

## BOOK REVIEWS

*HCSB Study Bible*. Holman Christian Standard Bible. Nashville: Holman Bible Publishers, 2010, lxii + 2280 pp., \$49.99.

The *Holman Christian Standard Bible* (hereafter HCSB) first appeared in 2004. Although most readers know the name Holman has Southern Baptist connections, the translation was the result of a team of scholars of many denominations. The goal was to provide a “multi-denominational effort, reflecting the very best in updated Bible translation scholarship” (p. xi). The *HCSB Study Bible* (hereafter *Study Bible*) appeared in 2010 and represents the work of more than a hundred scholars. It was the editors’ goal to take the same approach in the creation of this work as they had taken on the original HCSB. General Editor Jeremy Howard affirms the commitment those scholars have to the biblical text: “Each of our contributors honors the Bible as God’s inspired and inerrant Word” (p. xi).

The introductory pages contain several useful sections: (1) “Features of the HCSB Study Bible” (pp. xii–xv), which familiarizes readers with the overall layout; (2) “Essay Contributors” (pp. xxiii–xxiv), which alerts readers to twenty-seven key essays placed throughout the *Study Bible*; (3) “List of Maps, Illustrations, and Charts” (pp. xxv–xxix), particularly helpful where topics might potentially be covered in various parts of Scripture; (4) “List of Hebrew Word Studies” (pp. xxxi–xxxiii); (5) “List of Greek Word Studies” (pp. xxxiv–xxxvi); (6) “Introduction to the Holman Christian Standard Bible” (pp. xxxix–xliv), which provides explanation and insight into HCSB translation philosophy; (7) “How to Read and Study the Bible” (pp. xlvii–lv), a helpful overview to Bible study and interpretation for the work’s intended audience; and (8) “The Origin, Transmission, and Canonization of the Old Testament Books” (pp. lvi–lxii), which includes a defense of the OT canon and also discusses the proper place of the Apocrypha. (A corresponding essay entitled “The Origin, Transmission, and Canonization of the New Testament Books” appears later in the *Study Bible* [pp. 1596–1600].)

An introduction to each biblical book appears at the beginning of each work. The main headings in each introduction are consistently “Circumstances of Writing,” “Message and Purpose,” “Contribution to the Bible,” and “Structure.” Commentators receive room enough to adequately overview the key issues related to their particular book; the introduction to Genesis, for example, is much longer than the introduction to Obadiah.

The *Study Bible* is aesthetically pleasing and boasts a user-friendly layout. Good color usage helps the reader distinguish various items; for example, verse references printed in blue highlight verses for which cross-references are listed or on which scholarly comments appear. Inset articles typically are shaded to set them off, and full color high quality pictures enhance the reader’s understanding. Sometimes inset articles are brief (e.g. “yom,” p. 8); at other times, a full page is required (e.g. “The Uniqueness of the Genesis Creation Story,” p. 10).

The study notes are also laid out well, again with blue font highlighting which verses are receiving discussion. The notes bold the words discussed that appear in the translation above so readers can readily identify commentary on words or phrases. Typically parallel and/or supporting biblical references are given to guide readers into further study. The language is generally straightforward and easy to understand.

At the end of the *Study Bible*, a section entitled “HCSB Bullet Notes” (pp. 2231–37) lists a glossary of frequently used terms. These terms are bulleted in the translation on their first occurrence in a chapter of the biblical text. Rounding out the volume are three final tools: (1) a “Topical Concordance to the Holman Christian Standard Bible” (pp. 2241–52); (2) a “Bible Reading Plans” section (pp. 2253–68) that lays out a three-year plan and a one-year plan to read through the Bible; and (3) a “52-Week Scripture Memory Plan” (pp. 2269–70) that features a systematic memorization of key Bible verses that relate to fifteen major biblical concepts. (The plan notes that all dated Bible study curriculum developed by LifeWay Christian Resources is built upon these concepts.)

For all the above reasons, the *Study Bible* is a welcome addition. Those who have used the HCSB since its appearance now have a important resource. I will raise but two points of concern. The first is fairly minor and relates to transliteration practice of Hebrew words. In ten Hebrew word studies, the letter *y* is used in transliteration when a yod appears only to mark a vowel (i.e. as one of the *matres lectionis* letters). Examples include *meshiyach* (p. 498), *tamiym* (p. 19), *zjyd* (p. 791), *ewjyl* (p. 1044), *kesjyl* (p. 1058), *ashrey* (p. 881), *nagjyd* (p. 675), *duda'ym* (p. 1118), *yamiyn* (p. 968), and *heriy'a* (p. 351). I readily agree that not everyone agrees on standard transliteration practice, and further, that what may be standard linguistic practice may not meet the more practical needs of a study Bible intended for non-linguists. Nevertheless, the use of a consistently silent *y* appears odd.

Second, the *Study Bible*, despite its being the work of a multi-denominational team, in places does not reflect the breadth of evangelical interpretation one might hope for in such a work. I commend the *Study Bible* for the many places it presents various evangelical alternatives, guiding the reader toward a particular one (see e.g. the commentary on Gen 1:1–2; 6:1–4; Heb 6:4–20 [though the latter rather quickly dismisses view #1]; Rev 20:4–6). In other places, however, positions some evangelicals might hold or that studious readers might want to be aware of are sometimes glossed over or ignored in favor of a preferred view, or one side of a position is greatly oversimplified. A few key examples are as follows. (1) The authorship of Isaiah is only briefly discussed, and is settled merely with the words, “For those who believe that God knows the future and can reveal it to His servants, it is not problematic that God through Isaiah predicted the rise of Babylon, its victory against Judah, the exile, and the return” (p. 1124). (2) The traditional view of authorship and date for the book of Daniel is well articulated, but those who take a second-century BC date for Daniel are said to do so only “based on a naturalistic perspective that denies the possibility of the authentic foretelling found in Daniel” (p. 1430), and the view is “driven by a presuppositional rejection of supernatural prophecy and not objective evidence” (p. 1431). (3) The potential connection of

the “sayings of the wise” (Prov 22:17–24:34) with Egyptian wisdom literature is not mentioned at all. (4) Passages traditionally interpreted as endorsing male headship in marriage are treated as such without a hint of the egalitarian view (Eph 5:22–24, p. 2036; 1 Tim 2:12–15, pp. 2086–87; 1 Tim 3:11, p. 2087, though the inset hints that Phoebe may have held the deacon’s role). (5) The essay “Perseverance of the Saints” (p. 2028) allows no room for an Arminian position. To be sure, many evangelicals will agree with the positions stated. However, other evangelicals may feel the introduction’s assertion that “we endeavor to be even-handed on controversial issues” (p. xi) is somewhat overstated.

These concerns aside, however, the *Study Bible* will be a welcome resource for serious laypeople who want to delve deeper into the Scriptures. The commentators typically explain the text well, taking into account current scholarship, but writing in such a way that the average reader will find their explanations clear and straightforward. The layout of the work makes it easy to use, and the many helps and tools will provide readers what they need to take their biblical understanding to a higher level.

Bryan E. Beyer

Columbia International University, Columbia, SC

*An Introduction to Ancient Mesopotamian Religion.* By Tammi J. Schneider. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2011, 146 pp., \$15.97.

This book provides a concise summary of the Sumerian, Akkadian, Assyrian, and Babylonian religions. Schneider proposes a religiously strict lifestyle and carefully defined worldview of the Mesopotamians from the beginnings of the third millennium until the reign of Darius the Mede in 521 BC. Categorizing the evidence as tools of the archeological trade, she includes extant texts, artifacts, and architecture excavated within the last 150 years to support her conclusion that those societies were both highly literate and religious. Their lives revolved around the considerable tasks of appeasing a complex array of deities reigning somewhat arbitrarily over their own prospective city-states. Schneider proposes the ancient Mesopotamians understood the purpose of humanity to be found in alleviating work for the gods (p. 1). She defends her thesis through synopses of their history, myths, gods, temples, religious personnel, texts, rituals, and kingship.

With agricultural evidence suggesting the first perennial settlements around 6500–3500 BC (p. 20) and writing appearing as early as the fourth millennium BC (pp. 20, 141), city-states that then arose, would each serve their own deities (p. 21). When Mesopotamia was first united under the northern rule of Sargon (2334–2279 BC), the predominant language changed from Sumerian to Akkadian. A short-lived revival of Sumerian (2112–2004 BC) flourished prior to Amorite invasions. Those led, however, to a northern domination of Assyrians and a Southern rule of Babylonians for the next 1,500 years.

Documents uncovered at Mari, many contemporary to Abraham, showed that in Babylonia past religions were both assumed and changed (p. 26), as rival city-

states contended for supremacy. The rule of Hammurabi (1792–1750 BC) and his Babylonian dynasty provided some cohesion until an insurgence led to Kassite rule (1600–1350 BC). Ecological changes then reduced the population, resulting in military losses to the Assyrians and the Elamites until Nebuchadnezzar I (1124–1100 BC) restored Babylon's rule with the recovery of its stolen deity Marduk. The appearance of Arameans in the north and Chaldeans in the south subsequently provoked ongoing conflicts between Assyria and Babylon. The seventh-century BC Assyrian king Sennacherib stole Marduk once again but Babylonia maintained resistance and under Nabopolassar (626–605 BC) gained control over all of Assyria. Their greatest expansion occurred under Nebuchadnezzar II (604–562 BC) and their demise soon after under Nabonidus in 539 BC. An Assyrian history is similarly chronicled from documents uncovered at Khorsabad, Iraq, and Koltepe, Turkey, showing competing influences of the Hurrians, Hittites, Arameans, Egyptians, and Babylonians through the second millennium BC until Assur-uballit's defeat to Babylon in 609 BC.

After this brief history, Schneider examines the myth genre for its apparent attempts to explain the meaning of life. It reveals a plethora of deities who exert control over the world and invent humans so the gods would not have to work (p. 50). The identities, roles, and status of this pantheon were modified with changes in the fortunes of the various regions and city-states where they resided. The scribes who determined those identities also held them responsible for whatever injustices humans would suffer (p. 64).

The temples excavated to house these deities, however, furnished the most abundant proof of the highly extensive staffing and the complex, and essentially unchanging features of a multilayered organization built around providing the functions and rituals necessary to appease these gods (p. 78). The vast array of personnel devoted to their service included far more than prophets or priests and were supremely represented in the city-state's kingship. Kings were rarely considered divine themselves, but their authority hinged upon maintaining a relationship with the city-state's deity (p. 125).

Other publications such as Jacobsen's *Treasure of Darkness*, Dalley's *Myths from Mesopotamia* or Sasson's four-volume *Civilizations of the Ancient Near East* provide much more detailed information but as a primer, Schneider's introduction gives the most essential and uncontested basics of this field in as brief a format as may be found. It includes a valuable timeline of the significant figures and periods of various regions. It has a ten-page almost entirely English bibliography that includes helpful dictionaries and grammars of Akkadian, Sumerian, and Assyrian. She also points out a number of important lacunae in the studies made of the enormous wealth of data that has just now been brought to light on ancient Mesopotamia as a result of the recent availability of these grammars and dictionaries. Few studies, for instance, have traced the transformations that have occurred in the characterizations of some of their major deities across any extended periods of time (p. 129). What events led to their silencing for so long is still debated.

Curiously, Schneider concludes, with seemingly little support in my opinion, that Mesopotamians showed little interest in the future, death, or making the world

a better place (p. 128), compared to simply making the most of their present existence. If so, they would be quite unique among most societies, ancient or contemporary.

Kimon Nicolaides  
Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, Deerfield, IL

*The Character of Christian Scripture: The Significance of a Two-Testament Bible.* By Christopher R. Seitz. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2011, 218 pp., \$22.99.

In *The Character of Christian Scripture*, Christopher Seitz sets out to answer the following question: “How does the Old Testament extend its horizon beyond and in conjunction with the New Testament, as Christian Scripture and not as background literature for the New Testament or as a resourceful document to be cited for a discrete subject (p. 11)?” This is not a question asked in a theological vacuum but rather it is asked in light of recent work done by NT scholars concerning use of the OT in the NT and the threat these works pose to the continuation of the OT’s unique, Christian, theological voice. Seitz believes the canonical approach is the best interpretive model for maintaining the integrity of the Christian Scripture as a two-Testament witness.

In chapter 1, Seitz argues that the canonical approach “offers the most compelling, comprehensive account of biblical interpretation and theology presently on offer (p. 36).” In light of the fact that the canonical approach is rather well established in the field, and that he has written extensively on the subject elsewhere—in fact, this chapter is a reworking of a previous Seitz essay—I will simply point out that Seitz believes the canonical approach’s greatest strength for the question guiding this book is its *desire for comprehensiveness* (p. 34). It utilizes historical criticism, engages (positively) “pre-modern” works, and provides a biblical-theological handling of Scripture wherein the theological interpretation matches the formal reality of two distinct, yet related, Testaments.

In chapter 2, Seitz uses the canonical approach to correct a trend in NT studies whereby the OT is being interpreted primarily (if not solely) through the lens of the NT’s use of it. At stake, he believes, is the status of the OT as Christian Scripture *per se* and, consequently, a potential loss of the OT’s ontological claims that lie outside of the ways in which the NT interprets the OT (e.g. the OT’s considerable contributions to theological reflection on God’s character). Seitz is especially troubled by Richard Hays’s suggestion that we should become imitators of the apostle Paul in our theological interpretation of the OT. Seitz points out several problems with such an attempt. First, Seitz is not sure *how* one would go about imitating Paul. He asks: “Can one identify with Paul as an interpreter? ... Does one do as Paul did? Or does one judge Paul’s work to have a kind of finality ... in respect of the Old Testament?” (p. 105). Furthermore, Seitz is not convinced that one *should* identify with Paul as interpreter. To do so is anachronistic, for “we are not prophets or apostles”; rather, the church occupies the space after the OT and NT have been canonized into one Christian Scripture.

Seitz queries further: “If we identify with Paul in this way, and so get inside the New Testament as canon at a moment of identification en route to its own status as ‘Scripture,’ would not consistency demand that we proceed in the same way with the New Testament when it becomes Scripture, that is, selectively and charismatically interpret the New Testament based upon the concerns in the ‘community of faith’ as Paul is held to have done?” (p. 105). In chapter 3, Seitz discusses the fact that this method has already appeared in an essay by Andrew Lincoln entitled “Hebrews and Biblical Theology” (C. Bartholomew et al., eds., *Out of Egypt: Biblical Theology and Biblical Interpretation* [Milton Keynes, UK: Paternoster/Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2004] 313–38).

Chapters 4 and 5 return to the issue of our canonical location and the church’s identification with Scripture. Chapter 4 answers the question of how one should read the OT given our location as interpreters and the literary fact that the OT exists as both a witness both prior to the NT and as part of the plain sense of the NT (p. 138). Seitz argues that the OT demands to be heard apart from the NT on theological grounds in that God has acted in the OT and the NT does not challenge this claim. Indeed, the OT cannot be heard on the grounds of the NT’s use of the OT because the NT’s use of the OT is a “perspective that can only be occasional or provisional” because the NT has yet to emerge as a distinct witness in its own right (p. 138). In chapter 5, Seitz suggests that the relationship of OT to NT can be understood by analogy to the historical-critical processes and canonical shaping now recognized within OT studies. Bringing this same perspective to bear on the Pauline corpus may move us away from questions about authorial intention to that of intended audience.

Chapter 6 is a contemporary test case for canonical interpretation of Scripture via the American Episcopal Church’s crisis in interpretation over same-sex relationships. Seitz illustrates how this crisis is primarily a crisis of interpretation akin to what we have discussed before—issues of identification for the Church with the OT and the NT as Christian Scripture.

Chapter 7, the final chapter, investigates the manner in which the rule of faith was used by the early Church to establish the sufficiency of the OT to “preach Christ, prophesy Christ, adumbrate Christ, [and] demonstrate Christ and the Holy Spirit both as active and functioning from beginning to end, through the various economies of the Scriptures’ long story” (p. 194). Seitz ably contends that “the use of the rule of faith, with its assumptions about the character of the Scriptures that would in time become an older Testament, should serve a limiting function, guarding against an account of the two Testaments of Scripture that views them as one-after-the-other and not as mutually informing, mutually influencing witnesses, and turning the Old Testament as Christian Scripture into a species of *Vetus Testamentum in Novo receptum*” (p. 203).

Seitz’s ability to set up his arguments is masterful and is the real strength of this book. His questions are penetrating and invariably lead to a more nuanced line of questioning and theological implications. In my opinion, his final chapter on the rule of faith in the early church is his most convincing line of argument against reading the OT as imitations of Paul, with one caveat—we are not apostles, proph-

ets, or *Church fathers*. Is their treatment of the OT *necessarily* normative for a third-millennium church? At the very least, Seitz's work should serve as a serious caution against any hermeneutic that denies the OT its status as Christian in its own right.

Jeremy Cheek  
Wheaton, IL

*Introducing the Old Testament: A Short Guide to Its History and Message.* By Tremper Longman III. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2012, 192 pp., \$14.99.

This brief work adds another entry to Tremper Longman's extensive and ever-growing oeuvre. As the author explains in the introductory chapter, the OT is a closed book for far too many Christians. His remedy is a no-nonsense handbook in which he summarizes contents, authorship and date, genre, and connections with the Gospel, devoting a chapter to each OT book. These four prose sections are followed by suggestions for further reading and questions for review and discussion. He also promises an excursus on theological history part way through the volume. This appears to be a good plan; does it work?

Some of the chapters come across very well as they are straightforward and to the point, even when the contents are challenging. Examples that stand out include Genesis, Ruth, Joel, Nahum, Micah, and Malachi. Genesis is an exception; often the best summaries represent the shorter biblical texts.

To expand on the first example as paradigmatic, Longman's treatment of Genesis illustrates concern for a measured summary of the narratives, connections with wider ancient Near Eastern literary motifs, cogent and brief treatment of the Documentary Hypothesis in conjunction with Pentateuchal authorship, articulation of his understanding of the purpose of Genesis 1–2 (theological, not scientific), and good connections with NT material. In a number of the succeeding chapters, this success continues.

Other chapters, however, are not as strong, primarily due to excessive emphases or omission of key issues. Perhaps the four-part scheme is too much of a strait-jacket given the richness of the biblical literature. Some chapters come across as pedestrian; in others, the reader loses sight of the paradigm. The chapter on Psalms, for example, includes under "genre" extensive discussions of the characteristics of poetry (brevity, parallelism, imagery), myths in ancient Near Eastern parallels, and seven suggested categories of psalms. All of this is good material but it is overwhelming in this context.

Longman takes a cautious approach to the knotty issues of historicity, date and authorship, and genre. For example, he summarizes both sides of the arguments in regard to the hotly contested authorships of Isaiah and Daniel, but indicates that the matter is not that important in the long run. The same noncommittal judgment is given on the genre of Jonah. Given Longman's evident concern to represent critical views, it would have been appropriate to mention alternative positions on issues that are not so closely bound with perceived "orthodoxy" but are still significant. For example, he does not acknowledge that *hebel* in Ecclesiastes may

be read as “fleeing” or some synonym that better represents the Hebrew word and significantly changes the “meaningless” message. In regard to the Song of Songs, George Schwab’s insightful understanding of the text as a polemic against blatant sexual exploitation in conjunction with the surrounding religious practices (*The Song of Songs’ Cautionary Message Concerning Human Love* [Peter Lang, 2002]) ought to be on the radar screen.

Longman articulates four influential laws (those dealing with warfare, centralization, the king, and the prophetic office) that appear in Deuteronomy and resurface in the negative assessment of Israel in Kings. While these are important, it seems the most significant failure of the king and the people was their perpetual slide into idolatry, also a seminally important issue in Deuteronomy. Surprisingly, there is no reference to the reforms of Hezekiah and Josiah in conjunction with the chapters on Kings and Chronicles.

The long-awaited “Theological History” excursus is quite abbreviated given the lead-up to it. The “Further Reading” suggestions are uneven. Only three resources are listed for Deuteronomy, Isaiah, and Jeremiah, and one for Joel, while there are seven for Ruth. Ezekiel also garners only one major reference plus a one-page piece by Longman himself. In fact, the number of works by Longman rather overshadows other scholars’ contributions.

It appears evident the “final form” of this book was produced too quickly; there are lapses good editors should have caught. Examples include: (1) a reference back to Sodom and Gomorrah in the chapter on Judges even though that incident was not discussed in regard to Genesis; (2) no discussion of the Day of the Lord in its seminal appearance in Amos but a mention in the chapter on Zephaniah; and (3) reference to the lawsuit oracle (Amos) without any explanation of its significance. The “woe oracle” is defined twice (pp. 171–72) in the same words that were already used on page 155 in dealing with Amos. In additional errata, on p. 42 the reference should be to Gibeon, not Ai; on p. 81, it should read “cast a *pur*” (not *purim*); it is always identified as “*pur*, that is the *goral*” (Esth 3:7; 9:24). On pp. 103–4, the Hebrew name of Proverbs is Mishle [Shlomo], not Meshalim. On p. 135, king of Tyre “guarding the gate of Edom (18:11–19)” should read Eden, and 28, not 18. On p. 182, God protected Jerusalem with a “ball of fire” rather than a wall of fire (Zech 2:5).

In conclusion, I would encourage a second, significantly revised edition of this book in order for it to be a more constructive contribution to the Christian community.

Elaine A. Phillips  
Gordon College, Wenham, MA

*The Return of the Chaos Monsters—And Other Backstories of the Bible.* By Gregory Mobley. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2012, 155pp., \$16.00 paper.

Fewer things have become more popular in Christian circles than talking about the Bible as story. In *The Return of the Chaos Monsters—And Other Backstories of*

*the Bible*, Gregory Mobley, professor of Christian Bible at Andover Newton Theological School, provocatively continues the conversation by presenting seven basic “backstories” that serve as the interpretive key for unlocking the significance of the OT. Mobley’s backstories, which he defines as “implied or yet-to-be composed narrative[s] that [are] the necessary prologue to an existing story” (p. 9), all grow out of a worldview of *Chaoskampf*. In so doing, Mobley presents what he believes to be the metanarratives that gave rise to the Bible. These backstories are caught up in the deep structures of tale-telling that have captured human beings since the dawn of time.

Mobley begins his backstory biblical survey by examining the creation of the world according to the Babylonian *Enuma Elish*. The cosmic battle between Marduk and Tiamat illustrates that the Bible is built upon a worldview that saw all reality as struggle between chaos and order. In fact, both of these categories are built into the framework of creation. “Chaos is the raw material of creation” (p. 19), and for this reason it keeps breaking loose all over the place when not kept in check. This is played out within the story of the Bible by God revealing divine commands that give order to the world and human beings are to function as chaos “co-managers” with God by keeping his commands (p. 23). Therefore Mobley argues that “sin awakens the chaos monsters” (p. 22).

From here it is easy to see how Mobley develops his backstory for Torah: “God has given humans an instruction manual for life on planet Earth so they can partner with God in the management of chaos” (p. 34). As for the Former Prophets, “God has enacted the tough love of moral cause and effect” to encourage obedience, which in turn manages chaos. Mobley then works through the Latter Prophets, highlighting the prophets’ mediatory role as divine anger managers, and then identifies the backstory of the Psalms as “through praise humans release energy that augments God’s management of the chaos” (p. 97). Biblical wisdom is associated with humans catching glimpses of God’s chaos-managing blueprint that they can then choose to follow in order to subdue chaos. Lastly, Mobley turns to examine apocalyptic literature, which he argues recycles the story back to its origin: “The only hope the faithful have during such tribulation is that God, as in the beginning, as in the oldest stories about divine heroes and dragons, can subdue chaos” (p. 137).

Mobley’s work is creatively communicated and imaginative. He writes with an energetic style and quip that are rarely observed in the world of biblical studies. Furthermore, his articulation of the relationship between human sin and cosmic de-creation is very well taken. However, Mobley’s lively prose moves quickly from a playful pushing of the boundaries to a troubling reality that there appear to be no boundaries—especially hermeneutical ones. Many biblical scholars have recognized that the creation story of the Bible contains polemical elements that seek to distance it from other ancient cosmologies. However, Mobley ignores such methodological sensitivity and wades forward in his chaos hunt, assuming the human motivations that produced Mesopotamian tales are identical to those human motivations that produced the Bible. Mobley’s emphasis on chaos as an integrated part of the created world finds its ultimate—and disturbing—culmination in his dualistic

assertion that at the end of all things, Satan will receive his commendation from the Lord—"Well done, my good and faithful servant" (p. 138).

Evangelical readers will likely find numerous other problems in Mobley's work, such as his highly critical dating of biblical material, a derogatory dismissal of the doctrine of divine wrath, his frequent forays into Jewish mysticism, and his portrayal of a needy God who is sustained by the praise of his people. In many ways Mobley's book embodies the dangers of philosophical intertextuality where all texts have a pretext—or, as he puts it, "There is no single dry bone of a story" (p. 10). Mobley is right in that the biblical story points back to the beginning. But if God's revealed Word is not the "dry bone" of the biblical story, then we are all left merely with our clever backstories and metanarratives. Thankfully, and to his credit, Mobley makes no claims of truth in his re-telling, but what a sad position to be in after the hard work of writing a book about the Bible.

William R. Osborne

College of the Ozarks, Point Lookout, MO

*Divine Sabbath Work.* By Michael H. Burer. BBR Supplement 5. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2012, xi + 163 pp., \$29.50.

In this monograph, Michael Burer has published a revision of his 2004 Dallas Theological Seminary doctoral thesis. The focus of the work is just eight words in John 5:17: what did Jesus mean by defending his healing on the Sabbath by referring to his Father's activity on the Sabbath? Burer points out that C. H. Dodd had mined some rabbinic references to divine work on the Sabbath, but that the background had not been investigated beyond that point. Burer's work intends to be the needed further investigation.

The work divides itself into six logical chapters. The first is a seven-page introduction that describes the problem and sets out the methodology. The second is a 19-page defense of the historical plausibility of Jesus' Sabbath controversies over against the assertions of John P. Meier in *A Marginal Jew*. The third, the heart of the work, is 71 pages examining the relevant background material, expanding Dodd's scope considerably. Then follows the fourth chapter—33 pages on "Jesus, Sabbath Actions, and Divine Sabbath Work." A short five-page fifth chapter serves to summarize, giving the conclusions as well as suggestions for future research. Then comes a sixth chapter, which contains fourteen pages of bibliography and eight pages of indexes.

What Burer believes he has accomplished in this work is to show that Jesus did deliberately act on the Sabbath. He does not see any clear connection between Jesus' action and the later traditions of God's work on the Sabbath, but he does see connections between Jesus' action and a consciousness of the eschatological nature of the Sabbath. Thus his conclusions are limited, and wisely so.

It is clear that Burer is most interested in the biblical text. When he discusses the background materials, 31 of his 71 pages are on biblical background and another three are on the Septuagint. However, when he says "Septuagint" he means the

Deuterocanonical books. There is no discussion about how the Septuagint handles the various passages in the Torah and Nevi'im that he has previously discussed. This is a serious omission, even if the conclusion might be that the Septuagint translates literally and adds nothing in its vocabulary or grammatical choices, for the Septuagint (or, strictly speaking, the Greek versions we know best through the Septuagint) had significant influence on the Gospels, not to mention the rest of the NT. When Burer discusses Jesus in his fourth chapter, we are again in the world of biblical exegesis, for not only John 5 (and 9), but also Luke 13 is carefully examined, as well as less significant passages with Sabbath controversies.

Burer does examine documents found in Qumran, Second Temple literature (his term is "Pseudepigrapha"), Josephus, Philo, Mishnah-Tosefta, Targumim, Midrashim, and the Talmuds for ideas about the Sabbath and divine activity on the Sabbath. He is a bit quick to call the traditions of the Mishnah "Second Temple," but generally he shows appropriate caution when it comes to dating. Surprisingly, he does not call Philo "Second Temple," although Philo clearly lived and wrote while the Second Temple was functioning. This is significant in that Philo has the clearest presentation of divine activity on the Sabbath; furthermore, many scholars see a connection between Philonic type thought and the Fourth Gospel, so a redactional connection to John 5:17 is possible. Perhaps by "Second Temple" Burer means "pre-Easter Second Temple."

Naturally, part of the nub of the matter is redaction. While this relatively brief work is not large enough to fully refute Meier, Burer is convinced (and makes a decent case in brief) that the Sabbath controversies are genuine, although their presentation may show redactional coloring. But how much coloring? Burer is wisely cautious in attributing knowledge and motivation to Jesus beyond the words of the text. Yet a work of this size cannot go into the exegetical detail needed to clearly delineate, for example, Johannine redaction from *verba Christi* and *ipsissima verba* from *ipsissima vox*.

Burer has mined the data for us—especially the Jewish data—and laid it out. He has shown that at the least Jesus is presenting himself as acting appropriately on the Sabbath as a divine agent, since the Sabbath is a day commemorating past and eschatological salvation. And Burer has left hints and outright suggestions as well as open questions that should give plenty of grist to the mills of future researchers, who will in turn be indebted to him for getting them (and us) not just beyond Dodd, but a long way farther in this investigation of Jesus' meaning.

Peter H. Davids

Houston Baptist University, Houston, TX

*Theological Introduction to the Pentateuch: Interpreting the Torah as Christian Scripture.* Edited by Richard S. Briggs and Joel N. Lohr. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2012, 210 pp., \$22.99.

Several titles have recently appeared that address some part of the Bible as "Christian Scripture" and this is another volume in that vein. This particular work is offered as a mini-*Festschrift* for Walter L. Moberly by some of his former students

on the occasion of his sixtieth birthday. The goal of this volume is to provide a concise introduction to a theological interpretation of the Pentateuch and provide exegetical analysis of key texts as an example of how such an introduction can be undertaken.

Each main chapter follows the same format: a brief introduction to the biblical book, followed up by a discussion of the key theological themes of that book, and then an in-depth discussion of a biblical passage within that book is offered as a case study that details its significance to Christian theology. An appendix at the end contains an annotated bibliography listing Walter Moberly's contributions to the theological interpretation of the Pentateuch.

After an introductory chapter, Richard Briggs discusses Genesis and uses the Tower of Babel account in Genesis 11 as his case study of a theological reading. Jo Bailey Wells follows with her analysis of Exodus using Exodus 19:1–8 as her example text. Next is Joel Lohr's contribution on Leviticus, which concentrates on the Day of Atonement passage in Leviticus 16. Nathan MacDonald then surveys Numbers and focuses on Numbers 20–21. Rob Barrett then concludes the study on Deuteronomy, zeroing in on Deuteronomy 8 and 15 and concentrating on the law that prescribes the cancelling of debts every seven years.

The definition of the process used in this book comes from Moberly himself, who defines it as follows: "Theological interpretation is reading the Bible with a concern for the enduring truth of its witness to the nature of God and humanity, with a view to enabling transformation of humanity into the likeness of God" (p. 5).

One detailed example of what this looks like comes from Briggs's discussion of Genesis 11. He ponders whether the divine action of scattering the people after the Tower of Babel is seen as positive or negative. He notices that same Hebrew root for scattering is used earlier in Gen 10:18 in a positive sense. Briggs uses such evidence to argue that the Babel story can through a "theological" reading be seen then as a vehicle of blessing ("good news") rather than merely as passage of judgment on man's pride. God is seen then as blocking one type of human activity in order to channel it (via the scattering) into another positive one.

One of the main strengths of this work is the excellent summary offered by each author in detailing the main theological themes of each book in the Pentateuch. In addition, the case studies provide a clear window in to the types of conclusions that come forth when one seeks to interpret the Torah as Christian Scripture. One major weakness is that this volume contains very little discussion of how this book views the Pentateuch as "Christian Scripture" as compared to "Jewish Scripture." Instead of assuming it more should have been stated as to what make this approach distinctively "Christian," since the term is used without clarification. It is also not always clear what methodology is used in isolating the key theological themes and what steps can be used by readers govern the process of coming to a "Christian" theology of the Pentateuch.

Those holding to a conservative view of the authorship of the Pentateuch will be disappointed as each of the chapters assumes multiple human authors and a late composition of the Pentateuch. For example, the book of Numbers is seen as an independent book written last as a mediating voice that draws upon the priestly

concerns of Exodus/Leviticus and the theological complexes of Deuteronomy. However, since each of the authors focuses on the final form of these texts, there is still much that can be gleaned from their insights if one takes into consideration their view of the formation of the Pentateuch.

Since this volume is written primarily as a *Festschrift*, it is not entirely clear how this volume would be usefully implemented in the classroom. It would not be exhaustive enough as a survey or complete enough as an introduction to the Pentateuch, but perhaps it could be utilized as a supplemental resource in graduate level course on the Pentateuch. The book's stated focus is threefold: "to lead students into the joys and complexities of the discipline, to give them an understanding why the subject matters, and how best to contribute to it" (p. 6). The book admirably accomplishes the first two admirably but could do a better job on the last one.

Walter Moberly's *modus operandi* in his own writings have been mirrored in this volume. He has argued that each biblical text must be carefully examined and that the historical-critical background and literary dimensions of the text must also be taken into account. In addition, he espouses that a sustained engagement with key texts is the best place to derive theology and that the key character in all these texts is God. Walter Moberly should be proud that his students have followed faithfully in his footsteps in this volume dedicated to him.

James F. Coakley  
Moody Theological Seminary, Chicago, IL

*Understanding Wisdom Literature: Conflict and Dissonance in the Hebrew Text.* By David Penchansky. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2012, 141 pp., \$20.00.

David Penchansky's *Understanding Wisdom Literature* initiates the non-specialist into a postmodern reading of the biblical wisdom tradition. Although we may question some of his methods and conclusions, Penchansky provides an admirably concise summary of one prevalent perspective in wisdom studies.

The introduction argues that the wisdom literature is fraught with internal conflict and dissonance. Penchansky aims to deconstruct the wisdom corpus to construct meaning from the contradictions between its variant voices.

Chapter 1 argues that during the monarchy, a professional sage class emerged that was in conflict with other Israelite religious groups. These sages wrote the wisdom books. To support this theory, the author points to depictions of "the wise," such as the serpent in the garden and Jonadab, Amnon's advisor (2 Sam 13:3). He also notes Isaiah and Jeremiah's critiques of "the wise" who counseled kings to make foreign alliances.

Chapter 2 interprets Proverbs as a dispute between a Fear Yahweh Group and a Get Wisdom Group. Although both groups are Yahwists, the first believes Yahweh's ways are inscrutable while the second learns to live successfully by observation. Both groups are "mocked mercilessly" in the book of Job (p. 26). Only the figure of Woman Wisdom (Proverbs 8), an Israelite goddess, redeems the book.

Chapter 3 responds to Matitiah Tsevat (*The Meaning of the Book of Job and Other Biblical Studies*), who interprets Job in light of the Yahweh speeches. Penchansky argues that the speeches do not satisfy or transform Job but bully him into silence. Penchansky reads the book through the lens of 42:7, in which Yahweh validates Job's protests and admits to "persecuting Job like a ravening monster" (p. 47).

Chapter 4 examines three distinct voices in the book of Ecclesiastes: Pessimistic Qoheleth, Fear God Qoheleth, and Enjoy Life Qoheleth. These voices compete for dominance, and Penchansky sides with Pessimistic Qoheleth, whose perspective dominates the literary structure and appears more trustworthy.

Chapter 5 seeks to explain the absence of covenant words or ideas in Proverbs, Job, and Ecclesiastes, in contrast to Ben Sira and the Wisdom of Solomon. He admits some concepts do occur, such as the fear of God and certain ethical practices. But he emphasizes the general nature of references to covenant and *hesed* and the lack of emphasis on religious practices. He concludes that the sages did not value the Israelite covenants.

Chapter 6 interprets Ben Sira in light of the figures of Sophia and Simon. Ben Sira deviates from the wisdom tradition by identifying Sophia with Torah, domesticating her, and saying a great deal about the cult and priesthood. He also elevates Simon, the insignificant dictator-priest, to an embarrassingly important position in history. Penchansky laments Ben Sira's abandonment of the wisdom tradition of doubt and questioning in favor of blind acceptance of divine revelation.

Chapter 7 engages Alexander Di Lella's thesis that Sirach is conservative and the Wisdom of Solomon is progressive. Penchansky contends Pseudo-Solomon is a true conservative because he uses a *new idea* (immortality) to shore up a *traditional* belief in divine retribution. Pseudo-Solomon condemns doubt and removes ambiguity, failing to retain the progressive tradition of Job and Ecclesiastes.

Penchansky's conclusion presents two possible narratives about the wisdom tradition: (1) a tragedy in the loss of the Hebrew tradition of doubt and debate; and (2) the triumph of the sages who remained open to new and foreign ideas in response to Hellenism. In the ultimate postmodern conclusion, Penchansky refuses to choose between these narratives and affirms that the true essence of wisdom is to embrace ambiguity.

I applaud Penchansky for his clear writing style, which extends from his intriguing opening questions (e.g. "Why do the righteous suffer?") to his clever mini-narratives that attempt to account for the silence of the sages about the covenants. However, I have some serious objections to Penchansky's approach and conclusions. His choice to examine contradictions is a brilliant strategic move that produces a thought-provoking and concise book, but it leads Penchansky to some hasty conclusions. The label of "the wise" does not on its own identify the kind of people who wrote the wisdom books, and Penchansky fails to show overlapping concerns between the serpent, Jonadab, or "the wise" targeted by Isaiah and Jeremiah. Penchansky also presses the dissonance in the text to become a conflict tantamount to social war. For example, he absolutizes the claims of both groups in Proverbs to fit his argument. He also presses the character of Job to accuse Yahweh of being a "ravening monster," language which Job himself does not use.

Although I commend *Understanding Wisdom Literature* as an accessible artifact of one postmodern approach to wisdom, student readers must be prepared to be confronted with arguments against traditional positions about wisdom and the Bible and to struggle with a perspective that has proven persuasive for many in recent years.

Daniel C. Owens  
Singapore Bible College, Singapore

*The Targums: A Critical Introduction.* By Paul V. M. Flesher and Bruce Chilton. Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2011, xvii + 557 pp., \$69.95 paper.

This volume is a comprehensive introduction to the Targums, their interpretation, and what they can teach us about rabbinic Judaism and early Christianity. Flesher and Chilton lay out an understanding of the various Targums and their characteristics, their internal nature, external religious and social contexts, some historical and current scholarly discussions, and method for approaches. The book is divided into twenty-one chapters in six sections.

Section 1, "Getting Started," is a four-chapter orientation to the volume. In the introduction (chap. 1), the authors draw attention to early practices of synagogue expositions in the Gospels and writings of Philo and Josephus, raising the need for an Aramaic "translation" (e.g. Targum) in some linguistic contexts in which the Targum was not a translation of Scripture, but *was* Scripture (p. 6). The authors then provide a working definition of Targum: "Aramaic translations of the books of the Hebrew Bible done by Jews during the rabbinic period" (p. 8) in various Aramaic dialects (Jewish Literary Aramaic, Jewish Palestinian Aramaic, Late Jewish Literary Aramaic). Chapter 2 is devoted exclusively to defining terminology more specifically: "A Targum is a translation that combines a highly literal rendering of the original text with material added into the translation in a seamless manner" (pp. 22, 36). The Targum aims primarily to reproduce the form of the original at the hand of the *meturgeman* ("translator") in that some eighty-five to one hundred percent of the original's linguistic information is rendered in Aramaic (p. 23).

In chapter 3 Flesher and Chilton outline seven "rules of the Targum," or oft-shared characteristics among them, which include: (1) a literal translation of the original; (2) additional material introduced in a smooth, non-intrusive manner; (3) the substitution of an original word or phrase with a similar one without disturbing the surrounding translation; (4) the inclusion of additional material that may be drawn from or imitate related material elsewhere in the book; (5) the placement of additional material either at the beginning or end of a narrative to emphasize its message; (6) expansion (rather than translation) of poetic passages; and (7) the occasional omission of the original with a "smooth" targumic adaptation. The final introductory chapter (chap. 4) overviews the history and literature of the rabbinic period (c. AD 70–600) as a backdrop for the Targums.

Section 2 covers the Pentateuchal Targums, with chapters pertaining to the Pentateuchal Targums (chap. 5), the sources of the Palestinian Targums (chap. 6),

Targum Onqelos (chap. 7), the Pentateuchal Targums in rabbinic literature (chap. 8), and the dating of the Targums of Israel (chap. 9), respectively. Although there is an extensive range of dates for the corpus, the authors suggest evidence for a “Proto-Onqelos” from prior to AD 70. Section 3 addresses the Targums of the Prophets and the Writings, with attention to Targum Jonathan (chaps. 10, 11) and Targum to the Writings (chap. 12).

Section 4 relates to the Targums in “Late-Antique Judaism.” The authors begin with a chapter on the history of the use of Aramaic in Judaism (chap. 13). In “Targums and Translation in the History of Rabbinic Literature” (chap. 14), Flesher and Chilton helpfully describe the three practical uses of Aramaic translation in rabbinic Judaism: the synagogue service, teaching and study in a school, and private study, each of which are described in some detail with additional attention to translation techniques. In chapter 15, “Targum as Scripture and Hidden Interpretation,” the authors explore the intent of the *meturgeman* with respect to other genres, such as Midrashim. Whereas the latter may skip large sections of the original texts or rearrange them altogether, the Targum “interweaves interpretive additions with the Scripture translation in a way that obscures the difference” (p. 334). In chapter 16, “Ancient Scripture Translations,” the Targums are examined among other ancient translations—Septuagint, Syriac, Latin, etc., in their development and scope.

Section 5 brings the discussion to early Christianity, primarily selections from the Gospels. In their comparison of the Targums with the NT (chap. 17), Flesher and Chilton acknowledge that similarities among the two collections need not suggest historical dependence, but there are nonetheless “parallels between them” (p. 385). Curiously, they posit that “targumic influence on the Gospels” does not require their [in written traditions?] pre-dating the Gospels (p. 386), as they suggest that “in many cases [targumic] *interpretations* of scriptural passages” come from decades that predate the Gospels (p. 386). Yet their evidence is thin. For example, concerning Luke 6:36 they suggest, “Since no sources for the Lukan remark other than the Targum have so far been identified, it seems likely that the targumic tradition ... was current during the first century. Its presence in Luke indicates either that it influenced Jesus or that it influenced his followers’ formulation of this teaching” (p. 386). This seems to presume that the Lukan text must have an historical antecedent. Moreover, it precludes *a priori* the possibility that similar notions arise independently, even though sometimes simultaneously, in a common milieu without historical dependence of any kind, as they themselves acknowledge (on p. 385) and later illustrate (p. 387). Thus a conundrum arises on their perspective, whether they perceive that a Targum reading “influenced Jesus or ... influenced his followers” (p. 386) or whether it is “most certainly not the immediate source of Jesus’ statement” (p. 387). The authors fail to clarify, although the latter is more likely. They rightly illustrate the utility of this conclusion in that it “may help us to understand the nature and general character of Jesus’ statement within Judaism” (p. 387). Toward that end, Flesher and Chilton commend the study of the Targums as “useful in comparison with the Gospels and the rest of the New Testament” (p. 387). So we can say that, for example, in Mark 4:11–12 (citing Isa 6:9–10) the Targums aid us in seeing Jesus “characterizing people in the targumic manner” (p. 388). The

authors proceed to offer four types of comparisons between the Targumim and the NT: (1) stringent affinity; (2) comparable understanding of a common biblical text; (3) the presence of characteristically targumic phrases appearing in the NT; and (4) a common thematic emphasis. These observations are useful so far as the limitations of their purely *comparative* nature are recognized.

The next chapter (chap. 18) introduces readers to an Aramaic “retroversion” of the sayings of Jesus, looking to see how such an exercise can “assist us in identifying the language Jesus spoke and thus delineating the way in which his remarks formulated among his early followers” (p. 409). They posit a two-step method involving selection of a text and rendering it into “idiomatic, first-century Aramaic” (p. 411). Yet as Flesher and Chilton indicate previously (pp. 280–82), identifying the particular form of Aramaic Jesus spoke is allusive to say the least. Nevertheless, they settle on Jewish Literary Aramaic and render a retroversion of the Lord’s prayer into (transliterated) Aramaic. The methodological conundrums involved in retroversions are numerous, as has been shown by James R. Davila (“[How] Can We Tell If a Greek Apocryphon or Pseudepigraphon Has Been Translated from Hebrew or Aramaic?” *JSP* 15 [2005] 3–61) and Peter J. Williams (“Alleged Syriac Catchwords in the Gospel of Thomas,” *VC* 63 [2009] 71–82).

The authors then discuss the Gospel of John and the Targumic *Memra* (chap. 19), where John’s use of λόγος is compared with the Aramaic gloss *memra*, to contend that “the targumic theologoumenon of the *memra* as God’s activity of commanding has influenced the sense of *logos* in the Fourth Gospel and that *logos* in that Gospel is not only a Christological term” (p. 429). The final section (section 6), “Conclusions and Prospects,” compares the Targumic interpretation of the sacrifice of Isaac (Genesis 22) with early Jewish and Christian interpretations (chap. 20) and ends with a discussion of the “Targums in the Rabbinic World and Beyond” (chap. 21). There is an appendix with a detailed chart mapping “The Parallel Expansions of Genesis 28–50” and another that is a “Guide to Babylonian [Vowel] Pointing.” An extensive glossary (pp. 501–10) is followed by a thorough bibliography and index.

This volume is a *tour de force* of all things targumic. There is a considerable amount of highly technical material designed for targumic specialization that may overwhelm those working in other fields. Some aspects of this book rehearse work previously published by Chilton, while some of the chapters are rather disjointed. Martin McNamara’s *Targum and Testament Revisited: Aramaic Paraphrases of the Hebrew Bible: A Light on the New Testament* (2d ed.; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010) is more pointedly related to the role of the Targums in NT interpretation, but it is subject to critiques similar to those outlined above. Yet interface with the NT is only a small part of Flesher and Chilton’s more ambitious project. They have provided a remarkably comprehensive orientation to a complicated field, replete with annotated bibliographies for each chapter and an accessible glossary of terms, to produce a truly monumental resource for the study of the Targums.

Daniel M. Gurtner  
Bethel Seminary, St Paul, MN

*Understanding Language: A Guide for Beginning Students of Greek and Latin.* By Donald Fairbairn. Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 2011, xxiv + 190 pp., \$19.95 paper.

Students of Greek, Latin, and other ancient languages face a host of challenges. One is theoretical: unless they have a grasp of how language works, they have no framework for the (seemingly arbitrary) details they are learning. Another is experiential: students naturally compare the language they are learning to their native tongue, which often results in confusion (as when English speakers try to grasp the notion of a third person imperative). A third challenge is psychological: the complexity of language, together with the hard work of language learning, can lead to frustration and discouragement. Teachers and students seeking help in overcoming these challenges will find it in Donald Fairbairn's book.

Fairbairn, the Robert E. Cooley Professor of Early Christianity at Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary, has written what he calls "a book about language, with special reference to Greek and Latin" (p. xix). Intended to supplement a grammar text, the book uses Greek and Latin to help readers understand the kinds of things we need language to do. For example, rather than beginning with grammatical terms (e.g. personal, reflexive, indefinite, relative), he organizes his discussion of pronouns according to the purposes we need them to serve—for example, "Indicating the Speaker/Writer, the Audience, or a Third Party," "Referring Back to the Subject of a Clause," "Referring to a Member of a Class," and "Linking a Subsequent Clause to a Previous Subject." Similarly, Fairbairn surveys the various components of a verb's meaning using questions such as "What Kinds of Events Must Verbs Describe?" (stative, transitive, and intransitive distinctions), "Who is Doing the Action?" (voice, person, and number), and "What Is the Attitude toward the Action?" (mood). By helping students see the distinctions among such functions, Fairbairn provides a framework for the details learned in grammar texts. In doing so, he introduces students not only to grammatical terms, but to the concepts that attach to those terms.

The author is aware that not all students learn both Greek and Latin. As a historian, Fairbairn certainly appreciates the value of both languages for theological study; but he also understands that most evangelical seminarians will learn only Greek. Latin-only students, along with students new to Greek, will appreciate the transliterations that accompany Greek words and phrases. Greek-only students will find that little of the book concerns Latin only (see comments on Latin's lack of articles, pp. 84–89; and on time and aspect in Latin, pp. 118–20). Students learning either language will benefit from references to both—first, because they are able to see larger principles of how language functions; and second, because they are encouraged to think in terms other than English.

The tendency of textbooks (and teachers) to relate everything students are learning about a new language back to English is one of Fairbairn's major concerns. This tendency is unhelpful for two reasons. First, it ignores the fact that while students know how to *employ* English grammar, few know how to *describe* it using grammatical terminology. Second, and more seriously, continual comparisons of

another language to English subtly suggest that “our own language’s ways of expressing ideas [are] the standard” (p. xiii). Instead, Fairbairn helps readers to see that when an idea needs to be communicated, English may employ one structure (e.g. “the woman who is loving”) and Greek another (ἡἀγαποῦσα), but both are sensible ways of accomplishing the goal. Still, Fairbairn does not push the need to escape English mode too far, as when he uses English pronouns to demonstrate to readers that they already understand the concept of cases (pp. 53–58). Given that many Americans are both monolingual and intimidated by language learning, both teachers and students need the kind of balanced help this book provides.

*Understanding Language* is arranged in four parts: “Getting Started” (chaps. 1–3) addresses major obstacles to and advantages of learning Greek/Latin; “Nouns and the Words that Go with Them” (chaps. 4–5) reviews the functions of cases, as well as adjectives, articles, and pronouns; “Verbs: The Heart of Communication” (chaps. 6–8) surveys the kinds of information we need verbs to convey, then devotes special attention to tense and mood and to non-finite verb forms; finally, “Looking at Sentences as a Whole” discusses phrases and clauses (chap. 9), then offers practical strategies for reading sentences in Greek and/or Latin (chap. 10). The book opens with a preface for teachers and a separate introduction for students, and includes a subject index. Chapters 3–9 conclude with appendices in which newly-introduced terms and their definitions are reviewed.

While reviewing the book I made note of those portions I believe would be especially helpful to my Greek students. The resulting list covers almost the entire book: (1) part 1 as a whole, and particularly chapter 3, which introduces words and their uses, parts of speech (“word classes”), and syntax; (2) the overview of case functions in chapter 4 (summarized in tables on pp. 66–67); (3) the introductions to adjectives and pronouns (described above) in chapter 5; (4) the overview of verbs in chapter 6 (also described above); (5) the treatment of time, aspect, and mood in chapter 7; (6) chapter 9’s clear, simple explanation of purpose and result clauses, along with the helpful distinction between actual and natural result; and (7) chapter 10, “Reading a Greek or Latin Sentence.” Most language instructors will recognize that they already address many of the concepts represented here. However, given that many of us do so in an *ad hoc* manner (responding to student questions and supplementing/correcting grammar texts), Fairbairn’s book is helpful because it offers us a more systematic summary of these topics to put before students and a written source to complement what students learn in the classroom about these topics. That the tone of the book is so encouraging to students only makes it easier to recommend.

At points Fairbairn makes choices with which not all teachers will agree. Sometimes these are a matter of technical detail (e.g. some would categorize “hers” and “yours” as possessive adjectives rather than genitive pronouns, and not all would agree that present imperatives call for “continuing to do what one is already doing”; p. 126). At other times these are a function of the book’s “big picture” orientation (e.g. he uses an 8-case presentation in chapter 4, and twice he refers to the “Greek mind”/“Latin mind” without further discussion of the relationship between the structure of one’s language and one’s way of viewing the world). In

some instances the book makes general statements where more technical detail would be beyond its scope and purpose; for instance, it refers to the indicative mood as one of “factuality,” without discussing nuances such as lying, sarcasm, or humor. Still, while no book on language could anticipate every objection or satisfy every teacher, books written this clearly, convincingly, and carefully are rare.

Who, then, would benefit from reading *Understanding Language*? I would recommend the book for the following: (1) language teachers, including teachers of NT Greek, who want to sharpen their own understanding of how language functions; (2) language students, including students of NT Greek, who want to make their “hard work less frustrating and more rewarding sooner” (p. xix); (3) seminarians or seminary graduates whose formal language instruction is over, but who want to keep their language skills sharp; (4) prospective seminarians who need a big-picture framework that prepares them for what is ahead; and (5) any teacher or student of language who needs help breaking free from an English-only mindset. Each of these groups faces particular challenges related to using ancient languages—and in this excellent resource, each will find a faithful guide.

C. D. “Jimmy” Agan III  
Covenant Theological Seminary, St. Louis, MO

*Jesus and His World: The Archaeological Evidence.* By Craig A. Evans. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2012, xvi + 192 pp., \$25.00.

Craig Evans, Payzant Distinguished Professor of New Testament at Acadia Divinity College in Nova Scotia, is one of the premier historical Jesus scholars in our world today, and an evangelical as well. Most of his over fifty authored or edited books form parts of scholarly series not geared for or widely accessible to the general public. Two important recent exceptions are his *Fabricating Jesus: How Modern Scholars Distort the Gospels* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 2008) and, with N. T. Wright, *Jesus, the Final Days: What Really Happened* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2008). His new work on the archaeological evidence for Jesus and his world may be his most significant semi-popularized work yet.

After an introduction that refers to the fringe scholarship that pretends Jesus never existed, Evans notes the good early sources that testify to him and the general reliability of the main contours of the NT portraits. He promises, however, that archaeology will illuminate matters even more, especially recent investigations and discoveries. Chapter 1 deals with Sepphoris in some detail, and then Capernaum and Nazareth more briefly. Despite early claims during its excavation that Sepphoris was an extremely Hellenized city, the lack of pig bones, the style of pottery, and the absence of coins with Caesar’s image prior to AD 70 give the lie to this hypothesis. Jesus may or may not have worked in the construction boom there but he almost certainly would have been familiar with the city. The likelihood that he learned the Greco-Roman philosophy of Cynicism there, or patterned his ministry in any significant way after the Cynics, is small, not merely from the community’s makeup but also from the many differences between the teachings of the two

movements, all of John Dominic Crossan's efforts to argue the opposite notwithstanding. The remains of Capernaum all fit the biblical data—a synagogue, a site for Roman military personnel (recall the centurion), and the right location for a customs official (Levi/Matthew). Past questions about the existence of Nazareth in Jesus' day have also been laid to rest.

Chapter 2 treats “religious formation in the synagogue.” Evans shows how eight or nine synagogue buildings dating to before AD 70 have been discovered, refuting Howard Kee's claim that none existed at this time. Evans works systematically through the evidence from Capernaum, Gamla, the Herodium, Jericho, Magdala, Masada, Modi'in, Qiryat Sefer, and Shuafat. Jesus' frequent activity in the synagogues explains his reference to “Moses' seat” in Matt 23:2 (from which rabbis preached), Jesus' standing and sitting in Luke 4:16 and 20, and the similarities of several of his interpretations of Scripture to the Targums that would have been read there.

In perhaps his most important chapter, Evans turns to reading, writing, and literacy in Jesus' world. Despite frequent claims of only tiny numbers of people having these skills, all evidence suggests that men, Jews, and (even informally trained) rabbis would have had considerably higher literacy rates than the rest of the Roman empire. Not just later, potentially anachronistic rabbinic sources, but also Josephus (*Ap.* 1.60; 2.204), the Oxyrhynchus papyri (P. Oxy 2705), and 4 Macc 8:11 suggest reading and writing were more widespread than scholars often allow. Inscriptions, graffiti, personal letters, writing tablets, and small scrolls sealed in earthen vessels, in a variety of sites around the empire, all attest to these skills cutting across the socio-economic strata of society. Even more intriguing is a recent study of ancient libraries showing how manuscripts were regularly used for 150–500 years before being discarded. The idea that the considerable fragments of NT books that start to appear in the second century were several copies removed from the autographs is probably misguided. Nothing necessarily prevented these and even later manuscripts from having been copied directly from the autographa. Book writers regularly made two original copies, one for their initial audiences and one to keep precisely in order to make such later copies. Coupled with Jesus' use of Scripture, his frequent comments to other Jewish leaders beginning with, “Have you not read...?” and an understanding of the language of Acts 4:13 to mean those who were not formally trained as rabbis (rather than illiterate, ignorant individuals), it is highly likely that Jesus was quite literate.

Evans deals next with Jesus' confrontations with the temple establishment. The prevalence of *mikvaot* (ritual cleansing pools) around the temple precincts and in priestly homes attests to the preoccupation of these leaders with the laws and traditions of purity. Jesus' claims to create such purity apart from these rituals formed much of what scandalized the Jewish power brokers. The extraordinary wealth of the largely Sadducean aristocracy, attested to by elaborate mosaics and frescoes in their homes came under Jesus' further condemnation. Although Evans was one of those more suspicious of the so-called Caiaphas ossuary as actually belonging to the high priest of Jesus' day, he notes that further discoveries in 2011 to be discussed in a forthcoming issue of the *Israel Exploration Journal* may tip the

scales in the direction of genuineness. The *gorban* inscription in Jerusalem has confirmed that practice from the Gospels (Mark 7:11–13), and remains of people afflicted with true leprosy (Hansen's disease) have also been recently unearthed.

Jewish burial practices illuminate the endings of the Gospels. It was important to bury everyone if possible, even executed criminals; so Crossan's notion that Jesus' body would have been left to be torn apart by wild dogs proves fanciful. Such corpses were not normally to be buried with honor, but a year later, when the bones were exhumed to be reburied in an ossuary, they could be moved to a more honorable location. Family tombs were common enough, but the so-called Jesus family tomb is actually a Hasmonean-era aristocratic family tomb, as the pointed gable and circle over its entrance demonstrate. The ossuary found in 1968 of Johanan with a nail still connecting an ankle bone to a piece of wood demonstrated the historicity of that form of crucifixion, despite previous skepticism. The famous Nazareth inscription against grave robbing raises the tantalizing but probably unanswerable question of its relationship to the resurrection. The physical appearance of Jesus and his companions probably differed little from the 900 Egyptian mummy portraits of the first three centuries AD, especially because Egyptians and Jews were genetically quite similar at that point in history.

Evans's overviews survey some well known topics and some little known ones. They give enough explanation to introduce the issues to beginning students but also enough detail and state-of-the-art scholarship to be informative even for experts. Thirty-nine good quality black-and-white pictures punctuate the volume, disclosing the appearance of many of the artifacts and sites discussed. Evans's logic throughout is almost always impeccable; I could find only a very few things even to play "devil's advocate" with.

For example, Jesus need not have learned about the play-acting from which the Greek "hypocrite" comes just because the Sepphoris theater was near Nazareth. There was a theater in Jerusalem also, and the custom would have been well enough known in Israel even had Jesus never attended a single play. Some of the public inscriptions honoring benefactors or announcing decrees may not imply widespread literacy—the information could have spread to the many from the few—but may also have been erected to impress the populace with the power of the rulers. On the other hand, all of Evans's evidence for reading and writing probably *should* lead him to dispute William Harris's widely-cited estimate of only five to ten percent literacy throughout the Roman empire, even though Evans allows this overall approximation to stand unchallenged (p. 66). In discussing Jairus as synagogue ruler in Capernaum, it could have been mentioned that the large building foundation immediately next to the synagogue there could have been his (the ancient equivalent of a parsonage)!

Yet these are very minor glitches. The overall significance of Evans's volume is to refute the "minimalist" views of the Gospels that see only small amounts of history in them. When one adds to this the fact that "historical fiction" was not even a known genre in the first-century Mediterranean world, the consistent verisimilitude of what cannot be explicitly corroborated speaks volumes for historicity. We are greatly indebted to Evans for this succinct and lucid survey.

Craig L. Blomberg  
Denver Seminary, Littleton, CO

*God's Equal: What Can We Know about Jesus' Self-Understanding in the Synoptic Gospels?*  
By Sigurd Grindheim. Library of New Testament Studies 446. London: T&T Clark, 2011, xviii + 270 pp., \$130.00.

In this clearly written, wide-ranging, and persuasive work, Sigurd Grindheim argues that, when set against contemporary Jewish traditions, Jesus' words and deeds strongly suggest that he saw himself as both God's equal and yet unique and subordinate son (pp. 220–21). Grindheim continues the case for an early and high Christology (recently argued, for example, by Bauckham, Hurtado, Rowe, Gathercole, and Fee) and provides an original contribution in tracing its genesis back to Jesus himself.

Beginning with the question "Who did Jesus think he was?" Grindheim declares that previous conclusions whereby Jesus was "foremost among God's messengers" as his "final and ultimate agent" fall short of the data (p. 1). The rest of the introduction lays out his approach (pp. 4–5). Recognizing the inherent difficulties of knowing anything about an historical person's self-understanding, Grindheim rightly observes that we can nonetheless draw inferences from Jesus' words and deeds. Limiting himself to the Synoptics—presumably because of the academy's current ambivalence about John—he admits the oft-repeated concern that their authors' apologetic agenda might compromise historical accuracy. While fair enough, perhaps we might also admit the possibility that the influence worked in the other direction: their agenda was driven by a concern to present as clearly as they could the astonishing events they experienced. Nevertheless, Grindheim employs the traditional criteria of embarrassment, multiple attestation, coherence, and rejection/execution, hoping also to make some progress by using double dissimilarity, especially with respect to early Christian teaching, to establish positively that which is most likely authentic Jesus tradition. Although this approach has come under criticism of late, Grindheim's decision at the very least facilitates conversation with the broader academy. The resulting words and actions are then examined from a history of religions perspective in order to evaluate their significance.

The body of the book works through a range of topics moving generally from broader to more specific foci in eleven chapters of varying length (from 10 to 34 pp.). In each a general statement of the issue is followed by a discussion of the authenticity of a key text whose implications are then examined in the light of Israel's Scriptures and what we know of first-century Jewish expectations.

Chapter 1 concerns Jesus' announcement of the kingdom wherein his personal presence and activities are identified with God's rule. Grindheim's critical argument is that while scholarship tends to combine God's eschatological reign with the Messiah's eternal kingdom, in both Israel's Scriptures and even more so in Second Temple Judaism they are consistently distinguished—one or two exceptions are noted (p. 12)—with the former, where God comes in strength as warrior, being the presupposition of the latter (p. 10). This is an important insight, being consistent with Israel's historical experience where God's warrior intervention in the exodus and conquest was the preceded and was the basis of the subsequent Davidic kingdom. Having discussed the relevant background, Grindheim then turns to Luke 11:17–23. After establishing the case for the authenticity of the “finger of God” saying, he argues that Jesus, as the stronger one, is not so much the agent of God's rule but the divine warrior himself (p. 39). In terms of first-century Jewish traditions, there is no evidence of an expectation that the Messiah would cast out demons. It is God who defeats Satan, not the Messiah.

Beginning with the observation that most scholars now agree that Jesus was known as a miracle worker, “whatever the modern explanation for his extraordinary actions might be” (p. 40), Grindheim notes in chapter 2 how Jesus never prays for divine assistance but performs such deeds by his own power (pp. 41–42). While true, some discussion of similar autonomous actions by the prophets would have been appreciated (e.g. Elijah's smiting the Jordan; 2 Kgs 2:8). The key text here is Jesus' response to John the Baptist (Matt 11:5 *par*) with its allusions to Isa 26:19; 29:18; 35:5–6; 42:7, 18; and 61:1. (Exorcisms are not mentioned because they play no role in Israel's Scriptures and belong instead to Satan's downfall, p. 44.) Agreeing with the majority of scholars, Grindheim argues for authenticity, noting, for example, that the early church made no use of either Isa 29:18–19 or 35:5–6, and, since this kind of textual conflation is absent from earlier Jewish writings, it likely goes back to Jesus himself (pp. 46–47). A consideration here of the implications of Qumran and the later Targum's metaphorical reading of, for example, Isaiah 35 might have strengthened Grindheim's case. Nevertheless, in this text Jesus claims that he effects Israel's “healing and the realization of God's promises regarding the era of salvation ... with its paradisiacal conditions” (p. 49). However, since in Jewish expectation it was not the Messiah but God himself who healed (*Jub.* 23:26–30; *1 Enoch* 96:3; 4 *Ezra* 8:52–54; 2 *Bar.* 39:7), “Jesus identifies his own miracles with these prophecies regarding God's own acts” (p. 52).

Chapter 3 deals with what Grindheim regards as Jesus' boldest claim to divine authority, his offering on his own authority forgiveness of sins in Mark 2:10. Here the early church's lack of interest in Jesus' forgiving sins on earth testifies to its authenticity (p. 63). Rejecting regular appeals to the “divine passive” since the subject must be decided by the context (p. 67), he weighs and finds wanting proposed parallels with: (1) Daniel 7 (whereas the son of man figure is given authority, nowhere is Jesus' authority to forgive sins given to him; one might add neither is it clear that the Son of Man's authority extends to forgiving sins); (2) the priesthood (they did not offer forgiveness); (3) the Messiah (putting an end to sin, *Pss. Sol.* 17:36, is not the same thing as forgiving it, and 1QS 14:9 likely means atonement

through righteous deeds, pp. 70–71); (4) the unnamed exorcist who forgives Nabonidus (4Q242, “sin” is actually a metonymy for its consequences); and (5) 11Q13’s Melchizedek (he similarly does not forgive sin but eliminates its consequences—Jesus, however, clearly distinguishes between his forgiving and healing). Grindheim concludes that the best explanation is that in exercising authority that was exclusively God’s Jesus “implicitly claimed to be God’s equal” (p. 76).

Chapter 4 extends this idea, arguing that if Jesus forgave sins in the present he could logically see himself as the eschatological judge. Consequently, in the authentic elements of Matt 25:34–46, given that there is no pre-Christian evidence of the Messiah or any other intermediary figure exercising ultimate judgment (at best they are exalted deputies), Jesus’ self-designation as “king” picks up a well-attested epithet for God and so puts himself in a place reserved for God alone (p. 100).

Chapters 5 through 7 go on to argue that the antitheses in Matt 5:21–48 have Jesus correcting not as is often assumed various interpretations of Scripture but, uniquely, Scripture itself (p. 108; cf. the Messiah who in pre-Christian tradition upholds the Law); that in choosing the Twelve Jesus “trumps” God’s choice of the Patriarchs (p. 118) while demanding the kind of whole-hearted love appropriate only to God (p. 123; Matt 8:21–22, cf. Deut 6:5), thus transcending one’s funerary duty to parents (Matt 8:22); and that Jesus’ use of “bridegroom” in Mark 2:19–20 takes up God’s self-description of his relationship to Israel.

Chapter 8, the longest, examines a wide range of Second Temple Judaism’s eschatological heavenly mediatory figures. Grindheim concludes that even the most exalted (11Q13’s Melchizedek and *1 Enoch*’s Son of Man), although sharing in varying degrees some of God’s characteristics, are clearly subordinate in a way that Jesus, who “invests his earthly words and actions with an authority that equals God’s,” is not (p. 167). Furthermore, Jesus claims, as previously discussed, go considerably further and that without any need for divine ratification (p. 167).

In the light of the preceding, chapter 9 returns to the opening question of who Jesus thought he was. Grindheim’s earlier—and intentionally provocative<sup>2</sup>—language of Jesus “taking God’s place” (p. 3) is nuanced by the subordinate language of Mark 10:40 and 13:32 and parallels, the latter being about submission not inability. Defending the authenticity of Luke 10:21–22/Matt 11:25–27, Grindheim argues that neither Moses, nor Israel and the Son of Man, nor Wisdom traditions provide adequate background. Instead, Jesus’ sense of sonship is unique whereby he experienced a “fully reciprocal relationship between equals” and yet considered himself subject to his Father (p. 188).

The final two chapters deal with the Jesus’ use of “son of man” and what his sense of being God’s presence upon the earth might mean for the temple. In the former, while admitting his dependence on the extant sources and the difficulty of the question, he argues, against Vermes and others, that Jesus used this as an exclusive self-reference (Owen and Shepherd’s work would have strengthened his case). He might have had Daniel 7 in mind, and if so, it would at least cohere with Grindheim’s overall proposal. In the latter, it seems clear that Jesus threatened the temple’s destruction. If so, it seems likely that he expected its replacement, although with a qualitatively different one.

In the end, while recognizing that many scholars have come to very different conclusions, Grindheim sees three advantages to his study. First, it accounts for a wide range of Jesus tradition for which a churchly origin is highly unlikely. Second, it is parsimonious in that it does not require inferences based on unexpressed data (e.g. that Jesus' authority was given to him, that "in the name of God" is implied in Mark 2:10 or "thus says the Lord" when Jesus speaks authoritatively, or that in Matthew 5 Jesus is actually engaging with other interpretations when in fact he cites Scripture). Third, it does not invoke improper parallels (e.g. it does not confuse God's new creational kingdom with the earthly messianic one, or a deputized role with ultimate divine authority).

In such a broad-ranging work and in light of the often subjective nature of arguments for authenticity, readers will no doubt have questions over various details, occasional statements, and the omission of this or that work (e.g. Malbon's *Mark's Jesus* [Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2009], which argues that Jesus instead was at pains to point to God). Although highly sympathetic to Grindheim's thesis, I am, however, left with one pressing question. Generally, conflict in the Synoptics arises from issues such as healing on the Sabbath, ritual purity, and the source of Jesus' power over unclean spirits. However, if Jesus' implicit claims were as obvious as Grindheim's arguments seem to suggest they were, how is it that the Synoptics do not record Jesus' opponents critiquing him more frequently on precisely this issue?

Yet overall Grindheim impresses with his comprehensive coverage of both North American and Continental scholarship, succinct and clear delineation of the issues, and cumulative weight of argument. In the current climate of burgeoning interest in the theological contribution of the Fathers, this volume also demonstrates the great gains to be had by taking Jesus' Jewishness and his cultural background seriously. Furthermore, Grindheim's work marks a significant shift in the discussion. It is one thing, admittedly itself remarkable, to see the various NT writers holding such a high view of Jesus. They are, it might be argued, one step removed from him. It is quite another if that view can be traced back to Jesus himself. Grindheim's work is highly recommended for students and scholars alike.

Rikk Watts

Regent College, Vancouver, BC

*Mark as Story: Retrospect and Prospect.* Edited by Kelly R. Iverson and Christopher W. Skinner. SBLRBS 65. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2011, xii + 309 pp., \$36.95 paper.

This collection of essays celebrates the impact of *Mark as Story: An Introduction to the Narrative of a Gospel* by David Rhoads and Donald Michie (1st ed. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1982; 2d ed. by Rhoads, Joanna Dewey, and Michie, Minneapolis: Fortress, 1999). *Mark as Story* made a plain, systematic presentation of narrative criticism to the discipline of NT studies, moving it beyond the dominance of the historical-critical method to include also a text-oriented and reader/hearer-oriented

approach. With the benefit of over 30 years of hindsight, the essays in *Mark as Story: Retrospect and Prospect* illustrate the full flowering of narrative criticism, identify some shortcomings of the narrative scheme in *Mark as Story*, and connect narrative criticism to budding hermeneutical approaches.

The essays of the book trace the shift in interpretive interest from text to reader represented by the two editions of *Mark as Story*, and more recently the shift in interest from the medium of the Gospel to its mode of communication by connecting narrative criticism to performance criticism, which seeks to interpret Mark as a written work meant for oral recitation to public hearers. The book is arranged in three parts: Part 1 consists of essays that assess the hermeneutical impact of *Mark as Story*; Part 2 consists of essays that apply and develop the approach of narrative criticism to particular passages in Mark; and Part 3 offers responses from Rhoads, Dewey, and Michie to the essays in this volume and their reflections on the influence of their work. In what follows, I offer a critique that notes four merits and two demerits of the book.

Let me begin with the merits of the book. First, the opening essay by M. A. Powell (“Narrative Criticism: The Emergence of a Prominent Reading Strategy”) is noteworthy because it offers a primer on narrative criticism and provides a point of departure for the rest of the essays in the book. Powell explains how and why interpreters have used narrative criticism, arguing that it is best understood as a reading strategy rather than a method. In fact, Powell identifies three reading strategies among those who employ it, each of which exhibit different interpretive assumptions and goals: an author-centered strategy aims to discern authorial intent through the response of the ideal reader; a text-centered strategy aims to get at the right reading of the text through the response of the ideal reader; and a reader-response-centered strategy aims to explore and evaluate possible effects on real readers by using the response of the ideal reader as a point of departure. All who employ narrative criticism have an exegetical interest in discerning the ideal reader’s response to the text. They part ways, however, in their hermeneutical goals for the exegetical data. Powell observes that the 1982 edition of *Mark as Story* adopts a text-oriented approach, while the 1999 edition exhibits a more reader-oriented approach. Powell’s essay effectively shows that on the exegetical level, narrative criticism is consistent with concerns to discern the communicative intent of the author and the meaning of the text in conjunction with historical realities.

Second, the authors of the essays are pioneers of narrative criticism in their own right and illustrate admirably the enduring principles of a narrative approach espoused in *Mark as Story*, including a focus on the Gospel’s coherence, the analysis of narrative elements and rhetorical strategies, and attention to readers/hearers. Essays in Part 1 look at methods for analyzing characterization, plot, and audience; those in Part 2 demonstrate the coherence of the Gospel from different angles: through narrative analysis, a combination of narrative and performance analyses, and the use of various media (performance and film). For example, Alan Culpepper (“Mark 6:17–29 in Its Narrative Context: Kingdoms in Conflict”) demonstrates how narrative criticism works for interpreting the parts in light of the whole narrative by fitting the story of the death of John the Baptist with the overall plot and

themes of Mark. John's story functions both as a pattern and as an antithesis for other elements in the narrative. His arrest gives a pattern of persecution of the righteous that Jesus and his disciples will follow; and Herod's meal and kingdom gives the antithesis of Jesus' meals and the kingdom he has come to establish.

Third, not only do the essays illustrate narrative criticism, but they also perceptively critique and develop its use as espoused in *Mark as Story*. For example, Kelly Iverson ("'Wherever the Gospel Is Preached': The Paradox of Secrecy in the Gospel of Mark") develops the use of narrative criticism. He traces the coherence of the theme of the messianic secret throughout Mark by employing narrative and performance criticisms in conjunction. Using narrative analysis, he argues that secrecy is a literary theme because of its frequent repetition and its "avoidability" (that is, its unlikely appearance). Using performance criticism, he argues that the disclosure of secrets is an "audience-elevating strategy" meant to form a positive relationship between performer and audience, so that the audience is favorably disposed to receive and embrace the message. Iverson provides a literary and rhetorical explanation for the secrecy theme that may amplify a purely historical explanation.

Fourth, Rhoads, Dewey, and Michie, in their reflections at the end of *Mark as Story: Retrospect and Prospect*, rightly intimate the revolutionary nature of the interpretive shift from treating Mark's audience as silent readers to treating them as public hearers. Several essays address this shift by connecting narrative criticism to performance criticism. Holly E. Hearon ("From Narrative to Performance: Methodological Considerations and Interpretive Moves") compares and contrasts narrative criticism and performance criticism in order to show the distinctiveness of performance criticism and to explore the implications for interpretation. For instance, narrative criticism defines characters through verbal cues embedded in the text; but performance criticism defines characters through the performer's verbal cues like tone of voice and pace and visual cues like gestures and facial expressions. Such cues form what Hearon calls a "subtext." The result is that performers are essentially interpreters who personify the narrator and/or ideal reader, so that hearers have a second-person experience of the biblical text. If the first audience of the Gospel of Mark was indeed composed of public hearers, then we do well to think about the use of performance criticism in our approach to the biblical text. To do this, we may need to rethink theories of textuality that traditionally seek to explain the relationship between author, text, and reader by recasting silent readers as public hearers and by addressing the role of performers.

However, I should also discuss two demerits of the work. First, this book could perpetuate the common but unwarranted critique that narrative criticism essentially looks for meaning inherent in the text itself with little or no attention to extra-textual elements in the ancient world. The essays generally give little attention to the socio-religious, cultural, and political factors that influenced the writing, reading/hearing, and reception of the Gospel of Mark. The neglect of such factors, however, was never the intention of Rhoads, Dewey, and Michie in *Mark as Story*. Moreover, in their own reflections in Part 3 of *Mark as Story: Retrospect and Prospect*, they affirm the importance of such factors for understanding the Gospel of Mark

and challenge the interpreter to take a new look at narrative elements in conjunction with the interlocking contexts of the Roman empire, Jewish/Mediterranean culture, and the Roman Judean War of AD 66–70. They comment, “In our narrative research, we should expect to make use of historical criticism, cultural practices, religious traditions, archaeology, and other disciplines as means to imagine the narrative world in the different ways first-century hearers may have imagined it” (p. 281).

Second, the book frequently presents performance criticism as the next natural successor to narrative criticism. Although this emphasis is important, the reader may wonder if there may be other successors to or developments of narrative criticism that merited inclusion in the book. Moreover, Hearon (discussed above) and Thomas E. Boomershine (“Audience Address and Purpose in the Performance of Mark”) imply that performance criticism supplants narrative criticism. Boomershine focuses on Mark’s audience and argues that performance criticism is more aligned with the Gospel’s original nature as proclaimed to public hearers than is narrative criticism. He seeks to demonstrate that the pattern of the storyteller’s address to the audience in Mark reveals the nature of Mark’s intended audience quite directly. Since the narrator most often addresses the audience as Jesus speaking to groups of Jews, Boomershine concludes that Mark wrote to a mostly Jewish rather than Gentile audience. There may be other ways to construe this data, however, in consultation with other methods. Like narrative criticism, performance criticism is compatible with other approaches to the biblical text. One of the most compelling essays in the book employs performance criticism eclectically by combining it with narrative criticism (i.e. Iverson’s). The book could have included essays that extend this eclecticism to other approaches. In the final chapter, Rhoads, Dewey, and Michie challenge interpreters to take a new look at the narrative elements in the socio-religious, cultural, and political contexts out of which the Gospel of Mark was birthed through the approach of performance. In other words, performance, text, and extra-textual context should work together in a mutually beneficial interpretive relationship.

The ratio of merits to demerits indicates my high regard for this book. It accomplishes more than simply celebrating a significant volume; it also makes its own substantial contribution to narrative criticism and to biblical studies.

Elizabeth E. Shively

St. Mary’s College, University of St Andrews, St Andrews, Scotland

*Luke*. By David E. Garland. Zondervan Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2011, 1039 pp., \$49.99.

Garland is the Dean of Truett Seminary at Baylor University and has previously written commentaries on Matthew, Mark, 1 Corinthians, and 2 Corinthians. He has now written a commentary on Luke in the ZECNT series. This Luke commentary is a first-class work.

As to introductory issues, Garland sees Luke the physician as the author of both Luke and Acts, writing the Gospel in AD 75–85. Garland is agnostic as to specific provenance and addressees, since Luke was probably an itinerant traveler with no local community especially tied to him. However, Garland does assume Luke is writing to a Gentile audience that includes some familiar with the OT. Luke is not a Gentile, but a Hellenistic Jew (Col 4:11 refers not to all Jews, but only those of the circumcision party). Luke-Acts was intended as one historical work and belongs in the genre of the “broad spectrum of Hellenistic historiography,” but one that is in the “continuation of biblical history” (p. 30). Garland assumes the standard two-source hypothesis of Mark and Q, along with the special L material. However, he rarely presses this to make a conclusion. Primarily, this commentary looks at Luke (or Luke-Acts) as standing on its own.

Why did Luke write a church history? Garland answers that Luke wanted to “reassure the readers about the truth of the Gospel.” By the time of Luke’s writing, the “Christian community had largely separated from its Jewish roots, and the Jewish rejection of Jesus was overwhelming.” Hence, the Christian community needed to understand “who they are, where they came from, and where they are headed” (p. 37). For Garland, Luke is historically accurate. Concerning the critics’ often-mentioned geographical lapses, Garland retorts, “Luke’s lack of geographical precision should not be attributed to ignorance or indifference to Palestinian geography but to his theological purpose” (p. 409).

Hermeneutically, I noticed that Garland operated at two levels in the “Explanation of the Text” sections. He initially assumes the historicity of the events and attempts to ascertain the meaning of the pericope to the historical audience that was interacting with Jesus (“in Jesus’ context”). Then he often notes how the meaning to the original reading audience is expanded or better understood because of their broader perspective and/or Gentile background (“in the readers’/Luke’s context”). Of course, this second level is now called “narrative criticism.” Many commentaries do not include both of these levels, but Garland does this well.

As to footnoting, it is kept to a reasonable minimum. However, I did notice that the leading article or a recent monograph related to a particular pericope was almost always footnoted; and many times, there were paragraph-length quotes with substantive interaction included. I personally appreciated this as I felt reasonably “up-to-speed” concerning the latest on scholarship for many pericopes in Luke. I also found helpful Garland’s numerous references to Josephus and his many quotes of the Mishnah and the Babylonian Talmud. To Garland’s credit, he does not take the information in these sources as determinative, but does provide it to the reader.

Garland judiciously used unexpected slang in this technical commentary. In fact, several times I laughed out loud. Nazareth is “nowheresville” (p. 78). Jesus was not a “publicity hound looking for splashy headlines” (p. 194).

The most unique feature of the ZECNT series is the “Translation and Graphical Layout” section. In this section, the author’s English translation of each pericope is manipulated to show the logical progression of thought using non-technical discourse-analysis labels. These sections are useful to some degree in narrative material, but are more useful for an epistle.

Since both of us are evangelicals, it is no surprise that I agree with the vast majority of exegetical decisions by Garland. He clearly presents the meaning of the Lucan text and the wonders of Christ's person and work. Therefore, for purposes of this review, the following are a few miscellaneous conclusions by Garland that the reader may find interesting. Garland translates *πρῶτος* as "before," and not "first" in Luke 2:2 (p. 117). Hence, the census for Joseph and Mary was "before" the more famous census that Quirinius ordered later. In the parable of the prodigal son (Luke 15:11–32), the father figure is central, not the two sons (p. 624). In Luke 16:18, Jesus' response to the Pharisees includes an apparently disconnected comment about adultery following a brief discussion of John the Baptist and the law not failing. Garland argues "Jesus' comment on divorce is not intended to give instructions about divorce and remarriage. Instead, it is used to illustrate something about the permanent validity of the law and the prophets" (p. 664). That is, "the ethical thrust of the law and the prophets remains in force" (p. 663). Garland believes that Luke presents the Olivet Discourse (Luke 21) as being delivered in the temple complex. Portions of the discourse refer to the events of AD 66–70, and other portions to the second coming. The generation that will not pass away (Luke 21:32) "refers to all the generations after [Jesus'] resurrection to the last one" (p. 836).

The "Theology in Application" sections at the end of each pericope are a substantive part of the ZECNT format and this commentary. I would not so much call this a "personal application" section as theologizing with the modern church in mind. In these sections, Garland has some interesting discussions that especially pastors could use as they preach through Luke with the help of this commentary. These include "Christmas Fantasy versus the True Christmas" (pp. 128–30); "The Reality of the Devil" (pp. 184–87); a positive presentation of a "Sabbath Consciousness" (pp. 164–65); "Blasphemy against the Spirit" as not being the unforgivable sin since this is hyperbole (pp. 507–8); and "Deliverance [from Demons] Ministries," which Garland is against because Christians cannot be demon possessed (pp. 381–83). As it is a Lucan emphasis, there are several sections (e.g. pp. 653–55) related to treatment of the poor, where many American evangelicals, including myself, may feel a bit more balance is needed. Overall, the "Theology in Application" sections are well done. I would have preferred more discussion and interaction with traditional systematic concerns and more development of redemptive-historical themes, but, of course, that reflects my own interests and is not a requirement of a commentary.

My most substantive complaint is Garland's presentation of the Pharisees, which seems to be inconsistent or at least not clear. I believe that Luke presents some of the Pharisees as operating with a work-righteousness perspective (either Pelagian or Semi-pelagian). Garland sometimes seems to agree, but at other points, I am not so sure (see pp. 241, 251, 719–23). Given current scholarly debate about the Pharisees, a clear explanation of one's view is expected.

In sum, Garland's commentary is first class. It enables the professor and the preacher to better understand and proclaim God's word more effectively.

Robert J. Cara  
Reformed Theological Seminary, Charlotte, NC

*The Riddles of the Fourth Gospel: An Introduction to John.* By Paul N. Anderson. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2011, xiii + 295 pp., \$22.00 paper.

Paul N. Anderson (Ph.D. Glasgow University) is Professor of Biblical and Quaker Studies at George Fox University in Newberg, OR. Anderson has written and contributed to several books in Johannine studies. He wrote this book for those who are novices at interpreting the Gospel of John *and* for those who have wrestled with its "riddles" (puzzling features in the Gospel of John) for a while. Some of my most enjoyable times in reading through commentaries on John have been when the commentator provides an excursus on some particular Johannine theme. Anderson is providing an entire book to discuss these riddles. The book has three parts: defining the riddles, addressing the riddles, and interpreting the riddles. He breaks up the Johannine riddles into three categories, with twelve riddles discussed in each category: theological, historical, and literary. Before outlining the perplexing issues that await the reader, Anderson wisely offers a brief overview of the Gospel of John in order to provide readers a structure from which to think through the different riddles.

In this overview section, Anderson discusses the central structure of the Gospel of John, moving from the purpose statement in 20:30–31, to Jesus' prayer in 17:1–26, to two passages on Johannine Christology (3:31–36; 12:44–50), to the opening of the narrative (1:19–51), and finally to the prologue (1:1–18). At first readers might wonder why Anderson moves *backwards* through the Gospel to explain the central structure. However, when he adopts Culpepper's brilliantly argued-for chiasm in the prologue, he ties in all the previous passages to the central purpose of the prologue and the entire Gospel. The remaining chapters in Part 1 cover the "Theological Riddles" (e.g. who is the judge: Father or Son?), the "Historical Riddles" (e.g. the differences between the Synoptic Gospels and John's Gospel), and the "Literary Riddles" (e.g. the supposed *aporias* in John's Gospel).

In Part 2, Anderson begins by walking through the different approaches that have been utilized in the history of Johannine interpretation (chap. 5), covering twelve theories in all. Under the category of authorship, he discusses four theories, including apostolic authorship, John the Elder as the final compiler of the Gospel and epistles, another member of the twelve as author (e.g. Thomas), and a first-generation source who was not a member of the twelve as author (e.g. Lazarus). He then discusses composition theories of the Gospel, all of which are independent of an apostolic eyewitness, including the "Concocted" Gospel, Bultmann's diachronic composition, John as a spiritualizer of Mark, and John as historicized drama. Finally, he summarizes four theories of composition that do not consider authorship as essential to their theories. In this section he covers the multiple editions theory (e.g.

Brown, Lindars), the two-level Gospel theory (e.g. Martyn), a literary analysis theory (e.g. Culpepper), and the priority of John theory (e.g. Robinson). Anderson does a fine job of evaluating the strengths and weaknesses of each of the twelve theories he summarizes. He believes that Culpepper and Brown have the most helpful approaches for resolving the riddles in John's Gospel.

In chapter 6, by far the most important of the book, Anderson explains his approach: the dialogical autonomy of the Fourth Gospel theory. This approach does not depend on any particular author having written the Gospel and depends on interpreting the text as it stands. He posits an interesting relationship between the Gospels of Mark and John ("Bi-Optic Gospels"): both were autonomously written (he assumes Markan Priority) and therefore have similar illustrations and non-identical similarities, but the traditions were somehow influencing each other ("interfluence"). He presents the author as a dialectical thinker, someone who can hold "truths together in tension" (p. 129). He then traces how this type of thinking worked itself out throughout the writing of the Fourth Gospel, with three periods and seven crises forming the backdrop to its writing. He holds to two editions of the Fourth Gospel: an early edition, followed by the writing of the Johannine epistles by John the Elder and a final edition written by the Elder. According to his theory of interfluence, Mark and John influenced each other during oral stages of development and the Johannine tradition in its oral stage influenced Luke's Gospel (thus explaining the times when Luke sided with John and against Mark). It is in chapter 7 where Anderson returns to the Johannine riddles to explain how his historical reconstruction can help provide answers to the questions raised earlier in the book.

Part 3 offers a more detailed resolution to the riddles, based upon the preliminary observations made in chapter 7. Anderson continues an explanation of the riddles from the categories he discussed in chapter 7, like the dialectical Johannine situation and the rhetorical devices used by the Evangelist. He discusses how including the Johannine material could lead to a "fourth quest" for the historical Jesus. The final main chapter (chap. 9) explains how the content of the Fourth Gospel relates to the life of the church.

There are many commendable features to Anderson's volume. Anderson is a clear writer and his resolutions to the riddles are consistent with his historical reconstruction. The "boxes" included in the introductory riddle chapters present the evidence for each side in a manner that accentuates the problems, but also includes enough data to help the reader think through possible solutions. It is a helpful assembling of material on each riddle. He does a good job at explaining and critiquing various views throughout the volume. He also makes an intriguing point regarding Acts 4:19–20, where he argues that Peter said what is in 4:19 and John what is in 4:20. He finds evidence in this for the apostolic authorship of the Fourth Gospel (pp. 153–54). However, he points out that the closest parallel to Acts 4:20 is 1 John 1:3, which he believes was written by the Elder and *not* the apostle. His discussion on the first "historical" riddle (i.e. whether John is historical or theological) is refreshing as he does not pit "history" versus "theology." Instead he concludes that

“a theological association does not preclude the possibility of a historical origin” (p. 48).

There are several categories for concern as well. First, his view of specific Johannine interpretations or issues could prove problematic. The way he structures the signs by counting the Judean and Galilean signs separately is confusing in the outline (pp. 11–12), but then he adds additional signs (eight in total) that were not referred to as signs in the outline. He also fails to include the temple clearing as a sign, though Nicodemus appeared to think it was a sign in John 3:2 (p. 13). He seems confident that there were eight signs (e.g. p. 60), though Johannine scholarship has been debating this issue for some time. He could have addressed this as “the sign riddle” rather than presenting the data as a settled issue. Similarly, he did not seem to give enough credence to the theory of two separate temple clearings. That should have been offered as a possible solution (p. 51). On some textual issues, he suggests that maybe the final compiler (the author of 1 John) made some changes to emphasize pastoral concerns rather than apologetic concerns, like adding the sigma to the purpose statement in John 20:31. However, as Carson has pointed out, the meaning may not change whether the sigma is there or not.

Second, his view on the historical reliability of the Gospels, while much improved in comparison to some recent scholarship, still has significant problems. For example, the attitude of “either the Synoptics (or, Mark) is right or John is right” leaves out the option that both are right (p. 46). Statements like “John’s rendering seems more plausible” are pitting the Gospels against each other in the mind of the reader, which may not be necessary (p. 53). Anderson does assume a two-level reading is legitimate, though he approaches the two-level reading in his own nuanced way. He does not respond to recent challenges to the two-level reading (e.g. by Bauckham or Klink).

Third, Anderson’s specific reconstruction of the writing of the Fourth Gospel will surely be an area where he will receive the bulk of critiques. He seems fairly certain that there was a “final editor” because of the “we” in John 21:24 (e.g. pp. 49, 69). However, it does not appear that he has taken into account the studies by H. M. Jackson or A. J. Köstenberger. These studies might provide a more compelling explanation to some readers. Because of the similarity of style between 1 John and John 21, he suggests that maybe the author of 1 John was the final editor of the Gospel (p. 69). It seems that apostolic authorship of both could be another satisfactory conclusion. Anderson says: “Gospel texts, of course, were not produced with their present names attached to them; these were added later” (p. 48). While he might be correct, what about Hengel’s proposal that they could have been original in his 2000 book *The Four Gospels and the One Gospel of Jesus Christ* (Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International, 2000)? Finally, any kind of theory about multiple editions has the inherent weakness that no other edition has been found that is missing the supposed “later expansions.”

How does this introductory book on the Fourth Gospel differ from others (e.g. Pate, Kysar, and Köstenberger)? Most introductions cover the content in a very different way, a more general way, while Anderson’s approach is to view the Fourth Gospel through the lens of the riddles. He has one short section covering

an overview of the Fourth Gospel. His entire paradigm stands and falls upon his historical reconstruction. In the end, whether or not readers find Anderson's answers to the riddles convincing will depend upon how convincing his reconstruction is deemed.

David A. Croteau  
Liberty University, Lynchburg, VA

*Pauline Churches and Diaspora Jews.* By John M. G. Barclay. WUNT 1/275. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011, xii + 454, €129.00.

For years, John M. G. Barclay has labored at the intersection of Pauline studies and the analysis of early Judaism. He has published major monographs on Paul (Galatians), Josephus, and diaspora Judaism as well as co-editing collections of essays on related topics. This welcome volume brings together nineteen of his articles, all but three previously published.

The focus of this particular collection, in what he describes as “exploratory trenches in the excavation of early Christianity” (p. 1), is to investigate how Paul's churches constructed their identity alongside as well as over against diaspora Jews (as opposed to comparisons/contrasts with non-Jews). Following a thirty-three page introduction (“Pauline Churches, Jewish Communities and the Roman Empire”), the remaining essays are broken down into three sections: “Pauline Churches and Diaspora Jews” (seven chapters), “The Invention of Christian Identity in the Pauline Tradition” (five chapters), and “Josephus, Paul and Rome” (six chapters). In addition to the introduction, the new material includes “Paul, Roman Religion and the Emperor: Mapping the Point of Conflict” (chap. 18) and “Why the Roman Empire Was Insignificant to Paul” (chap. 19). From what I could tell, the only editing to the previously published material occurs in brief comments in the footnotes updating bibliographical data on the subject under discussion. The volume includes a full bibliography, a list of acknowledgments, and indices of sources, authors, and selected topics.

In order to avoid the tedium of saying something about each essay individually and because the bulk of the book has already appeared in print elsewhere, I will limit my comments to the newly published material and then provide a complete list of chapter titles at the end of the review.

In collections of essays such as this, the introductory chapter traditionally previews the succeeding chapters. Barclay's introduction, however, largely foregoes this task in order to perform other larger functions that make it valuable as a stand alone essay. First, Barclay briefly chronicles the development of socio-historical research within the field of biblical studies and explains how this movement provided him with perspectives and questions that shaped his own research agenda. That agenda is summarized in four sets of questions that produced the essays collected in the volume. Thus, the opening chapter situates the contents both within the larger corpus of the author's work (now spanning more than two decades) and within the contemporary field of socio-historical research on Paul and early Juda-

ism. For a student seeking an accurate, informative guide to contemporary issues in the study of Paul and his communities, one could hardly improve on these 30 pages.

Second, Barclay gifts his readers with his own synthesis of his primary arguments for and conclusions regarding vital issues addressed by his research. So, for example, he claims that in spite of genuine similarities between Pauline and Jewish diaspora communities, “to speak of the Pauline assemblies as a ‘sect within Judaism’ makes little sense in ancient terms” (p. 18). Paul’s assemblies must be categorized in some other way. Barclay supports this conclusion by carefully summarizing evidence from Paul’s letters. He notes that, on the one hand, even with his Gentile converts Paul employs a typical construction of Jewish ethnicity by drawing a dichotomy between Jews/Judeans and the nations. He observes that Paul at times seems to cancel out previous ethnic identities of non-Jewish believers (e.g. 1 Cor 12:2). On the other hand, Paul does not reinforce these Jewish means of social organization by demanding many Jewish social practices. Although Paul requires Gentile converts to abandon idolatry as Jewish sensibilities would demand, Paul does not direct those converts to observe core Jewish customs such as Sabbath keeping or male circumcision. Thus, according to Barclay, Paul’s churches do not fit within a strict Jewish paradigm.

I disagree with Barclay on this specific point. The degree to which Paul and his communities stood in continuity, discontinuity, or elements of both with contemporary streams of diaspora Judaism likely depended on whom you asked as well as where and when you did so. Nevertheless, this still does not detract from the fact that Barclay’s opening chapter provides one of the best compact analyses of identity formation in Pauline Christianity that I have come across.

In Barclay’s final two chapters he wades into one of the central debates in contemporary Pauline studies: Paul’s critique (or lack thereof) of Roman imperial power in general and the emperor cult in particular. Basically, Barclay argues that the debate has been conducted in misleading terms. For one, the “imperial cult” was no singular entity. Rather, it included a wide range of practices for relating to the emperor and/or his predecessors that varied considerably according to time and place. Summarizing his reading of classical scholars, Barclay states, “All are clear that there was no coherent or organized system of worship directed to the emperor as god” (p. 345, n. 3). Thus, to say that Paul opposed the “imperial cult” involves a category error since there was no one “cult” for Paul to oppose. Second, Barclay contends that emperor worship in all its varied manifestations never stood out above worship of other gods. Rather, the emperor was seen as enmeshed within a divine order that included local deities. In other words, scholars who claim the imperial cult to be *the* focus of Paul’s theologizing mistakenly assume the empire and its emperor demanded some sort of superior role within the pagan pantheon that it never occupied. Finally, Paul never distinguishes between the emperor cult and any other form of pagan worship. Within Paul’s worldview, all such devotion whether to Rome or to any other entity is subsumed under the one category of “idolatry.” Therefore, to claim that Paul singles out “emperor worship” or the Roman empire for focused critique is to introduce a conceptual distinction Paul him-

self never makes. In Barclay's terms, Paul simply does not "map" the world that way.

The final chapter, "Why the Roman Empire Was Insignificant to Paul," is a written version of an oral presentation made at the 2007 Society of Biblical Literature meeting in response to the work of N. T. Wright on Paul and empire. In addition to the critiques made above, Barclay reserves his sharpest criticism for Wright's (and others') reliance on James C. Scott's concept of "hidden transcripts." That is, Paul could not forthrightly critique Roman power for fear of retribution if his letters were discovered by Roman authorities. Thus, Paul's critique of Rome had to be communicated in "code" so that his auditors could understand it but Roman officials could not. In response, Barclay notes that open criticisms of Rome and its use of power were hardly uncommon in Paul's era. Josephus, writing under Roman imperial sponsorship, criticized Rome's exercise of power with no noticeable fear of adverse consequences. Furthermore, Jews were known as monotheists. Roman authorities would expect Jews to disagree with their claims. What therefore would a Jew like Paul have to hide that was not already known? Barclay summarizes his position by citing the boy in the well-known fable who saw the emperor parade in supposed new clothes and said, "But the emperor is naked." Barclay states that, "when I am bidden to watch the emperor walking around Paul's letters, I am rude enough to object, 'but I see no emperor!'" (p. 383, n. 69).

Barclay thus stands against the incoming tide of scholarly claims that Paul stood in opposition to the empire and its cult. I believe Barclay is correct and that his contrarian arguments need to be heard by a wider audience. Anyone aware of the history of NT research knows that potential new insights into the subject often attract enthusiastic followings. After the initial excitement, however, more careful assessments than those made at first win the day. The same may prove true regarding Paul and empire.

The essays collected here represent what anyone familiar with Barclay's work would come to expect, namely, careful and informed argumentation expressed in lucid prose and marked by keen insight into its subject matter. As anyone familiar with the publisher of this volume would come to expect, the book is superbly produced but priced beyond the range of individual scholars. However, it should be ready at hand in any theological library. Teachers and students in the field will benefit from time spent working through its pages.

Previously published work includes: "Do We Undermine the Law? A Study of Romans 14.1–15.6" (chap. 2); "Paul and Philo on Circumcision: Romans 2.25–29 in Social and Cultural Context" (chap. 3); "Matching Theory and Practice: Josephus' Constitutional Ideal and Paul's Strategy in Corinth" (chap. 4); "Money and Meetings: Group Formation among Diaspora Jews and Early Christians" (chap. 5); "Deviance and Apostasy: Some Applications of Deviance Theory to First-Century Judaism and Christianity" (chap. 6); "Who Was Considered an Apostate in the Jewish Diaspora?" (chap. 7); "Hostility to Jews as Cultural Construct: Egyptian, Hellenistic, and Early Christian Paradigms" (chap. 8); "Thessalonica and Corinth: Social Contrasts in Pauline Christianity" (chap. 9); "Πνευματικός in the Social Dialect of Pauline Christianity" (chap. 10); "That you may not grieve, like the rest who have

no hope' (1 Thess 4.13): Death and Early Christian Identity" (chap. 11); "Ordinary but Different: Colossians and Hidden Moral Identity" (chap. 12); "There is Neither Old nor Young? Early Christianity and Ancient Ideologies of Age" (chap. 13); "The Politics of Contempt: Judaeans and Egyptians in Josephus' *Against Apion*" (chap. 14); "The Empire Writes Back: Josephan Rhetoric in Flavian Rome" (chap. 15); "Who's the Toughest of the Them All? Jews, Spartans and Roman Torturers in Josephus' *Against Apion*" (chap. 16); and "Snarling Sweetly: A Study of Josephus on Idolatry" (chap. 17).

James C. Miller

Asbury Theological Seminary, Orlando, FL

*Creation in Paul and Philo: The Beginning and Before.* By Jonathan D. Worthington. WUNT 2/317. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011, xiv + 260 pp., \$115.00 paper.

The monograph is the author's dissertation, completed at Durham University (England) under the supervision of Francis Watson. Worthington is Lecturer in NT at Belfast Bible College (Belfast, Northern Ireland). Technical in nature, the WUNT series' intended audience is professional NT scholars and advanced theological students.

For centuries, scholars have highlighted Adam's post-fall significance for Paul's theology. Worthington notes, however, that Paul's *pre-fall* creation theology has been largely neglected. He asks, "The beginning of sin and death through Adam's disobedience in Genesis 3 is clearly important for Paul's construal of the common human plight 'in Adam' and of the gracious salvation 'in Christ'.... But what about *before* that fatal beginning of sin in the world ...? Was the ultimate Beginning of all things—creation itself—at all important in Paul's thinking and letter-writing?" (p. 1).

The author nevertheless does not offer "an exhaustive study of Paul's theology of creation" (p. 2). "Rather, through select passages," he writes, "I will tease out some of Paul's underlying interpretive tendencies when he employs terms and motifs from his scriptural texts of creation" (p. 2). Furthermore, the author does so by comparing Paul's interpretations of creation texts with Philo of Alexandria's readings of those same texts. The rationale for this decision is that the "benefits of a 'three-way conversation' between Paul, non-Christian Jewish writers (including Philo), and the shared scriptural texts to which each turns in order to understand and explain their world" are increasingly recognized as a fruitful way for exploration of each writer's thought (p. 15). Philo's formal and extended commentary on Genesis 1–3 provides ample witness to his interpretive tendencies with regard to creation (*De Opificio Mundi*, or, *On the Creation of the World*). Exegetical investigation of Philo is therefore a significant part of the study.

The author's thesis is that "Paul's interpretation of creation, like Philo's in his commentary, contains three interwoven aspects: the beginning of the world, the beginning of humanity, and God's intentions before the beginning" (p. 3). The

argument proceeds in three chapters, preceded by an introduction and followed by a conclusion.

In chapter 1 (“Before the Beginning?”), Worthington argues that “Paul’s concept of God’s intentions *before* creation, like Philo’s, is an important aspect of his interpretation of the beginning of both the world at large and humanity in particular” (p. 22, italics his). Philo reads Genesis 1–2 under the influence of the philosophical ideas of Plato as codified in *Timaeus*. God created the material, sensory world after the uncreated paradigm that existed beforehand in the mind of God. This noetic, pre-protological blueprint resulted in a physical world that conformed to this ideal archetype. To borrow the author’s parlance, God’s “Before” shaped the “Beginning.” The apostle Paul, Worthington suggests, also understood the Beginning (i.e. Genesis 1–2) to have been shaped by the Before (God’s pre-creational, causative activity). Paul read Genesis 1–2 via Prov 8:22–31, which provided lenses to read the creation narratives in this way. Paul understood God’s determinations before creation to have definitively shaped creation. Indeed, for Paul, as in Philo, the beginning of creation and God’s determining activity *before* creation mutually interpret one another. Yet Philo’s Before is shaped by Plato and results in a Beginning that is structurally good, since it derives from God’s ideal archetype. Paul’s Before “causes a historical and cruciform triumph for humans and the world,” patterned after principles established at the Beginning (p. 76).

Chapter 2 (“The Beginning of the World”) explores Paul’s and Philo’s understanding of Genesis 1 and the beginning of creation proper (before the creation of humanity). Philo’s thought is explored by his commentary on this chapter, while Paul’s must be gleaned from his allusions to it (in 1 Cor 15:35–41 and 2 Cor 4:6). Significantly, the comparison highlights that in Paul’s Corinthian correspondence, allusions to God’s original creating activity function to support assertions concerning aspects of the new creation inaugurated in Christ. Worthington argues that “the primary hermeneutical direction of Paul’s thought is that ‘the original creation provides the conceptuality for describing the new creation,’ not the other way around” (p. 97; quoting Francis Watson, *Text and Truth* [London: T&T Clark, 1997] 282). Moreover, “without a proper understanding of how Paul understands the ‘model’ or ‘framework’ for the new creation—i.e., the original creation—the research on the new creation is highly susceptible, to say the least, to misunderstanding the New” (p. 97).

Chapter 3 (“The Beginning of Humanity”) investigates Paul’s and Philo’s understanding of the creation of humanity as unfolded in Gen 1:27; 2:7; and 5:3. The author explores Paul’s use of these three texts in 1 Cor 11:7–12; 12:12–30; 15:37–49, 2 Cor 3:18; 4:4–6; and Rom 8:29. Of note, first, is that “both Philo and Paul fit their readings of Genesis’ human beginnings within the larger structure of Genesis’ cosmic beginning” (p. 203). Second, the author argues that both Paul and Philo offer positive as well as negative interpretations of Adam. The negative interpretations arise when they compare Adam to another figure. For Philo, this occurs when he compares the material Adam to the ideal, pre-creational “image” after which the former was fashioned (*Opif.* 134–35). For Paul, the negative interpretation arises when he compares Adam to the resurrected Christ (p. 203). In view of the OT allu-

sions in their new contexts, Worthington concludes that Paul does not teach a return of believers to the image of the pre-fall first Adam. Rather, believers will partake of the image of the new Adam, Christ. Moreover, this eschatological goal was “intended and marked out by the Creator *before* the beginning” (p. 204, emphasis original).

In my judgment, the author successfully defends his thesis. Although I will mention two weaknesses of the study below, these should not detract from the fact that the author has accomplished his stated purpose. With a clear and thoughtful argument, the author has demonstrated his modest proposal of the “interwoven nature of the Before and the Beginning in the apostle Paul as in the commentator Philo” (p. 205). The study is built upon careful and informed exegesis in Philo as well as Paul. The care with which Philo is handled is refreshing.

Let me mention what I perceive to be two weaknesses of the study. First, the author argues insufficiently for a few of his proposed OT allusions in Paul. The author does display some awareness of the vigorous conversation taking place in the sub-discipline of “OT in the NT” studies concerning method and validation of proposed allusions and echoes. Yet because a few of his proposed allusions are uncertain—yet important to his arguments—the author would have done well to have acquainted himself more with the field. The proposed allusions that, in my view are uncertain and therefore required further validation, are to Prov 8:23 in 1 Cor 2:7 (pp. 64–69), to Gen 2:7 in 1 Cor 12:12–30 (pp. 176–79), and to Gen 5:3 in 1 Cor 15:49, 2 Cor 3:18, and Rom 8:29 (pp. 191–203). In my opinion, the overall thesis still stands if the author erred in assuming any or even all of these debatable allusions.

The second weakness is the arbitrary limitation of the study to Paul’s Corinthian and Roman correspondence. More specifically, the weakness is that no rationale is given for this decision. One can surmise reasons why the author might choose to limit the study in such a way, but with no rationale offered the study feels incomplete. Perhaps the author desired to limit himself to the undisputed Pauline correspondence, but then why, for example, did he not explore Phil 2:6–11? Or, if the author had been open to inclusion of the evidence from the disputed Pauline correspondence, then the letters to the Colossians and to the Ephesians would have contributed significantly and should have been included in the study.

Worthington’s monograph has demonstrated that Paul’s “Beginning and Before” are interwoven. Indeed, the study impresses upon the reader that Paul’s understanding of the eternal purpose of God in Christ was seamless, all of a piece. What God predetermined in the Before definitively shaped the Beginning and provided redemptive history and the eschatological Beyond with their Christocentric focus and goals. Yet Paul can also read it the other way around, having left behind traces of evidence in his writings that his understanding of the Beyond and Beginning have shaped his understanding of the Before.

Christopher A. Beetham  
Evangelical Theological College, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia  
Ethiopian Graduate School of Theology, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia

*Paul's Use of the Old Testament in Romans 9.10–18: An Intertextual and Theological Exegesis.* By Brian J. Abasciano. Library of New Testament Studies 317. London: T&T Clark, 2011, xiv + 272 pp., \$120.00.

Brian Abasciano offers volume 2 of his ambitious three-volume intertextual and theological commentary on Romans 9. The initial volume received considerable praise from reviewers, with only occasional reservations expressed. The substance of this second volume will likely buttress Abasciano's approach outlined in the first volume and assuage minor criticisms earlier reviewers may have raised.

The striking thing about Abasciano's offering is its sheer size. Some may balk at the notion of a three-volume commentary on a chapter containing 33 verses (especially considering the price of each volume), but this fails to appreciate the nature of Abasciano's work. It is indeed a commentary in the sense that it provides a worthy exegesis of a preeminently important Pauline text (with copious notes, bibliography, indices of references and authors cited). However, it exceeds all expectations of a typical commentary in that it gives a thorough exegesis of all the OT allusions contained in the text, of which there are many. As such, it is also an OT commentary; OT exegetes will be remiss if they do not avail themselves of it. Moreover, Abasciano traces the occurrences of the alluded passages throughout Jewish literature, showing readers the range of interpretation of the OT text through the early rabbinic period and giving some indication of interpretive traditions that Paul might have known. As if this were not sufficiently ambitious, Abasciano keeps a vigilant eye on how these traditions might be compatible or incompatible with theological and philosophical issues that impact the Calvinist-Arminian controversy.

If Abasciano achieves nothing else, he at least succeeds in convincing that an intense and thorough exegesis of OT allusions is absolutely critical to the interpretation of Romans 9. One gains the impression that Abasciano's work will be a watershed event for the study of Romans 9, if not for Romans in general. Abasciano argues throughout the book that the texts Paul cites are not only generally compatible with Paul's flow of thought but often foundational to his theology. Some may conclude that Abasciano's exegesis is overly informed by the context of the OT allusions, but future commentators of Romans 9 are likely to be judged severely if they gloss over those texts without due consideration, and more often than not, skeptics who patiently follow Abasciano's argument down to the last detailed subpoint and extensive footnote are likely to become favorably disposed to his conclusion.

Likewise, so much prior discussion and research on Romans 9 by Calvinists and Arminians alike will probably be eclipsed by the insights that Abasciano brings forth from the OT. Indeed, one wonders how so many interpreters come to conclusions that differ so dramatically from the meaning of the allusions in their original context, as if Paul cited the allusions on the basis of superficial correlations rather than on substance. In this regard, Abasciano strengthens the Arminian case for corporate election, founded upon God's sovereign choice to identify the covenant seed as those who have faith like Abraham. Accordingly, the hardening of

Israel is a judicial punishment that is not absolute, nor final, nor universal, nor insuperable, and is designed to bring about the inclusion of the Gentiles into the covenant. Likewise, calling is not a matter of God's irresistible summoning, but of God's identifying or naming those who are the covenant seed, according to the divinely ordained condition of faith. Upon reading his treatment of the OT contexts, one has the sense that Abasciano has restored the meaning of Romans 9 to reflect its OT foundational texts, rescuing it from a meaning imposed upon it by an alien system of thought whose connections with the OT contexts are merely superficial and coincidental. Again, no doubt some may disagree with Abasciano's conclusions, but those who do will hardly be able to discuss election in Romans 9 without first engaging with Abasciano's OT exegesis.

I found volume 1 difficult to put down, but volume 2 required more effort. Volume 1 is essentially Abasciano's Ph.D. thesis and probably was edited and compressed under the rigors of the degree program, while volume 2 probably did not have the benefit of the same kind of fetters. I found myself wondering about the value of some arguments relative to the large number of words required to substantiate them (e.g. 14 pages on the various terms for "hardening"). I also found it challenging to keep track of Scripture references without more obvious indicators of what biblical text was contained in the reference, a problem illustrated in the conclusion of chapter 8:

Romans 9.17 and the second half of v. 18 together ground 9.14's insistence on God's righteousness vis-à-vis the negative side of God's sovereign election. Verse 18b states the significance of 9.17 and thus bears the logical weight of these two verses. At the same time, 9.18a sums up 9.15–16, which together ground 9.14 with respect to the positive side of the divine sovereign election. Hence, 9.18 sums up Paul's argument for the righteousness of God in election by faith apart from works or ancestry in 9.14–18, which is founded upon Exod. 33.19b and 9.16. Romans 9.14–18, headed by its main point in 9.14 of denying that there is unrighteousness with God, most precisely supports the purpose statement of 9.11c–12b (p. 219).

This summation makes perfectly good sense if the reader keeps one eye on the biblical text while the other studies Abasciano's comments. I recommend those who intend to read straight through the book to print out the text of Romans 9, as well as the text of the significant OT texts discussed in the book, and to keep these copies handy for quick reference. I would also suggest to the author that he consider using diagrams or charts to depict the relationships of some of the more complex syntactical and logical structures in his final volume on the last third of Romans 9.

These minor caveats aside, I think that experts on Romans 9 will no longer be expert if they do not digest Abasciano's work. One hopes, in light of the expense and the length of the three-volume series, that the author and publisher might find a way to reduce this to a one-volume paperback that is more accessible to Bible students and pastors, or perhaps even to those who specialize in Calvinist-Arminian studies.

James M. Leonard  
Cambridge University, Cambridge, England

*Letters to the Church: A Survey of Hebrews and the General Epistles.* By Karen H. Jobes. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2011, xvi + 478 pp., \$44.99.

*Letters to the Church: A Survey of Hebrews and the General Epistles* opens with instructions for "How to Use This Book," directed first to the student and then to the instructor, thereby clearly indicating its designated use as a textbook. The book begins with an introduction (20 pp.) followed by fourteen chapters (430 pp.), a glossary (6 pp.), Scripture index (8 pp.), an index of extra-biblical ancient texts (2 pp.), index of authors (2 pp.), and a subject index (10 pp.). The chapters, however, are segregated into four separate units or parts. Part 1 has four chapters devoted to Hebrews: "Hebrews: The Book of Better Things" (124 pp.). Part 2 also has four chapters but devoted to James and Jude: "Letters from Jesus' Brothers" (120 pp.). Whereas James is the center of attention in chapters 5, 6, and 7 (88 pp.), chapter 8 concentrates solely on the book of Jude (32 pp.). Like the previous two units, part 3 has four chapters but allocated to "Letters from Peter" (128 pp.). Chapters 9, 10, and 11 spotlight 1 Peter (88 pp.), and 2 Peter is the focus of chapter 12 (40 pp.). Part 4 "Letters from John" is limited to 2 chapters (58 pp.). The heart of part 4 is 1 John (34 pp.) with limited attention given to 2 and 3 John (14 pp.). Proportionately speaking, however, parts 1 through 3 are obviously equal in page length (*circa* 120–28 pp.) with part 4 disproportionate to the others. There also seems to be some disproportion when considering the amount of space given to the thirteen chapters of Hebrews (124 pp.) in comparison to James and 1 Peter (88 pp. each). Nevertheless, the length is of no critical consequence to this review but merely an observation.

Every chapter opens with a box that lists "Your Goals for This Chapter" with three to seven bullet points, which is immediately followed by a statement of relevance, a highlighted set of "Key Verses" with three to ten verses cited, and a "Chapter Outline." Similarly, every chapter closes with a "Chapter Summary," a highlighted listing of "Key Terms," "Questions for Review or Discussion," and a section entitled "Going Further." Jobes also alerts students to the specific "Challenges Presented by the Book of ...." Whenever she moves to a new letter she clearly points out the challenges of every biblical letter she tackles. The textbook's lucid and reliable format (along with maps, photographs, charts, and definitions of key terms that permeate every chapter) is clearly designed for a student's use. Con-

sequently, the plain and coherent presentation of the material makes comprehension and learning achievable for the student.

As would be expected in a survey book such as this, Jobes covers typical introductory issues: authorship, recipients, where the recipients lived, genre, date, purpose, major themes, and canonicity. The information, creatively presented, keeps the student engaged because with the exception of authorship and canonicity that tend to open and close a chapter, the other issues are interwoven with other material. Though this may be a plus to hold a student's attention for reading purposes, that same student may be hard pressed to return and relocate where some of the introductory material was discussed in the textbook. For instance, when introducing Hebrews, the "Chapter Outline" delineates clearly that the chapter will answer: who the people originally addressed were, where the original readers were living, when the book was written, who wrote the letter, whether Hebrews really is a letter, and the question of canonicity (p. 25). Yet when introducing 1 Peter, the "Chapter Outline" only answers questions of authorship, date, and canonicity (pp. 269–70). Similarly, when introducing 1 John, the "Chapter Outline" limits answers to authorship, date, genre, purpose, and canonicity (p. 398). Nevertheless, the other introductory issues are addressed, but they are interwoven with other material under different headings. An astute student may think to use the subject index and find the genre discussions for Hebrews (pp. 42–44), James (pp. 161–63), and 2 Peter (pp. 363–67). Unfortunately, the incomplete manner in which the index provides direction as to where to find the typical introductory material will hamper even the astute student from finding needed information. Yet this minor critique is easily overcome via an instructor's simple direction to students to take notes while reading about aforementioned introductory issues.

Jobes also directs attention to troublesome cultural and theological issues of the general epistles. On the one hand, every student will be made aware of our twenty-first century cultural misunderstandings surrounding a first-century biblical author's employment of an amanuensis (p. 7) as well as pseudonymous writings (pp. 7–13) and pseudepigraphal literature (pp. 6–12). Not only does Jobes deal with the issue in her introduction, she returns to these subject matters time and time again when tackling the issue of authorship for James (pp. 154–57, 239), Jude (pp. 240, 250–58), 1 Peter (pp. 277–80), and 2 Peter (pp. 357–63, 378). An instructor should expect any student *who claims to have read this textbook* to be well equipped to answer any exam question on these cultural issues. Other cultural issues that she confronts are matters of dualism (Platonic, pp. 47, 96–97, 419–20; Neo-Platonic, pp. 370–71) and more specifically as they relate to Hebrews (pp. 46–48) and the Johannine letters (pp. 407, 424), the household codes in 1 Peter (pp. 340–41), and hospitality in 2 and 3 John (pp. 412, 442–46). On the other hand, there are several sticky subject matters of theology covered in a succinct and pointed manner: the faith and works issue in Jas 2:14–26 (pp. 216–21), Jesus' descent into hell and the Apostle's Creed in 1 Peter 3:18–22 (pp. 309–17), and the elect lady in 2 John 1:1 (pp. 440–41).

There was, however, a cultural presentation that appeared unclear or perhaps misplaced. Jobes's discussion about Epicureans and Stoics appears in chapter 7 concerning "The Royal Law" in James. As she proceeds to discuss "wisdom from

above and torah,” Jobes introduces the Greek wisdom and ethic of the Epicureans and Stoics. However, James does not counter nor does he interact with Greek wisdom or ethics. Rather, James’s delineations of wisdom and ethics are more pointedly in line with the Jewish tradition (e.g. Proverbs and Sirach) and more precisely a recasting of Jesus’ ethical commands, which she acknowledges in the previous chapter via a chart entitled “Probable Allusions to Jesus’ Teaching in Matthew’s Gospel” (p. 193). Nevertheless, the discussion is extremely helpful for understanding 2 Peter when Peter appears to be addressing the Epicurean teachings of false teachers (pp. 371–72). Perhaps the Epicurean and Stoic discussion belongs later in the textbook.

A few uncertainties about *Letters to the Church* are worth raising. Is this volume a stand-alone textbook or the first of a series of textbooks to be authored by Jobes? Neither the textbook nor Zondervan’s webpage informs the potential instructor. Equally unclear is for what level student this volume was written: high school students, college students, or seminary students. Clearly the textbook has been written for students, but Jobes never says for what level of student. Yet Zondervan’s webpage avers, “Pastors, professors, students, and laypeople interested in deeper biblical study will find this an invaluable resource that offers well-researched commentary in an accessible, spiritually meaningful form.” Unfortunately, the marketing assertion does not appear to correspond with Jobes’s opening two pages directed at students and teachers. In my opinion, however, the textbook would serve well college students and *perhaps* an entry-level seminary student.

In conclusion, *Letters to the Church: A Survey of Hebrews and the General Epistles* contributes nicely and creatively to textbooks that are specifically designed to guide college students in their learning process about the Bible, in this particular case, the General Epistles.

Herbert W. Bateman IV  
Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, Fort Worth, TX

*The Doctrine of Salvation in the First Letter of Peter*. By Martin Williams. SNTSMS 149. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011, xviii + 322 pp., \$99.00.

This book is an edited version of Williams’s dissertation, which was written under the supervision of Paul Trebilco at the University of Otago in New Zealand. In his introduction Williams explains that he was motivated to undertake this study because of the central importance of the doctrine of salvation in Scripture, the rich development of this important theme in 1 Peter, and the general neglect in scholarly literature of the topic of salvation in 1 Peter. Motivated by these facts, Williams desires to make two main contributions in his study. First, he aims to investigate the concept of salvation as it is expressed in 1 Peter; this part of the work is exegetical. Second, he seeks to demonstrate the contribution 1 Peter can “make to the broader theological conversation between the different theological traditions” (p. 2); this part of the work is more theological. He seeks to wed the exegetical and theological in what he calls “theological-critical exegesis,” which he explains in his first

chapter. Chapters 2–6, which are the second and main part of the book, contain careful exegetical work on the passages in 1 Peter that treat the subject of salvation. These five chapters address the development of five aspects of salvation in 1 Peter: election, the atonement, the new birth, salvation as a future event, and salvation as future victory and vindication. Chapters 7–8, the third part of the work, are where Williams brings the results of his exegesis into dialogue with different theological traditions to allow 1 Peter to make its distinctive contribution to the ongoing discussion on the topic of salvation and to sharpen Williams's own understanding of salvation in 1 Peter. In this section of the book he attempts to construct an inter-catholic conversation on election and atonement. It is unfortunate that in revising the original dissertation for publication Williams had to eliminate several parts, including a chapter on baptism (1 Pet 3:20–21), which was apparently in part 2, and a theological chapter on regeneration, which would have been in part 3.

One of the most important contributions of this study is the methodology that Williams employs in his “theological-critical exegesis,” as described in chapter 1. He laments the unfortunate segregation of biblical studies and systematic theology and hopes to open up further the way for fruitful dialogue between the two (pp. 5, 273). Furthermore, he is seeking to “call into question the notion that biblical theology is necessarily more biblical than systematic theology” (p. 273). He gives two justifications for “theological-critical exegesis.” First, it is true to the nature of Scripture, which has God as its ultimate author and end. Second, we do theological interpretation anyway, so we should do it well. Under this second point he argues that presuppositions are necessary for interpreting the Bible and all interpreters have them; we must begin with our presuppositions, and from them we can spiral in on the truth of the text. Then Williams discusses two different approaches to theological interpretation: the “Ruled Reading Approach,” which is more reader centered and guided by the rule of faith, and the “Literal Sense Approach,” which is more author centered and seeks to determine the natural sense of the text as intended by the author. Williams follows the “Literal Sense Approach” and employs a number of the tools of historical, grammatical, and literary criticism to arrive at the author's intended meaning. Thus, the approach of theological interpretation that he advocates “does not dispense with all the methods of historical criticism” (p. 11). He demonstrates these basic elements of the “Literal Sense Approach” in his exegetical work in 1 Peter in chapters 2–6.

What distinguishes Williams's approach to theological interpretation is his combination of this basic “Literal Sense Exegesis” with an “intercanonical conversation” and an “intercatholic conversation.” The intercanonical conversation he advocates is a type of canonical criticism that considers the theological role of a biblical text within the completed canon of Scripture. Such intercanonical reading of texts helps explain the divine author's intention in passages as they are read in relationship to other passages. I say that Williams advocates, rather than employs, such an intercanonical conversation in his study, because “this [an intercanonical conversation] is not a strong focus in this work,” as he notes on pages 34–35. One reason there is so little focus on the intercanonical reading of texts in the book could be because his development of the topic of salvation in 1 Peter involves little

consideration of the use of the OT in 1 Peter. The main ways Williams evidences intercanonical conversation in his book are in the Christological interpretation of Isaiah 53 (in 1 Peter 2), in the demonstration of the various uses and occurrences of words in his word studies, and in the use of other NT texts to help interpret texts in 1 Peter. However, it is unfortunate that he does not do more with this aspect of theological interpretation, because it is one of the most controversial facets of biblical interpretation and a stronger demonstration of how to employ intercanonical readings of texts in the process of theological interpretation would have been helpful. Finally, in his theological interpretation Williams employs an inter-catholic conversation, dialoguing with other communities of faith. This component of theological interpretation is a means of testing one's exegetical conclusions, and it contributes to the broader theological discussion. He demonstrates this inter-catholic conversation in chapters 7–8.

Williams's treatment of salvation passages in 1 Peter in chapters 2–6 is very helpful. He offers grammatical, contextual, theological, and lexical analysis of the many passages he exegetes in this section. He clearly develops the flow of thought in the passages he covers, and he presents key exegetical questions, gives the options for their interpretation, and then gives the evidence supporting the various options, demonstrating why he favors the option he does. I have chosen not to spend much time on these chapters in this review, but that is not because they are not valuable. Anyone exegeting one of the salvation passages in 1 Peter, including the *crux interpretum* 3:18–4:6, would benefit from Williams's work in chapters 2–6.

I would like to use the rest of this review to go into more detail concerning Williams's inter-catholic conversation in chapters 7–8. Chapter 7, which seeks to bring the teaching on divine election in 1 Peter into conversation with the concerns of systematic theology, begins with a discussion of the trinitarian basis of election. In this section Williams interacts with Barth's view that primarily God elected or predestined himself, and as a result all are objectively elect in Christ but all are not subjectively called by the Spirit. Williams shows that in 1 Peter all are not elect, and the elect are those who come to faith in Christ and experience the Spirit's consecrating action. Williams proceeds to discuss whether election is conditional or unconditional, the meaning of election in Christ, whether election is individual or communal, and whether predestination is double. He concludes his discussion of each of these theological issues with the teaching of 1 Peter on it. In chapter 8 Williams presents various theories of the atonement and concludes his discussion of each with 1 Peter's teaching on it. The theories of the atonement, or the meaning and significance of the death of Jesus, that he covers are Jesus' death as victory, Jesus' death as ransom, Jesus' death as sacrifice, Jesus' death as penal substitution, Jesus' death as reconciliation, and Jesus' death as example. He analyzes each in light of the teaching of 1 Peter, and he concludes, "While the different models complement each other, the penal substitution model must be seen as central, for, as we have seen, without it the other metaphors make little sense" (p. 272).

This book is readable, exegetical, theological, and is characterized by clear discussion and reasonable conclusions. It is an excellent scholarly treatment of the salvation passages in 1 Peter, and, as the dust jacket says, "it will be a valuable re-

source for students and scholars interested in the exegesis and theology of 1 Peter, the doctrine of salvation, and biblical interpretation.”

W. Edward Glenny  
Northwestern College, St. Paul, MN

*A New Testament Biblical Theology: The Unfolding of the Old Testament in the New.* By G. K. Beale. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2011, xxiv+1047 pp., \$54.99.

Gregory Beale has written an important book on biblical theology which concentrates on the NT contribution to the teaching of the whole Bible. The book's twenty-eight chapters of various lengths dispersed among ten sections are filled with helpful expositions of OT and NT texts that, while offering scholars food for thought, will help preachers and students “keep their finger on the text.” Readers will want to use the indices to find discussions of their particular interest. The author says his audiences include serious Christian readers and college or graduate theological students. The size of the book might put off the former. Part of the reason for the extensive length is the abundant quotation of long Scripture passages.

About the only people who will read this book from cover to cover will be reviewers. In fact, I took the author's suggestion and read the conclusion first. The book functions somewhat like an encyclopedia with self-contained chapters written by one person and centered around one theme, which is repeated throughout and which comes to completion in the conclusion. Beale uses the term “story” to define this theme, and each section of chapters except the conclusion contains the word “story” or “storyline.” The story is that “Jesus's life, trials, death for sinners, and especially resurrection by the Spirit have launched the fulfillment of the eschatological already-not yet new-creational reign, bestowed by grace through faith and resulting in worldwide commission to the faithful to advance this new-creational reign and resulting in judgment for the unbelieving, unto the triune God's glory” (pp. 16, 23, etc.).

The conclusion brings together in relatively short sections the various themes developed earlier, although in some places it offers new texts or arguments to support ideas previously expounded. These themes are expounded in the following categories: “The Old Testament Reality,” “The Corresponding Inaugurated End-Time Reality,” and “The Consummated End-Time Reality.” In many ways the conclusion borders on being a systematic theology as it begins with the Latter Days, followed by discussion of the New Creation and the Kingdom, a King and Kingdom, Israel's Return from Exile and moving through themes such as Reconciliation, Salvation and Justification, the Role of the Spirit, the Resurrection, Mission, Christ the Image of God, Covenant, Sabbath, Baptism, the Communal Meal, etc.

The conclusion exemplifies Beale's intent. It is not to write a standard NT theology that discusses the contribution of each NT text to the meaning of the whole. Rather, his intention is to write a NT biblical theology. In other words, he wants to expound the NT as the conclusion of the revelation that was begun in the OT.

In spite of asserting the impossibility of writing a complete NT biblical theology that deals with every text, Beale has produced a book of nearly a thousand pages. This is my first little quibble with the book; it is too long for a monograph, yet as a textbook it might be a bit incomplete (especially in the development of OT themes). It might have been better to write a series of shorter volumes based on various themes or to have written a multi-volume work according to the standard format of NT theologies with volumes devoted to the Gospels, Paul, and General Writings. As it stands, because of its length the book is a bit incoherent and difficult to wade through. The author has attempted to mitigate the incoherence by repeating his major theme often, which adds to the length of the book. In addition, the style is a bit verbose. I think some careful editing of sentences and paragraphs here and there could have shortened the book a bit and made it easier to persevere to the end.

These negative comments do not negate the great value of the book and its ideas. In fact, this book should not be neglected by anyone serious about the notion of the theology of the whole Bible or of the NT for that matter. It carries on the program begun in modern times by C. H. Dodd in *According to the Scriptures: The Sub-structure of New Testament Theology* (New York: Scribner, 1953). Beale has done a masterful job of showing that the NT functions as a conclusion to earlier revelation. He addresses what for his purposes are the major themes of the OT, but more, he treats the OT as a story without a conclusion: "The main elements of the OT plotline become the basis for the formulation of the NT storyline" (p. 6). The book also highlights some of the ways the themes of the OT developed in early Judaism and how early Judaism may have influenced (positively or negatively) the NT.

One of the chief notions the book uses is the concept highlighted by many previous authors, namely, the already-not yet fulfillment of the OT. The NT sees the OT as promise. The promise is fulfilled now in the person of Jesus and in the church, but it is not yet fulfilled and will not be until Jesus returns in glory. Only then will the story be complete. Beale continually wrestles with this theme (note for example the excursus "The Issue of Analogy or Fulfillment"; p. 772), trying to discern how much is fulfilled now and how much will not be fulfilled until the second coming. The answer to this question determines in many ways if one should be characterized as a dispensationalist or covenant theologian. Beale falls on the covenant side of the fence.

Another theme that pervades the book is the kingdom of the new creation. This is built on the understanding of Genesis 1–3 and the various "exile and return" passages of the OT, finding its culmination in Revelation. Beale has written previously on the temple in the Bible, which melds with the theme of new creation.

Perhaps, the best way to conclude this review is to highlight one biblical theme from one chapter as an example of how other themes are handled. Chapter 23 discusses the Sabbath. The Sabbath is founded in and based upon the "rest" of God in Gen 2:3. This is a creational ordinance for all humanity that is applied to Israel by the fourth commandment, "Remember the Sabbath to keep it holy." The NT picks up this notion of Sabbath most noticeably in Hebrews 3–4. This passage, Beale argues, refers only to the final rest into which believers enter at the end of

age. He admits that the passage is difficult and controversial. Though Hebrews uses rest to refer to the consummation rest and not to a present rest, Beale argues that believers still must practice the Sabbath because it is a creational mandate and not one for Israel only. Israel's Sabbath celebrations, as all its ceremonial laws, were types of the Messiah yet to come. Therefore the church does not celebrate Sabbath in the same way as Israel. Christians still must keep Sabbath, but the day Christians must "rest" is Sunday, the first day of the week. The reason for this is that Jesus entered the rest of God on the day of his resurrection. Christians, on the first day of the week, should imitate the saints of Revelation who worship the Lamb on the throne. The ceasing from work is not a necessary part of the Christian celebration of Sabbath on the first day of the week.

Beale notes that his statement on Christian Sabbath is a biblical-theological conclusion because there is no explicit statement that says Christ achieved a latter-day rest and that Christians also participate in that rest in him. It might be better to say that this is a possible inference rather than a conclusion. This is a point, as noted above, where the book moves closer to systematic theology. Likewise Beale notes there is no exegetical evidence as to why the Sabbath has moved from Saturday to Sunday for Christians. There is no doubt that the earliest Christians met on Sunday to worship. Did they view this as the Christian Sabbath? There is no evidence, at least in the NT. It is another inference, one that many would doubt.

There are many points in the book where Beale does not rely on inference, so that the discussion of Sabbath should not color one's view of the book as a whole. Nevertheless, this discussion points to a caution for readers that not every conclusion drawn in the book has an equal amount of textual evidence.

All in all, as noted above, this book should be on the shelf of every NT scholar and on the shelves and on the desks of many preachers and students. There is a lot to be gleaned here for the good of the church.

David H. Johnson

Providence University College and Theological Seminary, Otterburne, MB

*Miracles: The Credibility of the New Testament Accounts.* By Craig S. Keener. 2 vols. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2011, xxxviii + 1172 pp., \$59.99.

This work started as a footnote to the author's forthcoming four-volume commentary on Acts (p. 4). Not finding the kinds of books he needed to draw on for his projected discussions of Acts' historiography and miracle passages, he found himself compiling information on his own. These two thick volumes are the result. Keener also describes it as "something of a companion volume" (p. 5) to his *The Historical Jesus of the Gospels* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009). In a word, since so much in the NT relates to miracle accounts and since so little has been done to sustain a pair of arguments that Keener feels must be pressed at the current time (see especially p. 13), Keener has shouldered the load himself.

The two arguments (see p. 1 and *passim*) are these. First: "Eyewitnesses do offer miracle claims, a thesis simple enough but one sometimes neglected when some

scholars approach accounts in the Gospels.” Keener catalogs these claims, not only in the NT (and frequently the OT) but also throughout the major periods of church history and then, remarkably, across a very wide range of the terrain of the whole earth in recent times. Chapters 8–12 are particularly pertinent to his first argument. The second argument is: “Supernatural explanations, while not suitable in every case, should be welcome on the scholarly table along with other explanations often discussed.” Chapters 5–6 (on Hume) and 13–15 (on causes, criticism, and more cases of miracles) are most central to his second argument. Keener feels that his book sustains the first argument so compellingly that disagreement will prove virtually untenable. He is aware that his second argument will meet stiffer resistance and indeed will not find acceptance in many cases. Yet this will not be for lack of rigor and thoroughness on Keener’s part.

After nearly 40 pages of front matter and a meaty 17-page introduction, Keener offers part 1, which consists of three chapters on “The Ancient Evidence.” The first chapter looks at the basic evidence and claims surrounding Jesus’ miracles. The point is to crystallize the “methodological questions” (pp. 33–34) that this book seeks to address and, where needed, refine. Chapter 2 looks at “Ancient Miracle Claims Outside Christianity,” while chapter 3 compares early Christian miracle claims with rival claims originating elsewhere in antiquity. Keener does not try to rule out the possibility of miracles occurring outside the Christian sphere, but he does point to “the dramatic and distinctive emphasis on miracles in the early Christian community” (p. 34) when compared with both Jewish and non-Jewish sources.

Part 2 consists of three chapters and asks, “Are Miracles Possible?” Chapter 4 sketches skepticism toward miracles in both ancient and modern times. Modern skepticism is not new so much in kind as in degree, with the “radical Enlightenment paradigm” (p. 106) attaining a comprehensive and dogmatic status that could fairly be termed draconian. Yet Keener notes that “a global context seriously weakens the persuasive force of these traditional objections today” (p. 106). Chapter 5 gives Hume himself a thorough exposition (pp. 107–70), finding his arguments largely circular. That is, for his skepticism “to succeed logically his approach must *presuppose* atheism or deism” and does not therefore deserve the honor often accorded it of “a neutral argument” (p. 108; *emphasis original*). Chapter 6 looks at other Humean arguments as well as the resultant “philosophic tradition against miracles” (p. 172) linked with his name. Keener shows that “the traditional radical Enlightenment prejudice against miracles rested on philosophic premises regarding nature that have since broken down” (p. 207).

Part 3 takes up “Miracle Accounts beyond Antiquity.” Hume (and later Troeltsch) banked heavily on the principle of analogy to discredit biblical miracle claims. In their worlds, miracles did not occur. Therefore, they never could have occurred anywhere at any time. Keener shows that today “hundreds of millions of people claim to have witnessed miracles” (p. 209). Not all such claims are true, Keener frequently notes. However, a preponderance of evidence now exists that Troeltschian analogy should no longer enjoy the lockdown status it has long enjoyed in many historical-critical methodologies.

Part 3, the longest of the book's four parts, consists of six chapters. Chapter 7 takes up the issue of "Majority World Perspectives" and lays out how Keener will approach this topic. Chapter 8 looks at examples of miracle claims from Asia; chapter 9 at claims from Africa, Latin America, and the Caribbean; chapter 10 at "Supernaturalism in Earlier Church History" from patristic times to the early twentieth century; and chapter 11 at "Supernatural Claims in the Recent West." Chapter 12, the longest in the book, weighs in at nearly 100 pages and treats "Blindness, Inability to Walk, Death, and Nature: Some Dramatic Reports." While not all of the reports in these chapters can be certified as true, many can be and have been. Keener observes that biblical scholars "who still write as if all such claims in antiquity must be legendary write as if in a social vacuum, oblivious to overwhelming testimony against their assumptions" (p. 506).

That such phenomena occur and can be documented is, Keener concludes, indisputable. The question that remains is: "How can investigators explain such phenomena?" (p. 599) The final section, part 4, looks at "Proposed Explanations." Chapter 13 takes up "Nonsupernatural Causes" and presents such compelling evidence, Keener thinks, that "even an atheist could affirm that many people believed themselves healed and experienced recovery through Jesus' and his first followers' ministry" (p. 644). Chapter 14 turns up the heat on skeptics, raises the matter of "Biased Standards?" and observes that many scholars follow a procedure that "will never acknowledge any evidence for supernatural activity" as the result of "rules designed from the start to exclude such evidence" (p. 711). This claim is richly documented, for example, in "Prejudice in the Academy?" (pp. 688–704), which all Christian students pursuing academic biblical or theological studies would do well to read carefully. Just one of many notable upshots: "Since science does not claim comprehensive knowledge of the universe, it cannot conclusively demonstrate that particular miracle claims are outside the realm of natural possibility," nor can it in principle exclude the possibility of supernatural activity in connection with those claims (p. 703). Yet many biblical scholars claiming the sanction of "science" continue to operate in this fashion.

Chapter 15 concludes part 4 with "More Extranormal Cases." There are many powerful examples of observed, apparently miraculous events here. Keener has shrewdly left many of his best examples until last to help clinch, he hopes, earlier sections of the book. One finds here, for example, the reminder that well-known philosopher of science at Biola University J. P. Moreland, "who had long moved in cessationist circles, was astonished to find himself instantly healed in answer to prayer" (p. 732). (For Keener's brief discussion on cessationist views and the question of miracles, see pp. 260–62.) Since that time Moreland and others report additional healings of various kinds, some in their own church. Keener even goes out on a limb professionally and responds to Hume's two-fold claim that: (1) only direct experience could count in favor of a miracle; and (2) credible witnesses with much to lose by testifying are unlikely to step forward with convincing information. Keener relates extranormal or miraculous events known to those close to him (like his wife) or to him personally (pp. 732–39). A major point of the chapter, and of part 4 overall, is that from weather changes to minor healings to major healings to

some three hundred cases of dead people returning to life, Keener has documented to varying degrees “a significant number of instant, nonpsychosomatic healings [or weather shifts, or other anomalies] after prayer, with prayer being a common factor” (p. 759). Keener reasons, “In these cases, supernatural explanations should be respected as one viable interpretive option among genuinely open-minded academics” (p. 759).

Conceptually, the book concludes on a dual note. “Conclusion” (pp. 761–65) is a free (as opposed to woodenly methodical) restatement of the whole book’s major findings and claims. Added to this is a “Concluding Unscientific Postscript” (p. 766–68), a gripping, brief reflection of where Keener’s findings leave him now in a world where, he thinks, God can and does work miracles—but where most human need typically goes unmet, where suffering and corruption are rampant, and where he wants to cry out, “Where is the God of Elijah?” (p. 767), not by way of accusation but as a longing for a brighter day. On this same page is a fine, one-paragraph avowal of the limitations of miracles, in biblical times and ours, and an affirmation of the cross as “the necessary gateway to the resurrection” as well as the key to understanding God’s kingdom, as miracles may “reveal the God of the cross.”

While this book is, then, rich in evidence, it is by no means a formally “evidentialist” approach to the miracle question but one that retains ample space for theology, or, one could say, the presence and work of the triune God in his power and wisdom that far exceed our own either to observe sometimes or to explain at any time. Keener is offering testimony (with backing) rather than claiming to present irrefragible proofs. The book combines broad (and often deep) knowledge of and sensitivity to the vast breadth and subtlety of issues that need to be considered to give miracle claims, ancient and modern, the thorough airing they deserve in the current climate.

Five valuable appendices extend the book’s utility: “Demons and Exorcisms in Antiquity”; “Spirit Possession and Exorcism in Societies Today”; “Comparisons with Later Christian Hagiography”; “Ancient Approaches to Natural Law”; and “Visions and Dreams.” The book ends with nearly 300 pages of bibliography and indexes.

Like, say, Eckhard Schnabel’s two-volume *Early Christian Mission* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 2004) in its field, Keener’s work on miracles will prove the standard work of its generation and perhaps several to come. It sustains two clear and important theses with effective organization, meticulous scholarship, passionate concentration, and gravity (though without the author taking himself with undue seriousness). A brief review cannot suffice adequately to commend this study, which given its massive scope and speed of production might even qualify as a mini-miracle in itself (a category, one admits, not found in the book). Whether those most in need of considering Keener’s arguments (i.e. skeptically inclined biblical scholars) will deign to read them may, sadly, be doubted. Yet even this, Keener’s book shows, can surely be hoped for in light of God’s ongoing unusual operations underway at all times around the globe and often in connection with his people’s faith and prayers. Therein may lie one of the book’s major challenges for

those convinced by Keener's arguments that miracles did and do happen: since they do, why do we not pray more frequently and fervently that they will?

Robert W. Yarbrough  
Covenant Theological Seminary, St. Louis, MO

*Purgatory: The Logic of Total Transformation.* By Jerry L. Walls. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012, xiv + 211 pp., \$35.00.

Jerry L. Walls is without embarrassment a Protestant who believes in purgatory. And his most recent book, *Purgatory: The Logic of Total Transformation*, which finishes his trilogy on the afterlife, is his theological apologetic for it.

Walls begins with a detailed survey of the history of purgatory, starting with pagan philosophers, moving next to a very brief treatment of the biblical text (specifically highlighting what texts advocates have appealed to), then tracing the doctrine from the patristic period to the twenty-first century. Though Walls admits that purgatory was not officially affirmed until the Second Council of Lyons (1274), he is convinced that the doctrine has a rich heritage prior to Lyons.

Chapter two evaluates Protestant objections to purgatory, including both Reformed and Wesleyan traditions. Walls's rejection of the Reformed view is no surprise, but what is fascinating is his critique of his own Wesleyan heritage. Walls believes that adopting purgatory resolves the tension in Wesleyanism between the need to reach entire sanctification and instant glorification at death. The Wesleyan affirmation of glorification as a unilateral, instantaneous act of God at death smacks of Calvinism. Rather, argues Walls, would Wesleyanism not be more consistent to affirm purgatory, whereby the sinner continues his cooperation with God until he reaches entire sanctification? Walls is dumbfounded by John Wesley's reasons for rejecting purgatory, namely, Wesley agreed with his Reformed counterparts that the doctrine is "contrary to Scripture and antiquity." Furthermore, for Wesley, justification meant that there no longer is condemnation; therefore, the believer is justified when he leaves this world and will have nothing laid at his charge in the life hereafter. Walls rebukes Wesley for thinking of salvation primarily in terms of justification.

But lest we think the advocacy of purgatory is uniform, Walls reminds us in the third chapter that there are three views: (1) the satisfaction model, (2) the satisfaction/sanctification model, and (3) the sanctification model. In the satisfaction model, guilt may be cleansed by contrition, but punishment remains and must be dealt with; hence, the need for punishment not only in this life, but also in purgatory, where one will finish paying the penalty (making atonement) for sins committed after baptism. Walls rejects this first view not because it is inconsistent with Scripture but because it has no ecumenical potential since even Protestants who deny the imputation of Christ's righteousness still affirm that "the gift of salvation through Christ pardons them of sin in such a way that they are no longer required to pay any sort of debt of punishment" (p. 69). Also, in this first view, though there

is a debt to be paid, nevertheless, at death the soul is still perfect. Walls considers such a tension “morally dubious” and “incoherent.”

In the satisfaction/sanctification model, the payment of debt is the means by which God cleanses the soul and makes it spiritually healthy. This view tries to have it both ways, because the metaphors of cleansing/healing *and* debt/payment are adopted. Walls’s critique is multi-faceted: (1) This view fares hardly better for ecumenical dialogue, since Protestants will reject any notion of punishment to satisfy debt. (2) The correlation between satisfaction and sanctification is problematic, because a person may be healed of character flaws but still have to endure to pay a sufficient penalty, or vice versa. (3) It is questionable that embracing a punishment is a sufficient condition for sanctification. (4) Advocates of this model affirm that pain in purgatory is worse than pain in this life. But for Walls, such an overwhelming amount of pain would negate the person’s libertarian free-will response, which is necessary if one must experience genuine transformation. Freely cooperating is essential, says Walls, otherwise why would God not perfect all souls when they die? (5) Last, it is not clear how this model accommodates indulgences.

The sanctification model is the one that Walls adopts. According to this view, one does not suffer in purgatory to pay a moral debt or to “complete penance in order to satisfy divine justice” (p. 82); rather, suffering occurs to grow one into perfection. Walls argues that such a view “is not in any way incompatible with Protestant accounts of justification by faith.” By analogy, Walls appeals to the fictional character of Ebenezer Scrooge in Charles Dickens’s *A Christmas Carol*. Dickens, a wretched, self-centered man, is slowly transformed in character when three spirits help “him to see others in ways he had not been able to before” (p. 85). Walls concludes that in his model, Protestants should not hesitate to pray for the dead and their sanctification.

While Walls’s case for purgatory explores other territory as well (e.g., ch. 4: “Personal Identity, Time, and Purgatory”), I must focus my attention on perhaps Walls’s most dramatic modification of the doctrine in chapter five, namely, purgatory and the opportunity for a “second chance” at salvation (i.e. postmortem conversion). Walls argues that if lost sinners have multiple opportunities before death to repent, why not after death as well? Furthermore, if God truly loves all people, is he not willing to extend every opportunity? If not, argues Walls, is God truly willing to save them? Assuming Molinism as well as an Arminian view of divine love, Walls concludes that “optimal grace” implies that “God is not content with merely giving everyone some chance for salvation, but desires to give everyone every opportunity” (p. 129).

But perhaps Walls is most shocking of all not merely in his affirmation of postmortem conversion, but postmortem purgatorial apostasy as well. In other words, a believer in purgatory may very well lose his salvation: Rather than progressing to heaven, he may digress to hell! After all, “if we allow for people to turn to God after death, is there any good reason to think they cannot likewise turn away from him?” (p. 147). Drawing from his Wesleyan-Arminian tradition, Walls places great weight on libertarian freedom at this point, arguing that the believer can resist “the demand for sanctification and transformation in purgatory and turn

away from God” (p. 147). Walls concedes that his view is “somewhat speculative,” but this does not bother him because “Scripture simply does not give us detailed information either way on this question, and the best we can do is lay out the view that seems most likely, given what we think scripture does clearly teach” (p. 150).

How should evangelicals respond to Walls’s proposal? And is Walls’s version of purgatory an option for evangelicals? In response, the answer must be an unwavering “no” for a variety of reasons.

First, and most importantly, purgatory is *never* affirmed, either explicitly or implicitly, by the biblical text. On the other hand, Scripture *does* affirm, both explicitly and implicitly, that the soul of the believer goes directly and immediately into the presence of God at death, thereby precluding the existence of purgatory. Several texts stand out in this regard. In 2 Corinthians 5:1–10, Paul addresses our heavenly home and explains that while we are at home in the body we are away from the Lord. However, we “would rather be away from the body and at home with the Lord” (v. 8). In other words, the intermediate state is one in which the soul of the believer goes to be with the Lord immediately upon death. Paul makes the same point in Phil 1:21–23, though this time he is far more personal. “For to me to live is Christ, and to die is gain. If I am to live in the flesh, that means fruitful labor for me. Yet which I shall choose I cannot tell. I am hard pressed between the two. My desire is to depart and be with Christ, for that is far better.” Again, to depart from the body in this life is to go to be with Christ. This is the hope of every believer, for it is much better.

Paul’s teaching here is consistent with narrative passages as well. Perhaps the most explicit passage is Luke 23:43. As the crucified Jesus is dying on the cross, one of the two criminals next to him cries out, “Jesus, remember me when you come into your kingdom.” Jesus responds, “Truly, I say to you, today you will be with me in Paradise.” What is so remarkable is how this passage directly contradicts Walls’s view of purgatory. For Walls, purgatory is necessary because the believer is a sinner in need of completing his sanctification, which for even the most holy of saints can only be finished in purgatory. But here on the cross hangs a criminal who has lived his entire life in disobedience. It is only in his last minutes during execution that he repents and trusts in Christ. And yet, Jesus promises him that today he will be with him in Paradise. Not only does this passage demonstrate that the believer goes immediately and directly to be with the Lord upon death, but it also demonstrates that a purgation period after death, even for those who repented at death and therefore never experienced a life of sanctification, is unnecessary; they are ushered directly into heaven. The need for purgatory is nowhere to be found in Luke 23:43.

The same truth is evident in Stephen’s martyrdom. Being put to death for his faith in Christ, Stephen cries out as he is being stoned, “Lord Jesus, receive my spirit” (Acts 7:59). Surely Stephen understood that his death was at hand and that the moment had come for him to meet his Savior. As with the criminal, so too with Stephen: his spirit went to be with the Lord immediately upon death (cf. Ps 17:15).

Finally, the author of Hebrews gives us insight. Hebrews 12 affirms that believers “have come to Mount Zion and to the city of the living God, the heavenly

Jerusalem, and to innumerable angels in festal gathering, and to the assembly of the firstborn who are enrolled in heaven, and to God, the judge of all, and to the spirits of the righteous made perfect” (Heb 12:22–23). The assembly to which the author refers is the one in heaven, consisting of people who have died already and are in the presence of the living God. Here we have a glimpse into the heavenly realm, and what we see there is that those who have died in faith are with the Lord. The spirits of the righteous, referring to old and new covenant saints, await their resurrected bodies, but in this time period in between death and resurrection they are present with God.

Before moving on, it should be noted that, for Walls, it is unproblematic if Scripture is silent on the issue. Quoting J. F. X. Ceveltello and W. E. Hayes, both of whom state that purgatory is tradition-based not Scripture-based, Walls even acknowledges that defenders of purgatory have no biblical grounds. However, for him, Scripture’s silence demonstrates that Scripture neither precludes purgatory. While one expects such concessions from Roman Catholics, given their denial of *sola Scriptura*, it is shocking to hear the same admission from a Protestant. Walls concludes that “there is no direct way to settle the issue by straightforward biblical exegesis of isolated texts.” I disagree, as have Protestants since the sixteenth-century Reformation. As briefly seen above, there is ample biblical evidence that the believer does not enter a purgatory cleansing period, but rather goes directly and immediately to be with the Lord. Scripture, in other words, is far from silent.

As for a second reason Protestants should not embrace his view, Walls’s theological method is misguided. For Walls, because Scripture is silent, the case for purgatory must be made by testing whether purgatory follows from other doctrines (p. 56). However, he never makes a biblical-theological case for these corresponding doctrines; rather, he simply assumes they are true and then concludes that purgatory must follow. It is hard to see how Walls avoids the classical fallacy of “begging the question” (*petitio principii*).

One example will suffice. Walls assumes libertarian freedom to be true in his argument for purgatory (pp. 56–57). However, not only does Walls caricature the Reformed view—which, correctly understood, sees election, regeneration, and glorification as unilateral and monergistic, but views sanctification as involving a human willful and active cooperation (via “freedom of inclination,” which the Reformed see as compatible with divine sovereignty)—but he fails to make the case for “undetermined” or contra-causal (libertarian) freedom anywhere in his book. This is a problem because Walls simply *assumes* a Wesleyan-Arminian view of sanctification—where God’s persuasive efforts are dependent upon man’s libertarian freedom, whereby he either progresses in godliness or digresses towards apostasy—then, based on this assumption, Walls concludes that man must continue his libertarian free-will cooperation with God in purgatory until he reaches perfection. Anything less (i.e. unilateral glorification at death) and God would fail to respect man’s libertarian freedom.

What we see here is a problematic theological method: (1) Walls assumes certain theological beliefs without testing them against Scripture. (2) He then allows these theological assumptions to drive him to certain conclusions regarding purga-

tory and post-mortem salvation. The danger is this: if one's theological assumptions are unbiblical, applying those unbiblical assumptions to other areas of theology (in this case, the afterlife) can also lead to unbiblical conclusions. To clarify, while it is a completely valid theological endeavor to ask how other *loci* influence what we believe about the afterlife, these *loci* themselves must be defended as biblical in the first place, lest we run the risk of importing an unbiblical system into our understanding of the afterlife.

Third, Walls not only opens the evangelical door to purgatory, but he then argues that the doctrine itself demands post-mortem conversion or apostasy. For Walls, such a view is perfectly acceptable because Scripture is silent on the issue. Scripture, however, repeatedly teaches that the souls of unbelievers go directly and immediately to eternal punishment at death, thereby precluding post-mortem conversion. For example, the author of Hebrews affirms "it is appointed for man to die once, and after that comes judgment" (Heb 9:27). Walls protests that this text never specifies when this judgment occurs and, furthermore, it is likely to occur not at death but at the end of the world (p. 145). However, Walls misses the point. The text directly connects death to the final judgment (even if it be at the end of the world), giving no indication that there is an intermediate period for post-mortem conversion. The same is true in Luke 16:19–31, the teaching of Jesus in which the rich man dies and goes directly to Hades where he is tormented; in contrast, Lazarus is with Abraham. Jesus assumes the Jewish belief that upon death, the soul of the wicked man is sentenced to irreversible torment, while the soul of the righteous man goes to be with the Lord. Additionally, a number of texts (Matt 25:31–46; Rom 2:5–10; 2 Cor 5:10) show that our final judgment is based on what we have done in this present life, *not* on deeds or choices committed after death.

Moreover, Walls ignores the doctrine of original sin in his assumption that all people deserve a second chance at salvation after death. Scripture, however, teaches that all of us are born into this world as children of Adam, so that by nature we are children of wrath (Eph 2:1–3; cf. Rom 5:12–21). As Paul argues at length, no one is righteous but everyone stands guilty before God, condemned, and deserving nothing but eternal punishment and condemnation (Rom 1:18–3:20). God owes no sinner a "second chance"; indeed, the only thing God owes the sinner is justice, giving him the due for his evil deeds.

Moreover, Walls undermines Christian assurance in his affirmation of post-mortem purgatorial apostasy. Not only is such a view entirely speculative and contrary to everything Scripture teaches about the preservation of the believer (e.g. John 6:38–40; 10:27–29; Rom 8:30; Eph 1:13–14; 1 Pet 1:5); it also kills Christian assurance by leaving open the real possibility that though one was a believer in one's earthly life, in purgatory one may turn away from the Savior and enter into hell forever. Indeed, even when Walls tries to reassure the reader that this is unlikely, his reasoning is based on human intelligence (i.e. there are "far deeper and more intelligible motivations for choosing God than for choosing against him"; p. 148), rather than the omnipotence of God who promises to bring to completion the salvation he first began (Phil 1:6).

Fourth, it is questionable whether Walls's version of purgatory escapes the charge of works-righteousness. He believes that his sanctification model of purgatory—which is not “about satisfying divine justice or paying a debt of punishment” but rather a “matter of continuing and completing the process of sanctification” (p. 87)—in no way violates the sufficiency of Christ's atonement nor *sola fide* as the Roman Catholic satisfaction model does. But has Walls escaped such a charge simply by making purgatory about sanctification rather than satisfaction (justification)? The reason the Reformers rejected the punitive or satisfaction model was because it made the cross of Christ insufficient and made justification dependent upon one's ongoing works of righteousness (Calvin, *Institutes*, 3.5.6.). But what Walls misses is that the sufficiency of Christ's work not only impacts justification but sanctification as well. The believer need not fret over finishing his sanctification via suffering in purgatory because his salvation rests not in how perfect he can become before entering heaven, but rather in the all-sufficient life and death of Christ. Do not miss my emphasis on the *life* of Christ: Christ not only paid the penalty for our sins, but he lived the perfect, sanctified life of obedience that we could never live and he did so in our place, earning righteousness for us. What Walls ignores is that purgatory is not only unnecessary because of Christ's *passive* obedience, but because of his *active* obedience as well (e.g. Phil 3:9; 1 Cor 1:30; Rom 5:19; Matt 3:15).

I am not convinced that Luther and Calvin's protest against purgatory as a means of salvation by works is entirely escaped by Walls's view simply because he places the emphasis on sanctification rather than satisfaction. The believer in Walls's purgatory is still left with the incredible burden that he must somehow perform enough good works (by his own libertarian freedom) to attain God's favor to let him into heaven. Until the believer earns that perfection in purgatory, heaven is kept at bay. Certainly this still smells of salvation by works, even if it be coated differently.

Fifth, rather than being governed by the biblical text, Walls is driven by an ecumenical agenda. At the end of the book, Walls reveals his motives: His aim in adopting purgatory, at least in part, is to bridge the gulf between Protestants and Catholics (p. 178). However, as I have sought to show, Protestants committed to *sola Scriptura* cannot walk across this bridge. Evangelicals do not share a common belief with Catholics in the doctrine of purgatory (nor in any modification of it) first and foremost because the doctrine is not only absent from Scripture, but contrary to Scripture.

To conclude, with the five hundredth anniversary of the Reformation nearly upon us (2017), the question must be asked: Is the Reformation over? The answer is “No.” And Walls's book is a case in point. While the Reformers were able to unite with one another against the Roman Catholic Church of their day, in our own day evangelical Protestants have no such luxury. Not only is our battle with those outside, but our battle is within, namely, with those in our own ranks who claim the evangelical label. What a shock it would have been to Luther and Calvin to see evangelicals not only ignoring our differences with Roman Catholics on issues as

large as justification by faith alone, but even going so far as to adopt Roman Catholic doctrines such as purgatory.

Matthew Barrett  
California Baptist University, Riverside, CA

*Beyond Evangelicalism: The Theological Methodology of Stanley J. Grenz*. By Steven Knowles. Farnham: Ashgate, 2010, 213 pp., \$99.95.

This book by Steven Knowles, Lecturer in Theology at the University of Chester, examines Stanley J. Grenz's work on theological methodology as it relates to his alleged non-foundationalist methodology and his attempting to "re-position" evangelical theology in line with postmodern concerns. Knowles's assessment and critique of Grenz's methodology concludes that his work goes beyond evangelicalism.

Grenz authored or co-authored more than twenty-five books and approximately eighty journal articles covering a wide range of theological topics. *Beyond Evangelicalism* is not a comprehensive overview of all of his theology but specifically focused on the issue of Grenz's work that caused some significant controversy— theological methodology.

Knowles claims that Grenz, in attempting to engage with developments of postmodern theory, adapted his methodology accordingly. Some scholars have claimed that Grenz was too accommodating toward postmodernism, whereas others are more sympathetic. Knowles opines that although Grenz is correct to employ certain aspects of postmodern thought, too often his analysis and appropriation of key areas is uncritical. I think the point is actually less an issue of Grenz being uncritical and more of an issue of his simplistic understanding of postmodernism and his being convinced of the importance and implications of certain postmodern theories.

The five chapters of the book are arranged to help answer the question: Does Grenz go beyond the boundaries of evangelicalism in his attempt to engage with various element of postmodern theory? The chapters are organized to trace the key issues (ch. 1), influences (chs. 2 and 3), and developments (ch. 4) in Grenz's thought before evaluating and answering the above question (ch. 5).

Chapter one introduces three key features of postmodernism—the demise of metanarratives, deconstruction, and the postmodern (de-centered) self. These three characteristics offer a good introduction to the general developments with postmodern theory, and each has generated significant reaction, mostly negative or dismissive, within evangelicalism. By many evangelicals, these three "postmodern traits" have been considered to be a threat to theological presuppositions with which they operate. Each of these three features is considered more positively by Grenz in his theological methodological developments.

Chapters two and three examine the significant influence that the works of Ludwig Wittgenstein and George Lindbeck had on Grenz. Wittgenstein's influence on Grenz was his theory of language that, according to Knowles, focused more on

showing how language should be understood in a particular context and having meaning according to its context and time as opposed to being understood as correspondence to reality that can be transposed across cultures. Lindbeck's influence on Grenz was his "cultural-linguistic" approach to theology, which Grenz employs in his methodology. When Grenz writes that "religions produce religious experience rather than merely being an expression of it" (Stanley J. Grenz and John R. Franke, *Beyond Foundationalism* [Philadelphia: Westminster John Knox, 2001] 49), he is relying on Lindbeck's view of doctrine as a second-order discourse, which is the grammar that rules how talk about God could be done.

Chapter four, taking up nearly half the book (ninety pages), is a substantial chronological engagement with Grenz's methodological developments. By attending to his methodology in this manner, Knowles claims that readers can see the gradual shifts in Grenz's epistemological outlook from more traditionally Baptist, evangelical, and rationalistic to "more experiential" and nonfoundational. This chapter focuses on numerous works that allow access to an analysis of his methodological explorations: *Revisioning Evangelical Theology*, *Theology for the Community of God*, *A Primer on Postmodernism*, and *Renewing the Center*; however, the bulk of the attention is given to *Beyond Foundationalism*. Knowles scrutinizes the supposed nonfoundationalist methodology and concludes that the approach is not evangelical in the traditional sense.

Chapter five moves from description and analysis to a constructive proposal. Knowles proposes a form of critical realism, adapting ideas from John Searle and Alasdair MacIntyre, as a more convincing method to deal with the disparity between foundationalism and nonfoundationalism. His methodology employs speech-act theory and a "soft" Wittgensteinian theory of language. Knowles's proposal is not a disavowal of Grenz's methodology; rather, its goal is to take some of his proposals forward and offer alternatives to others. It is clear that Knowles appreciates Grenz and has learned from and been influenced by him.

While covering a large amount of Grenz's work that dealt with lots of postmodern theory, at no point does *Beyond Evangelicalism* seem verbose; indeed, it deserves praise for the clarity of its claim—that Grenz is beyond evangelicalism. Also, *Beyond Evangelicalism* provides a valuable service in presenting a gracious engagement with and critique of Grenz's methodology.

The book, however, is limited with regard to the scope of the argument. If Knowles is going to argue that Grenz is beyond evangelicalism, he must define "evangelicalism" well and in more than one paragraph, for two reasons: it is a debated term, and it is such an important part of the argument. Accordingly, "evangelicalism" must be unpacked in more than "its most generic sense" (p. 1). If Knowles argues that Grenz is beyond the boundaries of "evangelicalism," he should have examined the variety of interpretations of evangelicalism or at least articulated his own understanding and definition. The four distinctives of David Bebbington's Quadilateral of evangelicalism—conversionism, activism, biblicism, and crucicentrism—are broadly helpful, but each of those distinctives has a plethora of interpretations and applications. Knowles make a bold claim—that Grenz is beyond evangelicalism—but barely discusses evangelicalism. A further critique is

that Knowles treats only a third of Grenz's books in his evaluation of Grenz in relation to evangelicalism. The book would have been stronger if Knowles had not attempted to determine if Grenz was or was not beyond evangelicalism and dedicated that space instead to a more thorough reading of Grenz's theology. If one is to make that argument, then the terms must be defined and discussed in a more robust manner. Knowles did not accomplish what he set out to and claimed to do.

The strongest part of the book is chapter one. The presentation of three important and abstract concepts—meta-narratives, deconstruction, and the postmodern self—is masterful and well-written. It offers fruitful and constructive engagement with postmodern thinking for theology. Its strength is due to the fact that it does not discuss much of Grenz's delineation of postmodernism. In his conclusion to chapter one—and at various junctures throughout the book—Knowles acknowledges Grenz's inadequate understanding of postmodernism. Grenz argued that Christians should engage with postmodernism in order to articulate their faith better and more clearly to an audience influenced by postmodern sensibilities. However, his description of postmodernism is a distorted reductionism that simplifies much of its history, legacy, implications, theological presuppositions, anomalies, and theorists (e.g. Grenz, *A Primer on Postmodernism* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996]). Because of his distorted and oversimplified postmodernism, Grenz's works lack a sophisticated understanding of the theological horizon touched upon and opened up by postmodernism.

Despite Grenz's simplistic understanding of postmodernism, Knowles applauds him for seeing the opportunity for theological engagement with postmodern theory and continues the tradition Grenz helped lead. If one is interested in Grenz's influences (chs. 2 and 3), this book delivers, as Knowles traces the seminal influences on Grenz.

If one is interested, however, in Grenz's theology and methodology, this book leaves much to be desired. Chapter four is a biased reading of selected works from Grenz and seems intent on constructing of a caricature of Grenz as a thoroughly convinced "anti-foundationalist." One need not read all of Grenz's works to know that this label does not represent his theological method. With such an important weakness in the largest and most important chapter of the book, the conclusion (ch. 5) was more of the same from chapter four.

In chapter five, Knowles claims to have given "a detailed analysis of the developments of the thought of Stanley Grenz in regard to theological methodology, with a focus on the epistemological ramifications" (p. 181). Claiming this does not make it so. Much of Grenz's theology—particularly his doctrines of the Trinity, Scripture, eschatology, and the church—and its influence on his theological methodology, seems to be ignored. What is needed, and what Grenz offers, is a theological method that is conceived, shaped, and determined by the content of its confession. In other words, the concern of theology should shape and determine the method for doing theology. Evangelical theology needs to develop and maintain a theological paradigm and method dependent on the content it is intended to illumine. Grenz served evangelicalism in modeling this point, even though some may disagree with his doctrinal conclusions.

Knowles argues that Grenz employed certain aspects of postmodern thought uncritically and then “adapted his theological methodology accordingly” (p. 2). He charges Grenz with an “over-reliance on postmodern theory” (p. 163) and describes Grenz’s theological methodology as “sympathetic to postmodern influences” (p. 181). These are unclear claims and analysis of Grenz’s works. Knowles even goes so far as to label Grenz an “anti-realist” (p. 146), which is not true. Grenz sought to re-vision evangelical theological method in terms of what he often called the “chastened rationality” of postmodernity (Grenz, “Articulating the Christian Belief Mosaic: Theological Method After the Demise of Foundationalism,” in *Evangelical Futures: A Conversation on Theological Method* [ed. John G. Stackhouse; Grand Rapids: Baker, 2000] 108; *Beyond Foundationalism* 22–23; and *Renewing the Center: Evangelical Theology in a Post-Theological Era* [Grand Rapids: Baker, 2000] 169). A chastened rationality is very different from anti-realism. Surprisingly, the very corrective to Grenz’s theology that Knowles offers—soft foundationalism—is actually Grenz’s methodology (as underscored by Brian Harris, “Why Method Matters: Insights from the Theological Method of Stanley J. Grenz,” *Crucible* 2/1 [November 2009] 11).

Additionally, Knowles claims that Grenz relegated Scripture to the status of a “second-order” theological source (p. 154). This is also not true. According to Grenz’s methodology, Scripture is the main source for theology, and tradition and culture serve as formative factors (Harris, “Why Method Matters” 11). This is not an anti-realist methodology. Grenz’s use of both tradition and culture as formative forces for theology is refreshing. His willingness to adopt both significant influences for evangelical theology is as a move towards greater honesty and transparency in theological method, which gives it greater integrity and credibility.

In conclusion, evangelical theologians should be suspicious of modernist foundationalist projects that smuggle in foreign concepts and presuppositions into the theological method that end up determining the trajectory and content of theology. On this point, postmodern theory and thinkers have proven very helpful in spotting the various forms of onto-theology. Certainly, epistemological baggage accompanies foundationalism, and some of it may be good to leave behind. For example, some forms of foundationalism adopt a transcendental “view from nowhere” and hyperbolic notions of certainty, individualism, and representational realism.

One should not overlook the criticism of modern epistemology’s failure to acknowledge the noetic effects of sin and the darker forces motivating claims to knowledge. This does not need to lead to an eliminativist posture toward epistemology that is ready to jettison altogether the notions of truth, rationality, and anything remotely resembling the traditional projects of epistemology.

A theological methodology that wants to avoid strict foundationalism can hold to critical reason influenced by a hermeneutic of suspicion. Suspicious critics of foundationalism claim that it is a means of control, an effort to gain for oneself a secure, invulnerable position from which to know and usurp power. A significant truth of Christianity is that we are not in control. Being finite and fallen, we are in a context that we can by no means comprehend, but of which and in which we can

nevertheless make lots of sense and apprehend. Grenz's method is a valid and important option after postmodernism's hermeneutic of suspicion. We do not need a foundationalist project that looks for first principles outside of Scripture, which then become the guiding principles to interpret the God-world relation, theological anthropology, Christology, pneumatology, ecclesiology, sacraments, and eschatology proper. Rather, the content for theology provides the source for its method.

Our definition of theology gives insight into the methodology we develop and use— theology is the church's reflection on its own witness to revelation in history, God's performative action in words and deeds, and its own participation in the drama of redemption. Methodologically, God's redemptive-historical words and deeds should be the lens through which to view theology and not merely *loci* of theology. The content of theology needs to define its methodology. Theological method is not something that someone does independent of theology, a salute to whatever contemporary intellectual trends are currently reigning. Rather, the methodological framework of theology grows out of Scripture and the structure of the covenantal relationship and its eschatological dimensions.

Justin S. Holcomb  
Reformed Theological Seminary, Orlando, FL, and Washington, DC  
Mars Hill Church, Seattle, WA

*Histories and Fallacies: Problems Faced in the Writing of History.* By Carl R. Trueman. Wheaton: Crossway, 2010, 192 pp., \$13.50 paper.

Carl Trueman is Professor of Historical Theology and Church History at Westminster Theological Seminary (PA) where he also serves as Vice-President of Academic Affairs. Although specializing in sixteenth and seventeenth century Reformed thought in Britain, he has written on popular topics such as *The Real Scandal of the Evangelical Mind* (Moody, 2011) and *Republicrat: Confessions of a Liberal Conservative* (P&R, 2010).

In a readable and entertaining style, Trueman addresses the most common mistakes that historians commit when writing history. His goal is to make historians self-aware of the various elements that affect their research, interpretation, and explanation of the facts. He accomplishes this in four chapters: "The Denial of History," "Grand Schemes and Misdemeanors," "The Past is a Foreign Country," and "A Fistful of Fallacies."

In his introduction and first chapter, Trueman discusses the postmodern threat of making all history relative. If all history is written with bias, how can we trust any account of the past? Are we not relegated to *Versions of History* (Yale, 1991)? While recognizing that all historians are situated contextually, Trueman believes that there are accepted parameters in which objectivity may be attained (although not neutrality): "My conclusion is that, while there is no such thing as neutrality in the telling of history, there is such a thing as objectivity, and that varied interpretations of historical evidence are yet susceptible to generally agreed upon procedures of verification that allow us to challenge each others' reading of the

evidence" (p. 21). While not everyone will approve of his use of the word "objectivity" in reference to the historian's craft, Trueman's point is well taken that "nonneutrality does not equate to solipsistic subjectivism" (p. 27, cf. pp. 66–67).

Trueman illustrates the validity of true historical knowledge by his evaluation of holocaust denial. He takes a few case studies of those who deny the holocaust and explains the nature of their evidence in a way that compels the reader to be sympathetic. He then takes the evidence and evaluates it for logical and historical flaws, providing a vivid picture of how evidence can be manipulated, how "historians" can put up a false facade, how critical thinking is vital to research (in particular, a foundation in logic), and how consensus may be attained through the proper method (consisting of "verification, correlation of evidence, awareness of the strengths and limitations of different types of evidence, etc"; p. 67).

In his chapter on "Grand Schemes and Misdemeanors," Trueman explains the dangers of allowing paradigms to affect one's interpretation of reality. Although he gives several helpful examples of this phenomena, his treatment of Marxism is penetrating (hence, the photograph of Karl Marx on the cover of the book). Recognizing how factors such as economics do indeed affect culture, Trueman exposes the folly of interpreting reality through this myopic, materialistic paradigm. His advice to readers is that "historians need to be aware of the explanatory schemes with which they operate and need to hold them as heuristic devices or as hypotheses that are themselves open to correction or modification in light of the evidence" (p. 97; cf. p. 107).

"The Past is a Foreign Country" is perhaps the most helpful chapter of the book because it contains vivid examples of one of the most abused fallacies in the writing of history: anachronism. Recognizing various forms of this fallacy, Trueman describes anachronism concerning the evolution of terms, understanding historical context based upon modern developments, misusing categorical terms (such as "anti-semitism" or "nationalism") to understand the past, and judging historical actions in accordance with modern standards of right and wrong. As further illustrations of how anachronism abuses the history of ideas, he makes a comparison between the theologies of John Calvin and Francis Turretin, and he evaluates the alleged anti-Semitism of Martin Luther in historical context.

Trueman's final chapter contains a brief survey of other common fallacies such as reification, oversimplification, *post hoc, propter hoc*, the word-concept fallacy, the genetic fallacy, and generalization. He offers advice about asking the right questions in relation to historical problems, avoiding confusion concerning categories that are incomparable (such as Presbyterianism and Puritanism), and appealing to providence as an historical explanation. Also of help is the citation of further reading on this issue such as David Fischer's *Historians' Fallacies: Toward a Logic of Historical Thought* (Harper & Row, 1970).

Trueman readily admits that no historian is innocent of the fallacies that he outlines in this book; indeed, he avers "the study of common fallacies is often akin to looking into a mirror: as we look at the mistakes of others, sooner or later, we see our own reflections .... Every historian makes mistakes; the important thing is to gain an understanding of why they are mistakes. Once that is done, they become

much easier to avoid in the future” (p. 168). To this end he includes a “Concluding Historical Postscript” that contains essential information for aspiring historians. Establishing the usefulness of history, Trueman gives advice on how to read historical books, which books to read as foundational history, how to evaluate foreign cultures, how to read outside of one’s area of interest, which histories of history to read, and further instruction on how to do history. A helpful addition is the citation of many books with which readers should be acquainted. As a word of encouragement, Trueman counsels his readers to be patient with their growth in historical knowledge: “Like fine wines and Scotch whisky in the barrel, historical knowledge, technique, and literary style should all improve with age” (p. 178). This “Concluding Historical Postscript” also exemplifies Trueman’s admonitions by means of an examination of the life of John Calvin.

In every chapter of his book, Trueman offers many interesting, lively, historical examples in every major period of church history to make his point. This is yet another selling point of the book: he teaches history through his discussion of the fallacies of writing history. With wit, humor, and personal appeal, Trueman immerses the reader in history with a cogent presentation of the pitfalls of the trade. This book is not only for beginners, but as the book painfully illustrates, professional historians should also take care to peruse its pages and learn its lessons.

Jonathan Moorhead

The Master’s Academy International, Samara, Russia

*Protestantische Unternehmer in der Schweiz des 19. Jahrhunderts: Christlicher Patriarchalismus im Zeitalter der Industrialisierung.* By Marcel Köppli. Theologischer Verlag Zürich, 2012, 251 pp., CHF (Swiss Francs) 42.00 paper.

This book investigates the complex interaction between religion, economics, and politics in the nineteenth century. As such, it offers a contribution to the research of Protestant socio-economic history in the latter half of that century. It focuses on a union of Swiss entrepreneurs, whose members analyzed the social question in the course of industrialization and who effectively attempted to stem back its negative effects with concrete measures. The rapid industrialization of the nineteenth century led to fundamental changes in Swiss society, resulting in economic development and wealth on the one hand and extreme poverty on the other. Led by Karl Sarasin (1815–1886), a Basel silk industrialist and member of the city council, a group of Protestant entrepreneurs advocated a “Christian patriarchy” in order to combat the negative social effects of industrialization. Sarasin was not alone in his endeavours. Others included Adolf Guyer-Zeller (1839–1899), who constructed the Jungfrau railway, and Carl Franz Bally (1821–1899), who in 1851 founded the shoe company that bears his name to this day. These as well as other entrepreneurs joined forces in the *Schweizerischen Ausschuss für die Bestrebungen der Bonner Konferenz* (SAABK), the “Swiss Committee for the Advancement (of the Goals) of the Bonn Conference.” Despite their good intentions, however, the concept of Christian patriarchy was ultimately doomed to fail.

Köppli's work focuses on the reactions of Swiss entrepreneurs to the new social question of their day with all its ramifications in the aftermath of industrialization. He thus chose to examine and analyze a theme that to date has hardly been investigated; as such, it is a welcome contribution to the discussion about the church's engagement with current social issues. In particular, the author's investigation brings to light how globally active entrepreneurs responded to the social challenges of their day. Hence, this work offers us both a rare and an in-depth contribution from a historical perspective to the overall question of business ethics. Rooted in extensive textual research, Köppli documents the social potential of Protestantism of a by-gone era, which he then attempts to categorize and interpret socio-politically. More recently, there has been a growing interest in the interplay between religion and socially responsible economic behaviour. In China, to name but one example of a growing economic powerhouse, there has been an ongoing debate on whether the Christian faith of the past has contributed in any recognizable manner to an economy that is socially more responsible, and how this contribution can be utilized for future days. This publication raises the topic of the social responsibility of entrepreneurs, and by providing a historically verified contribution to the current economic-ethical discussion, it is particularly of interest on the so-called micro-economic level. Anyone interested in both the inherent social potential of Protestantism, as well as in historical questions of the past (and present) will benefit from reading it. One shortcoming of this work is its exclusive focus on Switzerland, Protestantism, the nineteenth century, and the overall almost complete lack of interaction with current issues of an economic-ethical nature. Nevertheless, the results are still plausible and provide plenty of food for thought, perhaps precisely because of this limited focus. Hopefully, this publication will serve as a clarion call to evaluate entrepreneurs of other countries, of different denominational backgrounds, and of different eras; the results and the further penetration of the economic-ethical discussion will be, no doubt, of benefit to all.

In this study, Köppli sets out to achieve two goals. On the one hand, he describes the genesis of the hitherto unexplored history of the SAABK and categorizes the socio-political convictions that undergirded the members' motives in meeting the social challenge of their time. On the other, he reflects on the relationship between religious thinking and socio-political action. Köppli argues that these Protestant entrepreneurs were of conservative-pietist persuasion and their method to answer the social question was by means of an industrial patriarchy. Other methods were suggested as well, but the socio-patriarchal method enjoyed most prominence and singularly led to impressive achievements, albeit, however, meeting the challenge of the day head-on. In the following five chapters Köppli embarks upon proving his argument. He first sketches out the historical setting of the nineteenth century with its far-reaching political, ecclesial, and social changes. Following Jähnichen, he defines the social question as a "diagnosis of crisis with corresponding strategic measures since the development of the industrialized society" (p. 20), and he locates the churches' response to it in the "inner mission" advocated by the German theologian Johann Hinrich Wichern (1808–1881), the father of Protestant social work. He describes four socio-political approaches: the socio-

patriarchal, the socio-diaconical, the socio-conservative, and the socio-liberal approach. The first of these receives most attention as the path most trodden. Fixing his gaze on the Swiss Confederation of the times, he highlights some of the genuinely different conditions, as compared to Germany, of which direct democracy and a deeply ingrained political federalism are most conspicuous. These in turn inform the manifold approaches of various Protestant churches, groups, and associations, as well as the different theological schools, and how they dealt with the social question. Köppli then raises the question “What constitutes a Christian entrepreneur?” while highlighting how the question of the relationship between the churches and the economy has been raised repeatedly in the recent past. He subsequently describes the practical steps advocated by various entrepreneurs, which found its climax in the *Bonner Konferenz* in mid-1870 (in Germany) and its most immediate brain-child, the finally weekly published journal *Concordia*. He concludes this historical *tour de force* with describing how the seeds of the *Bonner Konferenz* found fertile ground in neighboring Switzerland, as the SAABK came into existence (an association heterogeneous in its theology but initially homogeneously united in its ideals of Christian patriarchalism), and its ultimate demise after uniting with the Swiss Philanthropic Society (a theologically liberal association).

With the historical background laid, Köppli focuses in detail on the most prominent individual who sought to find an answer to the social question: Karl Sarasin (1815–1886). He paints Sarasin’s environment and upbringing, as well as his theological orientation. It is noteworthy that Sarasin, the entrepreneur, politician, and evangelical Christian, reflected much on the social question: the vast majority of his writings, which were originally given as speeches, know no other topic. Sifting through these, the author draws out Sarasin’s beliefs. The Basel industrialist believed that a thorough analysis was called for in order to respond to the challenge of his time. Sarasin opined that the social question is as old as humanity. As an evangelical Christian, he intended to see beneath the surface to its ultimate roots: the collapse of morals and the theological novelties propounded during his time. Sarasin did not see the state as the one holding the answers to these challenges, but rather Christian entrepreneurs, like him. For Sarasin, the Christianisation of the industry was the sole solution, which he saw exemplified in the construction of workers’ apartments and “Sunday halls,” which were open to the workers to read devotional works. Being conservative in his political orientation, Sarasin held fast to the hierarchies he saw as God-given; thus, the entrepreneur and the worker are not on the same level, and yet, his ideal was that they both are one in the same practice of the faith.

These views, however, were challenged over a time period of forty years, from the time of his first publication (1846) to his last (1884). Two areas in particular show that Sarasin’s thinking did develop. First, he expressed doubts as to how far the Christian faith (i.e. his concept of Christian patriarchalism) could be utilized to solve the social question; second, this view led to an ensuing conviction that the state was to be far more involved in contributing to these endeavours. These changes in his thinking were spurred by various developments of his time: his involvement in the *Gesellschaft zur Beförderung des Guten und Gemeinnützigen* (GGG), the

“Society for the Advancement of the Common Good,” an association devoted to the insights of the Enlightenment; the first Basel *Klassenkampf* (“class struggle”); and finally his involvement in the *Basel Mission*, where industrial questions were raised anew on the mission fields abroad.

In his penultimate chapter, Köppli broadens his field of investigation. Although Sarasin stands out as the leading figure of the SAABK, others were involved. Köppli thus focuses on three others whom he deems worthy of analysis, though on a lesser scale. He proceeds along the same lines in describing their environment and upbringing, their writings, as well as their overall conviction about the social question. First, he chooses Johann Caspar Brunner (1813–1886), who was of humble origin and without political influence but who had the advantage of living through the worker experience himself. Allied with Sarasin in his belief of the feasibility of patriarchy, Brunner nonetheless wished for more state intervention and, in stark contrast to Sarasin, he did not attribute any significance to anything particularly Christian. Second is Victor Böhmert (1829–1918), a professor of economy of German offspring but literarily active in Switzerland, next to his involvement in the SAABK, where his contribution was again of a scientific and literary nature. Just like Sarasin, Böhmert attempted to analyze the social conditions as precisely as possible (by evaluating answering forms), but unlike the politician from Basel, he did not initiate any programs for the betterment of the situation. According to Böhmert, three parties were called upon to solve the problem: the industrialists (in seeing themselves first as servants), the workers themselves (in sharing in the company’s profits), and the general public (in providing education). It becomes obvious that Böhmert cannot be classified as endorsing any type of patriarchy. Indeed, for him, the social question was first and foremost a question of man’s conscience and not so much one of the Christian faith. Last but not least follows Henri DuPasquier (1815–1875), akin to Sarasin in being a fellow industrialist, and of noble birth. What separates this Swiss-French from the aforementioned three others is his sparse literary output, which nevertheless investigates the social question far more thoroughly. Interestingly, DuPasquier never referred to these experiences as an entrepreneur; rather, he approached the subject at hand from a decidedly Calvinist perspective. In sync with both Sarasin and Brunner, he advocated a form of patriarchy, but singularly he held that the state could contribute indirectly to solving the problem by providing a general education for all. Köppli concludes that these four members of the SAABK were united in their zeal to solve the social question but were divided in their socio-political and theological convictions. Thus, it comes as no surprise that the SAABK did not last long.

At the end of his work, Köppli summarizes the results of his investigation by discussing his initial thesis and raises the question of the significance of his investigation for current economic-ethical discussions, in particular on the micro-economic level. The book concludes with a detailed bibliography, the literature consulted, and—as a *novum*—includes an edition of a central source held by the *Staatsarchiv Basel Stadt* (the public archives of the city of Basel) discussing the social politics of Swiss Protestantism. In addition, the reader will find the index listing persons, places, subject matter, and Bible passages very helpful.

Assessing the book, I found that easy reading is somewhat hampered due to the frequent repetition of the author's approach and the chapter summaries; however, this allows a separate reading of individual chapters without the necessity of any prior knowledge of the others. Formally, this work leaves nothing to be desired. It is written with real care and sensitivity to its subject matter. Köppli writes to the point and with style. On occasion, he uses somewhat archaic language, which is understandable given the time frame he is investigating and treating. Overall, Köppli's work is reader-friendly, rooted in extensive textual research, and fascinating to read as a first-time account on the church's interaction with the social question. Although written as an academic work, reactions in various Swiss reviews as well as in Protestant journals indicate that this publication can and has been read with benefit by lay people. Köppli treats a subject matter that hitherto has not been thoroughly explored. He attempts to bring to light a subject that commonly has been summarized by the term *soziale Protestantismusforschung* ("research on social Protestantism"), a topic that has been discussed extensively in neighboring Germany but not in Switzerland. By focusing on the Swiss context, Köppli is breaking new ground.

Shortcomings in this work have already been identified: the too narrowly circumscribed denominational, geographical, and chronological focus, and the rather sketchy economic-ethical outlook. I will elaborate on each of these points in turn. The Catholic Church's response to the social question only receives a paltry three pages of attention (pp. 55–57). This is too short in view of the fact that the parallels that existed in the church's discussion on the social question were mirrored by both Protestantism and Catholicism (e.g., the social encyclical *Rerum novarum* of 1891). As a result of this one-sided outlook, the continental tradition of maintaining a dual approach (Catholic and Protestant) to historiography is further maintained, which is regrettable. The fairly narrow geographical focus on Protestant entrepreneurs in Switzerland is certainly broadened with a glance towards their German counterparts. However, this does not sufficiently address the question as to whether Christian patriarchalism was widespread among theologically conservative entrepreneurs beyond the borders of both Switzerland and Germany. However, to the author's credit, Köppli does not presume to know the answer. To put the findings of this study into a global context, it would have been desirable to lift the focus beyond national borders. It remains to be seen whether further research will be done on the question as to whether there were Christian entrepreneurs (beyond the confines of Protestantism and Switzerland) who, during the time of industrialization, attempted to solve the social question by means of Christian patriarchalism.

A further criticism relates to the rather narrow research on the activities of some entrepreneurs during the decade of 1865–1875. Even though the author attempts to answer the question of what makes an entrepreneur a Christian entrepreneur, he addresses it in one single paragraph (pp. 61ff.), claiming that there were then and there are still now Christian entrepreneurs. That is too limited an answer for a historical study. Finally, a few words on the fairly short economic-ethical focus. Köppli confines his discussion to just three pages (pp. 202–4) about how his historical investigation offers a contribution to the economic-ethical issue. This

short appraisal highlights some promising points of reference, in particular in the economic-ethical discussion on the micro-economic level, but these, too, are far too brief to be specific. Hopefully, Köppli's work will encourage others to pursue research in this direction and attempt to delve deeper into the question of the economic-ethical relevance of a social patriarchalism.

Thomas R. V. Forster  
Evangel Seminary, Hong Kong, China

*The Orthodox Christian World*. Edited by Augustine Casiday. New York: Routledge, 2012, xxii + 585 pp., \$250.00.

The last decade or so has seen the publication of at least four different volumes whose titles all fall into a "Orthodoxy through Western Eyes" theme (Clendenin, 1994, 2003; Fairbairn, 2002; Payton, 2007; Letham, 2007). Perhaps it is time for evangelicals to take a hiatus from writing books about Orthodoxy "from a Western perspective." The publication of *The Orthodox Christian World*, edited by Augustine Casiday, Lecturer in Theology at the University of Wales Trinity Saint David, will help Western readers to appreciate the unique complexity of the Orthodox tradition from the viewpoint of practicing Orthodox scholars themselves and from scholars deeply immersed in the Orthodox world.

This volume is part of the "Routledge Worlds" series and it fills a large hole in the scholarly literature on Orthodoxy, especially in the area of resources for English readers. Part of the richness of Orthodoxy is its multi-national sweep, but large swaths of Orthodox literature are inaccessible unless the reader knows Greek, Russian, Coptic, Syrian, Armenian, etc. This volume brings together forty-five scholars from various Orthodox traditions and gives a helpful overview of important themes and figures.

The first part of the book, "Orthodox Christianity around the World," presents historical and thematic surveys of the main ethnic and national Orthodox traditions: Greek, Russian, Armenian, Georgian, Syriac, Assyrian Church of the East, Arabic, Coptic, Ethiopian, Serbian, Romanian, as well as the Russian Orthodox exile in Paris (1925–40), Orthodoxy in North America, and Orthodoxy in Australia.

The second part, "Important Figures in Orthodox Christianity," recounts the lives and influence of major figures in Orthodox history; these include Mary ("the birth-giver of God"), Ephrem the Syrian, John Chrysostom, Dionysius the Areopagite, Babai the Great, Cyril and Methodius, Täklä Haymanot, Neageo Basarab, Saint Raphael Hawaweeny (bishop of Brooklyn), Sergii Bulgakov, and Matta al-Miskin. Western readers may recognize some of these names, but others will be fresh faces and new stories. It is particularly stimulating to realize how much Christian history, theological thought, growth, and persecution has happened in other countries and at other times. These stories are largely unknown in American theological schools, but with the explosive growth of Christianity in the developing world, some useful

lessons might be learned by studying the growth and struggles of the church in previous eras and very different cultures.

The third part of the book, "Major Themes in Orthodox Christianity," presents a multi-faceted survey. Topics include the doctrine of the Trinity, canon law, Orthodoxy and culture, ethics, women in Orthodoxy, devotion to the saints, philosophy and Orthodoxy in Byzantium (and in Russia), modern Greek literature and Orthodoxy, Orthodox church music, Orthodoxy and mental health, and Orthodoxy in relation to other world religions.

This volume is distinguished by its scope and by its honesty. In scope, it covers the major Orthodox traditions, most of which are tied to national histories and contexts. Both important historical figures and important themes are treated. The reader will gain an informative view of the diversity within the Orthodox world without thinking that one Orthodox tradition should be privileged over another. There are obviously some major differences between the traditions, but this volume strives for objectivity rather than continuing old feuds. Accordingly, the honesty of the book will especially appeal to evangelical Protestant readers. The writers are careful to separate fact from legend, or at least to alert the reader when scholars disagree on various aspects of an issue. What emerges is an overview of a tradition that is quite diverse though held together by central themes.

This multiplicity of expression is something that editor Augustine Casiday is quick to point out. Many fundamentalists or evangelical conservatives who convert to Orthodoxy seem to be overwhelmed by the apparent unity of tradition and practice in Orthodoxy (or Roman Catholicism, or even Anglicanism) and believe they have found the "church of the apostles" (as some of these American-convert apologists have put it). But Casiday is not such an idealist. He mentions the "persistent appeal for Orthodox themselves of seeking refuge in the sublime recapitulation of the past, a temptation towards romanticism so severe that it overflows into atavism" (p. xvii). Describing the diversity and divisions of Orthodoxy, he also comments: "Taking variations seriously is a first step toward understanding Orthodox Christianity without imposing artificial barriers" (p. xviii). He further comments: "Within and among Orthodox societies, we find lively arguments and heartfelt dissent no less than deep consensus and self-sacrificing loyalty. Orthodoxy is not monolithic. It would be dishonest, and a disservice to history and to posterity, to pretend otherwise" (p. xviii).

The Armenian tradition, as described by Verj Nersessian in this volume, gives us an example of how studying the variety and diversity in the Orthodox world can perhaps point towards a way to heal old divisions. The Armenian Orthodox tradition is one of the oldest in the world (Armenia was the first nation to officially adopt Christianity—in the fourth century), and preserves an ancient theological framework. The Armenians did not accept the Definition of Chalcedon, not because they were engaged in warfare or misunderstood the Definition, but "because it was judged to have betrayed the faith of Cyril of Alexandria. Both scripture and tradition were against it" (p. 46). This rejection earned the Armenians the title of "non-Chalcedonian" Orthodox, or "Monophysite;" however, Nersessian argues for the internal logic and consistency of the Armenian theological tradition. What

emerges is a case-study in how different theological vocabularies divide Christians. (As a side-note, this chapter could have been improved by short explanations of various Armenian terms that were used without explication.) Most of Orthodoxy regards the “seven ecumenical councils” as authoritative Tradition in the area of dogmatic theology (sometimes these councils are described as “infallible” or as expressing “Sacred Apostolic Tradition”). However, Nersessian observes that the Armenians only accept the first three councils. Additionally, he argues, “The definition of ‘orthodoxy’ cannot be based exclusively on the number of councils acknowledged or rejected” (p. 50). Evangelicals should be able to agree with that statement and should welcome a more honest exploration of various voices in the Orthodox tradition. Because so much is made by some Orthodox apologists for a “monolithic” and “unchanging” Orthodox church, it seems that more honesty about the diversity of the Orthodox tradition could lead to a more fruitful understanding on both sides.

Evangelicals can also relate to another aspect of the Armenian tradition: “Laymen and clergy together, represent the global organism of the Armenian Church. While in the Latin and Greek churches the ecclesiastical authority resides in the hand of the clergy, in the Armenian Church it lies fundamentally with the believers” (p. 50). Surely Protestants of all stripes will resonate with the approach taken by Nerses IV Klayetsi (1166–73). He is remembered as a great ecumenist who participated in union negotiations between the Byzantine and Armenian churches: “What is notable about this approach is that, in contrast to the maximalist attitude of the Greeks, who tended to demand that the Armenians conform in all ritual and ceremonial usages as well as in all dogmatic formulae to their traditions, Nerses insists that complete uniformity is necessary only in the most basic creedal essentials; to demand more, he says, is to risk falling into the Pharisaic legalism condemned by Jesus as elevating human traditions above the Word of God” (p. 51).

Similar realism also pervades Peter C. Bouteneff’s contribution, “Ecclesiology and Ecumenism”: “Any right concept of the Church that is to do justice both to essential holiness and existential sin must therefore incorporate not only profound reverence for the church, but also a genuine disposition of both personal and corporate self-criticism and repentance within it. In our concern to do full justice to the former, we Orthodox Christians have often been sorely lacking in the latter” (p. 374).

However, evangelicals will be disappointed by the lack of a chapter on the Orthodox doctrine of Scripture or biblical interpretation. Nor is there a chapter devoted to the Orthodox doctrine of Holy Tradition, one of the key differences between Orthodox and Protestants. However, this volume is focused on historical themes rather than narrow theological topics. For the Orthodox, history, culture, and tradition are all interrelated in a way that Protestants have difficulty comprehending. Protestants have their own traditions and culture that influence their hermeneutics, though they sometimes like to ignore this fact. However, with the emergence of evangelical scholars seriously exploring the relevance of church history

and willing to talk about tradition in positive terms, surely knowledge of how Orthodoxy approaches these issues can serve as a useful foil.

This publication complements other recent works like the *Encyclopedia of Eastern Orthodox Christianity* (ed. John Anthony McGuckin; 2 vols.; Wiley-Blackwell, 2011) and the more accessible *Cambridge Companion to Orthodox Christian Theology* (ed. Mary B. Cunningham and Elizabeth Theokritoff; Cambridge, 2008) and should be part of every theological library. Evangelicals are going to keep discovering Orthodoxy, and hopefully the Orthodox will discover good things in Evangelicalism. This volume should promote informed engagement with Orthodoxy from Westerners rather than caricatures and arguments against straw men. (Bradley Nassif and Michael Horton's contributions to *Three Views on Eastern Orthodoxy and Evangelicalism* are a good example of healthy dialogue, as are the chapters offered by Wilbur Ellsworth and Craig Blaising in *Journeys of Faith*.)

The book has generous bibliographies at the end of each chapter, which will be especially helpful to scholars because they reference both works in English, French, and German, along with the works in the various Eastern languages within which Orthodoxy has flourished.

Although the price tag might be prohibitive for most individuals, this work is a key addition for college libraries and seminaries. Anyone doing research in Eastern church history and traditions, as well as anyone seeking to engage intelligently with Orthodoxy, will find this volume useful.

Gregory Soderberg  
Vrije Universiteit of Amsterdam