within the discussion of individual texts, Hultgren counts 1:3–4 as a witness to a functional “adoptionist” Christology that should not be equated with the ontological adoptionism of the second and third centuries (p. 47). Consistent with that perspective, Hultgren denies that the ascription in 9:5, “God blessed forever,” modifies “the Christ.” Hultgren downplays the evidential value of Phil 2:6 in claiming that Christ is never called “God” elsewhere in Paul (pp. 354–55). He does not offer any warrants against the grammatical case offered by the many scholars (whom Hultgren identifies) who take “God blessed” as modifying “the Christ.”

Hultgren finds Paul a victim of a pre-scientific worldview. Paul traces death to Adam’s sin in Rom 5:12–14. Hultgren points out that, from the evolutionary perspective, death had been in the world long before the first humans or “Adam.” Thus “what biologists call death is only loosely related to what Paul calls ‘death’ in Romans Death is not merely biological in Romans, any more than the life that is given us in Jesus is merely biological” (p. 225). Hultgren wants to affirm a “both-and” logic, when he is, in fact, affirming an “either-or.” Since biological death was not brought into the world by “Adam,” Paul must be speaking of spiritual death. Similarly, on p. 98 Hultgren grants that Paul is referring in Rom 1:26–27 to “same-gender sexual relationships,” but he qualifies that “the concepts of ‘heterosexuality,’ ‘homosexuality,’ and ‘sexual orientation’ were unknown in Paul’s day” (p. 101). Sexual orientation is a “modern awareness.” Whereas the ancients defined “natural” by anatomical differences, the modern understands human nature differently (p. 102). This is questionable. Plato satirizes innate homoerotic passion (*Symp.* 189C–193D). The Hippocratic treatise *De victu* 1.28–29 attributes homosexual development to the preponderance of sperm from the opposite-sex parent or from opposite-sex elements within the sperm. Some people indulge in same-sex intercourse “by nature” according to Aristotle’s *Eth. nic.* 1148b, lines 28–34 (see the discussion of these texts and additional evidence in Robert Gagnon, *The Bible and Homosexual Practice* [Nashville: Abingdon, 2001] 384–85).

Hultgren is to be commended for a single-volume commentary on perhaps Paul’s most challenging letter. Students in a course on Romans will appreciate the compact discussion and identification of key exegetical issues. The overall result is mixed.

A. Andrew Das
Elmhurst College, Elmhurst, IL

Paul through Mediterranean Eyes. Cultural Studies in 1 Corinthians. By Kenneth E. Bailey. Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 2011, 560 pp., \$30.00 paper.

Kenneth Bailey is known for his cultural studies on the NT (e.g. *Poet and Peasant: A Literary-Cultural Approach to the Parables in Luke* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1976]; *Through Peasant Eyes: More Lucan Parables, Their Culture and Style* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980]), and in this volume he applies his expertise to 1 Corinthians. In particular, he examines the letter according to the rhetorical styles of the OT writing prophets and the culture of the eastern Mediterranean. Despite the immense interest in structuring the letter according to classical rhetorical categories such as discussed by Aristotle and Cicero, Bailey finds 1 Corinthians to be structured according to Hebrew parallelisms, such as chiasms and step and inverted parallelism. Bailey also brings a unique contribution in applying the translations of ancient Hebrew, Arabic, and Syriac translations of 1 Corinthians as lenses for reading the text.

Bailey's careful structural analysis is intended to dispel the notion that Paul's letter is a disjointed collection of practical advice as opposed to a carefully ordered presentation, an argument that has also been proposed by those who have applied the classical rhetorical categories (pp. 24–25). He notes various structures, such as what he calls a "prophetic rhetorical template," which is an inverted structure of seven units or "cameos" with the climax in the middle (pp. 39–41). He also identifies a "high jump format," which is a "ring composition with an introduction" (p. 43) consisting of a "short sprint" (the introduction), an "ascent," the "crossing of the bar" (which is also the climax), and a "descent."

As Bailey notes, there are important reasons for identifying these Hebrew structures. For example, chiasms, or "ring compositions," find the climax at the center as opposed to the end, as is usually the case in Western texts. Furthermore, the author's intent can be better identified by seeing the pairing of ideas in the corresponding parts of the composition. His analysis of 1 Cor 1:10–13 pairs verse 10 with verse 13b as the outer units (cameos 1 and 6), emphasizing Christ and his crucifixion. These are followed by verses 1:10b and 1:12–13a (cameos 2 and 5), discussing the divisions among the Corinthians, with the center units (1:10c and 1:11, cameos 3 and 4) urging the Corinthians to be united and not divided among different leaders. In this way Paul makes his appeal for a specific action, unity, buttressed by his emphasis upon the cross of Christ. As Bailey describes, "The question is not 'Who is *my* leader?' but rather, 'Who died for us?'" (p. 71).

In numerous instances, Bailey's structure highlights significant points, such as the proclamation of the crucified Christ as the Lord of glory as the center of 1 Cor 2:7–10a, or the citation of Gen 2:24, "The two shall become one flesh," as the climax of his discussion of sexual practice in 1 Cor 6:13–20. Scripture, along with parables such as the ones of the field and the farmers and the builders and building in 1 Cor 3:5–17, are often found at the center.

This identification of the center is one of the most important contributions of the commentary. For example, in 1 Cor 2:7–10a, when Paul explains the mystery of God's wisdom, which the rulers of this age did not understand, Bailey says that this

revelation is found in 2:8b, the center of the chiasm. In this way, Paul draws attention to the centrality of the cross in God's revelation and how Christ crucified is the Lord of glory. In this and many other places, the structure focuses the reader on critical themes and theological points in Paul's presentation. Thus, Bailey notes that the purpose of identifying these structures is to point out a "deeper understanding of his intent" (p. 22).

Connections with the OT are a particularly illuminating facet of this work. Bailey finds both similar structures and similar themes in Paul's writings and the Hebrew prophets. For example, he observes that both 1 Cor 1:17–2:2 and Isa 50:4–11 follow a "double ring composition," which is two chiasms where the last unit, or *cameo*, of the first also functions as the introduction to the second. He notes that both contain common themes, especially the suffering and eventual victory of the servant. Thus, the shared template helps demonstrate how the suffering leader does not go against Jewish tradition, but rather was already prophesied through Isaiah, and in this way it provides a message of assurance and encouragement to his followers.

Another rewarding aspect of the book is Bailey's application of his extensive knowledge of contemporary Middle Eastern culture, gained from decades of living in the region. The numerous examples sprinkled throughout the commentary help the Western reader understand the mindset of a different culture, such as when he describes how radical it would have been for the Corinthians to see the dwelling place of God not as a physical temple requiring a pilgrimage, but as the community itself (p. 132). In other places, his references add color and depth to our understanding of the passage, as in his description of how the feet are considered to be unclean in Middle Eastern culture. Bailey applies this knowledge to 1 Cor 12:15 as well as to the use of shoes in recent events, such as how many Iraqis beat Saddam Hussein's statue with their shoes when it was pulled down in Baghdad in 2003.

While Bailey has done enormous work in seeing the structure of the entire letter in terms of parallelisms and other literary devices, not all of the structures are convincing, such as some of the larger ones that are outlined according to themes but lack more explicit linguistic parallels. He rightly says that interpreters should be open to such a "*rhyme of ideas*" (p. 35; emphasis his). However, this might be something more appropriate to shorter units of Hebrew parallelism in which the corresponding lines follow closely after one another, rather than being separated by larger sections of text as in the more extended chiasms. The issue is to what extent we should expect more clear linguistic markers to help indicate corresponding units in the larger structures, especially for a document intended for what was still an essentially oral culture.

Because Bailey's methodology is to focus on the rhetorical flow of the text, he does not delve deeply into critical matters, and he will sometimes point the reader to extended discussions available in the more standard commentaries. Those looking for in-depth interaction with the secondary literature on 1 Corinthians will not find it in this commentary, and Bailey states at the outset that this is not the purpose of the book.

At times he does not go as deeply into ancient cultural matters as one might expect, given the subtitle of the volume, “Cultural Studies in 1 Corinthians.” For example, in his discussion of 1 Cor 11:17–34 he only touches on the issue of the possible reasons for the divisions during the Lord’s Supper. The setting of the conflict as a meal and the evident tension between the rich and the poor would seem to be a rich source of cultural material here, and one might have expected more examination of the possible social reasons behind the conflict. However, this again may be a reflection of the choices Bailey had to make in writing the commentary, which is over 550 pages as it stands.

In sum, Bailey has done an important service in identifying these structures and the way in which they can help us understand in a deeper way Paul’s intent in the letter. The book should be a rich resource for interpreters, and especially those who desire to see the rich theology underlying Paul’s practical concerns.

Michelle Lee-Barnewall
Biola University, La Mirada, CA

Emerging Leadership in the Pauline Mission: A Social Identity Perspective on Local Leadership Development in Corinth and Ephesus. By Jack Barentsen. Princeton Theological Monograph Series 168. Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock, 2011, xviii + 378 pp., \$44.00 paper.

Jack Barentsen, Assistant Professor of Practical Theology and New Testament at Evangelische Theologische Faculteit in Leuven, Belgium, concludes that “Paul instituted uniform patterns of leadership for those levels of leadership, which sustained the consistent communication of Paul’s gospel in each community in alignment with other churches in the Pauline network” (p. 15). In this revised Ph.D. dissertation, researched under Martin Weber at ETF-Leuven, Barentsen studies 1–2 Corinthians, Ephesians, and 1–2 Timothy through the lens of social identity theory and discerns patterns of leadership in Paul’s mission among those in Corinth and Ephesus.

Chapter 1 covers key definitions, surveys the plan of the book, and provides an explanatory rationale for his choice of texts and the social identity model of leadership. Barentsen’s research question serves as a helpful introduction: “what were the leadership patterns in these early Christ-following communities, and how did the communities as well as Paul influence the development of these patterns?” (p. 6). Chapter 2 provides a history of research on early church leadership. Barentsen rightly notes that denominational commitment heavily influenced these studies. The Holtzmann-Sohm hypothesis represented the consensus until the middle of the 20th century, when Post-Weberian social-scientific studies, disconnected from denominational ties, brought more diversity into the discussion (p. 20). However, this new approach simply replaced denomination ideology with sociological models. Thus, more integrative work still needed to be done. Barentsen situates his study at the intersection of the denominational approaches that were driven by prior institutional commitments and the social approaches with their focus on group dynamics evident in the Mediterranean cultural context. In many

ways, Barentsen's work builds on and seeks to further the work of Andrew Clarke by integrating rather than juxtaposing the social and ideological components of leadership. He also brings further refinement to the model-based approach to social identity theory evident in the work of Philip Esler.

Chapter 3 delineates Barentsen's "three-stage" social identity model of leadership that guides the exegetical discussions that follow (p. 32). This chapter analyses the way social identity approaches conceive of issues related to leadership. It begins with a brief history of social identity approaches and then covers the basic concepts important to this study (i.e. social identity hierarchies, social identity definitions, and group prototypes and stereotypes). Barentsen points to Esler's influence in the use of social identity theory within biblical studies, discusses some of the criticisms leveled against scholars using these tools, and introduces his case study approach (p. 42). His model begins with a description of the processes of social identification within groups, processes that will be applied to the situations in Corinth and Ephesus (p. 52). The second stage focuses on the way leaders manage these processes, relating the way Paul engaged leaders and the way the communities negotiate their social identity. The final stage looks at the way a leader's identity-based management leads to the "emergence, maintenance, and succession of leaders," providing a substantial discussion of the latter aspect since it has been somewhat under-theorized in the literature (pp. 58, 62).

Chapter 4 discusses the impact that cross-cutting social identities (and comparative fit) had within the Corinthian Christ-movement. Barentsen rightly notes that Paul's rule that members should maintain, where possible, existing social identifications (1 Cor 7:17–24) brought a certain added level of complexity in these identity negotiations (p. 82). One of the significant contributions from this chapter is that it brings to the fore the role of local leaders in the (mis)management of Christian social identity. Thus, paying attention to the way social identity is formed emphasizes details in the text that traditional approaches have overlooked (p. 86, n. 43). Next, Barentsen discusses Paul's agency with regard to the formation of social identity in Corinth. He provides an excellent overview of the way Paul relies on processes that are also found in social identity approaches; what results is a leader who empowers the Corinthians "to strong identity performance" (p. 100). The final part of the chapter outlines the patterns of leadership that emerged from his "social identity model of leadership" analysis of 1 Corinthians.

With regard to 2 Corinthians, which is the focus of chapter 5, Barentsen defines the problem as Jewish Christian leaders who have come to Corinth with a different vision for the way Jewish social identities continue to be relevant within the church. These intruding Jewish teachers were able to influence the community because Paul's social engineering in 1 Corinthians had been ineffective. This group also relied on more culturally acceptable leadership discourses (patronage and recommendation letters). Paul's initial approach to this problem included a painful visit, a tearful letter, and the agency of Titus, who functioned as a temporary delegate (p. 137). He ultimately was reconciled to the Corinthians, and 2 Corinthians records the way in which the negotiation of identity occurred. In reasserting his position, Paul focused on his position as the in-group prototype and

emphasized the centrality of suffering in mission (p. 138). However, this resolution had not yet taken place so there is no discussion of a leadership successor, and based on the evidence from 1 Clement, initial success in appointing local leaders fossilized and “further succession faltered” (p. 139).

Chapter 6 surveys Ephesians, which Barentsen understands as Paul’s attempt to manage the identity of a stable leadership group by focusing on a universalistic Christian social identity, in contrast to his focus on nested, cross-cutting identities in 1–2 Corinthians. Ephesians is a legitimating document designed to provide necessary organizational structures for a “city-wide church that had outgrown the small network of house churches” (p. 183). Barentsen navigates many of the traditional arguments raised against Paul’s authorship of this letter. For example, Barentsen accounts for the exalted persona of Paul in this letter, which scholars often note is not congruent with the way he presents himself in the undisputed Paulines, as a function of “the normal processes of charismatic leadership attribution” (p. 180). Thus, attention paid to social identity approaches provides plausible solutions for scholarly debates. Barentsen contends that the apostles and prophets were foundational leaders who embodied the in-group prototype and are joined by local leaders in the formation of Christian social identity, though this latter group “has not yet been shaped into the full-fledged form of church office” (p. 179).

Chapter 7 analyzes 1 Timothy as a communal structuring document. Barentsen provides a series of arguments for an orthonymous understanding of the Pastoral epistles, an important point in his approach. Although he recognizes the problem in approaching a personal letter with a hermeneutic of social identity, he suggests that the community was reading over the shoulder of Timothy. Issues of deviance are brought to the fore in this form of a *mandata principis* letter, and Paul writes to Timothy in order to instruct him on the way to maintain local leadership (p. 249). He does this through the use of stereotypes, gendered prototypes, succession chains, and the construction of an identity narrative that reinforces beliefs and values (p. 226). Chapter 8 then examines 2 Timothy as a leadership succession letter. Paul defends Timothy’s ecclesial position in the letter by reshaping key attributional processes. He is presented as a leader similar to Paul, which should in turn encourage the community to accept him as they had earlier accepted Paul (p. 274). Chapter 9 provides key implications from this study, especially as they relate to contemporary leadership practices in the church. Barentsen makes the similarities of Paul’s processes in each of the letters clear; the differences that are present are to be explained by the divergent local contexts and stages of leadership development within each community (p. 302).

Barentsen set out to provide a more comprehensive interpretation of the leadership patterns evident in the Pauline communities in Corinth and Ephesus than has been possible using traditional interpretive methods; he has succeeded commendably. For those who find themselves in religious contexts that identify closely with Pauline Christianity, Barentsen offers new and fresh insights for leaders seeking to fulfill their missional calling in a way that coheres closely to the scriptural witness. This highly recommended study provides groundbreaking insight

into the way social identity theory can inform contemporary ecclesiology rooted in the consistent leadership practices of the apostle Paul.

J. Brian Tucker
Moody Theological Seminary, Plymouth, MI

Paul's Letter to the Philippians: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary. By Ben Witherington III. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2011, xxix + 312 pp., \$38.00 paper.

Having written a two-volume NT theology, a commentary on every book in the NT, and a previous commentary on Philippians (*Friendship and Finances in Philippi* [Valley Forge, PA: Trinity Press International, 1994], Witherington now brings his skill and experience to a socio-rhetorical commentary on Philippians. He mildly regrets the previous work's title, as he did not then nor does he now consider Philippians a friendship letter. With time he has found the analysis of Philippians as a friendship letter less and less persuasive (p. 14). Also, Witherington's second commentary on Philippians is not simply a revision of the earlier work but "a whole new study from scratch including a fresh translation" (p. x).

The work includes an index of subjects, authors, and ancient sources. After 13 pages of bibliography and a 37-page introduction, Witherington comes to the commentary proper. The format is as follows: (1) *Section Introduction*: The introduction surveys the section, sets it in context, and opens discussion of key topics. The introductions are helpful without being overly redundant. (2) *Translation*: "Here, as in previous socio-rhetorical commentaries, the translation is not in fluid English prose but seeks, rather, to give as clear a sense in English as possible of the vocabulary and syntax of the Greek" (p. 41, n. 1). At times, Witherington's translation clarifies issues and opens up fresh possibilities. At other times, it gives odd renderings (e.g. the translation of 1:16–17 on p. 74). Forms of ἀδελφοί (brothers) are translated "brothers and sisters" at 1:12 and 14, but not again in the rest of the letter (3:1, 13, 17, 4:1, 8 and 21). It would have been helpful if verse numbers were given in the translation. (3) *Verse-by-verse comment*: Clearly marked sections would be helpful. If one wants to drop in to the comments on a particular verse, it is sometimes hard to find the place where he starts and finishes. (4) *Bridging the Horizons*: Bridging sections bring the issues of the text to bear on modern life and are valuable for sparking thoughts on application. Surprisingly, there is no bridging section for 4:2–3. The bridging section for 4:10–20 is found after 4:21–23. (5) Interspersed are valuable digressions, called "Closer Look" sections. Here Witherington does some of his best and most helpful work. These include: Paul's Right-Hand Man Timothy; Joy, the Elixir of Faith and Effervescence of Hope; Imitation, the Highest Form of Education; Honor, Shame, and Apostolic Life; E. A. Judge and the Social World of Early Christianity; The Christ Hymn in Recent Discussion; *Synkrisis* When There Is No Crisis; Social-Scientific Criticism—Will Meeks Inherit the Earth; Paul among the Ancient Moralists; Caesar's Household and the Household of Faith.

Witherington's commentary on Philippians contains a number of strengths. Some commentaries miss the forest for the trees. Witherington does a good job helping the reader see the flow of the text. As with all his works, Witherington writes clearly, with enthusiasm and appropriate humor, and always with an eye to relevance. *Paul's Letter to the Philippians* makes a valuable contribution to helping the reader set the letter in its Greek and Roman cultural context.

In a brief review such as this, it is perhaps worth pointing out some of the notable positions taken in the commentary. Those familiar with Witherington's work know that he writes from a Wesleyan and generally egalitarian perspective. Reflecting these concerns, his treatment of 2:19–30 (Epaphroditus and Timothy) uses one page per verse; that on 4:2–3 (Euodia and Syntyche) uses 4.5 pages per verse (not including a bridging portion). Regarding 4:2–3, Witherington comments, "It is important, however, not to overexegete this passage" (p. 234). Further he digresses on the book of life (4:3), asserting that Paul believed "in the possibility of genuine Christians committing apostasy" (p. 240). With P. T. O'Brien and against G. D. Fee and most translations (e.g. ESV, KJV, NASB, NIV, and NLT), Witherington translates 1:3 with "I give thanks to God, for your every remembrance of me." The rendering is preferable, and it is time that translations start offering readers at least a marginal note to that effect. For Witherington the righteousness of 3:9 is eschatological (not imputed) and comes through the faithfulness of Christ. Thus he translates verses 9–10a: "and may be found in him, not having my own righteousness that comes from the Law, but rather the sort that comes through the faithfulness of Christ, the righteousness from God bestowed upon the faithful [τὴν ἐκ θεοῦ δικαιοσύνην ἐπὶ τῇ πίστει]" (p. 185). Oddly, this takes the abstract noun πίστις (faith, faithfulness) as if it were the equivalent of the substantival participle πιστεύουσιν (the believers).

I have a few areas of concern with regard to Witherington's commentary on Philippians. Portions of the commentary might be difficult for pastors not familiar with rhetorical terms (e.g. *exordium*, *narratio*, *propositio*, *probatio*, *peroratio*, *deliberative rhetoric*, *insinuatō*), especially when a term appears repeatedly in short space (e.g. *peroration* 6 times on p. 242). A glossary of rhetorical terms would have been helpful. Similarly, one might think that a paperback commentary using Greek transliteration would be at best semi-technical or even non-technical. However, the vocabulary says otherwise: *diminuendo*, *Saturnalia*, *epideitic*, *apotheosis*, *adfectus*, *onomatopoetic*, *agonistic*, *polysendeton*, *leitmotif*, and *ratiocination*. Witherington's preface asserts that the socio-rhetorical commentary series is in wide use by "students, pastors, and educated laypersons" (pp. x–xi). Nevertheless, it is probable that many of these will find the terminology difficult.

Witherington has an odd use of "technical term." I take a "technical term" to be a word or phrase that has a specific meaning within a specific field of discourse or expertise. Witherington repeated asserts that Paul uses "accounting," "business," or "mercantile" language and that this language is "technical" (pp. 2, 199, 202–3, 266–67, 278). So *kerdos* and *zēmian* (3:7–8) are accounting language of profit and loss (pp. 202–3). Yet by definition technical mercantile language appears in a mercantile context; and this is not the context of Philippians. It is as if when one

hears the phrase “My emotions are a roller coaster,” one needs to know that this is the technical language of the amusement park. A search for κέρδος and ζημία in Josephus reveals extensive nontechnical usage (e.g. *Ant.* 3.267, 4.211, 15.417, 18.58; *J.W.* 4.102, 7.87).

As with the rest of Witherington’s voluminous output, we have come to expect that he will be insightful, careful, and precise. That is often the case in *Paul’s Letter to the Philippians*. Unfortunately, at other times, it is not. So, for example, Witherington says that “the language of friendship [φίλος and φιλία] is *singularly* missing in Philippians” (p. 20 italics mine) and that “Paul deliberately avoids the language of friendship in Philippians because” the Philippians are family (p. 125; cf. p. 278). These comments are misleading. Philippians is not unique. Paul does not use φίλος or φιλία in any of his letters.

Similarly, Witherington takes a subjectivist position regarding πίστις Χριστοῦ (3:9). The text reads ἀλλὰ τὴν διὰ πίστεως Χριστοῦ. Witherington says the reference is to Christ’s faithfulness not to faith in Christ, asserting that “the most natural rendering of *dia* here is ‘through’ not ‘in’” (p. 205). The comment is baffling since no objectivist asserts that the sense “in Christ” comes from the preposition *dia*.

Further, according to Witherington the working out of salvation (2:12) is not about *individual* effort but rather *group* effort since the pronoun “is plural” (p. 120; cf. p. 159). This is a common error (on this, see my “Plural You: On the Use and Abuse of the Second Person,” *BBR* 20 [2010] 183–96).

Witherington asserts that English has an impoverished vocabulary for love. For him it is significant that at 1:9 Paul speaks of *agape* love; such love is self-sacrificial and other-regarding (p. 68). Later, without giving specifics, he reasserts that English is impoverished, adding that “there are five or six different words in Greek for what we can only call ‘love.’ There’s one word for brotherly or sisterly love, another for family love, another for erotic love, and so on” (p. 226). I assume that Witherington means φιλία, στοργή, and ἔρως respectively. This older view of the distinctions between the words was corrected by B. B. Warfield, “The Terminology of Love in the New Testament,” *Princeton Theological Review* 16 (1918) 153–203.

Because of his stature as a NT scholar, scholars of Paul must have a copy of Witherington’s commentary. For students and pastors, however, I suggest the work by G. Walter Hansen (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009). Although costlier (retail \$44), one gets more pages per dollar, and it is available in hardcover.

G. W. Peterman
Moody Bible Institute, Chicago, IL

Wisdom Christology: How Jesus Becomes God's Wisdom for Us. By Daniel J. Ebert IV. Explorations in Biblical Theology. Phillipsburg: P&R, 2011, xi + 224 pp., \$17.99 paper.

This volume appears in a series entitled Explorations in Biblical Theology, edited by Robert A. Peterson. It grows out of the author's 1998 doctoral dissertation at Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, supervised by D. A. Carson. There is much to commend in this book. Ebert highlights a central NT theme: Christ the Son of God incarnates God's wisdom and invites followers to embrace this wisdom. His prose is a delight to read, a model of lucid exposition. He organizes his chapters carefully, capturing the readers' attention in the introductions, laying out the topics to be discussed, and succinctly summarizing at the end.

Ebert sets as his task to explore "how the doctrine of Christ functioned as wisdom for the early church" (p. 2) and to stress the importance of the relationship between Christology and the spiritual vitality of the church (p. 3). His approach consists of an examination of scattered NT texts that celebrate Christ as God's wisdom. In each case, he is careful to emphasize that these texts are always grounded in "the practical problems the church faced" (p. 4). One also detects a concern to correct what he considers to be a mistaken approach; namely, the widely assumed connection between the Lady Wisdom motif of Jewish wisdom literature and the portrayal of Jesus as the wisdom of God in the NT (pp. 10–14).

In his first two chapters, Ebert selects two texts from the Gospels (Matt 11:25–30 and John 1:1–18) in which Jesus is portrayed as God's wisdom incarnate. He locates the Matthean passage within the Gospel as a whole, drawing attention to Matthew's focus "on God's saving revelation, which centers in Jesus, the Son of God" (p. 20). This particular passage showcases Jesus as the unique mediator of God's wisdom who invites listeners to become "insatiable" learners in his school of discipleship (p. 37).

A concern, however, soon surfaces: "It is a mistake to read this as if Jesus were identifying himself as the incarnation of Lady Wisdom Matthew's wisdom is wrapped up with God's final revelation in the person and work of Jesus. We should not be unduly distracted by a supposed antecedent Wisdom figure" (p. 25). After surveying an alleged literary background in the apocryphal book of Sirach (Sir 51:23–26; 38:24–25), he concludes that these texts contain "more of contrast than of identification" with the Matthean formulation.

The center of John's prologue also contains an invitation to receive Christ as wisdom, even though the specific term John uses is "Word" (*logos*; John 1:11–13). Ebert calls attention to the fundamental shift away from the Torah as the embodiment of God's wisdom (as in Judaism), to Christ as the incarnation of God's wisdom (NT). Again, Ebert cautions the reader that "the wisdom motif needs to be interpreted with restraint and balance. Some have overread the role of the Wisdom figure for John's Gospel" (p. 40).

Turning to three Pauline letters (chaps. 3–5), Ebert unpacks how Wisdom Christology actually functions in each particular church situation. At Corinth Paul

counteracts a misinterpretation of the gospel of Christ resulting in “inappropriate competitiveness based on confidence in human wisdom” (p. 61). Paul’s treatment of God’s wisdom in Christ turns worldly wisdom—so highly prized in Corinth—on its head. Once again, Ebert makes the point that “Paul’s wisdom teaching is not about identifying Christ with some antecedent figure, even tangentially, but about the entire drama of salvation as it is played out in Christ” (p. 66, see also p. 60).

Chapter 5 discusses the celebrated Col 1:15–20 with its cosmic Christology. He ably summarizes the numerous exegetical issues surrounding this daunting passage (pp. 83–93) and then demonstrates how the three wisdom motifs—Christ the creator, Christ the center of the cosmos, and Christ the cosmic reconciler—spoke to the Colossian crisis (pp. 93–103) and continue to speak to our own circumstances (pp. 103–112).

Turning to Phil 2:5–11, he summarizes a welter of exegetical issues and options (pp. 119–27) and draws attention to the fact that Paul explicates what is only asserted in 1 Cor 11:24, 30; namely, Jesus’ death on the cross embodies the essence of divine wisdom. Paul’s paraenesis leading into and flowing out of this text challenges believers to adopt a similar “mind” as Christ, another way of speaking of God’s wisdom in Christ (pp. 114–15).

Ebert emphasizes the importance of the Suffering Servant of Isaiah 53 for understanding the passage even though “the identification of Christ with the Suffering Servant is *an inherited assumption under the surface rather than explicitly argued in Philippians 2*” (p. 131; emphasis added). Quite right. But apparently a similar admission is not permissible with regard to Lady Wisdom in Colossians or Philippians!

Chapter 6 focuses on the magnificent prologue of Hebrews, “an extraordinarily rich announcement of God’s amazing wisdom in his Son (Heb 1:1–4)” (p. 146). As with Col 1:15–20 and Phil 2:5–11, Ebert concisely discusses the exegetical issues involving structure, context, and intertextuality, especially the importance of Psalms 2 and 110 for the Christology of the passage. In his conclusion to the chapter, Ebert emphasizes that “while the prologue to Hebrews contains an amazing celebration of Christological wisdom, it builds on elements that are foreign to the Jewish Wisdom figure (e.g. the incarnation and resurrection)” (p. 170).

In short, Ebert’s approach to NT wisdom texts emphasizes discontinuity to the near-dismissal of any continuity with an OT and Second Temple Judaism Wisdom figure. Why the persistent red flags about discerning anything more than faint allusions to Lady Wisdom? Ebert is obviously indebted to his mentor, D. A. Carson, who praises the book because it “carefully demolishes the ‘Jesus as Lady Sophia’ Christology” (back cover). Ebert also references the substantial work of Gordon Fee who rejects even faint allusions (*Pauline Christology: An Exegetical-Theological Study* [Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2007], esp. pp. 595–638). Apparently, an impressive array of evangelical NT scholars (F. F. Bruce, Donald Hagner, Seyoon Kim, William Lane, Ralph Martin, Frank Thielman, and Ben Witherington, to name just a few) have erred by detecting indebtedness to the Lady Wisdom tradition of the OT and apocrypha. For Ebert, the NT concept of Jesus as God’s

wisdom depends on direct, divine revelation discovered in Jesus and the gospel, quite apart from any antecedent notion of Lady Wisdom.

Whereas Fee disavows any verbal allusion whatsoever to Lady Wisdom, Ebert appears reluctant to go so far. He allows that “at best, the background Wisdom material provided *language* to express truths about Christ, especially in his revelatory and creative functions” (p. 13; emphasis added). His primary objection rests on his observation that Jesus far transcends what was predicated of Lady Wisdom. In light of that, any linkage is problematic.

Both Fee and Ebert are disturbed (and rightly so) by some mainline scholars who employ Lady Wisdom as a master key, implicitly, if not explicitly, denying the high Christology of the NT (and, in a few cases, transmuting Jesus into Lady Sophia!). However, the evangelical scholars with whom I am familiar and who see conceptual indebtedness to Lady Wisdom readily agree with Ebert that Jesus Christ far exceeds anything found in Jewish literature of the Second Temple period.

So, is something else going on here? Perhaps there is an unstated unease with the notion that NT writers incorporate and reformulate ideas and concepts appearing in non-canonical Jewish sources. Resistance to this probably stems from a concern that the authority of Scripture is thereby subtly undermined. I appreciate and share the concern to safeguard the authority of Scripture, and I agree that one should exercise due caution in detecting reconfigured Jewish traditions in the NT. However, alarm over such an approach seems to me unwarranted. The evidence is quite compelling that the train of biblical revelation picks up extra freight when it goes through the intertestamental tunnel. This issue constitutes ongoing tension in evangelical biblical scholarship with no signs of an emerging consensus. (See Peter Enns, *Inspiration and Incarnation: Evangelicals and the Problem of the Old Testament* [Grand Rapids: Baker, 2005].)

The positive contribution of Ebert’s book is its welcome reminder of the importance of Christology for a vibrant faith. This is a “textbook” model for applying NT teaching to the church and will serve admirably in this capacity in colleges and seminaries. Its usefulness is enhanced by questions for reflection, a select bibliography, and indexes for scriptural and extrabiblical references, subjects, and names.

Larry Helyer
Taylor University, Upland, IN

Killing Enmity: Violence and the New Testament. By Thomas R. Yoder Neufeld. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2011, xii + 178 pp., \$22.99 paper.

In *Killing Enmity*, Thomas Yoder Neufeld, a NT professor at Conrad Grebel University College at the University of Waterloo, has provided a series of “studies of specific topics and texts” related to the theme of violence in the NT (p. 15). The book’s title is drawn from Eph 2:16, which speaks of the reconciliation God has accomplished through Christ on the cross, thus “killing enmity.” The phrase aptly summarizes the quandary proponents of non-violence face in reading the NT: even

in those passages that seem most amenable to a non-violent reading, one cannot escape the language of violence—even “enmity” is “killed.” This raises difficult questions that haunt the pages of this book: To what extent does “non-violence” actually represent the outlook of Jesus and the apostles? In addition, even if “non-violence” is a suitable description of a central concern of the NT, does the language and imagery used to describe this emphasis actually undermine non-violence, or even unintentionally condone violence?

An opening chapter first defines “violence,” noting both narrower (i.e. physical violence) and wider (e.g. social domination) definitions in the relevant literature. Yoder Neufeld concludes that “the meaning of ‘violence’ is not possible to delineate carefully” (p. 8), and so we must remain open to both narrower and wider notions of violence in engaging the NT. The chapter then offers a survey of general issues related to reading the NT with an eye to violence. One theme emerges from this chapter that is repeated throughout the book: the extent to which one sees the NT as condoning violence or condemning it is determined in large part by the reader’s own historical, cultural, and social location.

In the remaining chapters, Yoder Neufeld turns to some “representative” NT texts that especially reflect the quandary and questions noted above. The first of these chapters concentrates on the traditional “peace teachings” of Jesus in the Sermons on the Mount (Matthew 5) and on the Plain (Luke 6), especially focused on his commands to “turn the other cheek” and to “love your enemies.” Yoder Neufeld concludes that Jesus calls his disciples not to passive submission but to creative non-violence, even active love, subverting violence through confident vulnerability and always leaving open the door to reconciliation with one’s enemy.

The next chapter examines Jesus’ teaching on forgiveness through the lens of the parable of the unforgiving slave within its context in Matthew 18. This parable is a particularly difficult example of the quandary noted above, in that the king exhibits both violent severity and merciful magnanimity in extremes. In the end Yoder Neufeld determines that the parable does not set out either a “theory of judgment” or a “theory of forgiveness” (p. 54), but it highlights the biblical reality of both divine judgment and divine forgiveness even as it mandates that Jesus’ followers exercise “measureless forgiveness” while leaving judgment in the hands of God (p. 56).

Next, Yoder Neufeld turns to Jesus’ “cleansing” of the temple, the most problematic episode from Jesus’ life for proponents of non-violence. After surveying the Gospel accounts of this episode and determining exactly what these accounts claim Jesus did and did not do, Yoder Neufeld walks through some of the major proposals for the meaning of this symbolic “prophetic demonstration” (p. 62) and its relation to the question of violence. He concludes that, while Jesus’ action is a unique prophetic act and thus is not to be considered normative, following Jesus will mean “confrontation with the structures of power” (p. 71) in the same spirit of creative and confident vulnerability that Jesus advocates in the Sermon on the Mount.

A chapter on the atonement follows in which Yoder Neufeld surveys both the major historic atonement theories and the NT witness to the saving significance of Jesus' death. He determines that:

the New Testament does not contain *a* theory of atonement, let alone theories of atonement. We find, rather, metaphors and scriptural connections and allusions that point, *after the fact*, to how it could possibly be that the scene of humanity's worst crime could also be the moment of God's reconciling embrace of precisely that hostile humanity. The various metaphors are a way of naming the surprise of grace. (p. 85)

In exploring the question of violence and the atonement, Yoder Neufeld proposes that better than asking the abstract question "What *does* it take?"—how much violence does it or does it not take to effect atonement—is asking the question "What *did* it take?" (p. 91). In approaching the issue in this way, Yoder Neufeld suggests, we are left with a "surprise" and not a "necessity": the surprise of grace that a crime of such violence should become the means of reconciliation and not a detailed theory that establishes the necessity of violence in order to effect reconciliation.

The next chapter turns to the question of "subordination" and violence, examining both the NT household codes (especially 1 Peter 2–3, Colossians 3–4, and Ephesians 5–6) and Romans 13 related to the domestic and civic spheres respectively. For Yoder Neufeld, while the household codes reflect the patriarchal world of the first century, they each have features that would have encouraged the first readers to hear these codes "against the grain" of their world, and they offer no justification for readers today either to engage in domination or abuse or to accept one's oppression stoically as part of the divinely willed order. As for Rom 13:1–7, in its context it is best seen as a "supportive illustration drawn from Jewish wisdom, intended to reinforce Paul's teaching *against* participation in violence and *for* aggressive overcoming evil with good, with the 'weapons of light,' with the 'Lord Jesus Christ'" (p. 119).

"Divine warfare" is the final topic Yoder Neufeld investigates, looking especially to Revelation, 1 Thessalonians 5, and Ephesians 6. For the author, Revelation is intended to speak "the disturbing, angry but also intensely hopeful word of judgement and salvation, summoning the community of the Lamb's followers to defiant and vulnerable witness in imitation of and in participation with the Lamb" (p. 135). In both 1 Thessalonians and Ephesians, Paul uses the divine warrior imagery to call his readers to take up the divine task of overcoming the evil "powers" of this world—following Walter Wink and others, the oppressive religious, intellectual, moral, and political structures of our world, with their underlying spiritual dimensions—through active faith, hope, love, truth, justice, and peace.

A brief concluding chapter rounds out the book, followed by a useful bibliography of key resources related to the topic of violence in the NT, and indexes of biblical references, authors, and subjects.

Evangelicals will be pleased to know that Yoder Neufeld's work reflects a clear concern to be faithful to the biblical text as we have it, regardless of questions

regarding authorship, editorial redaction, scribal interpolations, and so on. As he notes himself, he approaches the NT “as Scripture, and thus as revelatory and normative” (p. 14). Nevertheless, some may be put off by his frequent evasion of a simple answer to the question, “Does the New Testament condone violence?” with his repeated refrain that “[i]t depends on who is reading the text.” However, this is unquestionably true: it is a fact of history that the NT has been used to condone violence in support of the status quo by those in power, just as it has been used to condemn the same violence by those outside these circles of power. Indeed, one of the strengths of the book is Yoder Neufeld’s recognition that the matter of “violence and the New Testament” is more complicated than anyone might wish.

There is a somewhat “unfinished” quality to several of the studies in the book, as if the author has left some of the most crucial questions open for further investigation. Yet this sense of incompleteness or lack of conclusiveness is not particularly troubling, at least in my view, since Yoder Neufeld’s exegetical studies and theological reflections are deep and rich as they stand, inviting the reader to engage his work with thought and care. The book is, in a way, like the beginning to a stimulating conversation. As such, *Killing Enmity* would make an excellent text for an upper-level undergraduate or graduate seminar—or just a terrific book to read in any setting for anyone willing to be prodded to hear afresh the NT call to peace and non-violence.

Michael W. Pahl
Cedarville University, Cedarville, OH

The Oxford Handbook of the Trinity. Edited by Gilles Emery and Matthew Levering. New York: Oxford University Press, 2011, xvi + 632pp., \$150, hardcover.

Although claims that the doctrine of the Trinity became marginalized and had to be rediscovered in the twentieth century are greatly exaggerated, there is no question that this pivotal doctrine has generated renewed interest in recent years. One striking feature of this revival is that it spans a broad theological spectrum that includes not only conservative Evangelicals but also mainline Protestants and a wide variety of Catholics. *The Oxford Handbook of the Trinity*, edited by Gilles Emery and Matthew Levering, bears witness to this renewal by introducing readers to contemporary reflection on the Christian doctrine of the Trinity. Forty-three chapters (along with an introduction and conclusion) are structured around seven core themes moving from the Trinity in Scripture (part 1), to historical perspectives on the Trinity (parts 2–4), to constructive presentations of trinitarian doctrine (part 5), to trinitarian perspectives on the Christian life (part 6), and, finally, to the role of trinitarian doctrine in ecumenical and interreligious dialogue (part 7).

Part 1 explores the scriptural witness to the doctrine of the Trinity. Khaled Anatolios (ch. 1) argues that the reality of the canon, including canonical reading strategies, provided an important context for the development of trinitarian doctrine. Christopher Seitz (ch. 2) suggests that a proper approach to the Trinity in the OT does not involve a creative search for triadic references but careful

consideration of how the text speaks of its divine referent. It is precisely the monotheism taught by the OT that gives rise to trinitarian convictions about God. C. Kavin Rowe (ch. 3) examines the Trinity in the letters of Paul and Hebrews, arguing that the pattern of trinitarian judgments expressed in the creeds represents the best way to make sense of how these texts speak about God. Simon Gathercole (ch. 4) suggests that the Synoptic Gospels and Acts provide important building blocks for the doctrine of the Trinity, especially when we recognize the way they include Jesus Christ in the “identity” of the one God. Ben Witherington III (ch. 5) argues that the Johannine corpus not only provides important trinitarian building materials but it also contains initial “construction” of certain aspects of what will later become the formal doctrine of the Trinity (e.g. statements about the unity of nature, will, and identity). Mark Edwards (ch. 6) explores patristic exegesis, highlighting the challenge early Christians faced in holding together the twin scriptural affirmations that there is one God and that Jesus Christ is Lord of all.

Part 2 examines the formative patristic period. Stephen Hildebrand (ch. 7) explores the pre-Nicene trinitarian theologies of Ignatius, Justin, Theophilus of Antioch, Irenaeus, Clement, Origen, and Tertullian. Warren Smith (ch. 8) surveys the pivotal events of the fourth century from the Arian crisis (AD 318) through the council of Constantinople (AD 381). Lewis Ayres (ch. 9) helps readers understand key elements of the trinitarian theology of Augustine, whose teaching on the Trinity has been deeply influential in the West but also profoundly misunderstood in recent years. Andrew Louth (ch. 10) surveys trinitarian developments among Greek-speaking theologians in the East, including Cyril of Alexandria, Maximus the Confessor, and John of Damascus.

Part 3 investigates medieval developments. Lauge Nielsen (ch. 11) surveys trinitarian developments from the late eighth century up to the end of the eleventh century, with special attention to the theologies of Alcuin, Gottschalk, Erigena, and Anselm. Dominique Poirel (ch. 12) examines trinitarian conflicts that emerged among masters (Peter Abelard, Gilbert of Poitiers, Peter Lombard) and monks (William of Saint Thierry, Bernard of Clairvaux, Joachim of Fiore) in the twelfth century. One key point of debate was the relationship between God’s oneness and threeness. Joseph Wawrykow (ch. 13) compares and contrasts the trinitarian theologies of Bonaventure and Aquinas. Russell Friedman (ch. 14) charts the emergence of two competing accounts of the basis for distinguishing the divine persons (i.e. relational vs. emanational), views that prompted vigorous debate in the latter part of the thirteenth century. Turning back to the East, Karl Felmy (ch. 15) chronicles the growth of Byzantine trinitarian theology from the ninth to fifteenth centuries with special attention to the debate over the procession of the Holy Spirit.

Part 4 surveys developments from the beginning of the Reformation through the twentieth century. Scott Swain (ch. 16) examines the doctrine of the Trinity in the Reformation and argues that the Reformers embraced traditional (i.e. creedal) teaching on the Trinity but were concerned to rearticulate its exegetical basis. Ulrich Lehner (ch. 17) charts developments between 1550 and 1770 among key Catholics (Ignatius of Loyola, Francisco Suarez, Dionysius Petavius, Louis Thomassin, Theresa of Avila) and Protestants (John Owen, George Bull, William

Sherlock, Samuel Clark, Johann Gerhard, Arminius/Remonstrants, Count Zinzendorf). One particularly challenging issue was the emergence of potent anti-trinitarian movements (e.g. Socinianism). Cyril O'Regan (ch. 18) examines the subversion of traditional trinitarian teaching in the theologies of Kant, Hegel, and Schelling. Samuel Powell (ch. 19) explores responses to these three men among nineteenth century theologians, including Friedrich Schleiermacher, Philip Marheineke, Isaac Dörner, and Johann von Hafmann, as well as representatives of classic liberal theology (Albrecht Ritschl, Wilhelm Hermann, Adolf von Harnack, and Ernst Troeltsch). Aiden Nichols (ch. 20) investigates the writings of select Catholic theologians during the nineteenth century, including Giovanni Perrone, Heinrich Klee, Franz Staudenmaier, Johann Kuhn, and Matthias Scheeben. George Hunsinger (ch. 21) summarizes key elements of Karl Barth's doctrine of the Trinity following Barth's presentation in *Church Dogmatics* I/1. Vincent Holzer (ch. 22) presents the trinitarian teaching of two leading twentieth-century Catholic theologians: Hans Urs von Balthasar and Karl Rahner. Aristotle Papanikolaou (ch. 23) explores the teaching of three prominent twentieth-century Orthodox theologians: Sergii Bulgakov, Vladimir Lossky, and John Zizioulas. Although no analytic philosophers have (to date) produced a monograph on the Trinity, Fergus Carr (ch. 24) draws attention to the work of several contemporary theologians where one can witness the influence of analytic philosophy on trinitarian reflection.

Part 5 articulates contemporary dogmatic perspectives on the Trinity. Kathryn Tanner (ch. 25) reflects on the exegetical process (and hermeneutical assumptions) that led early Christians to affirm the trinitarian faith confessed in the creeds as the teaching of Scripture. In conversation with Thomas Aquinas, Rudi Te Velde (ch. 26) reflects critically on the meaning of the term "person"—both in relation to God as a "personal" being as well as a term for designating the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit. Emanuel Durand (ch. 27) develops a theology of God the Father employing apophatic and analogical approaches. He also reflects on the medieval debate between Bonaventure and Aquinas regarding the personal property of the Father; he sides with Aquinas. Thomas Weinandy (ch. 28) offers a trinitarian Christology of the eternal Son, highlighting the meaning of Nicaea and reflecting on the relation of the two natures of the Son in his salvific work. Bruce Marshall (ch. 29) develops a trinitarian theology of the Holy Spirit, exploring the identity of the Spirit, the *Filioque*, and the nature of the Spirit's indwelling of believers (i.e. merely appropriated vs. truly personal). Risto Saarinen (ch. 30) discusses reflections of the Trinity in society, the church, and religions and reminds readers of the dangers of anthropomorphizing the Trinity. Starting with Matt 28:19, Charles Morerod (ch. 31) explores intrinsic links that exist between the divine persons, the church, and the sacraments, paying special attention to the relation of the Son and Holy Spirit. Daniel Keating (ch. 32) suggests that the relevance of the Trinity is not to be found in its ability to offer a model to imitate but rather in providing a life in which we participate through the mutual indwelling of believers and the triune God.

Part 6 explores links between the Trinity and the Christian life. In conversation with Basil of Caesarea, Geoffrey Wainwright (ch. 33) underscores the foundational role of trinitarian doctrine in shaping doxology, baptism, worship,

preaching, and hymnody in the church. François Bœpflug (ch. 34) traces the history of representations of the Trinity in the visual arts (among both Latin and Greek churches), identifying key characteristics of each historical period. Romanus Cessario (ch. 35) suggests that an imprint of the Trinity can be seen in human moral life. Amy Laura Hall (ch. 36) examines the relationship between the Trinity and morality in the theology of Julian of Norwich. In conversation with Patrick, Basil, Augustine, Aquinas, Newman, and von Balthasar, Francesca Murphy (ch. 37) reflects on the relationship of the Trinity and Christian prayer. Writing from an Orthodox perspective, Nonna Harrison (ch. 38) considers feminist apprehensions regarding traditional trinitarian language and argues that these concerns can be adequately addressed without surrendering the revealed names of the divine persons or abandoning “hierarchy” within the divine life. Reflecting on Trinity and politics, Frederick Bauerschmit (ch. 39) argues that we should not think about the relevance of the Trinity in terms of this doctrine providing a pattern for political structures to imitate, as is the case in some forms of social trinitarianism. We should instead consider the political implications of how the Spirit forms us into the image of Christ so we can become children of the Father.

Part 7 explores the role of the Trinity in dialogue. David Fergusson (ch. 40) examines the prominent role of trinitarian doctrine in twentieth-century ecumenical dialogue, focusing on the contentious *Filioque* clause, the *missio Dei*, *koinonia*, and Christian worship. Ellen Charry (ch. 41) briefly traces the history of early, medieval, and contemporary dialogue between Christians and Jews over the doctrine of God. After surveying contemporary attempts to relate the Trinity to non-Christian religions, Gavin D’Costa (ch. 42) argues that five key elements of Christian teaching (Spirit, Son, Father, church, kingdom) must properly be held together in the development of a Christian theology of religions. Tracey Rowland (ch. 43) explores the intersection of trinitarian doctrine with globalization and postmodern culture.

Emery and Levering conclude by identifying eight areas in which further research is needed. (1) We need to think more carefully about how to articulate the unity of the triune God. This is especially important as “social” approaches to the Trinity cannot provide an adequate basis for trinitarian monotheism. (2) We need to be more mindful of the implications of the incomprehensibility of God for analogies of the Trinity in human relations. (3) Additional work needs to be done strengthening the exegetical foundations of trinitarian doctrine, especially by identifying continuity between the teaching of the Scripture and creedal formulations. (4) Additional research needs to be done engaging patristic and medieval reflection on the Trinity. (5) More work needs to be done connecting trinitarian reflection to every aspect of Christian doctrine. (6) We need to learn from theologians like Augustine who understood trinitarian theology as an exercise for spiritual growth. (7) We need to discern the best philosophical tools for articulating our faith in the triune God. (8) In response to the contemporary emphasis on “economic” approaches to the Trinity, we must renew our attention on the often neglected metaphysical dimensions of trinitarian doctrine.

The Oxford Handbook of the Trinity is a remarkable reference tool that introduces readers to some of the best contemporary scholarship on the Trinity; it will be especially helpful to graduate students and professors. The chapters average fourteen pages in length, making them ideal as supplementary course readings. For example, if one wants to discuss fourth-century trinitarian developments, Warren Smith's essay provides students a helpful introduction to pivotal events of this formative period. Similarly, if one is teaching on the sixteenth century and wants to introduce students to trinitarian developments in the Reformation, Scott Swain's essay provides a great overview. The historical sections of this volume are attentive to trinitarian developments both among Greek-speaking theologians of the East as well as Latin-speaking theologians of the West. Contributors avoid simplistic overgeneralizations such as the oft-repeated (and factually incorrect) assertion that the West prioritized divine unity while the East prioritized the communion of divine persons. If one is teaching a course on the doctrine of salvation, Daniel Keating's essay on the Trinity and the Christian life helps students see the pervasive NT theme of Christian living as participation in the life of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. If one is teaching on Christian art, François Boëpflug's essay tracing the history of representations of the Trinity in visual arts makes a great addition. Geoffrey Wainwright's essay on Trinity and liturgy would be a useful in courses on Christian worship or preaching. Several essays (e.g. Bauerschmidt's chapter on Trinity and politics) draw attention to the misuse of the trinitarian doctrine and point readers in more fruitful directions.

Although contributors to the handbook represent a diverse variety of theological perspectives and ecclesial affiliations, the trinitarian theology of Thomas Aquinas plays a prominent role in the dogmatic section. This should not be surprising in light of the fact that the editors of this volume are Catholic theologians who hold the trinitarian theology of Aquinas in high esteem. Some readers may view their commitment to Aquinas as a limitation. Does this emphasis limit the value of this handbook for evangelicals? Not at all. In their trinitarian dogmatics, the editors have simply attempted to represent the main lines of catholic (small "c") teaching on the Trinity in the West—teaching that many of the Reformers (e.g. Reformed scholastics like John Owen and Francis Turretin) would have affirmed without reservation. Moreover, in the concluding chapter, Emery and Levering offer evangelicals wise counsel for future trinitarian scholarship. While their eight proposals are not aimed at evangelicals per se, most of them are quite relevant to evangelical scholarship. For example, the concern that Emery and Levering register regarding the inability of social trinitarianism to preserve the unity of triune God merits greater attention by evangelicals who present Father, Son, and Holy Spirit as three centers of consciousness and will. Although the hefty (\$150) price tag may scare some away, Emery and Levering have provided the church with an excellent resource for trinitarian scholarship.

Keith E. Johnson

Reformed Theological Seminary, Orlando, FL

The Shape of Participation: A Theology of Church Practices. By Roger L. Owens. Eugene, OR: Cascade, 2010, x + 197 pp., \$22.00 paper.

“Theology is born from practice, and shapes practice in turn.” Such a statement seemed radical not too long ago, but in recent decades church practice has been given a much more central place in the theological enterprise. In a fascinating theological study, Roger Owens succeeds in masterly fashion to ground the practices of the church in a robust Christological framework. The church embodies the practices of Christ or, as Owens would say, Christ practices himself in and through the church.

Owens completed doctoral studies at Duke University under Stanley Hauerwas, the results of which he presents in this book. He now pastors a medium-sized, urban United Methodist in Durham, NC, with his wife Ginger. He leads the church in its weekly practices and, as theologian, reflects on these practices. Likewise, he begins his book with a description of two concrete situations of church practice. The first is drawn from the writings of John Barritt, who describes his conversion in 1773 and testifies to the role of preaching, societies, and worship in the early Methodist movement. The Wesleys are quoted for their description of Methodist spirituality as participation in the divine life, which raises the questions that Owens wants to answer. The second is a description of modern-day worship at Mt. Level Missionary Baptist Church, whose pastor—also professor of homiletics at Duke—frequently uses participatory language to describe the congregation’s worship. How can these concrete practices be considered as visible expressions of participation in the divine life? How can participation in God become embodied in the activities of these two churches?

After raising these questions from his reflections on embodied church practice, Owens proceeds to the introduction. He focuses his study on the embodied church, visible in its meetings and other practices, rather than on abstract theological definitions of “church.” His contention is that one cannot speak about the church without speaking about particular local communities and their visible forms and activities. Their theology and identity are rooted in their concrete practices. Such a focus on the church as a practicing community aligns well with recent educational research that identifies the social context in which learning takes place (e.g. a company, a university) as a community of practice.

The concrete descriptions of church practice, combined with Owens’s insistence on studying the embodied church, result in three key questions that return throughout the book: “First, how should the relationship between the embodied, human practices of these ecclesial communities and the activity of God be understood? ... Second, how can these practices and their participation in God be articulated in a way that takes with utter seriousness the clearly embodied nature of these practices, that through ‘our frame, in our bodies, his beauty shines?’ ... Third, how do these communities relate the rest of creation to God’s life as well?” (p. 16).

The first step (ch. 1) toward an answer comes from the rediscovery of the embodied church in ecclesiological literature. Surprisingly, Cyril of Alexandria is

Owens's first witness. Cyril speaks of the church as an expression of and participation in the triune God, which demonstrates awareness that the church is church in its visible practices. Next in line are two modern authors, James Gustafson and Nick Healy, who criticize twentieth-century ecclesiology for its theological idealism and its lack of focus on the visible, embodied church. However, Gustafson finds the "essence" of the church in the interiority of inner life and fellowship, maintaining the dichotomy between idealism and reality that he criticized earlier but from a modern psychological perspective. For all their insight into the church as a social body among others, both Gustafson and Healy fail to develop more fully the ways in which God's activity constitutes the actual embodied practice of his church.

Chapter 2 turns to the writings of philosopher Alasdair MacIntyre about practice. In his attempt to reground the concept of virtue, MacIntyre defined a practice as a socially established activity that binds a community together, simply by participating in that practice. This thinking about practice has been appropriated by theologians such as James McClendon as well as Craig Dykstra and Dorothy Bass, who draw out the parallels with how a church engages in certain practices; however, the original context of MacIntyre's debate about virtues is lost. Even this better understanding of practice is still in need of theological ground. Part One of the book thus studies the nature of the church as an embodied community, and the nature of a social practice.

In Part Two, Owens turns to two examples of core church practices: preaching and communion. Dietrich Bonhoeffer is enlisted for the first matter. He conceived of preaching as a practice of the church, not just the preacher, because it reflects belief that Christ is the Word of God that comes to his people. In the very act of preaching, Christ presents himself afresh to the community, and even (re)creates the community through that Word (a notion that challenges some popular perspectives on the sermon). Moreover, Bonhoeffer conceived of the church as the body of Christ, practicing the life of God visibly in the world; thus, the practice of preaching is an embodied participation in the life of God.

For a second core practice, the Roman Catholic theologian Herbert McCabe is adduced. In his early work he reflects the internal/external dichotomy, typical of *Lumen Gentium* and the Vatican II focus on ecclesiology as both institutional and mystical. His later work, drawing on Wittgenstein and Aquinas, presents Christ as the true embodied communication of God with all of humanity. The Eucharist is now cast in terms of communication, where the bread and wine become signs that point to Christ as a deeper food and drink than bread and wine could ever be. Christ appears to his people in the traditional dress of bread and wine so that they will recognize him. For McCabe, participation in God is neither invisible nor interior, but God practices his life in the Eucharist in concrete, embodied form and invites his people to participate in it. Through the writings of Bonhoeffer and McCabe, Owens succeeds in providing a more thorough theological grounding for the discussion of embodied practice.

In Part Three, the discussion broadens into a wider consideration of the theological category of participation. More theologians are thrown into this already

heady mix. John Milbank, from radical orthodoxy, starts his theological analysis of participation with creation as given by God; all creation, therefore, participates in God's life. Milbank helpfully offers an alternative ontology to traditional metaphysics, but he does not root participation in the doctrine of the Trinity, nor in Christology. His view on participation thus falls short of the theologies of Bonhoeffer and McCabe, both of whom provide a clear Christological basis. Lutheran theologian Robert Jenson passes review next. Influenced by Barth, he places the doctrine of the Trinity at the center of his systematic theology. Jenson argues that Israel anticipated participating in the divine life through the future Israelite (Jesus), who enabled the whole world to participate in the divine life as the church, Christ's body, before the end. Finally, the Chalcedonian Christology of Maximus the Confessor provides Owens with the last component for his proposal that the church is not just symbolically the body of Christ, but that in the church Christ is practicing himself and making himself available to the world through the church, which is his body. Such statements only make sense if we conceive of the church in its visible shape, with its practices that embody Christ to the world. The embodied church, with its various and sometimes idiosyncratic practices, is nevertheless a real participation in the life of Christ and shows the world a vision of its future in Christ.

A very readable conclusion connects all these threads together. The three questions, returning throughout the book, receive their full answers here, and these answers are connected with the two concrete churches described at the beginning of the book. Owens argues convincingly that church practices in all their variety participate in the life of Christ in the fullest sense. Christ becomes visible in embodied form, not only in the first century but in every subsequent century. Theology is the reflection on how Christ is thus visible in these practices. In that sense, theology is born from practice.

Owens presents us with a remarkable theological essay in which he raises the discussion of our corporate church identity to a new level. Activities such as leading, baptizing, and worshipping are, in their very act, a participation in the life of Christ. Christ lives in us individually and corporately, so that our actions as a church are the actions of Christ in the world. What a privilege! What a responsibility! I am grateful to Roger Owens for sharing the results of his study. I would highly recommend the book for some solid reading that will inspire afresh towards wholehearted service, not just *for* the Lord and his church, but as an expression of his life in and for his world.

Jack Barentsen
Evangelische Theologische Faculteit, Leuven, Belgium

Natürlich-übernatürlich: Charismen entdecken und weiterentwickeln: Ein praktisch-theologischer Beitrag aus systematisch-theologischer Perspektive mit empirischer Konkrektion. By Manfred Baumert. Europäische Hochschulschriften XXIII Theologie/921; Frankfurt-am-Main: Peter Lang, 2011, xxv + 513 pp., €84.80 paper.

Manfred Baumert teaches New Testament and practical theology at the Theologischen Seminar Adelshofen, a community-based accredited evangelical training institution in southwestern Germany offering courses ranging from practical training for evangelistic and church ministry through master's degrees to the doctoral level. He was a dean of their program in practical theology for almost a decade. This present work is a significantly revised 2009 doctoral thesis (University of South Africa, Pretoria) arising out of his teaching and church interest. It is really three works in one, for any one of which the book is worth reading, although it is the last which is the driving force behind the whole.

First, this book is a survey of the historical discussion of charisms/spiritual gifts (Baumert prefers the older term that is less emotionally prejudiced due to contemporary discussion) arranged by type of approach, with a key individual chosen to represent each type of approach. This is a German work written within the context of the Lutheran state church of Baden, so the representatives are mostly German: Thomas Aquinas (transformational typology of charisms), Martin Luther (personal-relational typology and, naturally, the one discussed in most detail), Friedrich Schleiermacher (synergistic typology), M. C. E. Weber (relational-phenomenological typology), Karl Rahner (imaginary-mystical typology), Nikolaus Ludwig Graf v. Zinzendorf (convergence typology), and Johann Christian Blumhardt (example-copy typology). The most practically helpful part of these ninety pages is the charts summing up the thought of each person chosen. But whether one reads the text or compares the charts, one soon realizes that when it comes to spiritual gifts there is far more to discuss than usually comes out in a charismatic/cessationist discussion in North America. Blumhardt comes closest to what one might call a "charismatic" (a misnomer in that all of these scholars and church leaders and more claim the activity of spiritual gifts in one way or another), but Blumhardt will himself expand one's understanding beyond the normal categories.

The second part of the work is roughly a hundred pages on the present state of research. Baumert starts by examining the contemporary discussion of seven different dimensions of spiritual gifts (dialectic-fragmentary, inclusive-sociological, extraordinary, Christocentric-sanctifying, universalistic, relational, and circular-recognitional). Again, this expands the usual contemporary theological range of discussion. He then continues by looking at the biblical data about spiritual gifts from a biblical-theological point of view (revealing that the discussions in the biblical text are context dependent). In this survey the OT gets five pages, the NT, twenty. The key texts are discussed in their theological-historical contextual setting: a faith-exchange context (Rom 1:11–12), a first proclamation of a church planter context (1 Cor 1:4–7), an anamnesis of the appointment of a person context (1 Tim 4:14–15), a familial faith-influence and responsibility context (2 Tim 1:5–6), a

doxological prayer context (1 Pet 4:11–12), and a paraenetic context (1 Corinthians 12 and 14, and Ephesians 4, with each section having a different paraenetic function). One observes that Romans 12 is missing from the list in that it does not have a separate distinct context, so its content is taken up among the others. One also observes that trinitarian formulations are significantly underlined. Baumert concludes this part by presenting five different models (together with their proponents) for identifying and explaining spiritual gifts—deterministic-trinitarian model, C. A. Schwarz; complexity model of a gift-integrated personality, B. Hybels; creation-theological model, Evangelische Kirche Baden; supernaturalistic-ethical discipleship model, Fortune and Fortune; and cybernetic model, Frost and Hirsch—all of which result in paper and pencil tests. The best known to me of these five are those of Bill Hybels and Christian Schwarz. In this section in particular we are often looking at works stemming from or influenced by North America, because it is North America that has the most interest in identifying spiritual gifts via various forms of testing.

The third part of the work (250 pages) is an empirical investigation of how people identify their spiritual gifts or charisms. This is the nub of the issue for Baumert, for the Lutheran Church of Baden, one of the more pious areas of Germany, is facing a lack of ordained ministers, a lack that is requiring it to identify the gifts of the laity and engage them more deliberately in ministry. The empirical investigation in this work is introduced by a philosophically and sociologically informed discussion of what can be known and how it can be ascertained (the respective works of Karl Popper and Jürgen Rost are most important here). This leads to a discussion of the development of the research tools (and the problems involved in developing and administering the tools so as to get valid data) and a laying out of the criteria used in the data analysis. Both qualitative and quantitative methods were used in the research. The various items and item groups are all listed and discussed; there are ten items and item groups, most of them groups. Research using representative sampling was done among pastors and individuals in the Lutheran state church in Baden and also among charismatic free churches. A fascinating constellation of observations, issues, and convergences emerges, which is in the end carefully summarized. The main text of the book concludes with “a proposal for a Trinitarian dimension of the spiritual gifts in missional church building.”

The book as a whole ends with a printout of the online questionnaire used and a sixty page bibliography. While there were some works that I would have included in the research (e.g. Heribert Mühlen, *Die Erneuerung des christlichen Glaubens: Charisma, Geist, Befreiung*, 1974), the bibliography is relatively exhaustive, as one has learned to expect in German works. If Baumert does nothing else, he raises the bar for what reading is necessary to say that one has covered this field.

The contribution of this work is manifold, and I can only mention some of this richness. First, Baumert shows that the whole discussion of spiritual gifts is a multifaceted discussion that must be set in a wider theological context and must include everything from gifts given in one’s creation through gifts developed over time to special spiritual charisms. How many works do we know of that try to take

all of these aspects into account? Many, perhaps most, discussions of spiritual gifts are too monodimensional and suffer from oversimplification. This is one reason that the research found that the spiritual gifts tests, while sometimes helpful, were not significant overall in helping people discover and implement their gifting, despite these tests often integrating the psychological with the practical-theological. Each test has its own underlying theological and psychological assumptions, and all suffer from the problem that merely identifying a gift or gift complex does not thereby enable one to actually do anything, although it may point to a direction for future training and experience.

Second, Baumert exemplifies how thoughtful attention to the theory of knowledge and careful methodology can come together in doing research in an area that is theological both in the more cognitive meaning of the term and in its application, as one intends to mean when one says “practical-theological.” The melding of sociological research methods with philosophical and theological questions and the concrete sociology of a church context is fascinating. Too often one or the other of these aspects is given short shrift. Third, Baumert is careful to include numerous tables, charts, and diagrams. There is a lot of data and detail here, so his skill in drawing the data together is important if one is not going to get totally lost among the trees of his forest. There are plenty of other writers in the biblical-theological field who could benefit from his example, especially when dealing with topics with lots of detail, whether it be the detail of data or the detail of a variety of players. Fourth, the book is good theory, but it also results in practical observations and suggestions, including his final proposal. This makes it far more than another sociological analysis. It is an analysis that results in concrete proposals that can be implemented; furthermore, these proposals are for the church rather than the individual. This is not a book that is trying to solve an individual’s problem in identifying their role in the Christian community; it is rather a work that is trying to solve the church’s problem of effectively using the resources—i.e. people—whom God has given it. As such it has something to say about the pervasive individualism of our age.

There are some weaknesses in this work, which are more weaknesses due to its nature rather than due to its failures with respect to research. First, it is very condensed. Surely the whole 500 pages could have been devoted to the systematic theological discussion or to the biblical theological discussion (as Gordon Fee does in *God’s Empowering Presence*, which is cited in this work). Instead, Baumert devotes roughly ninety and twenty-five pages, respectively, to these topics. As a result, the reader must realize that Baumert is gathering, condensing, and analyzing the work of others and that the reader has to go to those others to get the discursive underpinnings of the conclusions that Baumert summarizes. Here Baumert’s use of APA style in his text and in his 1,233 footnotes is not entirely helpful (although appropriate to the main issue he is addressing). That is, when one reads “Fee (1994: page number),” the particular work by Gordon Fee does not jump to mind (it is *God’s Empowering Presence*). And sometimes Baumert is, again appropriately, citing an English work in German translation, which makes it less recognizable (especially since the English title is often not part of the bibliographical record). This is more a

concern about the social science style in general than about Baumert's work in particular, but the problem is underlined by the size and detail of this present work.

Second, the work is also sociologically dependent. While I do not feel fully qualified to evaluate Baumert's methodology (although with some knowledge of sociological research methods but without detailed analysis, I can say that it does appear valid; Baumert has done his homework in this regard), it is clear that it is focused on one slice of the church universal, namely, Lutheran state churches and charismatic free churches in southwestern Germany. Baumert is not personally rich, does not have large foundation or government grants available to him, and does not have a large organization, so he could not and cannot repeat his study elsewhere in Europe (say, in England) and then in North America and perhaps elsewhere. This raises a significant question: Could some of his findings be culturally dependent? We will only know the answer to this question if others take his methodology and repeat the study elsewhere. One suspects that significant parts of the result are indeed cross-cultural, but that is just an intuition. This issue is an endemic problem in empirical research, that is, research is done on a particular group within a particular culture. It is no problem if that is what one wants to know about—Baumert's study should have been extremely useful to the church communities he was studying, whose need was, after all, the driving force behind his research—but it is a problem if one wishes to generalize to a wider population. That is why one needs to read the data about the population studied and the sampling methods used in any study of this type. As a result, the conclusions are suggestive of what *may* be the case in North America, but they are not descriptive of what is *actually* the case in North America. Baumert realizes this limitation, which is why he discusses his methodology in such detail, but not every reader will pick up his caution.

In conclusion, if one wants to reflect upon the role of the Holy Spirit in the church (the wider topic of which charisms are a segment), this is a book one might read. It covers a wide field well, condenses it thoroughly, and discusses it with theological insight. Yet, despite the help that Baumert gives us, it is not easy to assimilate (assuming one knows German). He has included far too much for that. I will be reflecting on what I have read and perhaps be rereading this or that section for some time. This work will not summarize into a few cute slogans. But the book is worth that work should one want to go beyond easy answers and search for the deeper realities both systematic-theologically and practical-theologically. And it is also worth someone's consideration of expanding its data set to include the North American world.

Peter H. Davids
Houston Baptist University, Houston, TX

The Christian Art of Dying: Learning from Jesus. By Allen Verhey. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2011, xiii + 409 pp., \$30 paper.

Upon first encountering Verhey's title, one is prompted to anticipate excitedly a clarifying advocacy for *ars moriendi*—a valiant death in faith, heralding the resplendence of Christ alone. Moving through the text, however, such hope for clarity begins to fade. Although an *ars moriendi* (art of dying) is intended to attend to the one who seeks to die well, the portrait of the One to whom *Moriendi* (the dying one) dies, in this case, lacks clear definition. Reading *The Christian Art of Dying* may be compared to reposing to enjoy a favorite symphony, yet as the movements progress, one gets the sense that the musicians are not particularly familiar with the score; the composition just does not unfold as sonorously as originally anticipated.

Allen Verhey, professor of theological ethics at Duke Divinity School, writes from a deeply personal perspective about death and dying, himself having survived a recent bout with death. The structure of *The Christian Art of Dying* forms a bit of an *inclusio* such that the opening and concluding “movements” (the former more so than the latter) present beneficial instruction to all those who hold hopes of dying with dignity. These first and fourth sections are laudable for their clear call to resist the depersonalizing blight of “medicalized dying” (p. 3ff) and replace it with dying that both celebrates human life in community and escorts the dying to the brink of this life with a dignity befitting one who bears the image of the Creator of all things. The two middle sections, on the other hand, exhibit interpretive and theological ambiguity that cannot be overlooked, particularly in light of Verhey's thesis of Jesus' death as paradigmatic for the dying Christian.

As the subtitle indicates, Verhey desires that his readers learn from Jesus' death how to die well. Dying well—as distinguished from a “good death,” which terminology Verhey rejects (p. 26)—has become somewhat of a lost art since the seventeenth century Baconian project (p. 27ff) precipitated our current culture of what Verhey calls “medicalized dying.” In response to the negative fallout of this project upon the art of dying, our author suggests that constructing a proper Christian *ars moriendi* will involve “assessment, selection, and correction” of past and current models (p. 5). Accordingly, tracing the Western mindset about dying from the Middle Ages to the middle of the twentieth century, the opening chapters provide an eminently thoughtful assessment of the medicalization of death and both its deleterious and salutary contributions.

The cunning of death is that it is multifaceted in its destruction, more often than not, without alerting any of the participants—either the dying or the care givers—to its metastasizing effects. Verhey exposes some of those erosive facets of medicalized death: its alienation of the *person* from his or her body, thereby inevitably depersonalizing death; its alienation of the dying from his or her community, a catastrophe that never would have characterized the “tame death” of the Middle Ages (pp. 11–13); and finally death's alienation of the dying from his or her God through its deceptive infection of a sense of betrayal by that God (pp. 17–23). In all of these ways, medicalized death makes its power felt even before the actual event of death. The art of dying well is thus desecrated. In response, Verhey

assesses three movements, beginning with the mid-twentieth century, which attempt to quell this desecration: the patient rights, death awareness, and hospice movements. Each of these movements, avers Verhey, possesses qualities both laudable and cautioning. Chapter 4 provides Verhey's assessment of these qualities. Because these movements arose to fill a vacuum left by the church—the institution God ordained for instruction in the art of dying—the final chapter of this first section reprimands the church for its complicity by silence in the medicalization of death.

Part 2 begins with an assessment of *Ars Moriendi*—the church's response to the literal plague of death in the fifteenth century. Because, as Johan Huizinga has recounted, “No other age has so forcefully and continuously impressed the idea of death on the whole population as did the fifteenth century” (p. 79), the church—and culture in general—needed to respond to the immanent call to instruct people how to die well. *Ars Moriendi* was an illustrated handbook (as well as a subsequent literary genre of other such booklets) that appeared to undertake just such a task. It instructed Moriendi concerning the onslaught of five chief “temptacions” that were anticipated would assault the dying, and five complementary virtues that could overcome the onslaught, equipping *Moriendi* to die well. Verhey, again, both commends and cautions the assertions of *Ars Moriendi*. His citations of the literature are almost completely only from the 1490 publication *Crafte and Knowledge For To Dye Well* (p. 89, n. 1). Verhey's unfortunate narrowing of the sourcing for his critique to a singular *ars moriendi* presents some significant problems upon which I will elaborate later.

Part 3 is where Verhey unpacks his thesis of Jesus Christ's dying as paradigmatic for the Christian's dying. Rather than beginning with a “commendacion of death,” as did *Ars Moriendi*, Verhey begins his contemporary “correction” with a “commendacion of life,” showcasing the resurrection of Jesus Christ as vindication of the hope for God's “good future.” Verhey selects commendable components of the original *Ars Moriendi* from which to elaborate in order to assist us in constructing a contemporary *ars moriendi*. This paradigm of Christ's dying forms the preface for the final section of the book in which Verhey concludes his assessment, selection, and correction by offering practices, both old and new, with which the contemporary church may instruct both the dying and their caregivers in the art of dying.

The Christian Art of Dying itself presents notions worthy of both laud and caution. To be sure, our contemporary culture's taboo toward death makes difficult any attempt to speak seriously to that culture about one of its most weighty verities. Literature that does litter the landscape of the discussion often diverts attention from the theological significance of death as articulated by divine revelation, thereby gutting the discussion of any real meaning or capacity to edify genuinely. Verhey and others (e.g. Helmut Thielicke, *Living with Death*) note this taboo and our culture's reactionary fascination, therefore, with death. Verhey cites Geoffrey Gorer's article, “The Pornography of Death” (*Death, Grief, and Mourning* [Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1965] 192–99) where the latter compares our culture's attitude toward death with the Victorian attitude toward sex. Thielicke similarly

deemed this fascination with death, which almost fictionalizes death's reality, an attempt to override death's personal finality "with intensive clamor and concentrated self-anesthesia" (*Death and Life* 132). These authors reiterate the allusion of the apostle Paul that a matter is of little interest to sinful creatures until they are presented with the prohibition, "thou shall not." Commendably contrary to this adolescent fascination with a taboo, Verhey offers for our consideration a serious contemplation of the matter.

The "medicalized dying" seeded by our seventeenth-century forebears and nurtured to maturity by our own culture certainly has garnered its share of detractors. The good advances that medical science has provided since the inception of the Baconian project as a means of making God's blessings flow "far as the curse is found" (p. 266) are not renounced by Verhey; rather, the elevation of medicine to the status of virtual savior is. That is, when medical science fails to deliver upon its presumed promise to rescue those who are "overmastered by disease," it evidences that "the final victory over death [will] be a divine triumph, not a technological one" (p. 38, 270, 294) and that hope in God is the only legitimate response to the threat of death (pp. 16–23). Verhey is to be applauded for adding a clear voice to the group of detractors from medicalized dying and heralding hope in God as foundational for dying well.

A couple of concerns arise, however, as Verhey "attend[s] to just three episodes in the history of death, the 'medicalized' dying of the mid-twentieth century, the 'art of dying' in the fifteenth century, and the death of Jesus in the first century" (p. 3). The first, and perhaps most significant concern, is the fact that he, too, fails to provide a sufficient theological framework for why death even exists. One may not "die well"—whatever the circumstances surrounding one's death—absent an understanding of why one must die in the first place. Disappointingly, Verhey nowhere articulates the weighty theological significance of God's ordaining the entrance of death into his otherwise pristine world as clear and direct penalty against the rebellion of his own *magnum opus*. Rather, Verhey, in no uncertain terms, suggests that "sin brings alienation in its wake—not mortality." Death, then, is not the rendered judgment of a holy God as penalty against faithless rebellion, but the product of originally constituted "human weakness" that would make its "inevitable way toward death ... tilting back to chaos" (pp. 262–63). Oddly in this regard, Verhey critiques the death awareness movement for its mantra that death is "natural." If death is constitutive to man's origin, what can it be *but* natural?

Verhey is left, therefore, to characterize the gospel that Christ preached as merely "the good future of God ... at hand" (p. 218) and paint a portrait of the overturning of death as merely the restoration of the reign of God in life, with no emphasis on his expiation of the very rebellion that incited death in the first place. Christ's own passion and death, then, as Verhey sees it, is paradigmatic for the dying Christian chiefly in the faith and "faithfulness of the cross and its significance for our own salvation [whatever that might entail; for Verhey provides no exposition of the meaning of 'salvation']," rather than "reducing it to the price paid for the passage of our souls to bliss" (p. 219). Christ's death is exemplary for the

dying Christian because “he [Christ] is ‘the pioneer and perfecter’ of our *faithfulness* (Heb. 12:2)” (p. 217; emphasis added).

Second, and equally serious, Verhey renders Christ’s utterance of Psalm 22 from the cross a purely creaturely anguish. He asserts of David’s lament that “Jesus made this human cry of anguish his own cry,” thereby identifying with any who would encounter suffering and death. This “Psalm of David and the Psalm of Christ ... may be our psalm, too” (p. 231). Astoundingly, no mention whatsoever is made of an alternative cause for Christ’s agony: the unprecedented cosmic rift between the first and second persons of the eternal Trinity as the Father unleashed his holy wrath against the sin of the world upon his unique Son, who there “tasted death” (Heb. 2:9) on behalf of those whom the Father had given to the Son, who himself faithfully “guarded them and not one of them perished” (John 17:6–12). In crying out the words of Psalm 22, Verhey suggests, Christ was simply deluded that God had forsaken him. Verhey ponders, “Had Jesus in faith and hope thrown himself on the wheel of God’s purpose in the world, only to be crushed by it? Had his hope been an illusion, only recognized at death? Did God finally forsake him, abandon him?” (p. 231). To these questions Verhey responds heartily, “No, God did not abandon him!” To Verhey’s reply the obvious question may be rejoined, if the *holy* Father did not propitiate his infinite wrath via his own divine Son—who is singularly qualified to propitiate such wrath—how, then, do we have a savior? How, then, can *anyone* die well?

Third, Verhey exhibits a penchant for neglect either to differentiate between senses of meaning or to place concepts in their broader contexts. This failure facilitates misinterpretation and fallacious rebuttal constructed upon straw men. Because he both decontextualizes and perhaps misinterprets the semantic intent of the phrase “commendacion of death” by *Ars Moriendi*, he imposes a Stoic and Platonic reading on the meaning of the assuredly biblically literate authors of *ars moriendi* literature. In so misconstruing the authors’ intent, Verhey renders impotent the aim of his “correction,” which is to assert that death ought not to be celebrated, as he interprets *Ars Moriendi* to do. Surely these authors cannot be construed to be advocating “celebration” of God’s curse. Read in the context of Moriendi’s departure from an originally very good—but now decaying—world to the consummate and blessed state of his *nephesh* (i.e. “living being” or “self”), the “commendacion of death” by the *ars moriendi* authors needs no correction, only a proper contextualization. As mentioned above, Verhey’s unfortunate narrowing of the sourcing for his critique to a singular *ars moriendi* biases his reading of the authors’ intent. Interaction with later *ars moriendi*, such as Martin Luther’s *Eyn Sermon von der bereytung zum sterben* (*A Sermon on Preparing to Die*)—purportedly the first Protestant *ars moriendi*—would have helped greatly Verhey’s assessment.

Regarding semantic intent, the term “commendacion,” as used in the fifteenth century and in the context of the conceptualization of death by biblically literate authors, certainly entails not the same laudatory implications as our contemporary usage of the word “commendation.” Rather, the term may simply refer to the presentation of information. The phrase “commendacion of death,” then, would possess no more significance than “a handbook on dying”—which is precisely what

Ars Moriendi is. Moreover, the authors' aim was to instruct laity in the responsibilities that had become the tasks of the priests as members of the faith community who were charged to "take care of the church of God" as "holding to the mystery of the faith with a clear conscience" (1 Tim. 3:5, 9). Because these little handbooks were to be what Verhey somewhat crassly regards as "*Dying Well for Dummies*" (pp. 79, 174), they were not intended to provide full theological treatises of either thanatology or personal eschatology. In "assessment, selection, and correction," then, the context and purpose of *Ars Moriendi* must not be neglected.

Fourth, Verhey communicates unsettling ambiguity concerning the dying of non-Christians. Arguably, dying well necessitates the reception of eternal life—rather than eternal punishment—after death. Verhey seems to equivocate on this point. He writes, "It is obviously not my claim that only Christians have faith or can die faithfully. Neither is it my claim that only Christians can learn to respond to their vulnerability to death by learning to trust the power in whose hands they are as they lie dying. Nor is my claim an apologetic one, as if I could prove the moral or aesthetic superiority of dying well and faithfully within the context of the Christian story. I do not claim a point of view outside of the Christian story that would allow me to compare impartially different ways of dying. It is my claim, however, that Christians have a story that can nurture and sustain both faith and faithfulness in the face of death" (p. 259). The theological equivocations in this statement are too many to entertain in the space available here. The art of dying well seems here to be completely upended—puzzling indeed for a text whose title and thesis presumes to instruct in that very matter. Apparently, according to Verhey, one need not have "received a faith of the same kind as ours, by the righteousness of our God and Savior, Jesus Christ" (2 Pet. 1:1) in order to die well. The medieval authors of *ars moriendi* surely would disagree.

Finally, the entire third section of *The Christian Art of Dying* presents such a level of theological ambiguity that reading the text becomes a challenge to one's patience because so much of what is communicated is founded on either deficient theology or seemingly misinterpreted premises of others. The result is that virtually every assertion is debatable. For example, as his thesis, Verhey frames Jesus' dying as paradigmatic for the Christian. He does so, however, in such a way that prompts one to wonder if the second person of the Trinity is no more than Adam writ large. Although he repeatedly affirms, "We are not Jesus, and our deaths do not have the same cosmic significance that his does," Verhey asserts that Jesus nonetheless must "trust God" like us. Jesus must have faith in "the cause of God"—whatever that might be, for Verhey never fully explicates the meaning of this phrase nor, for that matter, the import of the phrase "cosmic significance"—like us. Jesus must hope in God's "good future" like us; and in Christ's humiliation, he must be "confident of the grace of God" like us. One is compelled to wonder whether Verhey's Christology accords with Chalcedonian orthodoxy.

Verhey interprets *Ars Moriendi* as instructing Moriendi to "thynke on the passion of Cryste" in order to glean from his example how one might die with Christ's "faith and faithfulness, his hope and his patient love, his humility and his courage" (pp. 216–17). That interpretation is implausible, however. Luther's *ars*

moriendi communicates quite a different purpose for instructing the dying to ruminate Christ's passion. In addition to joyfully receiving the sacraments, which were intended to signify for Moriendi that Christ's victory over the power of death, sin, and hell is also the Christian's victory, contemplation of Christ's vicarious suffering purposed to bolster Moriendi's confidence that through Christ's passion, his salvation—and life—would be eternally secured. Christ's death was to be contemplated not as a mere example. Rather, by Christ's passion, Moriendi was assured that his sins were forgiven; he could die now literally in peace. He could now die well.

Allen Verhey is to be thanked for contributing to advancing the discourse about death beyond the confines of “technology and the medical experts who know how to use it” (pp. 4, 64, 384, 391). He rightly admonishes the church to redeem the art of dying from the unwitting (or deliberate!) Baconian medicalization of death. However, readers will need to bring with them to this “symphony” a familiarity with the movements of God's ordaining the blessing of life, his curse of death, and his response to the threat of death. Without this programme, the art will be lost.

Toby V. Jennings

The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, KY

Parade of Faith: A Biographical History of the Christian Church. By Ruth A. Tucker. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2011, 509 pp., \$39.99.

A significant number of very commendable introductory texts on Christian history have recently appeared or are nearly forthcoming. Diarmaid MacCulloch's massive *Christianity: The First Three Thousand Years* (Viking, 2009) marked an important juncture in this most recent bevy of survey works. The second edition of Justo González's much-used two-volume, *The Story of Christianity* (HarperOne, 2010), added to this influx, as did Edward Engelbrecht as general editor of *The Church from Age to Age: A History from Galilee to Global Christianity* (Concordia, 2011). Averaging over 1100 pages each, however, these three important texts stretch the margins of accessibility and try the endurance of even the most longsuffering students (and their professors). Even more recently published and forthcoming titles promise to be much more practicable, especially in undergraduate courses, in terms of length and orientation. These include the long-awaited third edition of Noll's very successful *Turning Points: Decisive Moments in the History of Christianity* (Baker, 2012), Hans Hillerbrand's *A New History of Christianity* (Abingdon, 2012), and Edith Blumhofer's *People of Faith: A History of Western Christianity* (Wiley-Blackwell, forthcoming).

Amid this rush of noteworthy survey texts, Ruth Tucker's *Parade of Faith: A Biographical History of the Christian Church* offers a refreshingly unique introduction to church history. Her second “biographical history” (preceded by *From Jerusalem to Irian Jaya: A Biographical History of Christian Missions* [Zondervan, 2d ed., 2004]), Tucker's current work traverses the landscape of the church's past, from the New

Testament era to world Christianity at the start of the twenty-first century. Exploring the scenes of the Christian drama through the eyes of its most influential participants, she steers clear of a Henry Fordian conception of history as merely “one damn fact after another” in favor of Ralph Waldo Emerson’s persuasion that all true history is essentially biography. Written primarily for introductory church history courses at colleges and seminaries preparing for ministry, with hopes that lay people and “smart” homeschoolers will also take an interest, Tucker’s work aims to provide an accessible narrative organized around the individual lives of Christian history’s all-time greats (p. 12).

True to its purpose, *Parade of Faith* is conveniently structured for use in college and seminary courses. The book’s twenty-four chapters of remarkably equal length are ideally suited for the semester-length format. Divided into two parts, Tucker splits the major sections of the volume down the middle of the Protestant Reformation, between the magisterial reforms and the more radical separations of the Anabaptist movements. With varying degrees of success, each chapter juggles both thematic and chronological topics. The overarching halves cover the history of Christianity in a fairly predictable manner, cruising through the first fifteen centuries in roughly the amount of space that is allotted to the latter five. The resulting fast-paced survey covers much the same terrain as its copious rivals in about half the number of pages.

Additional features that help to diversify the content pepper the text. Introductory sections present the subject of each chapter in friendly prose, recounting Tucker’s personal thoughts about a particular person, event, or idea considered in the pages that follow. Frequent sidebars and vignettes about everyday life at key historical periods are interspersed throughout the volume, conveying details from both primary and secondary sources about the lives and times of persons and events for which space does not permit fuller treatment. These highlighted sections cover marriage in the medieval world, sixteenth-century fashion, same-sex love (and lack thereof), masculine Christianity, missionary letters, and sports and leisure, to name only a few. Many of the shorter sidebars provide brief quotations from such wide-ranging sources as Dorothy Sayers, Friedrich Nietzsche, J. I. Packer, the Qu’ran, Annie Dillard, and John Piper. Most are serious in nature, but a few—including the quotation from Garrison Keillor about his Puritan ancestors’ coming to America “in hope of finding greater restrictions than were permissible under English law at the time”—supply welcome comic relief (p. 334). Each chapter closes with a “What if...” section and a list for further reading. The counterfactuals Tucker posits often have the positive effect of reminding us how easily particular turns in Christian history might not, or might otherwise, have occurred. The bibliographies are quite useful, offering a helpful balance of standard and newer sources by both scholarly and popular authors.

More than its format, the conceptualization of church history that *Parade of Faith* embodies is what sets this introductory text apart. British writer L. P. Hartley famously quipped, “The past is a foreign country; they do things differently there.” The combination of Tucker’s biographical approach to history with her talent for lucid and captivating storytelling makes the Christian past seem less foreign and the

actions of historical figures more coherent to those occupying the present. The parade motif, visited and revisited at the beginning of every chapter and reinforced by the general atmosphere of the narrative, encapsulates the procession of “the delightfully messy disarray of our Christian heritage,” emphasizing the dramatic qualities in the story of the church as it has marched through the ages (p. 12).

Of the many things Tucker does well in this book, certainly the most outstanding is her candid portrayal of Christian history’s pivotal figures and events. Challenging “golden age” interpretations and disabusing us of hagiographic depictions of our most cherished heroes of the faith, Tucker retells the stories of the church with nearly as much attention to scandal and chaos as to splendor and piety. For instance, consider Peter Abelard, the “scholar with sex appeal” (p. 164). His brilliance as a theologian is not lost on her, but neither is the heinousness of his behavior toward the young nun Heloise, whom he left pregnant and abandoned in a convent. Likewise, Tucker’s recounting of the sexual scandals that surrounded Zwingli even as he was joining the Reformation—and which nearly cost him his pastoral candidacy in Zurich—is enough to dampen the enthusiasm of even the most full-blooded Protestant. Drawing a positive lesson from these lusts of the flesh, she rightly observes that the guilt that Zwingli suffered was “largely due to his increasing regard for Scripture” (p. 243). In the same vein, she shows no reservation in passing stern judgment on the wrong actions of our faithful forebears, whether it be the atrocities of the Crusades, the “utterly unchristian behavior” of Reformation-era persecutions against Anabaptists, the cultural obliviousness of overseas missionaries, or the complicity of the German Lutheran church in the aims of Hitler’s Nazi regime (p. 215). Tucker cautions against making easy assessments about the good Christianity has done in the world in this manner throughout the text.

Some of Tucker’s most compelling (and provocative?) biographical sketches are those that complicate the story of nascent Christian orthodoxy. In the opening chapters, from the New Testament period through the earliest ecumenical councils to at least the accounts of the desert fathers (and mothers), she has no qualms about exposing the incertitude that surrounded ideas about the biblical canon and “right” doctrine. For example, she emphasizes the great strides Tertullian made in the development of orthodox belief, giving us the term “Trinity” and first distinguishing the biblical texts as Old and New Testaments, but not without also fully disclosing his less-than-heroic end as the leader of a radical splinter sect of Montanism (p. 55). The same is the case with Tucker’s treatment of Arius. Stressing his status as “a fervent Christian and devoted disciple of Jesus,” she presents the overextension of his defense of God’s oneness in considerably positive terms (p. 65). Some church historians keenly devoted to their inherited orthodoxy tend to judge theological history without much self-awareness about the extent to which they benefit from creedal hindsight. Thus, Arius is often depicted (at best) as the unworthy foil to Athanasius or (at worst) as a dangerous threat to the continuance of the church. Against such interpretations, Tucker willingly credits Arius with admirable motives and honest mistakes, refusing to dismiss him as a heretical malcontent. (Indeed, nearly half of the instances in which Tucker

identifies an individual as a heretic, the label appears in quotation marks.) Although the theme of theological insiders and outsiders is most present in the early chapters, it frequently recurs elsewhere.

Parade of Faith's focus on the panoply of greats in Christian history does not translate to mean that all of the figures considered within its pages will be equally familiar or regarded as uniformly important. This is another real strength of Tucker's work. Without diminishing the prominence of the traditional cast of characters, she gives voice to many who have been historically silenced, including those living outside the orthodox neighborhood, a few racial minorities and, most predominantly, women. Among the particularly encouraging (and illuminating) additions are accounts that highlight the advantages of female influence in the church. A prime example is Marcella, a fourth-century Roman socialite-turned-ascetic who recalled meeting Athanasius and maintained a close friendship with Jerome. The famed biblical scholar benefited from her critiques of his translation work and praised her for being "in the front line in condemning heretics" (p. 84). We would be hard-pressed to find better support for Tucker's recovery of female voices in Christian history than the medieval monk William of Ockham, who argued in a piece on church councils that women were "necessary to the discussion of the faith" (p. 175). Other noteworthy female biographies that have not been assimilated into many other surveys include Anabaptist martyr Elizabeth Dirks, French Catholic missionary Anne-Marie Javouhey, African American Baptist missionary Eliza Davis George, and Hindu Christian reformer Pandita Ramabai. This vital attention to women of the faith includes often-neglected discussions of the married and family lives of church history's most visible leaders.

Several of the book's running themes are clearly directed at young, generally conservative evangelical Protestants. Of course, this is a subculture with which Tucker is quite familiar (not to mention the most obvious target audience for such a textbook), so the idea that she would commit portions of her work to upsetting some of the group's preconceptions is not surprising. Tapping into evangelicals' acute acclimation to the language of religious partisanship, she readily labels figures "liberal" or "conservative," depending on the relation of their ideas to their place in history. As a few pre-modern examples, Arius is called a "conservative" (nay, even a "fundamentalist") for his defense of God's holiness (p. 66); Ockham is "liberal" for his opposition to papal authority (p. 175); Abelard espoused a "liberal" theological methodology (p. 167); Savonarola is "fundamentalist" in his proto-Protestant reform efforts (p. 209); and Luther is a "conservative" who supported religious establishments (p. 219). In the same manner, Tucker appropriates modern evangelical vernacular to make historical points. From the mists of church history, especially before and outside the advent of modern evangelicalism, she uncovers revivals, radical conversion experiences, fervent biblicism, praise songs, and megachurches. Again, these attributions compellingly suggest that the past is not quite as foreign as we may think and that, just perhaps, what they do there is not so different after all.

Like the many personages it surveys, however, *Parade of Faith* is not without its flaws. As previously noted, Tucker rarely misses an opportunity to give her

subjects a scolding. But her criticisms, chiefly derived from moral and ethical concerns, are highly selective at best. Luther lands in hot water for his anti-Semitism, but Albert Schweitzer gets off with no more than a perfunctory slap on the wrist for his racism toward Africans (in stark contrast, admittedly, Schweitzer aided his perceived inferiors while Luther threatened his with extermination). William Carey and Billy Sunday are censured for their disreputable home lives, but Tucker dismisses similar (and worse) criticisms of Martin Luther King Jr. as distracting and unhelpful. And to the outrage of today's "neo-Puritan Calvinists," early English Puritans are not "spiritual giants" as much as they are individuals whose holy preoccupations were occasionally "little more than self-absorption" (pp. 323, 318). On the issue of theological content, it is remarkable that Ambrose gets a pass for his universalism, and Schweitzer for his anti-supernaturalism, while Constantine is chastised for his "questionably Christian" syncretistic approval of the Roman sun god (p. 72).

An equally frustrating extension of this moralizing is Tucker's occasionally excessive apologetic and judgmental tone, an ambience increasingly conspicuous through the second half of the book. In a few places this attitude even comes across as self-loathing, such as when she reflects on the persecution of Anabaptists and the "shame I bear when I look back on my Reformed heritage" (p. 239). She seems almost equally embarrassed by how few points of theological separation exist between herself and John Knox, "in some ways a male chauvinist of the first order" (p. 299). A more striking (almost appalling) instance is Tucker's personal introduction to the modern missionary movement. Of all the ways she might have opened this important chapter, she chooses to relay the story of a compelling missionary address she heard at a Bible camp in her youth—the speaker from West Africa turned out to be a child molester. I entirely agree with Tucker that we ought to promote full disclosure about Christianity's past, the bad with the good. And I support a posture of earnest contrition about atrocities committed in the name of the faith. But the extent to which Tucker dwells on these accounts runs contrary to her purpose, often seeming to encourage more remorse about our Christian heritage than exhilaration, more suspicion than celebration. In certain extreme instances the "parade" seems more like a protest.

Finally, despite Tucker's commitment to boosting underrepresented parties, the narrative remains notably oriented to Western Christianity. After the initial chapters on the early church, which are naturally inclusive of East and West, a very helpful chapter on "Byzantine Religion" explains some of the peculiarities (especially to conservative Evangelicals) of Eastern Orthodoxy, the Monophysites, and the Assyrian Church of the East. Nevertheless, the entirety of the chapter deals with people and events prior to the Great Schism. Women, minorities, and heretics may be given more of a voice throughout this biographical history, but with rare excursions into Asia, Africa, and Latin America, after 1054 the dialect sounds distinctly Western.

While these recurring hindrances do in some measure distract, they do not negate what is otherwise an excellent and indispensable addition to the troupe of popular introductory textbooks. More than a mere survey, *Parade of Faith* brings the

drama of Christian history to life, illuminating the lives and times of the church's trailblazers, including those we know and those we ought to know. Tucker's storytelling is in no way hagiographic or triumphalist; rather, she portrays the history of Christianity in all its glory and grime. There are no untouchable saints within these lively pages. And yet, for all the book's reprimands, it leaves us with a question that is never satisfactorily addressed: How should Christians use their history? Beyond heeding the warnings of past failures, what are the constructive lessons? It may be that Tucker simply wants us to know and embrace this story as our own, certainly a worthy ambition in itself and a crucial step toward using our collective past: "We are one family across culture and time: one Lord, one faith, one baptism" (p. 10).

Eric T. Brandt
Lancaster Bible College, Lancaster, PA

Talking with Mormons: An Invitation to Evangelicals. By Richard J. Mouw. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2012, x + 99 pp., \$7.59 paper.

Richard Mouw is the outgoing president of Fuller Theological Seminary. He is a key evangelical figure in the realm of interfaith dialogue and has spent the better part of the last decade engaged in discussions with Latter-day Saint scholars and some LDS church officials. His role has afforded him some high profile encounters typified by his role in the preliminary portion of Ravi Zacharias 2004 lecture at "An Evening of Friendship" in the Mormon Tabernacle at Temple Square in Salt Lake City. This event is central to the book's occasion and content because it affords much of the impetus for Mouw's role in Mormon/Evangelical dialogues and established him as both a respected and controversial figure in this arena.

As someone present at that Tabernacle event and as an evangelical regularly engaged with Latter-day Saints in both the public arena and local church life, I take a particular interest in Mouw's work and role in interfaith dialogue.

Mouw's book is short and consists of twelve chapters, including an introduction entitled "Explaining the Sound Bites." The general intent of the book seems twofold. On the one hand, it serves as an opportunity for Mouw to explain and possibly vindicate his approach to interfaith dialogue with Mormons. On the other hand, it is, in accord with the book's subtitle, an invitation for evangelicals to dialogue with Mormons, maintaining the tenor and optimism characteristic of his own approach.

He begins with two brief chapters orienting the reader to the subject at hand. The first sets out the defining moment that created Mouw's public platform in this branch of interfaith dialogue. He briefly describes his 2004 Mormon Tabernacle comments and offers a brief explanation for the nature of his conciliatory remarks. In the next chapter he shifts into a bit of autobiographical information regarding his early engagement with Mormonism that set the stage for his desire to craft a conciliatory approach focused on mutual understanding. Citing, among other

personal experiences, his observation of Walter Martin's factual but insensitive engagement with a Mormon, Mouw sets out to articulate a different kind of engagement; one less driven by polemical debate and more directed to mutual awareness of each other's theological convictions.

In the third chapter, he gets to the heart of his *modus operandi* in evangelical/Mormon interaction by criticizing the traditional "counter-cult" approaches to reaching Latter Day Saints. Mouw is mainly critical of the ethos of those vested in this approach typified by the aforementioned Walter Martin. Here Mouw overgeneralizes and egregiously lacks the nuance to proffer an adequate criticism of a label that encompasses a wide variety of philosophies for missional engagement. "Counter-cult" ministry does not resemble the monolithic gloss that Mouw uses to paint it as he describes "prominent" and "typical" strategies of such approaches. Additionally, his assessment of "counter-cult" failures is simply wrong in specific assertions. For example, he avers that "the problem with the typical evangelical historical effort to find a smoking gun in Mormon teaching is that it hasn't been very successful." In fact, the guns of Mesoamerican archaeology, the existence of reformed Egyptian writing, DNA evidence for the Semitic origins for Native Americans, and the location of Cumorah, among others, are still smoking furiously. His overall caution to make sure that we steer away from creating straw men is important and valuable. His means of illustrating his point, however, seems strained.

In his fourth chapter, Mouw interacts with a book by LDS author O. Kendall White entitled *Mormon Neo-Orthodoxy*. White wrote in 1987 out of concern for where he saw his church's theology heading. Mouw finds encouragement in what White was concerned about and wonders if it typifies the broader trend in the movement of LDS theology to which he attests. But perhaps it is here that Mouw's detractors find their most significant fodder for disagreement with him. He uses an example from White's book as he expresses concern about Glenn Pearson, a BYU faculty member, and his theological writings. Mouw quotes a section in which he believes Pearson to be sounding a "solidly biblical call for sinful people to plead for mercy from a righteous God." He even goes on to suggest, after quoting Pearson, that an evangelical would not find fault with what Pearson said in the quoted paragraph. But what does Pearson actually say? Here is Pearson's quote, and no review of Mouw's work can ignore this quote and Mouw's affirmation of its orthodoxy: "There has to be a down payment of a broken heart and a contrite spirit. Who has a broken heart and contrite spirit? One who is stripped of pride and selfishness. One who has come down in the depths of humility and prostrated himself before the Lord in mighty prayer and supplication. He has realized the awful guilt of his sins and pled for the blood of Christ to be a covering to shield himself from the face of a just God. Such a one has made the down payment." Strikingly, Mouw's affirmation of this quote's orthodoxy misses the very heart of the chasm between evangelical and LDS soteriology, namely, the sufficiency of Christ's death. What evangelical would regard Christ's death as a "down payment"? The very heart of evangelical and Reformation soteriology is grounded on the fact that Christ's death is a "full payment," not merely a "down payment." This lack of

savvy regarding how Latter-day Saints historically and presently speak of atonement in synergistic terms is what alarms Mouw's critics.

In his subsequent chapter entitled "Getting at the Basics," Mouw tries to show that we can disagree significantly about theology without asserting that the one we disagree with is eternally lost. At a basic level this assertion certainly holds. However, his assessment concerning Mormonism suffers from a weakness in both his sample size and his sample diversity. He admits that the sample that shapes his conclusions about whether he is being misled is the motives of his Mormon friends. This is fair enough. But his sampling is too nuanced and not indicative of Mormonism. A handful of BYU scholars and a couple of church officials do not give us the *sensu lato* of Mormon doctrine. But Mouw seems to assume that they do.

In one sense, Mouw is appropriate and honest to share from whence his assessment comes. This is commendable and does give insight into appreciating his perspective from his own experience. Yet if his book's subtitle holds, it provides inadequate grounding for an invitation for evangelicals to engage Mormons in dialogue because his sampling is not at all indicative of the warp and woof of Mormonism that evangelicals would normally engage. And while Mouw's personal engagement with LDS scholars may indeed be moving the meter at the scholarly level, his book is a broader invitation that is intended to extend beyond academia. And it is in this larger and more pedestrian realm that his experience and example fall flat.

The next several chapters in the book deal with different key points in the discussion of Mormon doctrine as it confronts evangelical Christianity. Mouw rightly and helpfully begins by asserting that our attitude needs to lack presumption when we engage our Mormon friends in discussion about important theological matters. His righteous desire to have dialogue flavored by Christian virtue is important and commendable, and it can serve as an important corrective to many who don't adequately value the weight of the Puritan admonition that "God loveth adverbs."

In these chapters, three issues are dealt with: Jesus' identity, the nature of religious authority, and the person of Mormonism's founder Joseph Smith. Mouw tries to show points of resonance and common ground for gaining theological traction in conversation with Mormons on these three important issues. He has rightly identified these three as central topics that cut at the heart of much of the discussion between the two communities.

In the first of these chapters dealing with Jesus, Mouw's generous spirit pervades so much that it feels like its intent is to minimize disparities between evangelical and Mormon perspectives about Jesus' identity (i.e. the Son's relationship to the Father, Jesus' pre-existent ontology, and the nature of Jesus' conception), to smooth over past statements of creedal rejection on the part of Mormons, and to reframe LDS soteriology. In the second chapter dealing with authority, Mouw discusses briefly the role of the prophet, revelation, and inscripturation in Mormonism, highlighting the fact that evangelicals often pragmatically add to the canon in the way they view creeds and confessions. Finally, in the third chapter dealing with Joseph Smith, Mouw takes an empathetic view of

the religion's founder, preferring to utilize Smith's quest for fulfillment of deep human longings as a starting point rather than specious assertions about his character. Throughout these three more doctrinal chapters, Mouw's generous and well-meaning efforts utilize a range of false analogies (pp. 48, 51, 65, 69) and eisegetical interpretations (pp. 53–54 and 56–57). Generosity of spirit is commendable, but only in concert with, not at the expense of, doctrinal clarity.

In the book's final two chapters, Mouw makes a final appeal that he is not being duped in his discussions with Mormons and that we need to "cut some slack" in these dialogues to allow for some of the misunderstood messiness that is part of two traditions trying to understand each other. Additionally, he closes with an illustration about the differences between propositional knowledge and experiential knowledge. He leaves the reader with the idea that he wants us to be open to people (presumably Mormons) having wrong propositional knowledge of Jesus but real experiential knowledge of Jesus via a genuine relationship.

Mouw's book is unique among literature addressing the topic because of its situational appeal. It is akin to Carl F. H. Henry's short book in 1947, *The Uneasy Conscience of Modern Fundamentalism*, which helped establish the divide between evangelicalism and fundamentalism. Like Mouw's work, it was an insider's polemical appeal to issues of cultural and theological engagement. While there are a number of works that address evangelical and Mormon dialogue at differing levels such as Blomberg and Robinson's *How Wide the Divide?: A Mormon & an Evangelical in Conversation*, Johnson and Millet's *Bridging the Divide: The Continuing Conversation Between a Mormon and an Evangelical*, and McDermott and Millet's *Claiming Christ: A Mormon-Evangelical Debate*, along with a plethora of works that attempt to engage LDS theology from evangelical perspectives, there is not a book like this because the situation and perspective is unique to a particular setting and occasion.

The book will serve as a helpful summary of Mouw's approach and his legacy in interfaith dialogue and as a helpful representation to an important perspective in evangelical engagement with Mormonism. At the same time, it is not particularly helpful or balanced if one wants an assessment of how to engage Latter-day Saint thinking. The book is overrun with false analogies and over-generalizations, and it lacks both the breadth and the nuance to be much help in practical or scholarly engagement with Mormonism. Its appeal is to a limited number of people engaged in or aware of the issues at play in this sector of interfaith discussion. Its arrival in an election year with a Mormon candidate running for president may evoke additional interest, but more than anything it will serve as an artifact of history in an ongoing debate about the nature of evangelicalism's engagement with Latter-day Saints.

Bryan Hurlbutt
Lifeline Community, West Jordan, UT

Reformed Thought: Selected Writings of William Young. Edited by Joel R. Beeke and Ray B. Lanning. Grand Rapids: Reformation Heritage, 2011, vi + 413 pp., \$35.00 hardback.

This book is an eclectic collection of writings by philosopher and theologian William Young. In some collections, the philosophical and the theological aspects of a work grow out of a single issue or interest. In this work we see that Young has parallel interests. It is not that his philosophy and theology do not connect with each other; rather, his pursuits are largely independent, and each of them requires some expertise to engage. Young's philosophical interests include Wittgenstein, Hegel, and Augustine, among other luminaries. His real passion, as is evidenced by this collection, is Reformed theology. His is an old-time, classic Calvinism.

After an introduction by Paul Helm and a biographical sketch by the editors, the book is divided into four sections. The first, *Theology and Doctrine*, consists of eleven chapters. Taking up over half the book, it is by far the most substantial of all the sections. The second, *Sermons and Pastoral Writings*, has ten entries. Third, *Christian Philosophy*, contains eight chapters, and finally, *Reviews*, has seven book reviews.

Those readers who are conversant with the details of the history of Reformed Theology will gain a great deal from this work. As I mentioned the largest section is given to *Theology and Doctrine*. Most of the essays in this section take up issues between various historic branches of Calvinism. As Young engages with issues such as hyper-covenantism or antinomianism, he draws upon a myriad of theologians and documents to make his case clear. Reading this section, I had the sense that there were deep wells of historical insight being brought to bear on the topics. Any reader interested in the history of Reformed thought will have much to ponder here. Being neither a theologian nor a Calvinist, I found much of it beyond me.

Young's philosophical pieces show that he has as much capacity as a philosopher as he does as a theologian. He is thorough and careful, yet he shows a breadth of facility that is staggering. Several of these essays were delivered or published in the 1950s and 1960s, well before the widely heralded "renaissance" of Christian philosophy had begun to get much traction. Yet Young's articles on truth ("The Validity of Religious Truth," "Modern Relativism and the Authority of Scripture," and "What is Truth?") bring a sophistication of analysis and a challenge of the current orthodoxy of secular philosophy that match the best work by Christian philosophers. In the latter essay, Young carefully distinguishes between various uses of the term "true" and argues with great clarity for a realist concept of truth: truth is a property of propositions, and a proposition is true if it represents the facts accurately.

Three of the philosophical essays are on Wittgenstein. Two of these are largely about Wittgenstein's relation to Christianity ("Wittgenstein and Christianity" and "Wittgenstein and Predestination"). Young has excavated the vast unpublished archives and has recovered interesting insights concerning Wittgenstein's own developing struggles with Christianity. At points Wittgenstein seems to be wrestling

hard to make sense—in his own understanding of sense—of the claims of Christianity. At other points, his concerns reflect his search to find meaning in his own life. These papers do not focus on expediting his established theories, but they open a window into the soul of one of the most enigmatic philosophers of the twentieth century.

In “Wittgenstein and the Future of Metaphysics,” Young takes on the task of unraveling the philosopher’s multi-layered concern over the proper domain of metaphysics. Young sees that Wittgenstein takes on three roles throughout his work. He himself is a metaphysician; he is also a critic of metaphysics; and he is a “forerunner of a future metaphysics” (p. 348). The thesis that Wittgenstein takes on all of these roles runs counter to much popular Wittgenstein interpretation, especially of his later works. Young supports his claims by employing the distinction between immanent metaphysics and transcendent metaphysics.

Immanent metaphysics takes up questions about the world, about states of affairs and the structure of propositions and facts. In Wittgenstein’s earlier period, immanent metaphysics involves the exploration of the logical form of propositions. Such form cannot, he emphasizes, be stated; rather, it must be shown. In his later works, immanent metaphysics is revealed in a two-fold manner: his continued acceptance of formal logic as well as the investigation of the grammar of our use of language. Transcendent metaphysics concerns the more traditional questions, such as those pointed out by Kant: the questions of God, of freedom, and of immortality. Wittgenstein rejected transcendent metaphysics throughout his career. He left a way open, however, for immanent metaphysics. In each of these ways, his project resembles that of Kant.

Where Wittgenstein differs from Kant, especially in the later periods, is in the nature of the boundary between legitimate and illegitimate metaphysics. For Kant, it is the nature of pure reason that makes it impossible to speak with meaning or to investigate rationally those questions that fall outside the bounds of the grounds of the possibility of any experience. Since reason is universal, Kant does not think these boundaries depend upon the contingent nature of our languages or cultures. The later Wittgenstein, in contrast, seems to draw the boundary around the limits of language. It is not that he unearths a universal essence of language; rather, the use of language, as contingent as it is, forms the boundary between what can be said truly and what cannot.

Taking Wittgenstein in this Kantian way is fruitful for understanding his project, but it is not the last word on metaphysics. In the essays on truth discussed above, Young carefully and successfully articulates the fact that propositional truth, especially propositional truth about God, is essential to Christianity. The fact that God has revealed himself cuts through the boundaries developed by either Kant or Wittgenstein. It is possible to speak and think truly about God because God has acted. He has revealed himself.

As we noted, Young argues that truth is a property of propositions. Following Augustine, Young holds the view that propositions are “eternal objects or contents in the mind of God” (p. 317). The possibility of truth, according to this position, is grounded in the mind of God. Such grounding shows truth to be independent of

any of human activity. Thus, the boundaries of legitimate metaphysics do not depend on human capacities or activities, whether these capacities are universal among human beings or not. The possibility of a future metaphysics is secured by the God who reveals himself to us.

Reformed Thought is a book containing numerous interesting and challenging essays. In addition, the publisher has produced a beautiful volume. The binding, printing, and dust jacket are excellent. My main concern is that the book will fall between two audiences. I fear that few philosophers will pick up the volume because the bulk of it is largely concerned with internal disagreements among various strains of Calvinism. Those interested in the history of these disputes will probably be more satisfied, although much of the second half of the book will not provoke their interest. Perhaps this straddling of concerns is fitting, as it reflects the man. At one point, Young makes the following observation: "I do not know where to draw the boundary line between Christian philosophy and theology. I must confess that if people want to accuse me of being a theologian and not a philosopher when I proceed along these lines, I am willing to plead guilty, and it does not matter too much what label one uses, as far as I am concerned. And this, too, is in the spirit of Augustine, no doubt" (p. 316). This disregard for strict borders between disciplines may have been the clue to William Young's pursuit of his calling, one he still pursues at the age of ninety-four. Augustine would be pleased.

Gregory E. Ganssle
Rivendell Institute and Yale University, New Haven, CT