

BOOK REVIEWS

The Archaeology of Israelite Society in Iron Age II. By Avraham Faust. Translated by Ruth Ludlum. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2012, xviii + 328 pp., \$49.50.

The focus of archaeological investigation in the land of Israel has begun to broaden from local and tel-driven projects to more regional considerations. The data amassed by decades of scholars working in the field and centers of scholastic and academic pursuits lend themselves to addressing even broader areas of study. For some, the questions arising from the growing database and material record have prompted them to pursue the largely unaddressed anthropological and social implications of that data.

Dr. Avraham Faust is one of the leading voices in this new area of study. He is the director of the Institute of Archaeology and associate Professor at the Martin (Szusz) Department of Land of Israel Studies and Archaeology at Bar-Ilan University. He participated in a number of excavations and surveys and has been directing the excavations at Tel Eton since 2006. Faust is the recipient of many prestigious awards for his excellent work and is recognized as a leading speaker and author in the field of archaeology today. The volume before us, *The Archaeology of Israelite Society in Iron Age II*, is actually the third book authored by Faust that deals in part or on the whole with this subject. I encourage readers to peruse his previously published two volumes as well (*Israel's Ethnogenesis: Settlement, Interaction, Expansion and Resistance* [Equinox, 2006] and *Israelite Society in the Period of the Monarchy: An Archaeological Perspective* [Yad Ben-Zvi Press, 2005, published in Hebrew]). These three volumes together introduce the reader well to a continually developing treatise that extends from Israel's emergence in the land until the end of the Iron Age.

Eisenbrauns, the book's English publisher, describes this present volume's content as a contribution "not only to the study of ancient Israelite society but to the most fundamental questions about ancient societies." The discussion covers some nine chapters plus an introduction, epilogue, bibliography, and indexes. The work is copiously footnoted and solidly grounded in reference material that could readily stand on its own as justification for buying the book. The chapters address questions concerning the identification of socioeconomic stratification in the archaeological record, the study of family and community organization, the significance of the pottery record, small finds, architecture as an indication of wealth, and many other items of interest.

The book's introduction clearly marks the place of this book in current research. Archaeological evidence constitutes the main source of information. This is a significant departure from most past studies of Israelite culture that have been written from a textual perspective. The discussions found in this book are defined by the author as both preliminary in nature and temporary in their conclusions. They are a starting point even if that requires one to consider them a point of de-

parture. That said, this book should be approached as one of the first attempts at a large-scale study of Israelite society mainly from archaeological evidence.

Chapters 1 and 2 provide the reader with a distillation of previous research and present extant conclusions defining the development and basic components of Israelite society and the processes it underwent in its development. Chapter 1 summarizes the historic research in the field without drawing specific conclusions. The differing options presented are examined further in subsequent chapters. Chapter 2 concerns itself with summarizing the archaeological record and points out that previous examinations of the data have not pursued a specific analysis of settlements from the viewpoint of their plan and organization. Indeed, there has been little analysis of the archaeological data from a social point of view in order that one might reconstruct Israelite society. Faust quotes Dever's comments in a paper written in 1995 ("The Archaeology of the Holy Land," in *Social Structure in Palestine in the Iron Age II Period on the Eve of Destruction* [ed. S. Mazzoni; Pisa, Giardini] 416–31) in support of this claim. Dever, in speaking about several introductory texts on the archaeology of the region, suggested that none makes any attempts to organize the data in terms of social structure, even though there are many suggestive possibilities. Dever considered this a serious deficiency in Syro-Palestinian and biblical archaeology, and reflective of a bias toward "political history."

Chapter 3 analyzes the archaeological findings from the cities and towns of the period. This major chapter is very thorough in terms of data and in its presentation of the material record. It seeks to draw implications concerning relationships between building size and family structure, the basic economic unit, community organization, social stratification, provincial towns versus capital and administrative cities, Israel versus Judah, and the general state of social affairs and status in the seventh century BC. Once again, Faust is careful to point out that his conclusions are preliminary, and that extensive research remains to be accomplished before a more accurate representative picture emerges. I, for one, appreciate the caution attendant to his findings as he proceeds. It is refreshing to encounter such transparency in a field often governed by an abundance of fragile egos and professional posturing.

Chapter 4 speaks to an often neglected topic—the community and family in a rural society. Most of the world's population has always lived in a rural settlement and should be included in any accurate statement concerning the nature of a society. That has not been the case in past studies of ancient Israel. Faust addresses the differing physical configurations of towns, villages and the surrounding topography and their resultant implications for social interaction. Included in the chapter's discussions are such topics as the village and community, the corporate group, the composition and structure of rural communities, villages large and small, and similarities and differences between communities found in Israel and Judah. This chapter gives the reader a window into aspects of Israel's culture seldom found in such a retrievable format. It is a goldmine of goodies to aid in setting a physical context for biblical narratives in rural settings.

Chapter 5 looks at the phenomenon of fortified structures in rural areas. Are they the citadels of estates or extended farms? Are they the product of an urban

element found in a rural setting—the “fortress” or “stronghold” of an important urban entity? Faust points out major differences between the military “forts” of Israel and Judah. While those of the North are quite small, probably best described as “strongholds” rather than “fortresses, the fortifications found in rural Judah are quite large, likely indicating a close relationship with urban authorities. This chapter helps the reader think through the social ramifications of the major fortified sites found throughout the land.

Chapter 6 examines the differing architectural structures of the community. Here, Faust attempts to provide a better understanding of the social and settlement hierarchies they illustrate and how they were affected by catastrophe as well as times of plenty.

Chapter 7 examines the dominant residential house in Israelite society—the four-room house. Its dominance in the culture and social structure of Israel plays an important role in understanding the domestic nature of interpersonal relationships and what it means to be part of a family structure. Its various sub-types contribute to a further understanding of the stratification of the local society based upon its many variations of style and materials while maintaining the basic four-room premise or prototype.

Chapter 8 deals with the difficult topic concerning ethnicity and identity. Simply stated, can a people be ethnically defined by the pottery record they leave behind? The question is first examined in a rural setting, where ethnicity tends to be more singularly defined. The chapter then moves to the more problematic situation of urban settings, where ethnicity tends to be more complex and where it is more likely differing ethnic groups live in community. It appears the key to identifying ethnic groups in Iron Age II Israel lies in the rural sector. The discussion quickly reveals the complex nature of the examination. It appears the best approach would involve identifying the specific traits of a relatively homogeneous group in a rural setting before one attempts the extremely difficult task of teasing out similar traits among the complex material record of an urban setting. Faust sets forth a very difficult archaeological problem in terms that are easy to understand.

Chapter 9 seeks to describe the changes in Israelite society from the settlement period to the end of the period of the monarchy. It pulls together elements of the preceding chapters to formulate an understanding of the process of urbanization that took place in the land of Israel derived from the archaeological material record culminating in Iron Age II. Faust shows that contrary to recent scholarly claims and arguments, both Israel and Judah had very clear views concerning their social identity. While in reality there was no one Israelite identity, there was indeed a great deal of similarity across various views.

Faust’s truly groundbreaking work puts a human face on the archaeological material record that has been largely inaccessible to most textual scholars. Faust has mined the enormous database available to technicians and scholars in the field of archaeology in the land of Israel and has begun the arduous task of interpreting the record quite apart from textually-based conclusions. Two schools of thought have prevailed for many years. There are those who hold the biblical text in high esteem and have tended to discount the material record where there appears to be contra-

diction. Others have set aside the biblical text in favor of the latest interpretation of the archaeological material record. The usual procedure of touting one position's merits over the other and thereby marginalizing the dissenting opinion needs drastic revision. For the evangelical scholar, both the text and the material record stand on their own merits. Faust's *Archaeology of Israelite Society in Iron Age II* has brought the two disciplines closer together in a form accessible to textual scholars. Whether one agrees or disagrees with his conclusions, the implications of his data based presentation must be given a fair hearing. This book provides the textual interpreter a broader and deeper view of the material and social context of the biblical comments he or she is seeking to understand. In my opinion, *The Archaeology of Israelite Society in Iron Age II* is a must-read for the evangelical scholar.

Edgar B. Hardesty
Cairn University, Langhorne, PA

The Lives of Ordinary People in Ancient Israel: Where Archaeology and the Bible Intersect. By William G. Dever. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2012, x + 436 pp., \$25.00.

What was life really like for the ordinary people of ancient Israel and Judah? That is the question that longtime archaeologist William Dever seeks to answer in his newest volume, which he considers to be the culmination of his life's work (p. x). In pursuit of his answer, Dever puts together a "secular history" (p. vi) of Israel in which archaeological data, rather than textual data, serve as the primary source, in order to produce a handbook that augments the picture of Israel's history found within the biblical texts.

Dever's work attempts to present the reader with a history of Israel during the eighth century BCE, written without recourse to the biblical text, and with no pretensions of total objectivity. Among his credentials for undertaking such a task, Dever notes that he is a secular humanist with "no theological or other axe to grind" (p. vii). He does not seek to prove anything from Israel's history, but only to summarize that which we can "actually know" (p. 372). Archaeology, by its nature, is best suited to produce what Dever refers to as "histories of things" (p. 377), rather than ideological histories—such as political, intellectual, or religious histories—and as such, Dever views archaeological inquiry into Israel's past as distinct from biblical inquiry into that past. The Hebrew Bible is "not history, but a testament to faith"; it is a "theocratic history" concerned not with what happened in the past, but with what past events mean within a larger, religious perspective (pp. 377–78). Dever's work, on the other hand, concerns itself with the question of what everyday life was really like for the ordinary men and women of ancient Israel.

Dever begins his work with a methodological discussion on writing history. The book is intended for students and non-specialists (p. vi), and the opening chapter serves as a good, if basic, introduction to the topic for these readers. In his chapter entitled "The Challenges of Writing a History of Ancient Israel," Dever surveys a selection of trends within the scholarship of the last twenty years that have influenced the discussion of Israel's history. Readers familiar with Dever's

own work over that period of time will not be surprised to find that much of this discussion is dedicated to exposing the so-called revisionist scholars with whom Dever has previously dueled over their attempts to deny the historicity of an Iron Age reality for the Israel depicted in the biblical narratives. At times this chapter reads as a sort of personal mini-history, chronicling Dever's own debate with his revisionist adversaries, though the work of scholars outside of this limited group is occasionally reviewed (including a section on evangelical responses to revisionism).

Chapter 3, "The Natural Setting," begins Dever's discussion of the archaeological data on life in ancient Israel by placing that data in its geographical context. From this point on, the majority of chapters follow a tripartite arrangement, with sections dedicated to the archaeological data, the biblical data, and a more subjective discussion of what life was really like. In this final division of each chapter, Dever is admittedly more speculative in his writing (p. 373). He attempts in these concluding remarks to pull together what is known from the archaeological and biblical data, together with his own insights from living in pre-industrial communities in the Middle East, to provide a picture of what the common Israelite's experience may have been like.

Chapter 4, "Sites and Hierarchies," is an important foundation for the remainder of the book's discussion. Here Dever reviews the sites from which archaeological data for the eighth century BC have been retrieved, and organizes them into a multi-tiered hierarchy based on size, location, and material finds. This discussion is important for orienting the reader to the sources of the archaeological data and the social organization of Israelite society. While Dever includes the larger and more politically and economically important sites like Samaria, Jerusalem, and various administrative centers, his primary interest is directed at the smaller sites and the non-elite members of society. Much of the discussion in later chapters is organized by site, underscoring the relevance of this chapter for the book. While Dever's hierarchies are helpful and well considered, there are some issues with the presentation. Gezer is presented as both a tier one (pp. 48, 64–67) and tier two (p. 81) site, with no explanation for the overlap. This indecision seems odd given Dever's own intimate history with the site; he directed the HUC excavations at Gezer for a number of years. Similarly, Beth Shemesh is discussed as both a tier one (pp. 48, 64) and tier three (p. 82) site. In a subsequent chapter, Dever explains that he has reclassified Beth Shemesh from tier three to tier one in light of recent excavations (pp. 111–12), but his discussion in chapter 4 reflects both opinions.

Chapters 5–10 represent the heart of the book. Dever first examines the archaeological record and describes life in ancient Israel solely on the basis of that evidence. He then turns to the biblical text and asks how the text can supplement the archaeological picture of ancient Israel, and often concludes that it offers very little (p. 138). He does this first for the sites that appear higher on his hierarchy (chap. 5, "Cities and Towns"), and then deals with the smaller sites (chap. 6, "Towns, Villages, and Everyday Life"). Dever offers his thoughts on what the real life experiences in both of these contexts would have been like, and while the reader can appreciate Dever's perspective as a long-time leader in this field of study, some of his suggestions are indeed quite speculative. For example, can Dever truly

support his suggestion that “many people in Israel and Judah were resentful” of the rapid urbanization of those states, and that the “persistent nostalgia for simpler times would have fueled resentment from the masses at all times” (pp. 140–41)?

Chapter 7, “Socioeconomic Structures,” is a good survey of the data relating to social stratification in ancient Israel. The economic aspect of this discussion offers a respectable attempt at reconstructing ancient Israel's economic system, though the data does not allow much certainty on the inner workings of this structure. Chapter 8, “Religion and Cult,” is very well done and will be particularly helpful to students unaccustomed to thinking of Israel as something other than the ideal prescribed by the biblical text. The apostasy in Israel so often decried by the biblical authors is well evidenced in the archaeological record, and Dever provides an excellent summary of this data.

The discussion in chapter 9 (“Israel's Neighbors”) surveys an assortment of non-Israelite peoples who lived in close proximity to Israel's borders. This is a helpful introduction to the archaeological data relating to these peoples, but the discussion is too brief to be of lasting value. Dever's work is focused on the eighth century BCE, which was marked by the end of Israel and the transformation of Judah, all at the hands of the Assyrians. Chapter 10, “Warfare and the End,” reviews the archaeological remnants of this fateful conflict and provides an excellent summary of the available data.

In his conclusion, Dever describes his work as “an experiment in method” rather than a “final history” (p. 373). However one may judge Dever's success in his experiment, we can note that the experiment itself ought to be repeated. His attempt was to distinguish his sources (archaeological and biblical) and allow the archaeological data to construct our understanding of ancient Israel apart from the biblical text, and only subsequently was the text allowed to supplement this historical reconstruction. Dever is fond of suggesting that these two sources ought to be in dialogue with one another, but scholars who are genuinely interested in this dialogue typically prefer to begin with a biblically based reconstruction of Israel's history and supplement this with archaeological data. Dever's call for a reversal of this trend is worth heeding. Only when both of these perspectives are voiced can our two sources truly be in dialogue with one another.

The book makes use of an abundance of archaeological data, including recently published materials, although Dever often applies the term “recent” to works as old as twenty-five years or more (perhaps a short period in biblical studies, but quite a long time for the rapidly expanding archaeological record). Some evangelical readers may be uncomfortable with Dever's attitude toward the biblical text at times—a likelihood of which Dever is well aware (p. 378)—but this should not deter from giving due consideration to his work.

On the whole, *The Lives of Ordinary People in Ancient Israel* is a well-written survey of eighth-century BC Israel from one of the field's leading archaeologists. The book is geared toward students, and they will find it to be a very helpful handbook. It is the product of a long and fruitful career, and contains a wealth of knowledge.

S. Cameron Coyle
Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, Fort Worth TX

A Brief History of Old Testament Criticism: From Benedict Spinoza to Brevard Childs. By Mark S. Gignilliat. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2012, 192 pp., \$16.99 paper.

Mark Gignilliat serves as an associate professor of divinity at Beeson Divinity School in Alabama, where he teaches OT studies. In the introduction, Gignilliat points to his own limited knowledge of higher critical scholars and theories when he began his doctoral studies as part of the genesis for this volume. He also points out that he wrote this volume with students in mind, not as an exhaustive presentation of the complex history of OT interpretation. He likens this volume as “a toe’s dip in a very large pool” (p. 12).

Gignilliat intentionally focuses on important OT scholars and their ideas rather than an abstract discussion of critical theories. Consequently, the book is arranged according to key OT scholars rather than important OT critical methodologies. Of course, this approach has its disadvantages. First, it oversimplifies the complexities of OT critical scholarship. Second, it requires the omission of numerous “important” critical scholars that beg for attention. Regardless, this approach also offers significant benefits. On the one hand, the normal approach to the history of OT critical methodologies prevents a reader/student from understanding more fully the times and beliefs of the key scholars who greatly impacted OT studies. In contrast to that, the present volume couches a person’s belief and impact on OT interpretation in its historical and life-setting. The approach chosen here offers student readers a deeper understanding of the chosen scholars rather than a thumbnail sketch of them.

Gignilliat introduces his readers to seven key scholars who significantly impacted OT studies and the development of critical methodology (a chapter devoted to each): Benedict Spinoza (1632–1677); W. M. L. DeWette (1780–1849); Julius Wellhausen (1844–1918); Herman Gunkel (1862–1932); Gerhard von Rad (1901–1971); William Foxwell Albright (1891–1971); and Brevard S. Childs (1923–2007). Although each chapter has a unique internal structure, each one has a clear introduction, helpful conclusion, and several books, essays and articles suggested for further reading. Here is one major contribution to OT critical methodologies by each of these scholars.

Spinoza: Unlike the rule of faith that guided the early Church (e.g. Irenaeus) in its reading of Scripture, Spinoza concluded the natural light of reason must be the determinative guide for reading Scripture (p. 27).

DeWette: DeWette inserted a major division between the canonical history of Israel and the empirical history of the nation. For him, the OT text is no longer a

continuing witness of divine revelation but is now a source for the critical retrieval of Israel's religious history (pp. 55–56).

Wellhausen: Although he was not a pioneer in OT critical methodology, his work has greatly influenced OT scholarship since his time (pp. 74–76).

Gunkel: He directed scholarly attention away from the literary development of the OT and focused on the oral, pre-literary stage of OT Scripture, especially the book of Psalms (p. 98).

Von Rad: For him, Israel's theology is rooted in God's historical acts on Israel's behalf that became embedded in Israel's traditions. These traditions were refuted or changed again and again in Israel's confessional life before God (p. 119).

Albright: He focused on situating the Bible in its ancient Near Eastern setting as he argued for the substantial historicity of the Bible (pp. 129, 141).

Childs: He focused on the finished OT canon, not offering a “method” as much as suggesting an approach to reading the OT text with benefit. Although he accepted many of the critical assumptions about the OT text, he gave priority to the final form of the OT text (pp. 166–67).

Gignilliat concludes this volume with a brief postscript. He recognizes that his review of OT criticism did not include reference to theologically conservative responses to the developing critical methodologies. After a very brief survey of some of the key conservative voices, he points out that most modern critical scholars “bracket out” any theological commitments at the outset of their exegetical inquiry into the Bible (p. 172). He asks the question, “How does our confession about the nature or ontology of the OT as an eternally youthful Word of God determine the way we go about reading it?” (p. 174). What we believe about Scripture must, of necessity, impact how we understand what it says. As Gignilliat writes, “This confession of faith shapes, if not determines, the way we go about reading the OT as Holy Scripture” (p. 175).

This volume provides a clear and helpful introduction to key OT scholars who contributed to the past and present scholarly landscape of OT studies. It deserves consideration in courses that deal with the historical development of OT critical methodology.

Michael A. Grisanti

The Master's Seminary, Sun Valley, CA

Genesis 1 as Ancient Cosmology. By John H. Walton. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2011, 214 pp., \$34.50.

Dr. John Walton is a world-renowned scholar who serves as Professor of OT at Wheaton College. His research interest in comparative studies between the OT and the ANE gave birth to the very important work titled *Ancient Near Eastern Thought and the Old Testament* (Baker, 2006). In *Genesis 1 as Ancient Cosmology*, Walton follows the same path and concludes that in regard to Genesis 1, “We ought to think in terms of functions rather than material objects” (p. vii). He boldly affirms that “Genesis 1 never was an account of material origins but that, as in the rest of

the ancient world, the focus of the creation accounts was to order the cosmos by initiating functions” (p. ix). Subsequently, the stated goal of the book is to “follow a path that seeks the commonalities that resulted from a shared cultural environment but also attempt to understand the nature of the Israelite ‘stamp’ that shaped its own cosmology” (p. 16).

In the first chapter, Walton focuses on methodology, arguing for a shared cognitive environment in the ANE. For him, the differences between the Bible and ANE texts can only be understood when one understands their similarities (p. 5). The categories used for comparing cognitive environments of the ANE with regard to cosmology include the following: ontology; centrality of order/disorder; metadivine functions; position of deity in the cosmos; theogony/cosmogony; theomachy; cosmic geography; and temple/rest (pp. 8–10). He notes that one will find many more similarities in Israelite literature and ANE literatures than differences (p. 12). Walton warns of extreme views, explaining that those who consider the Bible to be the word of God in a very narrow sense will tend to neglect its shared cognitive environment and will isolate it from the culture in which it was written. Those who emphasize the cognitive environment may likewise fail to see the distinctive perspectives within each culture of the ANE. He humbly admits that some may accuse this book of succumbing to one of these dangers and adds that this is exactly why studies like this must be furthered—so that conclusions may be reached that can be supported by many, if not all, scholars (p. 8).

In chapter 2, Walton includes two tables that summarize the segments of creation in ANE literature. I believe these tables are one of the best resources of this kind since they summarize and compare Egyptian, Sumerian, and Akkadian sources in light of the precreation condition, separating heaven and earth, theogony mixed with cosmogony, theomachy, naming as an act of creation, separating as an act of creation, the creation of people, temple connection, and rest.

Chapter 3 is entitled “The Ancient Cosmological Cognitive Environment.” In the chapter, Walton asks three questions: (1) What did the ancients consider to constitute nonexistence?; (2) What activities do the ancients describe as bringing something into existence?; and (3) How did the ancients describe the existing cosmos that they perceived with their senses? (p. 24). He notes that in a material ontology, material origins are the main concern, but adds that there is no reason to consider the cosmic ontology of the ancient culture in this way. Instead, Walton looks to present the cosmic ontology of the ancient world as one that was preoccupied with the assignment of function to everything that exists (pp. 23–24). He sees the concept of creation in the ANE to be predominantly one of function and divine purpose rather than being predominantly one of manufacturing (p. 29). Furthermore, since the main acts of creation in the ANE are naming, separating, and temple building, the question of who controlled functions rather than what/who gave something its physical form would then be more important (pp. 34, 43). Therefore, it can be concluded that in the ancient culture, something existed only when it was given a function (p. 43).

In chapter 4, Walton tackles Genesis 1 and begins by doing three word studies in an attempt to shed light on the expressions “in the beginning” (v. 1), “creat-

ed” (v. 1), and “made” (v. 7). Since he is looking through the prism of function, Walton suggests Gen 1:1 could read, “In the initial period God brought cosmic functions into existence” (p. 133). Then he considers the precreation state and focuses heavily on *tohu* and the Spirit of God (v. 2), showing that the separating in this verse is an act of creation that brings with it function. He believes that days 1–3 provide the majority of the evidence that supports a functional understanding of Genesis 1. If the focus of the text covering days 1–3 is the creation of time, weather, and food production—all of which indicate more of a functional ontology than simple material manufacturing—then days 4–6 have a political/bureaucratic focus. Humans then are positioned as rulers in the cosmos with all the functions of the cosmos structured on their behalf. Lastly, Walton believes day 7 of the creation account presents the creation of the cosmos as the inauguration of the cosmic temple. The entire cosmos is then viewed as a temple which is designed to function on behalf of humanity.

Walton ends his book with a timely chapter that succinctly summarizes the shared cognitive environment of the ANE. He also describes the areas that Israel’s cognitive environment was shared with individual cultures as well as those areas in which they are distinguished from them.

Walton is to be praised for his extensive study and knowledge in ANE literature. His work uses a variety of sources from several different ANE cultures that provides a surplus of materials to support his positions. He also does well to emphasize the importance of background studies for Genesis. I highly recommend this book because of its extensive ANE background study.

However, some may suggest that Walton has provided a false dichotomy between the functionality and manufacturing of material. There is no doubt that the Egyptians, Sumerians, Babylonians, and Israelites all saw that the sun rises and it sets, they all saw that the rain falls from above, and that fruit grows on fruit trees. But how they interpreted their shared cognitive environment could not be more different. What the other people groups believed of their gods and their writings was false while Yahweh was the only true God who revealed himself both through creation and Scripture. This Scripture is true when it comes to both Genesis 1 and John 3:16, while the *Enuma Elish*, the *Instruction of Merikare*, and *Eridu Genesis* are true neither for faith nor for practice. The text of Genesis gives us an account of material origins and at the same time shows how Yahweh created a fully functioning universe.

Tiberius Rata

Grace College and Theological Seminary, Winona Lake, IN

The NIV Application Commentary: Deuteronomy. By Daniel I. Block. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 880 pp., \$39.99.

The reading community of pastors, scholars, and the wider public has been blessed with a commentary on Deuteronomy by Wheaton professor Daniel Block that will likely set the bar for usefulness for decades. Block has produced major

commentaries on Ezekiel (NICOT) and Judges (NAC), but has made Deuteronomy a special focus of his ministry, with three books currently in print, as well as numerous articles and conference papers.

As is the case with volumes in this series, introductory and critical issues are avoided in favor of interpretation and application. The format is to give the NIV translation of the passage, expound on it (“Original Meaning”), expand its explanation (“Bridging Context”) and apply it (“Contemporary Significance”). While Block’s command of exegesis and backgrounds is superb, the volume is enriched by his employment of “literary methods” (e.g. chiasms, numerologies, word plays, and more). His “Bridging Context” sections are often revealing (e.g. his explanation on “love” regarding Peter’s threefold love affirmation in John 21, pp. 188–89) and demonstrate his command of the NT. It is perhaps in the “Contemporary Significance” sections that Block’s pastoral side is best seen. There, he calls for a biblical perspective on land use and ecology (p. 479), for ethical treatment of animals (p. 322), for sacrificial care for the poor and helpless (p. 361), and for a national and global ethic that reflects rightness rather than profit or pragmatism (p. 414). He also rejects Christian Zionism that often ignores the plight of the Palestinians (pp. 87, 296), a nationalism that is silent about the genocide of native Americans (p. 610), and a “prosperity gospel” that evidences the materialism of modern Christianity (p. 803).

Block is everywhere doctrinally conservative and argues for “essential” Mosaic authorship, allowing for later organization of the material. Moreover, Moses is really a facilitator of revelation because God is the real author. Indeed, throughout the book, Block is sensitive about overstating the person of Moses: “The reference to Moses as ‘prophet’ recalls 18:15. Moses performed many administrative, judicial, and even priestly functions, but he is never identified as a judge, ruler, priest, or lawgiver” (p. 811). Moses could not be a king because Israel was a theocracy and Moses was just a “mouthpiece” more akin to John the Baptist or the Apostle Paul than to a paradigmatic persona (p. 814). It seems to Block that Moses’ only “official” office was that of prophet (see p. 811). Lesser debated issues such as the date of Israel’s exodus and wilderness wandering, the size of Israel, and the logistics of life in the wilderness, are either ignored or commented on obliquely.

The commentary has distinctive emphases that result in a unified theological message for the two testaments. Moses is consistently referred to as Israel’s “pastor,” the book is a collection of his sermons and his final song is Israel’s “national anthem.” Deuteronomy is not law (*nomos*) but instructions (*torah*), which provides a necessary guide for obedience as the proper response to the gracious gift of covenant to Israel. “Moses’ role ... is not that of a lawgiver but a pastor” (p. 37), and “the Torah was Moses’ inspired commentary on the covenant for the people” (p. 33).

Indeed, Block is commonly sermonical throughout the work to counter the law-grace divide and to propose faithful obedience as essential for genuine believing faith. As an example, he renders the meaning of John 14:15 as “If you love me (that is, if you are covenantally committed to me), you will keep my commands” (p. 148). For Block, obedience includes both the commands of Jesus and those of

the OT (although by the latter he recognizes we must learn to identify the timeless principle in the OT commands). His effort to read “law-grace” as linear rather than binary can be seen in his comments on John 1:16–17: “Here the contrast is not between law and grace, but between mediated grace (‘through Moses’) and embodied grace (‘in Jesus Christ’)” (p. 57). Thus, “John understood the revelation of the Torah through Moses as a climactic moment of grace, superseded only by the incarnation” (p. 57). Not surprisingly, therefore, “Jesus=Yahweh” is a major unifying doctrine for true biblical theology; indeed, all persons, institutions and perspectives are subordinated to this doctrinal continuum. Block is especially sensitive that Moses be kept distinctly subordinate to the “Jesus=Yahweh” paradigm, rather than Moses=Jesus. Still another evidence of his uniting the testaments is his view of the new covenant: “The only new feature of the ‘new covenant’ is its scope. Speaking with Yahweh’s voice the prophet looks forward to a day when all Israel will embrace him and the boundaries of spiritual Israel will match the boundaries of physical Israel” (p. 702). This skillfully presented effort to unify the theology of the testaments is crucially important for linking Moses’ message in Deuteronomy with that of the Christ, especially in John’s Gospel.

In a commentary surpassing 800 pages, there will inevitably be points or emphases that can be debated, but these were few in number. The author’s rejection of typology, however, is puzzling. He writes, “We need to abandon the low Christology that sees Moses as a type of Christ, or Christ as a second Moses in the Gospels, particularly in Matthew 5–7” (p. 38). His reasoning is that this “typology” (which is not defined or clarified in the commentary) detracts from an essential emphasis on the uniqueness of Christ. Part of the problem, of course, is the fluidity of terminology or employment of typology, resulting in little agreement among those using the terms. If it is understood, however, that Moses is less the type, and that it is the events of divine intervention and deliverance overseen by Moses that provide the type, then perhaps some of Block’s objections to typology could be minimized. Some would specifically argue that it is the saving acts of God in the exodus and the wilderness that provide the real Moses typology. It is the repetition of OT events, institutions and persons in the life of Christ that is evidence of Christ’s preexistent control of history that culminates in him. He is both the executor of the divine plan of the Bible and the goal of the plan.

It seems to me that such repetition (more in event and less in the person of Moses) promotes a high Christology since Christ is, as Block (and others) put it, the “Christotelic” core of all biblical revelation (Luke 24:27). Such typology requires no prediction or alteration of the original context of the type and thus preserves the originally intended understanding of the text or type. If such a ‘method’ seems too subjective, then exegetical limits can be imposed to limit what is called a type. Certainly not all evangelicals who employ typological method need automatically be declared guilty of a low Christology! While Block has articulated his position with characteristic skill and precision, it seems unlikely that it will alter the mainstream of biblical scholarship, which allows for some form of typological approach. Block’s comments, however, will be useful in clarifying the need for more precise terminology and expression.

In summation, this is a commentary that if widely read will shape biblical preaching and interpretation of Deuteronomy for another generation. It elevates mere religion to the realm of behavior, emotivism to covenantal obedience, and mere scholasticism to sacred text and incarnate Savior. In the finest pastoral tradition of Moses and all subsequent faithful pastors, Block has clarified how to unite the testaments exegetically and applicationally. All religious traditions should find this work helpful and many people of faith will find it to be informative and inspiring.

Donald Fowler
Liberty University, Lynchburg, VA

Job. By John H. Walton with Kelly Lemon Vizcaino. NIVAC. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2012, 469 pp., \$29.99.

Now this is a helpful commentary. Readers of this journal will be familiar with John Walton, professor of OT at Wheaton, from his many studies on the Hebrew Bible within its ancient context. These studies have established him as a faithful and critical interpreter of Scripture with particular attention to its theological significance. These characteristics are on full display in his new commentary on the book of Job.

More than a commentary, Walton's work is actually a sustained theological reflection on the nature of suffering using the text of Job as a springboard for discussions of larger issues. This excellent result in some ways arises from the nature of the commentary series itself. By now the format and intentions of the NIVAC series are well known to those concerned with communicating the message of Scripture to the church. The "Original Meaning" section offers useful and concise guidance to the meaning of the Hebrew text. Next comes the "Bridging Contexts" section, where Walton treats larger issues arising from a sensitive reading of the passage, especially its rhetorical function within the context of the book and its particular theological concerns. Finally, Walton explores the passage's modern relevance in the "Contemporary Application" section.

It is in this last section on contemporary application that the reader encounters one of the great innovations of this commentary. Walton has enlisted the help of one of his former students, Kelly Lemon Vizcaino, now a budding photographer living in Ghana. The initial "Contemporary Application" section is devoted to Vizcaino's recounting of her history of physical and emotional pain, stemming from a terrible traffic accident when she was twelve years old and continuing up to the writing of the book a little more than a decade later. In subsequent "Contemporary Application" sections, she speaks about her own experiences in relation to themes encountered in the book of Job. Her narrative of failed surgeries (which hopefully have ended; cf. Mark 5:26), suffering (which has not), and faith adds immensely to the power of this commentary, and rightly earns her name a spot on the title page. It would be superficial to suggest that Vizcaino endured such suffering so that she could so powerfully share her experience in this commentary, and if there is one

thing this commentary reprehends, it is superficial responses to human suffering. But I can without question say that reading about her pain and her faith has blessed me, and will continue to influence the way I see the book of Job, suffering, and God.

While Walton himself does have some things to say in the “Contemporary Applications” sections, sometimes making comparison of Vizcaino’s statements with his interpretations of Job, he takes full advantage of the “Bridging Contexts” section to discuss Job’s developing message and theology. It is in this section that one can find profitable discussions on the “Challenger” (Walton’s term for the figure referred to in the Hebrew text as “the Satan,” pp. 74–86), Leviathan and Behemoth (pp. 406–10), Job’s view of the afterlife (pp. 125–34, 226–29), Job’s faulty view of God (pp. 270–72), the possible messianic significance of 19:25–26 (pp. 225–26), the positive and negative contributions of Elihu to the book (pp. 374–82), and God’s answer to Job (pp. 410–22), which turns out to be somewhat more constructive than simply saying “Can you make a hippopotamus?” (to echo Bernard Shaw, quoted by Walton, p. 397). Walton also uses the “Bridging Contexts” section quite effectively to summarize and analyze the developing argument among the four friends in the dialogue portion of the book (Job 4–27).

His discussion of the being known in the NT as Satan and the possible relation between this being and the character in Job whom Walton calls the “Challenger” is especially welcome and beneficial, as it addresses an issue perennially raised when discussing Job in the church and in the university. According to Walton, the text does not warrant the conclusion that the Challenger represents the epitome of evil, takes delight in Job’s suffering, or engages in “tempting, corrupting, depraving, or possessing” (p. 67). Isaiah 14 and Ezekiel 28 also receive treatment here, as does the serpent of Genesis 3, not an embodiment of Satan, according to Walton, though he admits that some NT passages “offer some basis” for such a connection (p. 85; cf. Rom 16:20; Rev 12:9; 20:2). Walton concludes the discussion with some provocative questions regarding Satan: “Is it possible that more of the Old Testament profile needs to be adopted as the backdrop for the New Testament profile? Is Satan less an immoral opponent of God and more an amoral agent, an instrument of God in a fallen world?” (p. 86).

The “Original Meaning” section provides guidance on select verses and phrases from the section under discussion. Though Walton does not shy away from citing and discussing Hebrew words in transliteration, he recognizes that this commentary is not the place to discuss the notoriously difficult Hebrew text of Job, for which he points readers to some of the technical commentaries (e.g. he mentions Clines, Hartley, and Habel, p. 118). His comments here focus on only the most difficult or tricky parts of the text or summarizing the speeches. He will also use the section to present more extensive commentary on issues arising directly from the text of Job, such as the divine council (pp. 63–64), the Challenger (pp. 64–67), and a stimulating and negative interpretation of Job’s sacrifices for his children in chapter 1 (pp. 58–63).

The thirty-page introduction establishes a suitable base of knowledge for Christians to continue reading the biblical book and commentary. It begins and

ends with theology, discussing more mundane matters between these bookends. Walton satisfyingly provides quick answers to the book's theology, author, and date—which he reveals in the first sentence of that section: no one knows and it does not matter—the difficulties of the language of the book, and his take on various redactional theories. The introduction also helpfully compares ANE texts on suffering with the book of Job (pp. 31–38). He classifies the story of Job as a “thought experiment” designed to get us to consider God's ways in relation to suffering before we are in the situation (pp. 24–27).

The book of Job does not disclose reasons for suffering, though it should provide “training for the mind so we can be prepared for suffering and crises” (p. 428). “The only explanation the book offers concerns right thinking about God and his policies in a world where suffering is pervasive and inevitable” (p. 437). It does not comfort the suffering but it does offer “theological guidance” (p. 428). Walton discusses some useful points in constructing a “Biblical Theology of Suffering” (pp. 420–22). He does not believe that Job is a model for us, or that Job spoke without fault, or that God declares that everything Job said was good (p. 433). Reflecting on the text of Job and suffering should “bring understanding that might prevent us from committing Job's error, which is the easy solution of blaming God. The alternative is to trust God” (p. 415).

This commentary will be by my side when teaching or preaching the book of Job in a church or university.

Edmon L. Gallagher

Heritage Christian University, Florence, AL

On the Writing of New Testament Commentaries: Festschrift for Grant R. Osborne on the Occasion of his 70th Birthday. Texts and Editions for New Testament Study 8. Edited by Stanley E. Porter and Eckhard J. Schnabel. Leiden: Brill, 2013, xxxvi + 493 pp., \$228.00.

This volume represents a well-deserved *Festschrift* for Grant Osborne, who has taught at Trinity Evangelical Divinity School for 35 years and has earned a reputation of being a prolific scholar (and commentary-writer!), a congenial colleague, and a distinguished mentor. On a personal note, I had the privilege of serving as Grant's research assistant for three years and would like to express my own gratitude for Grant's tutelage, particularly in the area of hermeneutics (which included chasing down hard-to-find references and compiling the indices for *The Hermeneutical Spiral*). As the title suggests, the volume is devoted to the interesting subject of NT commentary writing. After a foreword on Osborne's scholarly career by the editors and a list of his publications, the book features 21 essays by a stellar cast of biblical scholars. Part 1 (“Commentaries and Exegesis”) includes the following contributions: “On Commentary Writing” (Eckhard Schnabel), “The Linguistic Competence of NT Commentaries” (Stanley Porter), “Translation in NT Commentaries” (Douglas Moo), “Genre in Recent NT Commentaries” (Craig Blomberg), “Historical Competence of NT Commentaries” (Douglas Huffman), “The Histori-

cal Jesus and NT Commentaries” (Craig Evans). Part 2 (“Commentaries and the Hermeneutical Task”) features the following essays: “The Use of the OT in NT Commentaries” (Richard Hess), “The Hermeneutical Competence of NT Commentaries” (D. A. Carson), “Who Do NT Commentaries Say ‘The Lord’ Is? The Scandalous Rock of Romans 10:13” (Daniel Block), “The Ethical Relevance of NT Commentaries: On the Reading of Romans 13:1–7” (David Pao), “The Pastoral Relevance of Commentaries” (Robert Yarbrough), “The Preaching Relevance of Commentaries” (Walter Liefeld), and “(Re)constructing the Pastoral Office: Wolfgang Musculus’s Commentaries on 1 & 2 Corinthians” (Scott Manetsch). Part 3 (“Commentaries and Theology”) contains “Theological Commentary and ‘The Voice from Heaven’: Exegesis, Ontology, and the Travail of Biblical Interpretation” (Kevin Vanhoozer), “Christology and Commentaries: Examining and Enhancing Theological Exegesis” (Daniel Treier), and “Christology, the Pastoral Epistles, and Commentaries” (Linda Belleville). Part 4 (“Commentaries on the Gospels, on the Epistles, and on Revelation”) adds “Commentaries on the Synoptic Gospels: Traditional Issues of Introduction” (Darrell Bock), “Commentaries on the Book of Romans” (Stanley Porter), “James and His Commentaries” (Scot McKnight), and “Commentaries on Revelation” (Lois Fuller Dow). The volume concludes with one essay in Part 5 (“Commentaries and Publishers”), “Commentaries and Commentators from a Publisher’s Perspective” (Daniel Reid).

On the whole, the essays are marked by a very high level of scholarship. Some of the essays are a bit dry, but the material is consistently informative. Space constraints permit only brief comments on the various contributions. Eckhard Schnabel, in the opening essay, amasses an astonishing amount of technical background information about the writing of commentaries. Stanley Porter closes his evaluation of the linguistic competence of NT commentaries with the rather negative verdict that “the days of the New Testament Greek language commentary ... are a thing of the past if current commentaries are any indication” (p. 54). Douglas Moo recommends that commentators “would be well advised to integrate translations more often into their exegetical argument” (p. 71). With regard to genre, Craig Blomberg, in a characteristically competent treatment, suggests that NT commentaries “have made significant strides in recent years, so perhaps we can look forward to better things still to come” (p. 98). Douglas Huffman, in his contribution on the historical competence of NT commentaries, unlike Porter, does not assess the competence of specific commentaries but instead provides a general discussion of issues pertaining to the treatment of historical matters. He does so mostly in descriptive fashion, frequently by assembling relevant quotes by other scholars. Craig Evans’s essay on NT commentaries and historical Jesus research excels in discussing the treatment of the historical Jesus in selected passages in Mark’s Gospel by particular technical commentaries. He also helpfully observes that commentaries should give balanced attention to both historical and literary matters, noting that proper historical work will aid in the appreciation of the literary dimension of a given Gospel and *vice versa* (pp. 126–27).

In part 2, Richard Hess discusses selected examples of the use of the OT in the NT in passages such as Rom 1:17 (faith/faithfulness), the Lord’s prayer, and

the NT teaching on discipleship (which, according to Hess, is grounded in Levitical sacrifices such as the sin, burnt, and ordination offerings of Leviticus 1–8). The next essay, by D. A. Carson, offers a deft survey of the hermeneutical contributions of commentaries written over the past two millennia. Particularly helpful is Carson's discussion of J. P. Gabler (pp. 157, 160), including Carson's observation that subsequent scholarship readily complied with the first part of Gabler's program—distinguishing between biblical and dogmatic or systematic theology—while largely ignoring the second (reconstructing dogmatic theology after the completion of biblical theology). Carson's reference to the more holistic efforts by von Hofmann and Schlatter in this context is useful as well, as it shows how these interpreters sought to be more (re)constructive and integrative than most of their contemporaries. (Two minor editorial quibbles here: *gesamtbiblische* is one word, not two [p. 161]; and Moo's distinction is between “*appropriation* [not: *appropriate*] techniques” and “hermeneutical axioms” [p. 168].) Carson's prescriptions for hermeneutical competence include striving to become a better reader, focusing on the text, deploying multiple hermeneutical approaches, and embarking on the quest to discern the Mind of the ultimate author of Scripture, God himself (pp. 170–72). Space does not permit a summary and assessment of the next two more technical and narrowly focused studies by Daniel Block and David Pao. Robert Yarbrough pays tribute to the fact that the honoree wrote his commentaries with pastors in mind. The pastoral relevance of commentaries is indeed a feature well worth noting. While not substituting for linguistic or hermeneutical competence, a commitment to equip those who are charged with caring for the spiritual wellbeing of their congregation is vital in order for commentaries to have true and lasting impact. Few things are more gratifying for a commentary-writer than a word of thanks from a local pastor for the hours of study and service to the local church. Along those lines, Walter Liefeld's chapter on the preaching relevance of commentaries provides a fitting exploration of the utility of commentaries for preachers as well as some possible pitfalls of the use of commentaries in the preaching ministry (Liefeld uses commentaries on Philippians as a case study). I will skip Scott Manetsch's essay for the same reason I skipped the chapters by Block and Pao above.

In part 3, Kevin Vanhoozer's essay—surprise!—deals with the theological interpretation of Scripture (TIS). It includes a fascinating case study of the Synoptic transfiguration account, taking its point of departure from Grant Osborne's M.A. thesis written at TEDS in 1971. Vanhoozer decries the theological vacuum in many current approaches to biblical interpretation and claims that in this regard “the theologian is closer to God than the exegete” (p. 284). He is concerned to “repair the partnership between biblical scholars and theologians by reflecting again about the meaning of ‘historical’ and ‘theological’ exegesis” (p. 297). Vanhoozer posits that the theological context consists of the canonical, creedal, and catholic contexts. He also identifies five levels of interpretation: grammatical-historical, literary, canonical, catholic, and ontological. Vanhoozer's essay is genuinely helpful as it clarifies his particular version of TIS by discussing several key issues and fleshes out his approach by way of a specific biblical passage. He is right that theology should not merely be an afterthought or be relegated to a late step in the exegetical process.

My only question is whether at times Vanhoozer engages in a type of strawman argument that stereotypes practitioners of conventional exegesis in a way that is neither entirely fair nor accurate. Continuing and completing the TIS two-punch, Daniel Treier discusses Christology and NT commentaries, using the interpretation of Phil 2:5–11 as an example with Dunn, Wright, and Yeago as points of departure. Treier's conclusion: "all biblical commentaries are actually theological, like it or not; the question is how well they engage their subject matter in its potential fullness" (p. 316). Linda Belleville's contribution, likewise, is on Christology, specifically on commentaries on the Pastorals. After a helpful survey of the treatment (or lack thereof) of Christology in Pastorals commentaries, Belleville focuses most of her discussion on preformed Christological materials (e.g. 1 Tim 1:15; 2:5–6; 3:16). She urges that more attention be given to (1) the title "Christ Jesus"; (2) God/Christ as "our Savior"; (3) Christ Jesus as *ἄνθρωπος*; and (4) Christ's coming as an epiphany.

Part 4 is devoted to commentaries on the Gospels, selected epistles (Romans, James), and Revelation. Darrell Bock discusses the coverage of traditional introductory issues (esp. authorship and date) in commentaries on the Synoptics. He concludes that the Synoptics are well served and "[q]uality commentaries exist for each Gospel and from a variety of perspectives" (p. 363). In a final footnote, Bock notes that he changed his view on the dating of Mark since writing his Luke commentary (he is now "much less certain about Mark's date and therefore what the dating sequence is," p. 363). Stanley Porter, in his second essay in the volume, assesses commentaries on the book of Romans based on the Greek text, using Rom 5:1–11 as his focus passage. Doug Moo, Tom Schreiner, and Tom Wright (among many others) are all subjected to a detailed (and in some cases rather unflattering) critique, and Porter concludes that "newer is certainly not necessarily better" (p. 403) as far as Romans commentaries are concerned. Singled out for special commendation by Porter are the commentaries by Sanday and Headlam, Beet, Schlier, Louw, Moo, and Waetjen. Scot McKnight canvasses James and his commentaries, using Jas 1:27 as an entrée. Commentaries on Revelation are subjected to closer scrutiny by Lois Fuller Dow, in particular those by Aune, Beale, Keener, Osborne, Smalley, Mangina, Resseguie, and Blount (she says she is discussing seven recent commentaries, but in fact discusses eight). Last but not least, Daniel G. Reid closes out the volume with a discussion of commentaries and commentators from a publisher's perspective.

As one who is gearing up to write a commentary on the Pastorals for B&H's new Biblical Theology for Christian Proclamation (BTCP) series, I have greatly appreciated working my way through this fascinating volume. It is not every day that commentary writers actually reflect on the writing of commentaries! Thanks are due the publisher, the editors, and the contributors—as well as the honoree for providing the occasion!—for a very interesting, engaging, and multi-faceted volume whose only major drawback is its heavy price tag (\$228.00).

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

Handbook on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament: Exegesis and Interpretation. By G. K. Beale. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2012, xviii + 173 pp., \$17.99 paper.

G. K. Beale has coedited a work with D. A. Carson, *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007), in which the contributors treat all of the OT quotations in the NT, and has provided a recent biblical theology, *A New Testament Biblical Theology: The Unfolding of the Old Testament in the New* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2011). In this new book, Beale provides the methodological underpinnings used for the commentary and for his biblical theology. Regarding the intention of the book, Beale writes, “The purpose of this handbook is to provide a short guide to the use of OT citations and allusions in the NT” (p. xvii). He accomplishes this task in seven chapters.

In chapter 1, Beale addresses the challenges to interpreting the use of the OT in the NT. He summarizes these debates under two main headings: “How much continuity or discontinuity is there between the OT and NT?” and “the debate over typology.” Under the first heading he addresses the following issues: (1) the debate over the influence of Jewish interpretation on the NT writers; (2) the Testimony debate; (3) the Christocentric debate; (4) the rhetorical debate; and (5) the post-modern debate. The root issue of all of these debates is whether the NT author displays awareness of the OT literary and historical contexts. Beale concludes, “My own overall judgment is that NT authors display varying degrees of awareness of literary contexts, as well as perhaps historical contexts, although the former is predominant” (p. 12). Under the second heading, Beale addresses the following issues: (1) the definition and nature of typology; (2) the criteria for determining what is a “type”; and (3) the debate on recognizing types in the OT. Beale defines typology as “the study of analogical correspondences among revealed truths about persons, events, institutions, and other things within the historical framework of God’s special revelation, which, from a retrospective view, are of a prophetic nature and are escalated in their meaning” (p. 14). For Beale this definition contains five essential characteristics of a type: (1) analogical correspondence; (2) historicity; (3) a pointing-forwardness; (4) escalation; and (5) retrospection (p. 14).

In chapter 2, Beale provides definitions for quotations and allusions and offers criteria for discerning them. He defines a quotation as “a direct citation of an OT passage that is easily recognizable by its clear and unique verbal parallelism” (p. 29), although he notes that specialists still dispute what is and what is not a quotation of the OT. Next, he defines an allusion as “a brief expression consciously intended by an author to be dependent on an OT passage” (p. 31). Beale then reviews the criteria for validating allusions and echoes laid down by Richard Hays, noting also Stanley Porter’s critique of Hays. Beale agrees with Porter’s criticisms but he says they “do not entirely invalidate the criteria” (p. 35). Helpfully, Beale closes this chapter by pointing the reader to sources for recognizing quotations and allusions in the NT.

In chapter 3, which sets forth an approach to interpreting the OT in the NT, the reader comes to “the core of the book” (p. 41). In this chapter, Beale presents his nine steps for evaluating the use of the OT in the NT. They are as follows: (1)

identify the OT reference (is it a quotation or an allusion?); (2) analyze the broad NT context where the OT reference occurs; (3) analyze the OT context both broadly and immediately; (4) survey the use of the OT text in early and late Judaism in order to see how this use might be of relevance to the NT appropriation of the OT text; (5) compare the texts (including their textual variants) in the NT, LXX, MT, Targums, and early Jewish citations (DSS, the pseudepigrapha, Josephus, Philo); (6) analyze the author's textual use of the OT (which text does the author rely on, or is the author making his own rendering, and how does this bear on the interpretation of the OT text?); (7) analyze the author's interpretive (hermeneutical) use of the OT; (8) analyze the author's theological use of the OT; (9) analyze the author's rhetorical use of the OT. Beale expounds and illustrates these steps in a constructive manner throughout the chapter.

In chapter 4, Beale provides a heuristic list of the various ways in which the NT uses the OT. He lists and demonstrates twelve ways but notes that this list is not exhaustive, since others may discern different uses (p. 56).

In chapter 5, Beale supplies the hermeneutical and theological presuppositions of the NT writers. While noting five significant presuppositions, he provides both primary evidence and secondary literature on each in his footnotes. The presuppositions are as follows: (1) there is an assumption of corporate solidarity or representation; (2) Christ is viewed as representing the true Israel of the OT and the true Israel—the church—in the NT; (3) history is unified by a wise and sovereign plan; (4) the age of eschatological fulfillment has come in Christ; and (5) later parts of biblical history function as the broader context for interpreting earlier parts because they all have the same, ultimate divine author.

In chapter 6, Beale discusses the relevance of Jewish backgrounds for the study of the OT in the NT through a survey of the sources. This chapter is not a repetition of the earlier discussion in chapter 3; it rather represents an annotated bibliography of the Jewish sources and provides an illustration of how Jewish background sheds light on the NT use of the OT. Beale outlines three steps: (1) consult background commentaries on key NT passages; (2) consult major NT commentaries; and (3) consult primary sources in Jewish literature by utilizing indexes of these sources in English translation. The rest of the chapter expands on this third step. Here, he surveys the LXX, OT apocrypha, OT pseudepigrapha, Qumran (DSS), Philo, Josephus, Targums, Rabbinic literature, and early Christian literature. He then offers an illuminating example of how Jewish sources enhance one's understanding of the NT in the example of the tongues of fire in Acts 2:3. For the reader not conversant with the abbreviations used in the principal editions, Beale provides an appendix that contains many of them (pp. 129–32). It should be noted that Beale only mentions the Jewish revisers of the LXX (Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion; p. 110), but he does not describe their work or list the magisterial work of Frederick Field, *Origenis Hexaplorum quae supersunt*. Furthermore, in his discussion about *Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum*, he could have mentioned that the extant readings of the Jewish revisers are listed in the second apparatus of these volumes. In chapter 7, Beale provides a good case study of the use of Isa 22:22 in Rev 3:7, in which he illustrates the whole method of the book.

Since the handbook focuses on methodology for analyzing the use of the OT in the NT, this critique concerns only method and not interpretation. In my estimation, the book's strong methodology could be further strengthened if Beale had discussed the Jewish Greek sources of the *Hexapla* in further detail. This point requires some demonstration, and I will use Isa 22:22 and Rev 3:7 as an example. In his discussion of the textual use of the OT, Beale compares the text of the MT, LXX, and NT. Under the LXX text, he notes that "some LXX manuscripts and traditions conform to the MT, perhaps sometimes as the result of Christian scribal influence" (p. 139). Beale is of course correct that some manuscripts contain a Greek rendering of the MT. He notes that Rev 3:7 is closer to the text of the MT than the LXX, and he therefore concludes that the NT draws from the *Hebrew text*, even though there are some minor differences (p. 139). The problem with this analysis is that it does not take account of the second apparatus of the *Isaias* volume in *Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum*. Joseph Ziegler records a Greek version of Isa 22:22 attributed to Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion, which is a good translation of the Hebrew text (proto-MT). The reading is also marked with an asterisk, which may indicate that it was included in Origen's Hexaplaric text. In time, this reading corrupted the textual transmission of the LXX, to which Beale refers in his note. Even if one dates these Jewish Greek sources to the second century AD, the reading would still depend on first-century tradition (or perhaps earlier). This reading provides a window through which to see how the Jews read the Hebrew text in Greek. In terms of methodology, Beale should list the evidence of the Jewish versions, since now it is more probable that Revelation adapted an already existing *Greek version* rather than the Hebrew text.

This issue aside, the book achieves its purpose, and I will be using it in my seminary class on the use of the OT in the NT. I believe it will aid the student in the classroom and beyond. Beale presents a sound method and a helpful guide to the necessary resources, which will assist scholar and student alike.

John D. Meade
Phoenix Seminary, Phoenix, AZ

Encounters with Jesus: The Man in His Place and Time. By Adriana Destro and Mauro Pesce. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2012, xx + 254 pp., \$29.00 paper.

In *Encounters with Jesus*, Destro, an anthropologist, and Pesce, a historian, join forces to engage in "a reflection that employs ... tools of analysis and methodologies in order to give [Jesus] a place in the sphere of today's intellectual debate," to "help establish a contact between his story and our own culture, which is still being shaped by Christianity" (p. ix). The authors propose that "penetrating into the depths of Jesus' lifestyle and habitual actions" allow us to "discern the secret of his person" (p. x). Their focus, therefore, is on Jesus' "lifestyle," by which they mean "the cultural forms on which he based his life, the mechanisms by means of which he organized his existence and his means of support, the logic of his actions, and the modalities of his contacts with people and with institutions" (p. xi). They see

Jesus' way of living as his true message. Luke 9:58 ("Foxes have holes, and birds of the air have nests; but the Son of Man has nowhere to lay his head") provides an interpretive lens through which the authors read Jesus' story: "he was a man who had abandoned home, goods, and work" (p. xi).

The body of Destro and Pesce's work contains seven chapters. In chapter 1, "Jesus on His Landscape: Mental Maps and Real Territories," the authors seek to reconstruct Jesus' mental map and its link to the place where he actually lived. Jesus' place was important, since place is simultaneously "a principle of meaning for the people who live in it and also a principle of intelligibility for the persons who observe it" (p. 4). The authors note that "the immediate objective of [Jesus'] existence and his place of action seem to have been almost exclusively located in rural areas and in centers of habitation that were not very important in urban and political terms" (p. 6). Jesus' focus was not on the big cities. Destro and Pesce reason that "Jesus was profoundly alienated from the city *qua* nucleus of juridical structures constituted by the urban elites who aimed at integration into the empire" and that, from this point of view, Jesus "was an unintegrated man" (p. 8). The relationships and paradigms that give Jesus identity are developed in the village rather than the city. Destro and Pesce see Jesus' attitude as deeply anti-urban, and they propose that he saw the rural village as the only place where it was still possible "to combat integration or to resist Roman domination" (p. 24).

While chapter 1 argues that Jesus preferred rural settings, chapter 2, entitled "Jesus on Foot: A Life in Continuous Movement," proposes that Jesus was not a sedentary inhabitant of any particular village but that he moved about from place to place. Destro and Pesce propose that "Jesus' refusal of a stable residence can be defined as a continuous calling into question of the relationships and the bases of human existence" (p. 25). They argue that Jesus extricated himself from any local obligations and that he was "against stability, against certainty," a philosophy characterized by his statement that "The Son of Man has nowhere to lay his head." This chapter reconstructs Jesus as an itinerant in a peasant society (p. 30).

In chapter 3, "Jesus Face to Face: Encounters," Destro and Pesce propose that "those with whom [Jesus] entered into dialogue were not some occasional part of the scenery, but were his objective" (p. 41). The programmatic goal of Jesus' continual moving from one place to another, in other words, was to meet people, and his various encounters reveal much about his self-perception, values, and mission.

Chapter 4, "Jesus at Table: Eating Together," shows how eating with others provides the opportunity for special encounters and exchanges to occur in Jesus' ministry. Meals were an important locus for Jesus' practice of commensality (pp. 82–83). Jesus' behavior at meals is significant, in that he "revolutionizes the practice of eating together through his reversal of hierarchies, his attention to the position of slaves and of women, his inclusion of the poor and the marginalized, and his closeness to transgressors" (p. 101). Jesus' meals become kingdom parables in that "[w]hen friends, rich and poor, righteous and unrighteous eat together, this teaches people what the kingdom of God on earth will be" (p. 101).

In chapter 5, "Jesus Leaves Home and Is Made at Home with Others," Destro and Pesce argue that Jesus called for significant changes in behavior on the part of households and "turned their system upside-down" (p. 125). He summoned disciples to abandon their homes and sell their goods "because this was the only way to prevent them from becoming instruments of an alliance between their own household and the household that received them" (p. 125).

Chapter 6, "Jesus and His Body," is based on the fact that every aspect of human existence occurs in the realm of corporality. The authors note that "the body interacts closely with the system of meaning and the intellectual processes of the milieu of which it forms a part, and this interaction is even more obvious in the field of religion" (p. 129). This chapter, therefore, focuses on the bodily practices of Jesus and notes especially the ways that "religion always needs to express itself in a bodily manner and that the body has the ability to give appropriate expression to religious reality" (p. 129).

In chapter 7, "Jesus and Emotion: Feelings and Desires," the authors note the ways in which Jesus' experience "is profoundly marked by all that is human, by all human emotions" (p. 169).

In a short conclusion, entitled "The Concrete Reality of a Radical Life," Destro and Pesce conclude that "a primarily theological reading of the career of Jesus empties it of much of its power and meaning" (p. 170). In their reading, Jesus sought "to get people to bring about in the reality of their lives the ideals of liberation and regeneration that are envisioned in the utopia of the Jubilee in the book of Leviticus," and he "began with a radical personal choice that departed from what had been the custom of his life up to that point. He abandoned everything," and "he asked a similar detachment of his closest disciples" (p. 171). They argue that "the groups that grew up around him accepted his invitation to say no to family, work, and property," and find instead a welcome in the network of Jesus' followers (p. 171). Instead of a stable center, Jesus envisioned many houses and, "in this way, the people of Israel would return to the equality they had at their origin" (p. 172). The most important act Jesus engaged in was eating together, since it embodied his egalitarian vision for society (p. 175).

Methodologically, Destro and Pesce are able to illuminate aspects of Jesus' life through the use of anthropology and history, but they miss the larger context of the text. Their use of Jesus' saying that "foxes have holes and birds of the air have nests; but the Son of Man has nowhere to lay his head" (Matt 8:20/Luke 9:58) as a programmatic statement of Jesus' intent to adopt the lifestyle of a homeless itinerant in order to make a social statement overlooks the larger textual context of Jesus' mission and fate. Jesus saw himself as the last of the prophets and as sharing their fate, which included rejection and martyrdom. This saying expresses his marginalization by his people. Furthermore, the text never states that Jesus was homeless or that he renounced all possessions. It does say that, after the arrest of John the Baptist, Jesus left Nazareth and "made his home in Capernaum by the sea" (Matt 4:12). He did undertake a degree of itinerancy, but this was for the purpose of taking his message throughout the region.

Destro and Pesce provide much fodder for reflection on the human experience of Jesus, and they successfully highlight the importance of certain aspects of his ministry, especially his bodily experience and the importance of meals for his interactions with others. However, their approach does not produce a portrait of Jesus much different from that of the anti-family 1960s-style itinerant peasant of the Jesus Seminar (cf. *The Five Gospels: The Search for the Authentic Words of Jesus* [New York: Scribner, 1993] 316). If an anthropological study of Jesus is to be successful, it cannot be carried out to the exclusion of theological emphases in the life and mission of Jesus.

Ralph K. Hawkins
Averett University, Danville, VA

The Obedient Son: Deuteronomy and Christology in the Gospel of Matthew. By Brandon D. Crowe. BZBW 188. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2012, x + 284 pp., \$140.00.

One welcome development within the last generation of NT scholarship has been the proliferation of specialized studies of the NT authors' use of the OT. Earlier critical scholarship had alleged that predominantly apologetic considerations informed the methodology and shape of the NT's use of the OT. The result, it was argued, was an engagement of the OT text that was interested predominantly in the specific words cited and was largely disinterested in the OT context from which the words cited were drawn.

Recent study has gone some distance to demonstrate that the NT writers were sophisticated and contextually sensitive readers of the OT text. They had ways of referencing the OT text beyond simple citations, ways that demonstrate an awareness and engagement of the context of the OT. Furthermore, studies in the NT's use of the OT are increasingly shedding light on how the OT has played a constructive and formative role in the theology of the NT books.

Brandon Crowe's *The Obedient Son*, a revision of his 2010 dissertation at the University of Edinburgh, has made a welcome contribution to this literature. His thesis is that "the best backdrop for understanding the obedient sonship of Jesus in Matthew is the call for Israel to be filially obedient as it is foundationally set forth in Deuteronomy" (p. 225). He undertakes the defense of that thesis in three parts: (1) a statement and defense of method; (2) a consideration both of Deuteronomy (especially its related motifs of sonship and obedience) and of the engagement of this book and these motifs in subsequent Jewish and Christian writings; and (3) an exploration of the ways in which Matthew has engaged Deuteronomy.

Crowe's statement of method is clear and well-reasoned. Matthean scholarship now recognizes that Matthew's interest in the OT extends well beyond the citation formulas for which he is well known. Matthew, for instance, demonstrates his claim that Jesus is the New Israel precisely through his sustained engagement of the OT throughout the opening chapters of the Gospel (p. 9).

Yet to what extent has Matthew referenced the OT? Crowe offers a taxonomy to help address this question. Matthew evidences both explicit OT citations

(e.g. Matt 3:3) and implicit OT citations (e.g. Matt 18:16b). However, Matthew also instances OT allusions (p. 13). Citing Richard Hays's criteria for discerning OT echoes or allusions in NT texts (p. 28, cf. pp. 15–16), Crowe plausibly argues that if one can establish a Matthean pattern of citing Deuteronomy, then it is therefore likely that there are allusions to Deuteronomy in that Gospel and that Matthew intended to include those allusions (p. 23, cf. p. 31).

The next chapters concentrate upon Deuteronomy, its motifs of sonship and obedience, and the reception of both the book and these motifs in later Jewish and Christian literature. Deuteronomy, Crowe argues, was well read and amply cited in antiquity, judging by the degree to which postbiblical Jewish literature, the NT writers, and the Apostolic Fathers evidence familiarity with it (p. 86). Certain sections of Deuteronomy, furthermore, received particular attention in these later writings—Deuteronomy 5–6, 8, 10–11, 27–30, 32 (p. 87).

The motifs of sonship and obedience are prominent in Deuteronomy (cf. chaps. 1, 8, 14, 32, and “quite possibly Deut 21”; p. 116). With both the book of Exodus and the ANE suzerainty treaty as its background, Deuteronomy's development of these motifs is the “fullest” and “most foundational” in the OT canon (p. 117; cf. p. 95). This importance of Deuteronomy's expression of these motifs is clear from the way that later writings employ them. For Deuteronomy, sonship and obedience are not only juxtaposed, but Israel's obedience is understood in expressly filial terms. Crowe demonstrates that this pattern persists through the OT prophets and that this pattern was not overlooked in subsequent Jewish and Christian literature (pp. 118–57).

The third and final part of Crowe's work explicitly addresses Matthew's use of Deuteronomy, and specifically Deuteronomic sonship and obedience. He understands that engagement in terms of three categories: “strong allusions,” “likely allusions,” and “possible allusions.” For Crowe, the strong allusions fall entirely in Matt 4:1–11 (Matthew's temptation account). He argues that this passage represents a nexus of three related strands: (1) Jesus' sonship is described in terms of Israel's sonship; (2) Jesus is the obedient son that Israel was not; and (3) Matthew appeals to Deuteronomy in order to make these two former points. In light of its literary placement in the Gospel, this text, Crowe contends, provides the “basis for *all* of Matthean Christology” (p. 165). Matthew's articulation of Jesus' representative sonship, therefore, is especially indebted to Deuteronomy (p. 159).

Crowe then discusses two “likely allusions” that contain “very strong links with Deuteronomy, obedience, and sonship” (p. 180). The first is the Sermon on the Mount (Matthew 5–7), in which the fatherhood of God and the sonship of Jesus' disciples are often invoked and conjoined. Because the Sermon frequently references and evidences influence from Deuteronomy (pp. 166–67) and because the Sermon's particular statements concerning sonship and obedience are thematically evocative of Deuteronomy (pp. 168–75), Crowe concludes that Matthew “quite likely ... had Deuteronomy in mind” as he crafted the Sermon, particularly its discussions of the fatherhood of God and the sonship of disciples (p. 175). The second “likely allusion” is Matt 11:16–19, in which Crowe discerns an echo of Deut 21:20 at verse 19 (pp. 176–80). This connection is both verbal and “contextual” in

nature and serves to underscore how the Jewish leadership deemed Jesus, the truly obedient son, to be the disobedient son, worthy of the covenant penalty of death (p. 180).

Finally, Crowe proposes what he terms “possible allusions” or “significant possibilities” (p. 181). These texts include Matt 3:15–17 and Matt 17:1–20; Matt 1:20; Matt 12:46–50; and Matt 21:28–22:14, and they reflect a descending of order of likelihood of Deuteronomic influence. Crowe argues at some length that Deuteronomy 32 is the most probable background for the heavenly voice of Matt 3:15–17 and 17:1–20 (pp. 181–208, esp. pp. 200, 207) and that Matt 1:20 contains an allusion to Deut 32:18 (pp. 209–13).

Crowe has produced a persuasive and clearly written case that Deuteronomy, and particularly the motifs of sonship and obedience in Deuteronomy, constitute an indispensable background to Matthew’s presentation of Jesus’ representative sonship and, consequently, of the sonship of Jesus’ disciples. One of the most helpful features of this book is its methodological self-consciousness and care. This dimension of *The Obedient Son* commends its applicability to similar research efforts. In both form and content, Crowe’s work is a model for future studies in the NT’s use of the OT.

Two considerations merit further reflection. First, Crowe broaches but does not fully develop the knotty questions that the Synoptic Problem poses for a project of this nature (see pp. 35–37). Because Crowe operates with the two-source hypothesis, the possibility of Q’s mediating influence between Deuteronomy and Matthew is a distinct one. Crowe acknowledges this point in at least a couple of places in his study—in his argument that Matthew may have “recognize[d] ... a connection between Ps 90[91] and Deut 1” (p. 163) and that Matthew’s word in 11:19 is an “echo” of Deut 21:20 (p. 176). This matter is a genuine methodological difficulty in addressing the Synoptics’ use of the OT. A more thoroughgoing treatment of it might have strengthened Crowe’s thesis.

Second, while Crowe argues successfully for Deuteronomic influence upon Matthew, not an insubstantial proportion of the Deuteronomic texts that he cites come from Deuteronomy 32. Some Jews in antiquity understood Deuteronomy 32 (*ba’azinu*) as a literary unit distinguishable but not inseparable from Deuteronomy as a whole. This fact raises the question whether Deuteronomy 32 may have played a particular role in Deuteronomy’s influence upon Matthew’s Gospel.

In sum, Crowe has helpfully demonstrated Matthew to be a nuanced and contextually sensitive reader of Deuteronomy. Matthew’s engagement of Deuteronomy as narrative not only speaks loudly about his posture toward the OT Scripture, but it is a constitutive part of his account of the person and work of Christ. In helping us to see this point more clearly, Crowe has helped us understand better what it means that Christ came not to abolish but to fulfill the Law and the Prophets (Matt 5:17).

Guy Prentiss Waters

Reformed Theological Seminary, Jackson, MS

The Gospel according to Mark: A Commentary. By Camille Focant. Translated by Leslie Robert Keylock. Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2012, xvi + 740 pp., \$75.00 paper.

Camille Focant received his doctorate from the Catholic University of Louvan in 1975 and is a faculty member of that university. Some of his major works include: *Jésus: Portraits évangéliques* (Paris: Cerf, 2008); *Marc, un évangile étonnant* (a collection of essays; Leuven: Peeters, 2006); *Analyse narrative et Bible* (coauthored with André Wénin; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2005); *La Loi dans l'un et l'autre Testament* (Paris: Cerf, 1997); and *The Synoptic Gospels: Source Criticism and the New Literary Criticism* (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1993). In addition, Focant has written numerous journal articles, contributions to *Festschriften* and essay collections, as well as several 50-page monographs. Focant's *The Gospel according to Mark: A Commentary* is a translation of his 2004 French work *L'évangile selon Marc* (Paris: Cerf, 2004). The most recent references in the commentary date from 2001.

The commentary begins with a table of contents, a forward to the English translation, a six-page list of abbreviations, and an introduction, consisting of eleven different subjects: (1) *The Gospel Genre*: Focant understands the genre to be an "evangelical narration." (2) *Author*: The authorship is ascribed to a "certain Mark" but not necessarily the John Mark of the tradition. After mentioning various difficulties with the traditional authorship of Mark, Focant nonetheless concludes that "there does not exist any real reason for rejecting the attribution to (John) Mark" (pp. 5–6). (3) *Date*: Focant points to the late sixties before the destruction of Jerusalem, since there is no mention in Mark 13 of the massive fire that destroyed the temple and much of Jerusalem. (4) *Place of Writing*: Due to the language of the Gospel being Greek, the explanation of Jewish customs (7:3–4; 14:12; 15:42) and Aramaic words (3:17; 5:41; 7:11, 34; 14:36; 15:34), it is assumed that the Gospel must have been written in a non-Jewish environment. The presence of many "Latinisms" in the Gospel favors Rome. (5) *Recipients*: Little can be known for certain beyond that they were somewhere in the Roman Empire. (6) *Sources*: Mark is the oldest Gospel and not dependent on any other canonical Gospel or "Q." There is also no dependence on the Gospel of Peter, the Secret Gospel, or the Gospel of Thomas. Reconstruction of any small written or oral sources is ultimately conjectural. Although oral forms of the passion narrative, controversy, parable, and miracle collections, and an apocalyptic source for Mark 13 may have existed, most of this material came to the evangelist as isolated traditions. (7) *Structure*: The arrangement of the Gospel consists of an opening prologue in 1:1–13 and the following main sections, 1:14–3:6; 3:7–6:6a; 6:6b–8:30; 8:31–10:52; 11:1–13:37; and 14:1–16:8. (8) *Textual Transmission*: Here Focant lists the major Greek manuscripts of Mark, their dates, and the parts of Mark they contain. (9) *Theological Aim*: "The gospel of Mark is paradoxical and enigmatic" (p. 14) and emphasizes Christology and the importance of Jesus as the Son of God (in the title [1:1], the voice from heaven at the baptism [1:9–11] and transfiguration [9:7], and the confession of the Roman centurion [15:39]) rather than eschatology. (10) *The Approach of This Commentary*: The main objective of this work and the series in which it appears is "to make the dynamic of the text appear as a whole ... through narrative analysis ... that grants privileged

attention ... to the *story world* and not to *history* itself" (p. 20). Comparison with the other Gospels is of little value, and *intratextuality* from within Mark is the methodological choice over *extratextuality* coming from outside Mark. Procedures of narrative analysis have precedence and require a spiral reading of Mark by second, third, and other readings to bring greater clarification. (11) *Translation*: The translations in the commentary are not meant for public reading, but are word for word translations favoring "the retrieval of the verbal recurrences offered by the original Greek text" (p. 21).

The commentary proper consists of an introductory summary beginning each major section. Each subsection contains a word-for-word translation; a specific bibliography; an interpretation of the passage; and a section of notes dealing with exegetical issues. The heart of each section is found in the part entitled "Interpretation." After the last section (16:1–8), there follows "Appendix 1" dealing with the longer ending of Mark (Mark 16:9–20), which is not considered authentic. "Appendix 2" deals with the shorter ending of Mark. Following these appendices there is a general bibliography of works referred to by Focant divided into Markan commentaries (2 pages); studies on Mark (9 pages); and other studies (4 pages). This is followed by an index of biblical and other ancient sources (34 pages), a subject index (4 pages), and an index of modern authors (12 pages).

An example of the "richer meaning" that Focant finds in his narrative readings can be seen in the account of John the Baptist's death. He states concerning Herodias, "The importance of her role is going to be confirmed by what follows in the narrative. Indeed, in the three parts, Herodias is present at the center of the structure, first of all so that the murderous intention is stated (6:19), then so that she confirms it herself to her daughter (6:24), and finally to receive from the latter the head of her enemy (6:28). She thus plays a very decisive role even if it is not very active" (p. 242).

A major disagreement that I have with Focant involves his interpretation of how the demonic confessions of Jesus should be understood. For him, "Even if they use the language of a confession of faith (1:24; 3:1; 5:7), Jesus tells them to be quiet because [theirs] is a demonic way of giving the good answer" (p. 19). This disparagement of the demonic confessions is repeated constantly in the commentary: "The truth cannot come from this confused mixture that faces Jesus [the demoniac of 1:21–28] and is not a real human subject capable of speaking the truth" (p. 66). The title "Son of the Most High God" cannot be understood as a confession of faith but is "an attempt to weaken Jesus by the magic use of his name and his honorary title" (p. 198). The issue in Mark, however, is not whether the demons in their confessions are expressing their faith in Jesus, but whether their confession is correct. Throughout the Gospel Jesus is confessed as the Son of God by authoritative spokesmen of the evangelist's point of view. The Gospel writer himself makes this confession in his opening statement, "The beginning of the Gospel of Jesus Christ, the Son of God." It is confirmed twice by the voice from heaven at Jesus' baptism and transfiguration. The fact that the demons' confessions are in harmony with these other trustworthy confessions indicates that we should assume that their confession is also trustworthy. Most importantly, Focant does not

take seriously enough the Markan comment in 1:34b, where the evangelist states that Jesus “did not allow the demons to speak, because they knew him.” Thus their confessions as to the identity of Jesus are correct.

My major problem with Focant’s commentary involves his use of what he calls a “spiral reading” of the Gospel. This requires a second, third, and additional readings of Mark in order to ascertain the narrative strategy of the narrator and understand the good news of the Gospel (pp. 20–21). This can only come about by a “spiral reading” of Mark. On several occasions, Focant refers to the original readers of the text (pp. 21, 620), and he even rejects a suggested interpretation because the first readers would not have understood the alleged interpretation (p. 430). Reflection on these original readers of Mark raises serious questions as to Focant’s method of spiral reading. For one, the only certain readers of the Gospel that Mark was sure of were his first readers. Consequently, he wrote primarily with them in mind, not the second, third, or fourth spiral readers! Second, we must realize that the first readers of Mark were not readers. They were “hearers!” This meant that the author had to write clearly enough, so that his hearers would be able to understand the passages being read and still keep up with the continued reading of the Gospel. They simply would not have had the time to come up with many of the subtle interpretations Focant gives in his commentary. We need also to remember that, while a reader in Mark’s day used three senses in reading a text (sight, hearing, and speech [ancient readers tended to read out loud; cf. Acts 8:30]), the first readers of Mark had the use of only one—hearing. The Gospel therefore had to make sense to them the first time they heard it read. Finally, the great majority of Mark’s original hearers were illiterate. Less than twenty-five percent of them would have been able to read. These readers Paul described as “not wise according to worldly standards, and not many being powerful nor of noble birth, but rather weak, low, and despised” (1 Cor 1:26–28). They are not likely to have found the subtle allusions and suggestions present-day scholars with their Ph.D.-level education and theological training find in their multiple spiral-readings, as they heard Mark read to them for the first time.

Despite the above criticisms, I believe that this commentary is a must for the library of all serious Markan scholars, and it is directed to this audience. For one, it informs the reader of what is going on in European scholarship with respect to the study of this Gospel. This is evident by a look at the index of modern authors. The thirteen authors most referred to by Focant include six French authors (Légasse [201x], Delorme [79x], Lagrange [56x], Cu villier [53x], Neiry nck [53], and Dupont [48x]), three German authors (Gnilka [145x], Pesch [126x] and Bultmann [80x]), and four English-speaking authors (Marcus [120x], Evans [99x], Taylor [56x], and Guelich [51x]). Thus this commentary opens up for the reader a broader world of scholarship than found in most English commentaries. Second, the commentary introduces the reader to the world of narrative criticism. Although I have serious reservations with this aspect of the commentary, students of Mark should be familiar with it. However, for the average pastor or layperson possessing a limited number of Markan commentaries, I find it difficult to recommend Focant’s commentary as being one of them. For one, it is expensive. Second, there are a plethora of

splendid commentaries that have appeared in English during the last two decades that are easier to understand and more helpful. These include those of Collins, Donahue and Harrington, Edwards, Evans, Guelich, Marcus, Stein, and Witherington, to name a few. These will be more useful for pastors and laypeople seeking to understand the authorial meaning of the text of Mark.

Robert H. Stein

The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, KY

The Johannine Discourses and the Teaching of Jesus in the Synoptics. By Philipp F. Bartholomä. Texte und Arbeiten zum neutestamentlichen Zeitalter 57. Tübingen: Francke, 2012, xiii + 491 pp., €78.00 paper.

Only about 20% of the contents of the Gospel of John overlaps directly with one or more passages in the Synoptics. Particularly distinctive are the extended sermons or discourses in the Fourth Gospel. A typical synopsis will print only a handful of parallels of a verse or two in length across from any portions of Jesus' extended teaching in John. Not surprisingly, even among proponents of what John Robinson over a half-century ago dubbed the "new look on John," skepticism flourishes about the possibility of recovering any of Jesus' *ipsissima vox* from the Johannine discourses.

Enter Philipp Bartholomä into the conversation with this most erudite of Ph.D. theses, successfully defended at the University of Leuven. Surprisingly, almost all opinions about the inauthenticity of Jesus' discourses in John are based on stylistic and impressionistic observations. The Jesus of the Synoptics and the Jesus of the Johannine discourses just sound too different! What is lacking from the literature is a painstaking comparison, verse-by-verse and clause-by-clause, of Jesus' messages in the Fourth Gospel with the corpus of his teachings in the Synoptics, combing them for both verbal and conceptual parallels. After all, ancient Greco-Roman historiography expected writers to put others' speech into their own words and to assimilate it with their own emphases, while being faithful to the content and thrust of what had originally been spoken. The same can be demonstrated from Jewish, and even OT, authors.

Bartholomä therefore chooses six major discourses of Jesus in John for careful analysis. Two are dialogues with individuals—Jesus with Nicodemus in John 3 and with the Samaritan woman in chapter 4. Two involve his addresses to the Jewish public—the Bread of Life discourse in chapter 6 and the Light of the World discourse in chapter 8. The last two focus on his speeches to his disciples—the first part of the Farewell Discourse (John 14) and his first post-resurrection teaching to the disciples (20:11–29). This creates a large enough sample space for valid conclusions and also represents an adequate cross-section of Jesus' messages in the Fourth Gospel.

The bulk of Bartholomä's work encompasses his analysis of these six texts. In each case, he mines the entire Synoptic corpus for any plausible verbal or conceptual parallel to each line of the Johannine passage at hand. Using a ranking scale of

two numbers separated by a forward slash, he identifies each parallel as 0/1, 0/2, 1/1, 1/2 or 2/2, with the first number standing for verbal parallels and the second for conceptual parallels. For both digits, 0 means little or no agreement, 1 refers to some agreement, and 2 means close agreement. If he can find no parallel of any kind to a segment of a Johannine discourse he labels that section 0/0. Both in tabular and in prose form, he presents and then discusses his assessments and their significance for each of Jesus' messages.

In John 3:1–21, although none of the propositions merits a 2/2 rating, only 3 of 22 propositions find no elements of at least some verbal parallels in the Synoptics (vv. 8, 10, 11). The need for spiritual rebirth, the importance of personal faith in Christ for eternal life, and the stress on Jesus as Savior for all who believe provide some verbal parallelism and close conceptual parallelism. In 4:1–30, there is noticeably less verbal parallelism, with only Jesus' messianic self-revelation in 4:26 ranking even as high as 1/2. On the other hand, 8 of Jesus' 12 propositions contain conceptual parallels, including the pivotal motifs of Jesus' identity as giver of salvation, Judaism's foundational role in salvation history, and the inauguration of the new age in Christ's person and work.

In John 6:22–59, 40 of 49 propositions uttered by Jesus have at least some conceptual parallelism to Synoptic *logia Jesu*. The main themes of the discourse are all present in the Synoptics—the authoritative Son of Man, Jesus as God's envoy, the importance of belief and the identification of the one whom God has sent, the Father as salvation's ultimate source, Jesus as doing the Father's will, and the unique relationship between Father and Son more generally, including the Son's preexistence. In John 8:12–59, the percentage is higher still: 63 of 68 propositions find at least some conceptual parallelism in the Synoptics, while 38 contain at least some verbal parallelism also. Particularly important are the invitation to follow Jesus and accept his truth, Jesus who truly knows and obeys his Father, the self-predication claims using *egō eimi*, the eagerness of Jesus' opposition to kill him, the charge against them of unbelief, the crowd being rebuked as children of the devil, and the general discussion about Abrahamic descent.

Finally, in John 14:1–31, 34 of 53 discrete statements contain verbal similarities to Matthew, Mark or Luke, while 48 contain at least some conceptual resemblances. A list of even the core sayings proves lengthy, including Jesus' call to the disciples not to be distressed but to believe as his departure looms near, the need for him to leave in order to provide access to the Father, the significance of looking to Jesus if one wants to see the Father, the call to pray with expectation, the nature of the coming ministry of the Holy Spirit, the prediction of Jesus' resurrection appearances (but only to the disciples), the relationship between obedience and love, the promise of peace, and the mutuality in the relationship between Father and Son accompanied by the voluntary subordination of the Son to the Father. Where skepticism tends to be the greatest—with Jesus' post-resurrection words to the disciples—the correlation is almost the highest. 10 of 13 utterances of Jesus in John 20:11–29 show verbal parallelism and 11 of 13 conceptual parallelism. Particularly significant are the commissioning of the disciples, the invitation to see that Jesus really is who they think he is, and the repeated bestowal of peace.

Bartholomä frequently stresses that he understands he has not mounted a positive case for the authenticity of the teaching of Jesus in John so much as he has undercut major objections to authenticity. However, he cites my work in *The Historical Reliability of John's Gospel* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 2001) as having made good progress in the former endeavor, which he now supplements with the equally important latter task. Stepping back from the minutiae of the comparisons and the resulting statistics, Bartholomä identifies three reasons why John seems to the more casual reader so different from the Synoptics: the Johannine propensity for repetition, the Fourth Gospel's reduced semantic range, and John's higher level of abstraction. Additional, distinctive grammatical features of John's style add to the feel of foreignness. Theologically, John has a more extensive and explicit emphasis on Jesus' Christological identity, on Jesus as the object of faith, on eternal life as an already present reality, and on the well-known Johannine dualisms. Bartholomä does not want to trivialize any of these differences but emphasizes that these different renderings of the dominical teaching remain rooted in the same theological soil.

Bartholomä rounds out his volume with brief overviews of related topics that impinge on how significant scholars will find his conclusions: how authentic they deem the Synoptic teachings of Jesus to be, how historical they rate the rest of John's Gospel (i.e. the non-sayings material), and whether they see any significant eye- or ear-witness testimony behind the composition of John. An appendix succinctly reviews in tabular form the Scripture references to all the conceptual and verbal parallels between John and the Synoptics identified throughout the study.

Bartholomä's work is worthy of close scrutiny, especially by anyone who is overly confident that they know just how different the discourses of Jesus in John are from his Synoptic teachings. So often, scholarly consensus is achieved more by repetition of beliefs than by replication of inquiry. Bartholomä does not inflate the case he is making. Where there is nothing in the Synoptics even conceptually close to John, he does not try to force the evidence and claim to find parallels. Evangelicals will particularly welcome this volume, not merely for its conclusions but for the rigorous methodology that leads to them.

Craig L. Blomberg
Denver Seminary, Littleton, CO

Four Views on the Apostle Paul. Edited by Michael F. Bird. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2012, 236 pp., \$17.99 paper.

Michael Bird brings together four prominent scholars for a conversation over Paul in Zondervan's "Counterpoints" series (Stanley Gundry, general editor). Readers of this journal are likely aware of the series and the value of its volumes for use as course texts on various topics. The present work appears at an opportune moment as the era of the "newness" of the "new perspective" on Paul is coming to a close and the time may be ripe for a dispassionate assessment of this and other perspectives.

Thomas Schreiner represents a Reformed view. Schreiner is well known for exegetical commentaries on Romans and Galatians, along with other works on Pauline theology. In various publications he has consistently critiqued the “new perspective” and has advanced a Reformed interpretation of Paul and the Mosaic Law. Luke Timothy Johnson represents a Catholic view. Johnson has written a number of significant works on Paul and, while a Catholic Christian, cannot easily be defined by any singular interpretive school.

Douglas Campbell contributes a “Post-New Perspective” account of Paul. Campbell is well known for his apocalyptic reading of Paul’s justification language, and especially for his massive tome, *The Deliverance of God* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009). Finally, Mark Nanos gives a Jewish interpretation of Paul. Nanos is part of a growing movement of Jewish interpreters of Paul who have benefitted from the revolution brought about by the “new perspective” on Paul. Nanos has argued, however, that the revolution is incomplete. Most “new perspective” interpreters have simply shifted their view of what is wrong with Judaism. No longer do they regard Judaism as beset by legalistic tendencies; they claim that what was wrong with Judaism is that it was ethnocentric. Nanos regularly reminds Pauline interpreters that it is inaccurate to view Paul as imagining that there was anything at all wrong with Judaism. Paul’s critique of “justification from works of law” is directed at some other target than Judaism per se.

In order to provide some structure for the conversation, Bird asks his contributors to address four key areas: Paul’s view of salvation, how he viewed the significance of Christ, the best framework for describing Paul’s theological perspective, and Paul’s vision for the churches (p. 11).

Schreiner’s Reformed articulation of Paul leads the series of essays. He views Paul through a strongly forensic lens. All humanity is guilty before God, judged as sinful by the Law (pp. 30–31). Paul views Christ’s death in terms of penal substitution (pp. 33–34), a provision that God’s elect will inevitably appropriate by faith in Christ (p. 35). Schreiner provides a number of reasons why *pistis Christou* ought to be interpreted as “faith in Christ” and not “faithfulness of Christ” (pp. 35–36).

Campbell and Nanos have clear methodological and ideological differences with Schreiner. Campbell critiques Schreiner for his imposition of forensic categories onto Paul. He claims that Schreiner begins where Melancthon does, but not where Paul (followed by Luther and Calvin) begins. Schreiner’s starting point is judgment and sin rather than Christ. This is part of Campbell’s larger critique of “justification theory” that he has published elsewhere, most recently in *Deliverance of God*.

Nanos’s response to Schreiner is quite extreme and would have been more effective had it been tempered. His main criticisms are Schreiner’s negative assessment of Judaism and his replacement theology (p. 62). Schreiner states several times that Paul views the church as “the new Israel” (p. 41); so it is understandable that Nanos, arguing for a Jewish reading of Paul, might be drawn up short by Schreiner’s presentation. His critique would have been greatly helped, however, by toning down his rhetoric. The engagement between Schreiner, Campbell, and

Nanos, however, is a window into the methodological differences between a Reformed evangelical reading of Paul and some of the newer approaches.

Johnson's Catholic perspective on Paul is remarkably balanced and text-based. He claims that all the letters attributed to Paul are genuine (pp. 66–68), with which Campbell disagrees (pp. 102–3). He also asserts that Paul uses a variety of metaphors to speak of the greatness of salvation that cannot adequately be captured by any singular image: "No single metaphor is the most important or governs the others. Paul uses them rather as roughly equivalent symbolic modes for expressing a reality that cannot be fully communicated by any of them. Indeed, Paul mixes the metaphors, so that the language from one logically distinct set finds a place within another" (p. 85).

Schreiner finds himself in remarkable agreement with Johnson on much of what he writes (p. 97). It may surprise some readers of this volume to have such remarkable agreement between the Reformed and Catholic contributors.

Campbell presents a "Post-New Perspective" approach to Paul, by which he means to take into account the "new perspective" insights regarding Paul's expression "works of the law." Paul does not indicate "legalism" by this phrase, but "some problem in relation to Jewish ethnicity in terms of pride and/or exclusiveness" (p. 114). Campbell's view "emphasizes the importance of revelation as the basis of Paul's thinking about God; the Trinity, as the God who is revealed to him and with whom he is now involved; and mission as the life that Paul is called to, largely by way of participating in the loving mission of God to the world in Christ and through the Spirit" (p. 116).

Campbell's chapter is unique in that he focuses on one singular text, Romans 5–8. He believes that Paul spells out his theology clearly here (p. 117), so that he can treat the whole of Paul's theology as he sees it by treating this text. Because Campbell is such a significant contributor to the contemporary discussion of Paul, readers may be disappointed to find something less than a summary of Campbell's theological vision. He has presented how he would interpret this singular text, but what does that say about how other problems and theological emphases in Paul would fit his reconstruction?

Johnson rightly scores Campbell for choosing to address Paul's theology from a text such as Romans. While it is a common move to presume that Romans represents Paul's theology, being written "above the fray and at leisure," representing what Paul really thought about various topics, this is not at all the case (p. 149). Campbell might just as well have chosen a text such as 1 Corinthians 15 to get to the heart of Paul (p. 150).

Nanos writes the final essay, and this may be the most instructive for readers already familiar with the work of the previous three scholars. He begins by describing the typical ways that Paul is read and why Jews historically have viewed Paul as a traitor and enemy of his heritage: "Imagine if a religious group presented the values of your group in negative comparative terms while simultaneously claiming to exemplify the ideal values you actually perceive your group to uphold, thereafter not only stereotyping your group with values you do not hold, but at the same time claiming to be the 'true' version of what your group should be. If that group legiti-

mated this viewpoint by appealing to texts that were not part of your canon and written by someone you did not really read, how would you feel about that person, and how likely is it that you would concern yourself with reading those texts or, as an outsider, challenge their interpretations of them? That is the role Paul and his letters play for Jews” (p. 161).

Nanos then presents a reading of Paul that goes beyond the insights of the “new perspective” to claim that Paul found nothing inadequate or wrong about Judaism. Rather, in several situations in which Jews were coercing non-Jews to embody salvation in Christ through circumcision, Paul argued that this was not necessary. However, Nanos claims that it is an inappropriate move to first note that circumcision was not necessary for non-Jews and then claim that Jews who become Christians must also discard their Jewish identity. Nanos’s contribution will likely provide much food for thought and will hopefully draw many readers to rethink long-held assumptions about Paul’s relation to Judaism.

This review has only scratched the surface of the many issues raised and addressed in this volume. It is an excellent volume to introduce Pauline interpretation and would work perfectly for an undergraduate or seminary course in NT or on Paul’s theology.

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

Paul and Union with Christ: An Exegetical and Theological Study. By Constantine R. Campbell. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2012, 479 pp., \$34.99 paper.

This is an impressive work. With regard to the size, scope, and attention to exegetical detail, one is tempted to refer to this book as a magisterial treatment of its subject. It seems safe to agree with the assessment of Michael Bird, that this “will be the authoritative book on the subject for decades to come” (back cover). The subject is the apostle Paul’s understanding of union with Jesus Christ, and Constantine Campbell, senior lecturer in Greek and NT at Moore Theological College in Sydney, Australia, has produced a comprehensive exegetical analysis of this pervasive theme in Paul’s writing. Further, Campbell has provided the reader the proper fruit of Christian exegetical study: theological reflection and implications. This book is to be welcomed, not only because of its contribution to the growing interest in union with Christ in biblical and theological studies, but also because of the gravity of the subject for the confessional and doxological life of the church. Biblical and theological reflection on the profound and momentous reality of the church’s union with Christ has marked the existence of the church from the very beginning, and the church in our day will profit no less from renewed reflection.

Campbell’s work can be categorized into three parts: historical, exegetical, and theological. I will proceed in this review to summarize the first two parts, and then offer a more sustained interaction with part 3. Due to the rise in the intensity and volume of studies on the theme of union with Christ in NT studies more generally, and in Pauline studies more specifically, the author provides the reader a brief

overview of the twentieth and early twenty-first-century scholarly landscape. Major figures in the recent history of interpretation—Adolf Deissmann, Albert Schweitzer, Karl Barth, and E. P. Sanders, et al.—are given précis-style introductions and evaluations. This portion of Campbell's book serves as a helpful orientation to the field, allowing the reader to grasp the nature of the discussion to date, and as a point of reference from which to consider Campbell's own contribution. Part 2 (chaps. 3–7), the exegetical analysis, is the most remarkable feature of this work. Campbell exegetes every passage in Paul's letters that includes the Greek phrases ἐν Χριστῷ, εἰς Χριστόν, σὺν Χριστῷ, διὰ Χριστοῦ, and their variations, devoting a full chapter to each phrase. A final chapter of this section examines what Campbell refers to as Paul's metaphors for union with Christ—body of Christ, temple and building, marriage, and clothing. By subjecting these phrases and metaphors to textual analysis, Campbell seeks to provide a thorough, if not exhaustive, treatment of the textual data relevant to a study of Paul's thought. As an example of the exegetical rigor that marks this section, chapter 3 ("In Christ"/ἐν Χριστῷ) is 132 pages long and provides commentary on each of the 72 occurrences of this phrase in the Pauline *corpus*, dealing along the way with lexical, semantic, and contextual details that help the reader gain a grasp of the issues involved in determining meaning in each passage. As might be expected, Campbell must deal carefully with the meaning and interpretation of Greek prepositions, a notoriously complex enterprise. Interpreting Paul's understanding of union with Christ rests in large part on how one interprets the meaning of a given preposition. For example, does the "in" in the phrase "in Christ" function locatively, causally, instrumentally, or in terms of agency? Much rides on such interpretive decisions, and Campbell helps the reader sort through such issues. The exegetical portion of the book is its outstanding quality, providing a wonderful and comprehensive resource for students and scholars. Campbell's exegesis throughout appears even-handed and even charitable, and it is scholarly without being obtuse. The book is worth owning for this section alone.

The exegetical portion of the book sets the groundwork for the author's theological conclusions. He describes his study as "exegetical-theological, belonging to the discipline of New Testament theology," differing from traditional systematic theology "in that it begins with textual minutiae and develops through to the conceptual big picture" (p. 23). The final part of the book (chaps. 8–13) thus allows Campbell to offer the theological fruit of his interpretive analysis. Among the most important of the theological conclusions are the following: (1) In whatever way that Paul refers to the work of Christ—salvation, redemption, creation, election, adoption, sanctification, eternal life, and many others—"virtually every element of Christ's work that is of interest to Paul is connected in some way to union with Christ" (p. 331). (2) The union the church has with Jesus Christ is implicitly trinitarian, in that union with Christ brings believers into fellowship with the Father, through the Holy Spirit. (3) Every aspect of Christian living is informed by and results from the Christian's union with Christ: "The Christian life is so weaved of the fabric of union with Christ that the most appropriate moniker for believers is 'in Christ'" (p. 375). (4) Justification is to be understood in light of the instrumentality of union with Christ. Justification is an outworking of believers having been

joined to the crucified and resurrected (vindicated) Christ. Imputation should thus be understood as the unmerited reception of the righteousness of Jesus Christ received through, and only through, a real union with him. (5) In the all-important matter of defining the nature of the church's union with Christ, Campbell asserts that four terms taken together—union, participation, identification, and incorporation—best convey the depth and nuance of Paul's thought, gathering up the characteristics that are spread across Paul's letters. (6) Finally, as to the matter of whether union with Christ is the "key" to, or the "center" of, Paul's theology, Campbell prefers to say that union with Christ is the "essential ingredient that binds all other elements together; it is the webbing that connects the ideas of Paul's web-shaped theological framework" (p. 442).

As with the larger exegetical section, I found Campbell's theological conclusions fair and judicious, discriminating without being heavy-handed. The caveats I wish to introduce, although they certainly do not detract from the overall usefulness of the book, are nonetheless worth mentioning briefly. The major issue facing any interpreter on the question of union with Christ, in Paul and elsewhere in the Bible, is defining the nature of the union in question: What *kind* of a union is it? Campbell is surely right to note that Paul is attempting to describe a union that is more than merely metaphorical or illustrative; he is describing a union that is at once real, and yet a mystery that transcends logic (which may be what makes it real). Campbell opts to describe this union as a "spiritual reality" (p. 411). The advantage of this phrase, understood rightly, is that it conveys the fact that the union believers have with Jesus Christ himself is brought about by the Holy Spirit. It has the disadvantage, however (of which Campbell seems aware), of understating the ontological reality of this union that includes the whole of our existence: "Do you not know that your *bodies* are members of Christ himself?" (1 Cor 6:15; cf. Eph 5:29–32).

With refreshing candor, Campbell is ready to admit that no interpreter can avoid prior theological and, thus, exegetical commitments. Two such commitments struck me as noteworthy. I found it surprising that this extensive study has no discussion of the incarnation. There are excellent exegetical, not to mention theological, reasons for assuming that the reality of the incarnation lies behind Paul's conception of our union with the one who took on our flesh (e.g. Rom 8:3; Rom 6:6; Phil 2:7). It would have been helpful for Campbell to discuss, for example, whether the fact that the Son of God joined himself to our humanity is instructive for understanding the church's union with him. Perhaps this study will act as an incentive for the evangelical church to return to the mystery of the incarnation as it recovers the riches of our union with the God-man. On a related note, I was also surprised, given Campbell's salutary and crucial attempt to convey the realistic character of this union, to find him interpreting Paul's understanding of the sacraments as merely symbolic (p. 387). Certainly Paul thought of the sacramental elements as symbols, but symbols to what end? Are they not gospel symbols that elicit faith in Christ, through which faith we are really, continually joined to the one who joined himself to us? Or does Paul think of union with Christ as merely punctiliar, occurring only statically at the point of conversion? Why interpret Paul realistically in one place and merely symbolically in another?

Finally, one cannot help but wonder whether the author's methodological commitments—developing his theological conclusions from the “textual minutiae” of Paul's letters (an exegetical-theological approach)—impoverish the study unnecessarily. If, as Campbell admits, the Gospel of John is rich with the theme of union with Christ (precisely because Jesus consistently spoke of this reality) and Paul is obviously “influenced” by Jesus' own words and self-revelation (which may be stating it too lightly: Acts 9; Galatians 1; Colossians 1), then Pauline theology is necessarily broader than the mere “textual minutiae” of his letters. Is there such a thing as “Paul's understanding of union with Christ” or “John's understanding of union with Christ” that is less or other than Jesus' self-proclamation and revelation? Should not a genuine Christian theology of revelation claim much more than the “theoretical possibility” for parallels between Paul and John (p. 417)?

Caveats aside, I found Campbell's book extraordinarily helpful. As I have mentioned, for the nearly comprehensive analysis of the Pauline texts alone the book is worth owning. It is certainly not to be missed by anyone interested in the study of the momentous gospel reality of union with Christ, biblical scholar and theologian alike. It is at least a very helpful reference tool, and it may be used with great profit in a class on this theme. Because Campbell is learned without being pedantic, readers ranging from upper-level undergraduates to scholars can equally benefit. I hope this book will help the church delight ever more in the “profound mystery” of our union with Jesus Christ.

Marcus Peter Johnson
Moody Bible Institute, Chicago, IL

For Whom Did Christ Die? The Extent of the Atonement in Paul's Theology. By Jarvis J. Williams. Paternoster Biblical Monographs. Milton Keynes, UK: Paternoster, 2012, 267 pp., \$31.00 paper.

For whom did Christ die? This is the issue that Jarvis J. Williams, Assistant Professor of New Testament and Greek at Campbellsville University, addresses in his monograph published in the Paternoster Biblical Monographs series. Williams sets forth his thesis from the very outset of his work: “According to Paul, Jesus died exclusively for all the elect Jews and Gentiles to achieve their salvation” (p. 1). Williams argues his case in five chapters. In the first he deals with introductory matters where he surveys the history of the question of the extent of the application of Christ's atonement from the early church, through the Middle Ages, Reformation, and then into the present day (pp. 2–30). In chapter 2, he sets the broader context of the necessity of the atonement through an examination of the “plight” of humanity (pp. 32–103). In other words, humanity is universally under the power of sin and death. Williams surveys numerous Pauline texts to prove the point that humanity, both Jew and Gentile, is powerless to respond to the work of salvation God has provided in Christ. According to Williams, “Paul deems Jews and Gentiles to be under the power of sin as a result of Adam's transgression and

that such power both condemns and destroys their ability to respond by faith to God's great act of salvation in Jesus Christ" (p. 103).

In chapter 3, Williams covers divine and human agency in Paul's soteriology and contends that only the elect, according to Paul, are enabled by God to believe and thereby embrace the salvation in Christ. Once again, Williams surveys numerous Pauline texts to build his case that God must initiate salvation to enable fallen sinners to respond to the gospel. Williams strives to demonstrate that when Christ achieves redemption, it is not hypothetical. Rather, "[t]hose for whom Jesus died actually receive God's Spirit and those who receive God's Spirit by faith actually experience this new status in Christ" (p. 179).

Chapter 4 deals with the purpose and benefits of Christ's death in Paul's atonement theology. Williams does not delve too deeply into the OT but moves quickly into intertestamental Judaism and Second Temple views of atonement theology, which he argues, shapes the conception of Paul's own views of atonement and soteriology (p. 201). Along similar lines as presented in chapter 3, Williams contends: "Paul does not speak of Jesus' death as hypothetically accomplishing soteriological benefits for all people via his death, but that Jesus actually effected justification for those for whom God offered him to die. This suggests that the group for whom he died is the same group whom he elected and predestined for justification and glorification to be vessels of mercy ... since they are the only ones (not those who die in disbelief) who receive God's soteriological benefits effected by the death of Jesus" (p. 203). In the fifth and final chapter, Williams offers summaries of his previous chapters and then gives observations and suggestions for future dialogue for NT scholars and theologians about the extent of the atonement in Pauline theology (p. 218).

There are a number of positive strengths in Williams's work that deserve attention. First, this work is thoroughly researched and demonstrates an excellent familiarity with NT scholarship on a host of subjects in Pauline theology. The densely packed gutters on each page of his book provide a trove of relevant literature that will satisfy the scholarly-minded reader. Second, Williams presents a compelling argument over the course of his book that requires readers to work through a host of Pauline texts on several important exegetical and theological questions. Williams provides ample grist for the mill for future theological discussion on this hotly debated subject. In other words, Williams links questions about the extent of Christ's atonement to broader considerations, such as humanity's inability to respond to the gospel, the necessity of the priority of divine agency in order to give fallen sinners the capacity to respond, which should be considered in the debate over the extent of Christ's atonement.

A third strength of this study is that Williams investigates matters related to Paul's immediate historical context through an exploration of Second Temple Judaism's understanding of atonement and martyr theology. Paul's original historical context is equally as important as the things that he writes in his epistles, because questions of agreement and disagreement, continuity and discontinuity, can provide important confirmation of Paul's views or vital foils by which one can contrast the apostle's understanding of a particular subject. Regardless of where one stands on

the exact relationship between Paul and Second Temple Judaism, these issues should be raised and discussed in the course of the scholarly explanation of Paul's theology. A fourth strength is the broader historical picture that Williams employs—he makes an effort to expand the discussion on the question of the extent of Christ's atonement to other periods in church history to give the reader a broader perspective.

Beyond these strengths, there are a few areas in Williams's work that deserve further consideration. As important as it is to address the broader history of this question, there are a number of gaps in Williams's treatment. The debate surrounding the controversies about the views of Gottschalk of Orbais (c. 808–67), for example, is a notable omission as well as any coverage of the views and exegesis of Jacob Arminius (1560–1603). One of the technical deficiencies in this respect is that Williams repeatedly employs the term *atonement* to describe early modern views when the term was generally not used; rather, the term *satisfaction* (*satisfactio*) was regularly employed. Williams never addresses what theologians actually mean by the term *atonement*.

Another weakness is Williams's failure to address the exegetical claims of those who reject his thesis. Williams is dismissive of counterclaims to his arguments. Concerning John 3:16, 1 John 2:2, or 2 Pet 2:1, Williams writes: "The preceding verses neither prove nor say anything about the extent of the atonement in Paul, for Paul did not write them. To cite these texts as the end all verses in the discussion only adds to the current confusion regarding the extent of the atonement" (p. 219). While Williams's book is focused upon the question of Paul's views on this subject, does not the broader apostolic witness of the rest of the NT canon constitute a vital dimension of the first-century historical context in which the apostle set forth his views? Treatment of these texts, therefore, and others claimed by opponents of Williams's thesis, would have further strengthened his case.

Along these lines it was rather disappointing to see so little space, about one page, given to the OT. Williams instead invested his energies in establishing the connections between Second Temple Judaism and Paul's theology. As important as investigating Second Temple literature is, it seems that the OT was more formative upon Paul's views than his context. Arguably, Paul never cites Second Temple literature, but repeatedly references the OT. The recent trend in biblical scholarship to investigate quotations, echoes, and allusions to the OT, evident in numerous scholarly works (such as Beale and Carson's *New Testament Commentary on the Use of the Old Testament* [Grand Rapids: Baker, 2007]), identifies a plethora of OT connections in the Pauline corpus that beg investigation. What should be made of the connections, for example, between Leviticus 16, Isaiah's Servant Songs (chaps. 40–55), and Paul's likely echoes of these texts in 2 Cor 5:20–21? All of these passages pulsate with "atonement" and are part of the warp and woof of the apostle's theology.

Lastly, Williams chides "Calvinists, who appeal to the Reformed tradition," and "Arminians who appeal to the Wesleyan tradition," without citing any specific examples of such (p. 220). He gives the impression that he is one of the few who has engaged this question exegetically while others only appeal to extrascriptural traditions. To make such a claim, especially apart from specific evidence, unneces-

sarily paints Williams's claims in negative light. Why chop off someone's nose and then ask him to smell a rose?

These weaknesses aside, Williams has written a work worthy of careful consideration by theologians on both sides of the debate on the question of the extent of Christ's atonement.

J. V. Fesko

Westminster Seminary California, Escondido, CA

Paul's Letter to the Romans. By Colin G. Kruse. PNTC. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2012, xlii + 627 pp., \$52.00.

The Pillar series expounds the NT, according to general editor D. A. Carson, from the standpoint of evangelical Christian faith "for serious pastors and teachers of the Bible," distilling the gains of recent scholarship without bogging down in technicalities. It is based on the NIV; Greek is relegated to footnotes—transliterated. Colin Kruse's commentary on Paul's epistle to the Romans achieves the goal of the series with distinction.

Kruse is well qualified for the task. A seasoned NT scholar, his decades in the Anglican ministry have spanned Australia and America and include teaching stints in Indonesia and Melbourne. Among published books and articles that feed into the present work on Romans are a study of models for ministry in Jesus and Paul, a commentary on 2 Corinthians, and a monograph on *Paul, the Law and Justification* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1996).

After a bibliography of 19 pages containing approximately 500 items and an introductory discussion of critical issues (pp. 1–33), the commentary breaks down the letter as follows:

Letter Introduction (1:1–17)

Exposition and Defense of the Gospel (1:18–11:36)

 Humanity under the Power of Sin and Exposed to Wrath (1:18–3:20)

 God's Saving Righteousness Revealed (3:21–4:25)

 Justification Brings Freedom and Hope (5:1–8:39)

 Israel and the Purposes of God (9:1–11:36)

The Ethical Outworking of the Gospel (12:1–15:13)

Paul's Ministry and Future Plans (15:14–33)

Conclusion (16:1–27)

Each large section of text has an overview tracing Paul's line of thought in broad strokes, followed by detailed comments by paragraphs. Repeatedly, Kruse has to point out places where the NIV omits Greek particles that signal Paul's argument. As he goes along, he lays out concordance studies of all the key words. At cruxes he canvasses the interpretive options and gives sensible reasons for his choices, reserving arcane syntactical analysis for points where it is indispensable. To enhance clarity, 49 "Additional Notes" punctuate the linear exposition, summing up matters mostly theological in a page or two each.

In keeping with the aim of the Pillar series, a prominent feature of this volume is interaction with relevant secondary literature. Almost all the journal articles cited were published after 1970, the bulk since 1985, with a sprinkling of older classic contributions by the likes of G. F. Moore, Dodd, Bultmann, and Hooker. Over the last half-century Romans has been well served by a row of fulsome commentaries in English, out of which Kruse has chosen a short list: Barrett, Cranfield, Käsemann, Dunn, Fitzmyer, Byrne, Moo, Schreiner, N. T. Wright, Witherington, and Jewett. Paragraph-length quotations from all these works are copious, so that the reader enjoys generous exposure not only to positions taken but to the very words of their authors, to which Kruse sometimes adds little or nothing when he is in agreement. Thus the commentary puts the reader readily in touch with trends in contemporary research.

Without overlooking the several reasons why Paul wrote this epistolary treatise, Kruse refreshingly identifies its main purpose from Paul's own statements in 1:13–15 and 15:15–16: “to exercise a ministry by letter as a forerunner to his ministry in person” (p. 10; cf. 58). That the theme of the epistle is the “revelation of the righteousness of God” is widely recognized; Kruse rightly accents with “in the gospel” (p. 4). Kruse could sharpen his case by anchoring the letter's purpose and theme even more firmly in Paul's situation, which Kruse outlines clearly (pp. 3–4). Did not Paul, obligated to deliver his collection to the East at a time when he was eager to conduct mission work in the West and uncertain exactly what peril faced him at Jerusalem (15:30–31), commit his gospel to writing and send it to Rome to edify the predominantly Gentile Christians there (1:11) with a view to reaping a further harvest among unevangelized Gentiles in the sprawling imperial city (1:13, 15), whether or not Paul himself should succeed in reaching Rome, and Spain beyond?

A Reformed theological perspective informs Kruse's interpretation, with the result that he marches in rank with Moo and Schreiner. There is nothing sinners can do to save themselves from inevitable condemnation. Justification is God's propitious verdict that an ungodly person who puts faith in the crucified and risen Christ is just, apart from works. To be under grace is no license for ongoing sin. The Spirit of Christ, poured into the hearts of the justified, produces good deeds. Because of divine election, only a remnant of Israel calls on Christ for salvation. Grafted into that stock, believing Gentiles form with them a single people of God. Church members are to love one another and thus fulfill the essential content of the law's requirement, to God's glory.

Today any commentary on Romans has to take a stance *vis-à-vis* the “new perspective” on Judaism and Paul that has swept Anglo-American scholarship from the late 1970s. Kruse aligns himself with Westerholm, Hagner, and others who think E. P. Sanders presented too monolithic a picture of Judaic soteriology based on divine initiative. Above all, Kruse cites *Justification and Variegated Nomism* (ed. D. A. Carson, Peter T. O'Brien, and Mark A. Seifrid; 2 vols.; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001, 2004), wherein a panel of experts find enough unreflective strains of works-righteousness in influential pre-rabbinic Jewish circles to contrast with Paul's stress on *sola gratia* (pp. 14–17). Paul's foil “works of the law” is restricted neither to par-

ticular Jewish boundary markers (circumcision, Sabbaths, food laws), nor to the whole of Torah insofar as it set Jews apart from others (*pave* J. D. G. Dunn); the phrase refers simply to what the law required of Israel, and primarily to its moral demands (pp. 18–19, 173–76). Striving in them cannot save. While valuing the link between justification and ecclesiology that Dunn and N. T. Wright have highlighted and taking into account their protests of appreciation for the Protestant Reformers, Kruse has the lingering impression their emphasis “resulted in moving the truth of justification as the acquittal of guilty sinners ... from the centre to the periphery” (p. 21).

Kruse usually observes the important distinction in Romans between the juridic (positional, static) aspect of righteousness (to the fore in chapters 1–5, with recurrences in 8:1, 33–34; chaps. 9–10) and the existential (chapters 6–8; 12–14); but not always. For the whole human race to be “under sin” (3:9) means, in context, that it is indicted on a charge of sin, not primarily under “the power of” sin, as some translations and commentators have it, followed by Kruse. On the other hand, does not “righteousness” refer to a quality of human acts moved by divine grace, not primarily to a status imputed to faith, in places like 6:6–7, 16; 8:10; 14:17, where Kruse habitually reads forensic righteousness? While Christ’s representative death for all (2 Cor 5:14, 21) is certainly a presupposition of believers’ dying and rising “with Christ,” Kruse is quick to identify the two things (6:9–10; pp. 272–79; cf. the comments on 7:4; 8:3); whereas this latter language complex arguably points further to the mortifying and vivifying power of the risen Christ made effective in believers by Christ’s indwelling Spirit. However, Kruse is probably right that “obedience of faith” (1:5; 16:26) denotes believing itself as an act of obedience to God’s will (rather than the moral fruit that springs from faith).

Like many fine biblical scholars, Kruse comments squarely on the text but can fight shy of a needed doctrinal synthesis. If it is true that the justification even of believers properly belongs to the last judgment (pp. 154, 183, 198, 252, 361 n. 407, 394) and that they will be judged then by deeds produced by the Spirit in their lives (pp. 142–44), how exactly is present justification by faith alone related to that final event? Yes, God has predestined some individuals to salvation, determining those to whom he will show mercy (pp. 356, 374, 391–92); how, then, are the reprobate responsible for their own rejection of the gospel (pp. 374, 383)? On such substantive points strict exegesis without systematic reflection can leave readers dangling.

Overall, Kruse on Romans makes a handy, up-to-date reference source for busy clergy and a sound guide for students, without becoming too hefty. It wins a hearty recommendation.

Paul A. Rainbow
Sioux Falls Seminary, Sioux Falls, SD

The Politics of Inheritance in Romans. By Mark Forman. SNTSMS 148. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011, xiv + 268 pp., \$90.00.

In this monograph, Mark Forman provides a study on the meaning of inheritance in Paul's letter to the Romans with special attention to the social context of the Roman empire. Forman contends that inheritance for Paul denotes a "this-worldly" reality that is neither spiritualized nor individualized nor apolitical, despite the scholarly trend since W. D. Davies's study in 1974 on the concept of "land" in the NT. The three main questions that Forman seeks to answer regarding this motif in Romans are: (1) *Who* will inherit? (2) *What* will be inherited? (3) *How* will the inheritance come about? These questions provide Forman an opportunity to understand what Paul meant by the inheritance imagery (content) and how it related to the empire's claims and anticipations (context).

Before addressing the text of Romans in depth, Forman begins with an analysis of the expectations of the ideal society in Roman culture. The basic assumption—as seen through the coins and literature surveyed on pp. 28–41—was that the Roman emperor would usher in an era of material blessing through militaristic advances. As to the timing of this, a dialectic emerges between those who claimed the utopian age had already come and those who saw it as still future, especially the marginalized in society (pp. 41–57). In light of this, Forman contends that Paul's vision of inheritance was inherently subversive given the current state of the empire: *Ought* is a critique of what *is* (cf. p. 7).

Turning to the text of Romans, Forman unpacks the three key passages with κληρονόμος and cognates: Rom 4:13–25 (chap. 3); Rom 8:17–39 (chap. 4); and Rom 11:1 (chap. 5). Commenting on Rom 4:13, which states that the promise made to Abraham was that he would inherit the world (κόσμος), Forman notes that Paul's language has intentionally been de-territorialized from the land of Canaan. However, he rightly notes that this does not mean that geographical realities are removed altogether, since what is meant by the expanded referent is the restoration of creation (pp. 63–72). When the promise to Abraham about "the world" and the background of Genesis 15 are appreciated, Rom 4:14–18 is appropriately understood as a relevant question about who comprises Abraham's family, and therefore, about who are the heirs to this promise. It is not strictly "the adherents of the law" who are heirs (i.e. Jews; οἱ ἐκ νόμου in Rom 4:14), but the promise includes Gentiles who profess faith as well (Rom 4:16–17a). This naturally implies a kind of future sovereignty that undermines the aspirations of Rome, since it is the people of God who will inherit. In the following verses (4:19–21), Forman finds in Paul's statements about Abraham's faith despite the barrenness of Sarah an allusion to Isa 54:1–3 (pp. 85–92). From this allusion to a text about Israel's experience of exile, Forman detects an implicit critique of empire (pp. 92–100). To defend the allusion Forman draws upon the work of Richard Hays on intertextuality and notes that the criteria of recurrence, historical plausibility, and thematic coherence are satisfied. However, the evidence amounted for the most important criterion, *volume*, is noticeably lacking (pp. 89–90). If the allusion is present, which I doubt, it is nev-

ertheless difficult to see how Rom 4:19–21 carries the empire-critical connotations suggested by Forman.

Transitioning into Rom 8:17–39, Forman suggests that this passage should be interpreted in a similar vein as Rom 4:13–25. He demonstrates that the text is about the inheritance of “the world” as in Rom 4:13, in light of the connection with the liberation of the created order in Rom 8:19–23. Furthermore, the idea of being “joint-heirs with Christ” denotes an exercise of sovereignty over the restored creation, especially in light of the regal imagery of 8:29 and 8:34, and the explicit statement that the Father will give “all things” to his people (pp. 117–21). Of course, since those who are “joint-heirs with Christ” are only such through suffering with Christ (cf. εἴπερ in 8:17), Forman contends that this establishes a counter-imperial message that undermines Rome’s advancement of utopia through warfare (pp. 121–34). Additionally, Forman suggests that to speak of the present creation as “groaning” (8:22) is to critique the way things are presently ordered by Rome (pp. 130–31). If the suffering mentioned in 8:17 refers to persecution at the hands of Roman officials, then a critique of Rome would most likely have been discernible by Paul’s audience. Otherwise it is difficult to perceive how intentional the counter-imperial rhetoric was. Yet with a context of suffering in mind, it is natural that Paul and his audience would have resented the claims of Rome. Thus I find Forman’s comments on the political implications of Rom 8:17–39 appealing, though not certain.

Beyond Romans 4 and 8 there are no other undisputed references to κληρονόμος, or cognates, in Romans. However, there is an intriguing textual variant in Rom 11:1 that Forman explores in the following chapter. The reading that most prefer is: “has God rejected his people” (τὸν λαόν). Yet, following the work of Mark Given, J. Ross Wagner, and Sylvia Keesmaat, Forman offers good evidence to support the reading of κληρονομίαν, such as the allusion to Ps 94:14 and scribal tendencies (pp. 136–41). The likelihood of κληρονομίαν being original is considerable, and Forman is able to make sense of the variant in a manner consistent with his discussions on Romans 4 and 8. Specifically, with a question about “inheritance” in 11:1, this has implications for the references to “riches for the Gentiles” (11:12), “the reconciliation of the world” (11:15), “life from the dead” (11:15), and the salvation of “all Israel” (11:26). These are not merely promises of spiritual salvation, but are consistent with the earlier references to inheritance in Romans regarding a restored land and people. The connections made to first-century Rome (pp. 165–69), however, do not seem to be so clear. Though of course, for this vision of future inheritance to become a reality, Rome would have to be stripped of its power. So there is an inevitable political statement being made.

Forman then turns to compare his findings in Romans with Galatians. Although Paul states that the promise made to Abraham relates to the Spirit (Gal 3:14), Forman contends that the “inheritance” spoken of in Galatians is not “spiritual” but contains the same connotations as Romans. The Spirit works to fulfill the promises by begetting sons of Abraham (p. 176, cf. Gal 4:28). Additionally, a future kingdom is referred to (Gal 5:21), which should be understood as a *place* where God intends to rule (p. 202). Noting Gal 4:1–7 in particular (pp. 176–82), Forman

points to the allusions to the exodus in this passage and argues for a concept of universal sovereignty through the phrase “lords of all” in 4:1. The exercising of authority in this context takes the form of the egalitarian vision of Gal 3:28 with the elimination of ethnic distinctions and oppressive hierarchies. This is explained in relation to Paul’s statements about the στοιχεῖα in 4:1–9. Arguing that these refer to demonic supernatural beings, Forman then begins to speak of the στοιχεῖα as “powers” in a rhetorical shift that allows him to include earthly powers, such as Rome (pp. 196–97). The broadening of the referent is unwarranted, however, and the connection to Rome feels forced. As another way to include Rome in his discussion on Galatians, Forman contrasts the military might of Rome with participating in the sacrificial posture of Christ (p. 200). No doubt this is also intended to align his exegesis of Galatians with Rom 8:17–39 in particular, but he does not cite any passages in Galatians that demonstrate this. I believe there are many parallels with Romans 8 that would buttress Forman’s claims, not least the “Abba-cry” of Gal 4:6 and Rom 8:15, but also the broader theology of suffering presented in Galatians (Gal 1:4, 13, 23; 2:19–21; 3:1, 4–5, 13; 4:6, 12–15, 19, 29; 5:11, 24; 6:12, 14, 17). However, the implications for critiquing Rome along these lines are not clear to me.

Finally, Forman addresses 1 Corinthians and Colossians, though the discussion on each text is brief. For 1 Corinthians the main connection with the inheritance language of Romans comes in 1 Corinthians 15. The concept of physical transformation before inheriting the kingdom implies the restoration of creation (pp. 209–17). On Colossians, I was perplexed that, although he notes the exodus imagery surrounding κληρος in Col 1:12, the only connection to Rome that Forman makes is in his comments on Col 3:24 regarding the inheritance that slaves will receive. Of course, this would have been counter-cultural on anyone’s reckoning, let alone to Roman officials, but I would contend that there is far more to say about Rome in Colossians. Developing from the exodus imagery in 1:12 and the Davidic references in 1:13 comes the hymnic material of 1:15–20, which I have argued contains regal motifs and counter-Imperial resonances (see my article in *TrinJ NS* 32 [2011] 3–18). Additionally, I found it disappointing that he chose to include a discussion on Colossians, but neglected to comment on the other disputed Pauline texts where κληρονόμος and cognates appear (Eph 1:14, 18; 5:5; Titus 3:7). The neglect is unfortunate because I find these texts to share much of the same resonances that Forman tried to demonstrate elsewhere in the Pauline corpus.

In the conclusion Forman summarizes the arguments of each of the previous chapters and then provides a discussion on Romans 13 (pp. 234–43). He contends, against the traditional reading, that Paul’s wording in Romans 13 is laced with irony, which would have been discernible by Paul’s audience. This discussion is provided because otherwise many would question the subversive nature of Paul’s inheritance language. Whether or not Romans 13 contains irony, which is impossible to determine and in my opinion unlikely, Paul could still have used counter-imperial rhetoric at times. Subversion does not necessarily equate to rebellion and revolution.

Forman’s work is to be commended for offering a historically sensitive critique of a mainstream interpretation of inheritance in Paul—sensitive to the OT,

Jewish eschatology, and the particular Roman context of Paul's audience—which subtly critiques broader Christian pitfalls (especially in America) towards escapism, political passivity, and Gnosticism. I found the main intent of the book—to understand Paul's language of inheritance—illuminating and enjoyable to read. However, the weakest aspects of the book were the connections Forman tried to make to the Roman empire at every turn, though I did not find all potential connections unper-
suasive and at times felt that more could be said. In short, *The Politics of Inheritance in Romans* is recommended reading for all those interested in the study of Romans generally, Pauline eschatology, social-scientific approaches to Paul, as well as counter-Imperial and postcolonial readings of Paul.

John Anthony Dunne
St Mary's College, University of St Andrews, Scotland, UK

A Narratological Reading of 1 Peter. By Abson Prédèstin Joseph. Library of New Testament Studies 440. London: T&T Clark, 2012, xviii + 205 pp., \$120.00.

In his revised Ph.D. dissertation taken at Brunel University, Abson Joseph offers a narrative reading of 1 Peter with an eye to appreciating the text's "christological understanding of God's actions on behalf of Israel for its audience" (p. 1). This narrative lens allows Joseph to uncover the pattern of events 1 Peter's audience was experiencing, which, in turn, corresponds to the pattern of events that occurred in the lives of Israel and Jesus. He argues that the "hermeneutic of 1 Peter is ... located in his christological understanding of the role of the Old Testament and his understanding of the person of Christ which the author has in view in the opening section of the epistle" (p. 16). The overall result of this analysis is an appreciation of how the author of 1 Peter invites his suffering audience to understand its identity and experiences in light of the similar experiences of Israel and Jesus. Thus, where others have noted 1 Peter's extensive use of the OT, using his particular version of narrative analysis, Joseph seeks to uncover the structural logic (narrative substructure) that orders 1 Peter's use of the OT for theological and pastoral (identity forming) ends.

Joseph's opening chapter ("A Survey of Literature," pp. 1–32) highlights three periods of Petrine scholarship: Relative Obscurity: 1946–1976; The Rehabilitation Process: 1976–1986; and Recent Scholarship: 1986–present. Here he helpfully organizes, summarizes, and critiques major movements in the study of 1 Peter within the last 70 years. He concludes with a discussion of the audience of 1 Peter (arguing that "the audience's status as 'marginal' trumps the importance of their being Gentile or Jewish"; p. 28), and he sets out his own proposal for a narratival reading of 1 Peter. As he turns from a survey of Petrine literature, Joseph marks out three areas in which his monograph seeks to make a contribution to the study of 1 Peter: (1) In the relationship between 1 Peter and the OT, Joseph notes that "Peter's appropriation of the Old Testament [is] guided by his christological understanding of God's actions on behalf of Israel." (2) He forwards the insight that the author of 1 Peter both reads Scripture and encourages his audience to make sense of their situation

based upon four “elements” (election, suffering, steadfastness, and vindication) arising out of the OT. (3) He notes, “whereas the author’s awareness of sociological factors characteristic of Greco-Roman culture is evident in the letter, he encourages his audience to find fresh ways to interact with their social environment” (p. 25). Though faced with real social problems, Joseph understands that 1 Peter calls its audience to respond to these challenges primarily in theological terms.

Chapter 2 (“Methodology,” pp. 33–68) takes up the question of why a narratological approach to 1 Peter is useful. Though 1 Peter is a non-narrative text, Joseph surveys recent developments in narrative analysis that have helpfully opened many of Paul’s letters to new insights and marshals these developments in support of reading 1 Peter with similar narrative concerns. Setting his narratival approach alongside other attempts at reading 1 Peter through a narrative lens (e.g. M. Eugene Boring, *1 Peter* [Nashville: Abingdon, 1999]; Joel B. Green, *1 Peter* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007]; and J. de Waal Dryden, *Theology and Ethics in 1 Peter* [Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 2006]), Joseph works to distinguish his particular version of narrative analysis (depending upon the work of Mieke Bal) as a needed improvement on these previous studies. Specifically, Joseph argues for a three-level narrative methodology including “fabula,” “story,” and “text” (which roughly cohere with what may be the clearer categories of Gérard Genette, namely, “story,” “narrative,” and “narrating”). He defines “fabula” as a series of events that are either logically or chronologically related; the “story” consists of the ordering of the “fabula” or it is “the manner in which a fabula is presented” (p. 45); and finally the “text” is the actual narration itself. Joseph argues that the narrative substructure “contains the fabula of 1 Peter, whose four elements—election, suffering, faithful response, and vindication—constitute the lens through which the author desires his audience to interpret their situation” (p. 67). Joseph contends that his three-level method is superior to other narrative approaches, because the category of “fabula” (or “the story behind the story”) allows one to isolate the pattern or arrangement of the “fabula” making up the “story” that, in turn, appears in the author’s telling of that “story” in a particular “text.” From this point, the main burden of Joseph’s study is to isolate the origin of the key “elements” of the “fabula,” while demonstrating where these “elements” surface in and structure 1 Peter’s argument.

In the next four chapters (“Election in 1 Peter,” pp. 69–93; “Suffering in 1 Peter,” pp. 94–121; “Faithful Response in 1 Peter,” pp. 122–47; and “Vindication in 1 Peter,” pp. 148–71 respectively), Joseph surveys each of the four “elements” making up the “fabula” of the letter. Each chapter follows the same general outline: first he traces the particular “element” through the OT including Israel’s particular experiences of that “element”; second, he considers how the “element” surfaces in the story of Jesus; and finally, Joseph traces how the particular “element” structures the rhetoric of 1 Peter and, in turn, shapes the identity of 1 Peter’s audience. The building insight of these four chapters is that each of the four “elements” appears in the experiences of Israel and Jesus and, in turn, shapes 1 Peter’s audience.

In his final chapter, “1 Peter and the Story of God’s Actions on Behalf of Believers” (pp. 172–78), Joseph considers the “way the author manipulates the elements of the fabula [election, suffering, faithful response, and vindication] to re-

hearse the story of God's action on behalf of 1 Peter's audience" (p. 172–73). This final chapter focuses on the second layer of Joseph's narrative strategy, namely, the "story" constituting the narrative substructure of 1 Peter. Noting how previous narrative readings of 1 Peter have failed to elaborate the pattern of arrangement in the narrative substructure, Joseph attempts to demonstrate how election, suffering, faithful response, and vindication are arranged in various ways in 1 Peter as they structure the author's use of the OT and, in turn, shape the identity of the audience. Though helpfully noting the need for a clearer account of the actual ordering of the narrative substructure, Joseph's attempt to identify passages in 1 Peter where all four of the "elements" are at work lacks the depth of discussion that was offered in tracing the origin of the individual "elements" (this part of the study is only four pages in length). Whereas the work is successful in demonstrating the presence of these four "elements" in 1 Peter, more could be done to articulate the particular pattern of these "elements" and how such a pattern functions within 1 Peter.

Joseph's work stands among a growing number of narrative approaches successfully applied to NT epistles generally, and to 1 Peter in particular. Though Joseph claims his three-level narrative methodology possesses superior clarity over the so-called two-level methodologies, this claim is undercut by the inconsistent use of terminology throughout the work. Joseph defines "story" as the way the narrator orders the events of the "fabula," but much of the monograph discusses "the way the author manipulates the *elements* of the fabula to rehearse the story of God's action on behalf of 1 Peter's audience" (p. 172; emphasis added). Though Joseph offers a brief definition of "events" (pp. 44–45), he neither defines the term "element" nor discusses the relationship between an "event" and an "element" as they relate (or are interrelated) in the patterned "fabula" of 1 Peter. This lack of precision renders the thesis weak at just the point Joseph attempts to demonstrate the superiority of his method.

Even with this critique, Joseph's work is worthy of attention especially because of how he considers the theological implications of 1 Peter's use of the OT. The monograph is quite helpful in highlighting Peter's theological concerns in selecting and using OT passages in a text that seeks to shape the identity of his audience. This is a welcome addition to a growing library of narrative studies focused on 1 Peter.

Darian Lockett

Talbot School of Theology, Biola University, La Mirada, CA

Revelation and the Politics of Apocalyptic Interpretation. Edited by Richard B. Hays and Stefan Alkier. Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2012, vi + 233 pp., \$49.95.

G. K. Chesterton once wrote, "Though St John the Evangelist saw many strange monsters in his vision he saw no creature so wild as one of his own commentators" (*Orthodoxy* [New York: John Lang, 1908] 19). Chesterton's commentary on commentators highlights the wide-ranging ways in which the book of Revelation can be read. The contributors to this volume recognize the staggering interpre-

tive spectrum that the last book of the Bible typically generates and seek to provide a framework for navigating this apocalyptic terrain. These nine essays were first presented at a conference held at Duke University in 2010. Editors Richard B. Hays of Duke Divinity School and Stefan Alkier of Johann Wolfgang Goethe-Universität decided to publish the essays in the order in which they were originally presented.

After the introduction, Michael J. Gorman discusses the reception history (or “impact history”) of the book of Revelation. Gorman explains that the reception/impact history of a text takes into account “a broader range of responses and effects—in and upon music and other arts, politics, liturgy, Christian practices, and so on, as well as on theology” (p. 13). This line of inquiry is especially appropriate for studying Revelation, as this work “has given rise to a wonderful, if sometimes bizarre, story of reception and impact” (p. 16). The “incredible multivalence” of interpretive responses to Revelation flows from the book’s symbolism, hybrid of genre characteristics, highly intertextual character, its “symbiosis of otherworldly and this-worldly phenomena,” and its position and function in the canon (pp. 18–20). The presence of these factors within the scope of one composition, Gorman observes, “creates a perfect storm for polyvalence” (p. 20).

In the next essay, Steve Moyise investigates various “models for intertextual interpretation of Revelation” (pp. 31–45). In intertextual theory, “texts are not viewed as isolated units of meaning but are interpreted in the light of other texts (canon) and traditions (‘rule of faith,’ creeds)” (p. 31). Moyise delineates the major options for understanding John’s use of other biblical texts. Some interpretations focus on the *author’s* intertexts (e.g. Genesis 1–3, Daniel 7), while others focus on the *reader’s* intertexts (e.g. apocryphal writings or canonical texts John does not draw upon). Moyise surveys the work of scholars across this spectrum and highlights the echoes of intertextuality they have uncovered. He concludes by affirming the value of “naming the intertexts and the weight that is being accorded to them” (p. 45). This methodological transparency, Moyise contends, will help readers sift through the sometimes wildly divergent readings of the Apocalypse.

The essays that follow investigate specific aspects of John’s compositional strategy. Thomas Hieke examines the importance and reception of Daniel 7 throughout the book. Richard Hays lays out the intertextual matrix by which John characterizes Jesus as the “faithful witness” and the “Alpha and Omega.” Through intertextual narration, according to Hays, John paradoxically portrays Jesus as one who shares in the divine identity yet still suffers to create a redeemed community of worshipers. Joseph Mangina highlights the role of the *ekklesia* in the Apocalypse and examines the mysterious relationship between Israel and the church as the one people of God.

With a slight shift of emphasis, N. T. Wright outlines the present political implications that John’s Revelation has for the notion of Christian hope. For Wright, John’s message is that “the coming of God’s kingdom on earth as in heaven” has “already been inaugurated through the victory of the sacrificed Lamb who is also the Lion” (p. 106). In a similar vein, Stefan Alkier seeks to explain how Revelation “can help Christians live their political lives” (p. 125). Alkier’s thesis is that “Revelation’s pragmatic model of *Zeugenschaft* (witness) could be a political model for Chris-

tian life today" (p. 127). In short, Alkier avers that the Apocalypse encourages its readers to remain witnesses rather than warriors.

Tobias Nicklas follows these essays by considering the Apocalypse within the "framework of an already existing canon" (p. 143). Nicklas asks, "What is the import of Revelation's voice in the 'choir' of voices we hear in the canon of the Christian Bible? What would be missing if the Apocalypse did not stand at the end of the canon of Old and New Testaments?" (p. 143). The Apocalypse, argues Nicklas, provides a distinctive tenor to the NT's witness to God's action in the world, the church's role in society, the relationship between the Testaments, and God's faithful yet mysterious relationship with his people. In sum, "the Christian Bible would lose a decisive dimension without Revelation" (p. 151).

Marianne Meye Thompson concludes the volume with a series of reflections on the "theological interpretation of the book of Revelation today" (p. 155). For her, "What we are interested in is interpretation of certain kinds of texts, namely, theologically interested texts" (p. 159). More specifically, she considers "how we might allow the book of Revelation itself to shape our understanding of theological interpretation" (p. 161). Readers of the book are "not only to see *what* John sees or to hear *what* he heard, but also to see *as* John sees, and to hear *as* John hears" (p. 164). Thompson argues that "John calls not for sight but for insight, not just for hearing but for understanding" (p. 164). For Thompson, this understanding can take place when readers view the book as a word addressed to them, as a message designed to renew their minds, to invoke their worship, and to be read within the context of the canon.

The dialogue in these presentations demonstrates the eclectic array of interpretations that the book of Revelation is capable of provoking. Assembled here are textual, theological, historical, and ideological/political insights, and most of the contributions have a mix of these elements. There are also valuable introductions to the disciplines of reception history (pp. 13–16), intertextuality (pp. 31–33, 138–40), and theological interpretation (pp. 158–61). Further, the first two essays provide a helpful hermeneutical orientation to the various issues raised in the subsequent discussions.

Within this broad diversity, Hays and Alkier argue that the essays "embody a significant convergence of perspective" that shares "an appreciation for the symbolic and 'theo poetic' power and complexity of the Apocalypse, a resistance to narrowly literalistic predictive readings, a disposition to read the text as calling followers of Jesus to nonviolent resistance of secular power, and a deep engagement with the Christocentric message of the book" (p. 9). While each analysis maintains its distinctive features, these interdisciplinary essays do bear this methodological family resemblance. The volume as a whole is thus a substantive example of the reception history of Revelation that it seeks to describe.

The contributors present a compelling case that there are real political implications in the interpretation and identification of the main message of the Apocalypse (pp. 1–2, 8–9). For instance, Gorman characterizes Revelation as "a theopolitical text" (p. 27). This is true, he says, "because the heart of Revelation is worship, and worship is a theopolitical practice" (p. 27). However, the book lacks a direct

interaction with the method and nature of ideological or political interpretation. The essays demonstrate that the Apocalypse has political *implications*, but some readers might have lingering questions about the nature of political *interpretation*. Though the contributors are typically mild in their ideological assertions, the futurist perspective, historical criticism, and American foreign policy do receive a consistently negative characterization (e.g. pp. 2–3, 94, 118–19, 123, 127, 156–57, 164). However, on the whole, these sections are muted and do not dominate the discussions like they might have. Given the prominence of the topic in the title and introduction, a brief outline of the basic tenets of ideological interpretation in one of the essays might have strengthened the volume.

Accordingly, perhaps a more accurate title for this work would have been “Revelation and the Intertextual Interpretation of the Apocalypse.” Indeed, discussion of the intertextual references woven into the fabric of John’s composition and the question of their canonical function is more prominent than the title suggests. Even the two overtly political essays draw extensively on intertextual connections to make their point. More specifically, in this volume there is an assumed connection between the study of intertextuality and the question of canon. Hays and Alkier note that “to ask about the role of the book of Revelation within the canon, we must consider not only how the author may have been influenced by his sources and precursors; we must also consider literary issues about the interplay of images, and we must assess the theological impact of the juxtaposition of diverse ways of conceptualizing God’s action in history” (p. 3). They are convinced that “in order to understand the Apocalypse well, we need to understand the complex way in which the author is reading these books and employing their ideas and images” (p. 5). This textual emphasis on the connective nature and canonical function of John’s compositional work is a welcome feature of a substantive and thought-provoking collection of essays.

Ched Spellman

Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, Fort Worth, TX

The Oxford Handbook of Natural Theology. Edited by Russell Re Manning. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013, xiv + 632 pp. \$150.00 cloth.

In this timely volume, Russell Re Manning, Lord Gifford Fellow in the School of Divinity, History, and Philosophy at the University of Aberdeen, serves up an impressive array of articles on the topic of natural theology. And what is natural theology? Re Manning responds: “There is no easy answer to this question; indeed it is one of the primary aims of this *Handbook* to highlight the rich diversity of approaches to, and definitions of, natural theology. The lack of a fixed consensus on the definition of natural theology is due, in part, to its inherently interdisciplinary character and the inevitable limitations of definitions that belong firmly within particular disciplines” (p. 1). Each contributor, then, gives their own definition of natural theology, “reflect[ing] the plurality of contexts within which the study of natural theology must be situated” (p. 1). Carving out space for conversa-

tion, Re Manning notes: “To assert the contemporary vitality of natural theology is to cut against a widely accepted and deeply ingrained standard narrative of the rise and fall of natural theology, a simplified story of the historical and intellectual trajectory of natural theology that still dominates most assessments of the topic. As the chapters in this *Handbook* collectively demonstrate, however, “this standard story is a myth, and one that deserves nothing so much as a decent burial” (p. 2). Re Manning goes on to outline “this myth ... point by point” (pp. 3–4). That said, the *Handbook*’s thirty-eight articles are grouped into five, post-Introduction parts: (1) Historical Perspectives on Natural Theology; (2) Theological Perspectives on Natural Theology; (3) Philosophical Perspectives on Natural Theology; (4) Scientific Perspectives on Natural Theology; and (5) Perspectives on Natural Theology from the Arts.

In Part 1, Stephen R. L. Clark begins with the classical origins of natural theology. Here, *theoria* is significant, and this despite the fact that “neither Aristotle nor his successors are clear about what *theoria* involves,” though it “does at least include a delight in beauty” (p. 15). Christopher Rowland opens his essay on natural theology by noting that he is “deliberately playing with several approaches to the meaning of nature and natural” (p. 23). Acknowledging that “Biblical writings rarely offer an argument for God’s existence based on appeal to the natural world” (p. 28), Rowland deftly shifts the conversation to “the human in the midst of the natural world” (p. 28) “as the peculiar vehicle of the divine” (p. 31). He concludes with Revelation and William Blake, for whom “the natural [was] a signifier for the theological” (p. 36). Wayne Hankey covers the patristic period read through the eyes of Henri de Lubac and the nouvelle theologians with their conflation of natural and supernatural. This chapter is largely concerned with philosophical harmonization and the relationship of philosophy to theology. Alexander W. Hall describes the medieval period as one in which “philosophy is ancillary to theology” (p. 57) and where “Scripture sets the agenda for and fixes the parameters of natural theology” (p. 58). Scott Mandelbrote argues that natural theology in the early modern period “was a contested arena” reflecting “differences in how one should read the evidence of nature, and what weight one should give to the Bible and to reason” (p. 86). Special attention is given to the changing role of natural theology in the context of the universities of Western Europe in the late seventeenth century. Matthew D. Eddy’s contribution considering the nineteenth century focuses on the argument from design, an argument synonymous with natural theology during this period. That said, Eddy also considers Immanuel Kant and the moral argument, as well as John Stuart Mill’s response and the impact of the First World War, “one of the biggest blows to Victorian natural theology” (p. 113). Finally, Rodney D. Holder addresses the twentieth century, beginning with Karl Barth’s “Nein!” and moving through Dietrich Bonhoeffer, Wolfhart Pannenberg, T. F. Torrance, and Alister McGrath (as well as several additional voices in his “Conclusion”), each of whom offer opportunities for natural theology.

In Part 2, Daniel H. Frank presents a Jewish perspective on natural theology, a lively account that begins with Job via Maimonides before turning to Saadia Gaon and Baruch (aka Benedict de) Spinoza. Robert G. Morrison introduces natural the-

ology in Islam, noting that “Islam has deemed nature relevant to knowing about God” (p. 152). East meets West in Jessica Frazier’s consideration of natural theology in Eastern religions, an instructive attempt at intercultural natural theology. Taking Michael J. Buckley’s work as his point of departure, Denis Edwards advocates a middle way between “the theologies of [Karl] Rahner and [Hans Urs von] Balthasar [which] are best seen in non-competitive terms” (p. 187). Russell Re Manning critiques the “Reformed Objection to Natural Theology,” addressing Karl Barth’s “Nein!” and proponents of Reformed epistemology head-on. He rereads the Reformers alongside Richard Muller and Michael Sudduth, suggesting that “a Reformed epistemology demands ... a Reformed natural theology” (p. 209), albeit “not ... as the attempt to argue to the existence of God without reliance on religious presuppositions” (p. 210). Christopher C. Knight admits that “*natural theology* is not often used by Orthodox theologians” (p. 213) but adds that “the term *natural theology* may—if understood more broadly—legitimately be applied to aspects of the Orthodox theological tradition” (p. 213). Andrew Moore closes Part 2 with an overview of “Theological Critiques” with an almost exclusive focus on the Barth-Brunner debate.

In Part 3, Keith Parsons addresses analytic philosophy, focusing on the fine-tuning argument (à la William Lane Craig and Robin Collins). Parsons tends toward the atheistic single universe hypothesis, more or less an accusation of infinite regress. Generous and even-handed in his critique, Parsons nonetheless concludes that “natural theology, if construed as a project intended to persuade (or at least intimidate) unbelievers by the sheer force of evidence and logic, has failed and will continue to fail” (p. 260). That said, “natural theology need not be viewed as a sort of logical bludgeon” but might “function mainly to provide rational support for those who already believe” (p. 260). Re Manning returns to address continental philosophy. Beginning with Peter Berger’s *A Rumour of Angels* (Anchor, 1970), Re Manning offers “a more synthetic account of the general tendencies of continental philosophy” (p. 264) in which the imagination looms large. David Ray Griffin presents a process natural theology which he takes to be “overwhelmingly more probable than the atheistic view” (p. 291). Neil A. Manson considers the question “Why would God design or create anything at all, much less a world like this one?” (p. 296). William Schweiker identifies ethical approaches unfriendly to natural theology (e.g. divine-command) before presenting and critiquing the standard approaches and proposing another possibility: a “hermeneutical approach” concerned with mutually critical interpretations and reflection as opposed to proving the existence of God. Mark Wynn discusses arguments from religious experience, including the familiar versions concerned with “non-materially mediated intuition of God” (p. 331) as well as less familiar arguments having to do with materially mediated experience. Clayton Crockett wants to “get beyond the limits of a postmodernism obsessed with language and culture to the exclusion of nature” (p. 347). Pamela Sue Anderson surveys feminist perspectives before commending Hannah Arendt’s notion of the “active life as a shared vision for women and men today” (p. 367). Wesley J. Wildman advances the claim “that traditional natural theology is impossible, ... outright skepticism ... needlessly defeatist, and ... a different approach to

navigating the conceptual and logical linkages between the ontology of nature and the metaphysics of ultimacy ... required (p. 370). He advocates a comparative approach acknowledging multiple complexities, and this in an effort to be transparent. Finally, Charles Taliaferro offers a survey of the various philosophical critiques of natural theology. He considers external as well as internal critiques before ending on an optimistic note concerning philosophical theism and metaphysics.

In Part 4, Michael Ruse (biological sciences), Paul Ewart (physical sciences), and David Knight (chemical sciences) conclude that their respective sciences offer permissibility, not proof. John Polkinghorne addresses mathematics, suggesting that it encourages further metaphysical exploration (p. 453). Accepting Hume's critique, Christopher Southgate considers ecology and offers a "natural theology of the biosphere" (p. 462) that "is more exploratory, less apologetic in emphasis" (p. 459). Fraser Watts focuses on the mind sciences, specifically the distinctiveness of the human mind and the naturalness of religion. Richard K. Fenn's sociological approach deals with "a 'pre-animist' form of religiosity" (p. 488) with salvation being a "desire for instruction that leads to understanding" one's "place in the cosmos" and "the meaning of the moment" (p. 503). Finally, Philip Clayton offers various scientific critiques of natural theology, but not before addressing more fundamental challenges such as "historical, cultural and scientific context" (p. 505) as well as "the changed status of the humanities" (p. 506).

In Part 5, Frank Burch Brown begins with an apologia for aesthetics and the arts in relation to natural theology. After identifying and responding to potential problems, Brown provides an overview of several attempts and concludes with an endorsement of Re Manning's reading of Tillich (Peeters, 2005). Douglas Hedley speaks to the imagination and natural theology, and, suggesting that "there is a deep and important connection between" (p. 539) the two, argues that "it takes the work of imagination to remove the veil of phenomena of our habitual experience and to habituate the mind to the presence of the transcendent God of theism in the world" (p. 548). Following Hans-Georg Gadamer and George Steiner, Guy Bennett-Hunter focuses on "the possibility and nature of religious experience" (p. 553) in literature, specifically Edwin A. Abbot's *Flatland* and Arthur Schnitzler's short story, "Flowers." Jeremy Begbie takes up music and, after summarizing the contributions of David Brown and Anthony Monti, argues that "a continued commitment to the term 'natural theology' is confusing" (p. 573). In its place, Begbie offers "one responsibility of a theology of creation" (p. 573) and, later, "'natural theology' (appropriately conceived)" (p. 579). Kristóf Nyíri tackles images in natural theology and, drawing upon John Henry Newman, Austin Farrer, and Karl Rahner, suggests that we might transcend images. For Nyíri, images are "capable of suggesting extended meanings additional to, and beyond, their straightforward ones" (p. 588). Finally, Robert K. Johnston addresses the film viewer and natural theology. He begins with the results of an informal survey given to one of his classes and, using these results, gets at the variety of transcendent/spiritual experiences that individuals might have. In the latter half of the chapter, Johnston reflects on the earlier phenomenology and, drawing upon the work of Avery Dulles (who makes use of Michael Polanyi), suggests that natural theology might be understood in terms of

“discovery” (i.e. the creaturely side of revelation), a particular kind of “paying attention” (p. 609).

The Oxford Handbook of Natural Theology takes its place alongside of *The Blackwell Companion to Natural Theology* (Blackwell, 2009), and while the latter claims to be “representative of the best work being done in the field today” (p. xiii), “the field” is, in that volume, quite limited. Re Manning’s *Handbook*, on the other hand, offers a wide array of interdisciplinary engagement. In this sense, the *Handbook* succeeds in its stated aim “to highlight the rich diversity of approaches to, and definitions of, natural theology” (p. 1). That said, this diversity of approaches persists in begging the question “What is natural theology?” Are we to be left with multiple definitions and alternate suggestions (e.g. the oft-suggested “theology of nature,” Eberhard Jüngel’s “more natural theology,” Jürgen Moltmann’s “creaturely theology,” Begbie’s “one responsibility of a theology of creation,” etc.)? In an effort to give shape to, and encourage, the conversation, Re Manning might have offered something approximating a bird’s eye view (e.g. Michael Sudduth [Ashgate, 2009] 4, 53), though perhaps this would have fallen outside the stated aim of this volume. Perhaps he intends to address this in his forthcoming *New Directions in Natural Theology: Innovations at the Interface of Religion, Science, Philosophy, and the Arts* (Oxford University Press). In any case, this *Handbook* is a splendid achievement, and though some articles are better than others, they are with very few exceptions a real pleasure to read. The *Handbook* is highly recommended for anyone interested in natural theology in its various forms and for apologetics courses everywhere.

Christopher R. Brewer

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

Learning to Lead: Lessons in Leadership for People of Faith. Edited by Willard W. C. Ashley, Sr. Woodstock, VT: Skylight Paths, 2013, 353 pp., \$40.00.

Leadership is theological. Leadership in the church *must* be theological. Leadership within the church must be consistent with what the church is and what the church does, and both of these are defined by Scripture and our understanding of it—theology. Without a theologically informed approach to leadership, we may inadvertently introduce into the body of Christ a viral form of leadership, one that is inconsistent with its nature and mission, slowly rewriting the congregational DNA into that of a business, school, organization ... anything but a church. The church as a distinctive entity requires an equally distinctive design of leadership.

Willard Ashley’s *Learning to Lead: Lessons in Leadership for People of Faith* is an edited volume, with its twenty-eight chapters provided by thirty-four different contributors, drawing from their own academic fields and personal/professional experiences. The book was not designed to be read as a book but to be used as a resource, that is, “a teaching tool” (p. xvi), which explains the relative short length of each chapter (typically 10–12 pages). It was written primarily for those serving as field educators in theological education, particularly in the area of pastoral care, and anyone else in a faith-based leadership role. While this adds to the scope of the text,

it also makes reviewing such a work challenging, given that it is held together only by general themes broadly defined. The book presents a peculiar image of spiritual leadership, gleaned insights from contemporary theories from psychology and the experience of organizational leaders, as well as utilizing case studies to illustrate leadership principles and practices. Ashley should be affirmed in correctly asserting that faith-based leadership is *both* spiritual and pastoral, and that the two cannot be separated within the context of the faith community. This fact is indeed often absent in many contemporary popular-level evangelical treatments of leadership in the church.

The contents of his book orbit around two foci—the *methodology* of leadership and the *content* of leadership—both of which are informed by spirituality and a concern for providing pastoral care for those with whom we serve. As one reads the book, one factor is crucial in understanding its subject matter and structure. Ashley explains that the ultimate purpose of his work is to equip the reader with a “multi-faith and cross-cultural ... international” resource for “clergy, seminarians, faith-based executives, lay leader, and people of faith” (p. xv). For example, the editor explains that the book’s terminology is intentionally “inclusive,” for example, using the term *congregation* in indistinguishable reference to a church, temple, or synagogue; similarly, rather than *religion*, Ashley uses *spirituality*. So, the book does not purport to be evangelical, nor was it written with an exclusively Christian audience in mind.

The book’s structure is prompted by four questions, each one serving as the theme of a division within the book. Part 1 addresses the foundations of “spiritual leadership.” Five foundations are identified: (1) the dominion mandate of creation in Genesis 1; (2) the psychological traits of an effective leader; (3) universally affirmed tools of leadership; (4) the well-being of the clergy as it influences congregations and communities; and finally (5) clerical relationships that provide partners for the spiritual journey that lies ahead.

Part 2 focuses on evaluating spiritual leadership, which addresses the effectiveness of particular tasks and/or practices within a given cultural context. A general subtext to this section is theological education. These chapters do not overtly identify “teaching” as their focus—e.g. “Teaching Worship” (ch. 8); “Teaching Ministry in an Urban World” (ch. 9)—or include it as part of a chapter, such as addressing the theological education of clergy in the sixth chapter. This section emphasizes the need for contextualization of leadership.

Part 3 turns the direction of the book toward pastoral care, asking “How do you care for others?” At first glance, this may seem out of place: What does leadership have to do with pastoral care? Are leaders expected to be counselors? However, Ashley correctly reminds readers that leadership is not about *things* but *people*. Faith-based leadership provides pastoral care for those whom are led. That is part of the faith distinctive and leadership within a community of faith. The chapters provide insights not only into the methods of pastoral counseling and necessity of providing personal spiritual attention to those we lead, but to the need for the faith communities in which we serve to be people-friendly. For example, chapter 14 calls congregations to be safe spaces for people, while chapter 15 emphasizes the necessary inclusiveness of faith communities, affirming that “each person is sacred”

(p. 179) and extending that affirmation to matters of race, gender, sexual-orientation, and even beliefs. This part gives particular attention to people groups traditionally marginalized in society, such as those with disabilities, immigrant workers, and the poor. It is indeed a reminder to all of us of the diversity within humanity, and that not everyone is like us.

The final part, Part 4, which is the most practical section, asks, “How do you collaborate with specific spiritual leaders?” and centers on inter-faith collaboration among spiritual leaders in a multicultural climate. For example, the final chapter of the book is “Leading a Multifaith Disaster Response Group.” This final section identifies the unique opportunities of working with leaders from particular gender, ethnic (specifically Black, Afro-Caribbean/Latino, Asian), or religious groups (Muslim, Jewish, Catholic, Protestant), and the challenges it presents.

Evangelicals will find agreement with the *broad* brush strokes of the text. With Ashley we can affirm that leadership is a spiritual matter, and that within a faith-context spiritual leadership involves providing pastoral care to those with whom we serve. Additionally, his book does indeed serve as a reminder of the multicultural context in which we all live and minister, and that we must adapt our spiritual leadership in such a way as to connect with those communities. One must bear in mind that Ashley did not set out to write an evangelical book on leadership and pastoral care, but rather to provide a resource for those in faith-based leadership, broadly defined, who would not reject spirituality as a necessary component of their approach to leadership, and would embrace the call to provide pastoral support and encouragement to those with whom they work. Acknowledging that people within organizations are in need of spiritual guidance through pastoral care, and that the leaders of those organizations are in an unparalleled position to provide leadership and partner with other faith-based individuals and organizations in so doing, are other key points. On one level, Ashley does indeed fulfill his own expectations for his text. It can well serve as “a conversation starter” for “people of various faiths to use as a teaching tool” (p. xvi). Also, *Learning to Lead* reminds us that there are in fact *others* beyond the evangelical or Christian community who are concerned about faith-based leadership with whom we may have to partner during a time of crisis. The book tries to introduce us to our theological and religious neighbors. For example, it is indeed advantageous for a Christian leader to possess a basic understanding of Islam and the role of the Imam, or of contemporary Judaism and the function of a rabbi when interacting in a broad, diverse, and international context. Given that the book does not purport itself to be evangelical or *exclusively* Christian or a piece of practical theology for use in the church, Ashley has fulfilled the purpose and design of the book.

One must further ask, however, if the book is suited for an evangelical constituency, such as those comprising the Evangelical Theological Society. Does it serve as a suitable tool or resource for an evangelical leader or in theological education within the evangelical tradition? While some of the text’s broad themes and assumptions can be affirmed by evangelicals, several aspects of the text make it deficient and even contrary to traditional evangelical convictions. First, the book’s subtitle, *Lessons in Leadership for People of Faith*, should be understood *broadly*, and

perhaps too broadly for an evangelical constituency. Contributors include Christians from various traditions and denominations, but also Jewish and Muslim adherents. Hence, “people of faith” is not metaphoric or descriptive of the church, but of any community wherein faith defines its members. While this is in alignment with the purpose and nature of the book itself, the evangelical community may find parts of the book irrelevant and even erroneous.

Second, the multifaith nature of the text prohibits any significant level of scriptural or theological engagement; hence, theological insights and their implication for the subject of leadership are lacking. For evangelicals, life itself is rooted in a theological orientation to God’s truth revealed in Scripture. Leadership that is distinctively Christian, and consistent with the nature and mission of the church, must be derived from significant engagement of the biblical text and theological tenets of the church. However, in a text designed to be a multifaith leadership resource, any significant theological treatment of the subject would only serve to divide the religious authorities contributing to the book. For example, while it was indeed informative and insightful to read “Working with Muslims” (ch. 25), and it may lead to an interesting discussion of the differences between evangelical and Muslim leaders, it may be irrelevant for developing one’s skills and disposition as a spiritual leader or provider of pastoral care in the church. Similarly, by engaging a multifaith, multinational, and multicultural audience, the text has to stay on the practical extreme so as to not offend its readers, thus watering down the potential depth with which the topic should be treated.

Third, while the book affirms the spiritual dimension of leadership, it is not distinctively Christian. As previously noted, Ashley substitutes the term *spirituality* for *religion* so as to be more inclusive of all Christian traditions—e.g. Catholic and Protestant—as well as other religions—e.g. Islam and Judaism. Yet, while spirituality in various religions may share some common elements, no such thing as generic spirituality exists. Significant differences exist in Christian, Jewish, and Islamic spirituality, to say nothing of those between Protestant, Catholic, and evangelical parties. For spirituality to actually be a formative factor in developing and equipping leadership within a community of faith, it has to be more substantive than the treatment provided by this book, especially for an evangelical audience. Once again, the inclusive, multifaith, and crosscultural element of the book contributes to its generic treatment of spirituality, making it less desirable for an evangelical audience.

In many respects, the book’s purported strengths to a general audience of religious faith become its relative weaknesses for an evangelical constituency. It may still prove to be a valuable resource for those seminary professors teaching courses in leadership or pastoral theology, but only when coupled with significant biblical and theological engagement and contextualization into a distinctively Christian setting.

James Riley Estep, Jr.
Lincoln Christian College, Lincoln, Illinois