

BOOK REVIEWS

A Cultural Handbook to the Bible. By John J. Pilch. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2012, xii + 307 pp., \$26.00 paper.

This work by John J. Pilch of Johns Hopkins University joins a growing number of volumes on the cultural world of the Bible. Pilch is active in The Context Group, a gathering of scholars who use social-scientific methods to view the text and world of the Bible with the goal of setting aside Western interpretive lenses in favor of those from the ancient and classical Mediterranean worlds. In his *Cultural Handbook to the Bible*, Pilch emphasizes some contributions of cultural and psychological anthropology to biblical interpretation.

The book is organized into eight sections: “The Cosmos,” “Earth,” “Persons,” “Family,” “Language,” “Human Consciousness,” “God and the Spirit World,” and “Entertainment,” with a short bibliography specific to each. Each section contains five to nine short essays on specific topics of scholarly and general interest (e.g. “Desert and Wilderness,” “Status by Gender and Age,” “Marriage,” “Naming the Nameless in the Bible,” “The Middle Eastern Jesus,” and “Final Words”), though some are a bit unusual (e.g. “Imaginary Mountains in Matthew,” “Dragons,” “Photina the Samaritan Woman,” and “Journeys to the Sky”). Together they are a collection of short articles published between 1998 and 2006 under the heading “A Window into the Biblical World” in *The Bible Today* (Liturgical Press), a journal for Catholic laity. They represent enlightening and at times provocative (Pilch uses the word “fresh”) attempts to bring the results of scholarly thinking into the pew. Similar articles by Pilch that appeared earlier (1993–1997) were published in *The Cultural Dictionary of the Bible* (Liturgical Press, 1999).

Following the methods and goals of The Context Group, Pilch seeks to apply broad-based anthropological observations of human behaviors worldwide to the biblical text. His sweep takes in peoples from Australia, Siberia, central Asia, eastern and Nordic Europe, and Central America. One of Pilch’s stated goals (p. 105) is to show that God neither is culture-specific nor privileges one culture over another. While Pilch acknowledges that the culture (he consistently uses the singular) of the Bible is indeed distinct from others, he stresses that biblical culture is simply one way of being human among many. Bible readers, as a result, need to appreciate how other cultures view differently the same realities that are described by the writers of the Bible. By implication, the interpretations of reality recorded in the Bible—including its moral exhortations—are not exclusively better than those of other cultures. (See, e.g., Pilch’s generous and relativistic assessment on what is not adultery, p. 122.) An underlying theme—unstated but clear throughout—is to discount any objective sense of ancient Israel’s being chosen by God, and with it the significance of Jewish roots of Christianity. According to Pilch, the apostle Paul “rejects the Second Temple and the Torah interpretations associated with it, [dismissing] Israel’s legal tradition in favor of [a number of] developing, distinctive Jesus-group

customs” and in the process “insists that post-Jesus group behavior should at least be as good as the best in surrounding cultures” (p. 127).

Pilch is most convincing in his treatment of traditional cultural background categories such as honor and shame, naming and names, marriage, gender, sexuality, literacy, music, and the value of the spoken word. More problematic (for evangelicals at least) are his discussions on “The Cosmos,” “Human Consciousness,” and “God and the Spirit World,” which view the Bible’s religious thought through a number of anthropological observations grounded in animism. Much is made of alternate states of consciousness; Pilch notes that psychological anthropologists have categorized thirty-five different levels or kinds, including dreams, daydreams, fantasies, prayerfulness (!), trances, soul-flight, near-death experiences, and the like (p. 184). Through these states of consciousness, holy people (on the pattern of shamans), including Jesus and his followers, communicated with God and other divine beings. Or, with one form of altered consciousness or another, they traveled to alternate realities by way of holes in the sky (portals) that Pilch asserts ancient Israel believed were found over holy places on earth (e.g. above the rock on which Jacob slept at Bethel or over the Jerusalem temple). Based on anthropological parallels it is even possible, we read, for multiple believers to enter into the same state of alternate consciousness, experiencing the same alternate reality, at the same time. In this way, Pilch explains the appearance of angels, the transfiguration, the appearance of Jesus walking on the water, all of the post-resurrection appearances (including those at the tomb and Paul’s encounter on the road to Damascus), and Jesus’ ascension to heaven (which had to be from Jerusalem rather than Galilee because that is where the hole in the sky was).

In a few places Pilch makes basic errors of fact in matters of geography or archaeology, such as “rain tends to fall every winter season, especially in March and April” (p. 28); “the traditional site [of the feeding of the 5000] is Heptapegon, approximately two miles east of Bethsaida (p. 31); “nothing like modern city-planning existed [in the biblical world]” (p. 275).

There is plenty here to discuss, not only of particulars but of method, presuppositions, and approach. Readers of this *Journal* are familiar with debates about the extent to which the Bible participated in the cultural worlds of ancient Israel and its neighbors, and the roles of the social sciences as interpretive tools. (This reviewer holds that much of value is gained through anthropology). Finding parallels for cultural behavior here and there may be interesting, but how might they be *relevant*? Traditional human cultures differ both widely and wildly, and not all possible parallels are equally valid. (It is as unfair to harmonize far-flung cultures as it is to harmonize divergent texts.) It seems that more powerful cultural parallels for the world of the Bible might be drawn from indigenous cultures closer to the place-context of the Bible itself, specifically from traditional peoples living in the Semitic Levant. Pilch’s emphasis on the Mediterranean world is primarily aimed at broad-based observations of Mediterranean culture—which itself is far from monolithic—and the Greco-Roman world in particular, even though the most enduring roots of thought and behavior of the peoples of the biblical world are found in the Semitic ancient Near East. Anthropological work among the Bedouin of southeast

Asia and the Sinai, or among the Palestinian Fellahin (peasant village farmers)—peoples who still live in the lands of ancient Israel and its neighbors and who cling to ancient values in spite of forces of modernization—provide many interesting and relevant parallels to the world of the Bible. These people groups are ignored by Pilch. Similarly marginalized are texts from the world of Second Temple-era Judaism that are chock full of everyday, culturally relevant data that can be read through social-scientific lenses, as well as specific archaeological data that can both corroborate and illustrate minutia of everyday life otherwise revealed by social-scientific approaches. In our attempts to understand a fixed text from a fixed set of cultures (timeless though the Bible is), there is plenty of room to continue to offer fresh perspectives by drawing primarily on information from within the Bible's own cultural environments. *A Cultural Handbook to the Bible*, read with insight and discretion, is a good reminder of that.

Paul H. Wright

Jerusalem University College, Jerusalem, Israel

Beginning Biblical Hebrew. By John A. Cook and Robert D. Holmstedt. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2013, 324 pp., \$39.99.

The existence of so many first-year Hebrew grammars testifies to a relatively high level of dissatisfaction many instructors have with available books and places upon newcomers an obligation to set forth justification for their contributions. In an informative preface to *Beginning Biblical Hebrew* (hereafter *BBH*), John Cook and Robert Holmstedt provide seven distinctives, and the grammar they have produced admirably satisfies each one. First, they employ pedagogical principles common in the field of second-language acquisition. For instance, the readings in the book are heavily illustrated and alive with color. Students encounter texts from Genesis 3, 22, and 37 multiple times with increasing complexity and similarity to the actual biblical text. *BBH* presents vocabulary words with icons rather than English glosses. For example, a silhouette of four camels walking in the same direction accompanies the word אֲרָרְהָא. This encourages students to learn vocabulary in the context of the readings where actual usage shapes meaning. When an icon does not work so well, an English gloss appears, such as “in order to” with the word לְמַעַן. While many exercises expect students to provide translations and grammatical information typical of parsing, most show creativity by asking students to fill in blanks or to change words from singular to plural. The exercises that accompany the readings focus on comprehension not only of the text but also of Hebrew as a language. For example, after reading Genesis 37 the student is asked, מָה עָשׂוּ אֶחָיו לְיוֹסֵף? (“What did his brothers do to Joseph?”)

Second, guided by the goal of understanding Biblical Hebrew texts (rather than decoding Hebrew words and phrases so that one can recode them into English), *BBH* provides a minimum of grammatical explanation in favor of exercises, readings, and comprehension questions. Students thus encounter morphological features of weak verbs inductively. The hefty Appendix C on Verb Morphology

provides much of the detail that takes center stage in many grammar-translation style textbooks. As important as grammar and the meta-language that describes it are, students learn these best when they already have a measure of competence with the language itself, both as written text and as something they can understand aurally as well as produce orally and in writing.

Third, *BBH* moves away from the traditional organization of phonology-morphology-syntax. Instead, it presents smaller chunks of information in different order, often with increased focus on syntax and semantics.

Fourth, *BBH* directs the student's attention to authentic Biblical Hebrew texts and provides linguistic explanations necessary to comprehend them as texts, not simply as examples of grammatical features. The book has fifty lessons that lead students into thirteen readings.

Fifth, the authors have chosen to deal with selections of prose from the book of Genesis only. They recognize a danger in trying to be overly comprehensive or in regarding Biblical Hebrew as a uniform language across the genres of biblical and extra-biblical literature. Still, one could wish that first-year students get at least a little exposure to Hebrew poetry.

Sixth, *BBH* minimizes use of grammatical meta-language. Instead of such terms as *status constructus*, it prefers to use native Hebrew terms such as בְּנִי (rather than "stem" and מְבֻרָךְ for the construct form.

Seventh, *BBH* has adopted a non-confessional orientation. It attempts to serve a wide community, including those who come to the study of Biblical Hebrew with linguistic and cultural as well as theological interests.

Beginning Biblical Hebrew is a working manual for students. It has wide margins and a very open format complete with blank lines where students can write answers to exercises. In the context of an academic course, it would be helpful to have these exercises formatted on pages that could be turned in for grading. After an introduction to Hebrew as a particularly significant Semitic language, the lessons that follow make up roughly half of the book. There are appendices on phonology, morphology of the noun and the verb, plus a helpful appendix on how to use a lexicon, helpfully illustrated with examples from BDB as well as *The Concise Dictionary of Classical Hebrew*. An extensive Hebrew-English Glossary is followed by an English-Hebrew Glossary useful for exercises that ask students to produce written Hebrew. The book concludes with ninety pages of Hebrew readings that begin at the back of the book and proceed from right to left. An Instructor's Manual is also available. Its page layout and numeration is identical to the main version, though it includes an additional preface detailing its pedagogical principles and suggestions for use in the classroom. The margins of this version contain many helpful notes and explanations for instructors. The exercise blanks are filled in with answers in a colored font. This version also has a section of vocabulary lists grouped by lesson, reading, and frequency. Support for teachers continues online with a website run by the authors as well as one hosted by the Baker Publishing Group. Students can download vocabulary cards and audio files. Upon request, instructors may receive sample quizzes, exams, lesson plans, as well as a beta-version of an illustrated reader on the whole book of Jonah in both student and instructor versions.

Cook and Holmstedt have been producing instructional materials since 1996, not only incorporating best theory and practices from the field of second-language acquisition but also responding to feedback from actual use in the classroom. The result is a fresh, intentional, creative, and richly supported set of materials geared to help students joyfully discover the meaning of basic Biblical Hebrew prose. Instructors who wish to provide more grammatical information can easily do so using the appendices or other grammars on the market, but this reviewer heartily agrees that motivation comes from early comprehension and use rather than premature mastery of details. *BBH* excels at bringing a sweeping breadth of material to students in ways that support genuine language learning as focused on the biblical text.

This approach to writing a beginning grammar is good for students who are not yet ready for advanced linguistic discussions. That said, the Instructor's Manual would be an ideal place to provide further references, particularly studies in second-language acquisition that are relatively unknown to specialists in biblical studies. In a similar vein, this grammar rests on theoretical foundations that may not be shared by each instructor. This is especially the case with how one understands the tense, aspect, and modality of the Hebrew verbal system. *BBH* presents the views of Cook's study of the Hebrew verb published by Eisenbrauns (2012) and potential users are advised to be aware of this orientation.

The authors have chosen to downplay the semantic significance of the *binyanim* as an integrated system. In several places they note that meanings of verbs are unpredictable and must be learned individually. Some instructors may be uncomfortable with this approach and would prefer to make clear, for example, the causative difference between the Qal יָרַד ("go down") and the Hiphil הוֹרִיד ("bring down"). The Hebrew-English Glossary does provide a bit of grouping in this regard, listing the Piel meaning "beautify" as part of the entry for the Qal verb יָפָה (be fair, beautiful). Inexplicably, *BBH* prefers to list unattested 3ms Perfect Piel forms rather than the actual Piel forms from the Hebrew Bible. For instance, in the Hebrew-English Glossary one finds the unattested word אֶבֶד rather than אָבַד, which appears twice. Likewise *BBH* provides the hypothetical forms מְנֶה and קֹדֵשׁ rather than the attested forms מָנָה and קִדַּשׁ. The same could be said of נָבַט and קָצַר, נִבְט and קָצַר, and שָׁלַם. The word שָׁבַר does appear once but as a pausal form; שָׁבַר is normal. This tendency to reinforce the Piel pattern is especially evident when *BBH* gives the words דָּבַר and בָּרַךְ whereas the actual forms דִּבֶּר and בִּרַךְ are far more common and widely attested.

Appendix C on Verb Morphology is quite full and devoted to weak verbs but it does not alert the student to the existence of any variations from the Piel pattern with *šere*. On another technical note, the authors deal with the irreal use of the Perfect conjugation, usually with the clause-initial presence of a *weqaṭal* form. They do not, however, mention the accent shift that occurs with the 2ms and 1cs forms nor do they accurately represent the Hebrew Bible text in three translation exercises. For example, the practice sentence וְלָקַחְתָּ אִשָּׁה לְיִצְחָק (so you may take a wife for Isaac) clearly depends on four instances in Genesis 24 where the verb is consistently accented on the final syllable (וּלְקַחְתָּ).

Cook and Holmstedt offer a significant and unique contribution to the field of introductory Hebrew grammars. *BBH* reflects thoughtful design that meets the requirements of effective instruction in the real world. In light of the book's focus on prose passages from the book of Genesis and the authors' work on the Jonah reader, one would welcome a forthcoming book of similar design and quality introducing Hebrew poetry.

Robert C. Stallman
Northwest University, Kirkland, WA

The T&T Clark Hebrew Primer. By A. A. Macintosh and C. L. Engle. London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2014, viii + 82 pp., \$22.95 paper.

Of the publishing of Hebrew grammars there seems to be no end. *The T&T Clark Hebrew Primer* by A. A. Macintosh and C. L. Engle, however, differs some in that—true to its title—it is a primer. As specified in the preface, this primer is “designed to facilitate revision and consolidation for those who are following, or who have followed, the standard courses of instruction in elementary Hebrew, as also for those who, after an interval of neglect, wish to revive their knowledge of the language and their ability to read the Hebrew Bible” (p. vii).

The introduction briefly presents several preliminary matters, such as the vowels of biblical Hebrew and how they are transliterated throughout the primer, the difference between *dāgēs forte* and *dāgēs lene*, and the distinction between open and closed syllables.

The first chapter groups nouns and adjectives into six categories with the goal of enabling the reader to “master a large number of Hebrew nouns (and adjectives), as well as the forms of the verbal system” (p. 5). The categories are largely dependent on vocalization and how the vowels change or do not change when endings are added. Macintosh and Engle begin with what they contend to be the three most important categories of nouns, namely nouns with final accent (e.g. דָּבָר), nouns with initial accent (e.g. segolate nouns like מְלִיץ), and nouns with unalterable first syllable (e.g. מְזִבְחָה). The other three categories are nouns with a weak middle letter (e.g. nouns with medial *māw* or *yōd* such as מְנוּחָה and בְּרִית), nouns with a final weak letter (e.g. geminate nouns such as עָם and nouns ending in historical *yōd* such as שְׂדֵה), and nouns that exhibit no vocalic changes when endings are added (e.g. בְּרִית).

Chapter 2 first outlines the basic patterns of the perfect, imperfect, participle, imperative, and infinitive construct for Qal strong verbs. Macintosh and Engle then present the seven “themes” (i.e. *binyānīm* or verbal stems) of the Hebrew verbal system. They label the third-person masculine singular perfect and imperfect forms as “crucial signposts” that represent the basic vocalic pattern for each of the stems. The consistency of the endings of the perfect and imperfect across the verbal stems is emphasized in contrast with the signposts, which necessarily vary from stem to stem. The chapter ends with brief discussions of stative verbs and suffixes attached to verbs.

Chapter 3 builds on the previous chapter by presenting the weak verb paradigm in the Qal and derived stems. Macintosh and Engle label each verb with both the terminology based on the numerical placement of the weak letter (e.g. I-*nûn* verbs) and the terminology based on the root פֿעל (e.g. *pê-nûn* verbs). This chapter contains discussion of all the standard weak verbs; relatively minor stems of weak verbs (e.g. the Polal and Polal) are excluded.

The remaining three chapters treat the definite article (chap. 4), *wāw* (chap. 5), and finally prepositions, the interrogative marker הַ, and the direct object marker תָּ (chap. 6). The primer concludes with a vocabulary list of words that occur frequently in the Hebrew Bible. Many of the list's entries are accompanied by memory aids for learning the vocabulary.

The T&T Clark Hebrew Primer has much to commend it—in particular, its brevity, conciseness, and clarity. As a primer and not a detailed grammar, it is well-suited for those looking to review the basic concepts of biblical Hebrew without getting too bogged down in the details. The primer's memory aids for vocabulary are useful overall, although not all students may find the comparisons with Israeli Hebrew, Arabic, and even Modern Greek helpful.

The primer suffers most significantly, however, in its discussion of the verbal system and its presentation of *wāw*. This is apparent in at least three ways. First, although the opposition between fientive and stative verbs is fundamental to the verbal system in biblical Hebrew as it is in the other Semitic languages, this distinction is mentioned almost as an afterthought. Second, the primer contains several common misconceptions regarding the *binyānîm* that stem from reliance upon translation possibilities and a desire to make each *binyān* uniform in its function. The Niphal is medio-passive and not “properly reflexive” (p. 20) as Macintosh and Engle contend; the Piel is neither intensive nor causative, but (in addition to its denominative function) is typically a pluralitive for fientive verbs and is most often factitive for stative verbs. Third, concerning *wāw*, the primer misleadingly presents the *wāw* as if it magically converts the perfect to a future tense and the imperfect to a past tense: “When the conjunction וַ is prefixed *directly* to a verbal form ... the result is that *wāw* with an imperfect has a past meaning, while *wāw* with a perfect form has a future or present meaning” (p. 62). Despite the further contention that “this extraordinary phenomenon is not fully understood” (p. 62), the reality is that past *wayyiqtol* is not a converted imperfect but the preterite *yiqtol* with *wāw*, and future *weqatal* originated via the usage of *weqatal* in conditional clauses. Obviously, beginning and remedial students of biblical Hebrew should not be expected to know how the above-mentioned forms originated and why they function as they do. Those learning biblical Hebrew should, however, be taught the forms' correct meaning and function in light of what is known from actual texts and from comparative Semitics.

The T&T Clark Hebrew Primer does an excellent job when it comes to brevity, clarity, and conciseness. Its usefulness is somewhat limited, however, by the common misconceptions and errors it perpetuates.

Benjamin J. Noonan
Columbia International University, Columbia, SC

Exploring our Hebraic Heritage: A Christian Theology of Roots and Renewal. By Marvin R. Wilson. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2014, xxxviii + 304 pp., \$22.00 paper.

The basic task of *Exploring our Hebraic Heritage* is to prove that Judaism and Christianity can mutually enrich each other if properly understood. Marvin Wilson is H. J. Ockenga Professor of Biblical and Theological Studies at Gordon College in Wenham, MA, and is well qualified to present a thorough case for renewing Christian faith by rethinking our Hebraic heritage. He describes his aim as “primarily to explore some of the theological, spiritual, and ethical themes that more directly affect Christian understanding and experience rather than to explore specific, narrowly focused, highly theoretical, or abstract legal issues that may lack relevance and applicability to most Christian readers. . . . Our Hebraic heritage is not an exploration of Jewish “legalisms” or a call for people to practice ancient or modern Judaism. Ours is a call to explore and to learn more of the richness and depth of the roots of the Christian faith” (pp. xxii–xxiii). There is a need to correct the de-Judaization of the church that began in the second century with the spread of Christianity throughout Europe. Greek and Latin expressions of Christianity became more prevalent and influential than those of its Jewish roots.

Wilson claims we can regain useful knowledge and wisdom from extra-canonical Jewish sources even though they are not the Word of God. In fact, they are incomplete and limited in perspective, but they deserve our effort to test them against the Scripture. He goes as far as to say that today’s church needs early Jewish sources “and knowledge of comparative religions to help in understanding the biblical text and cultural world of the Bible” (p. xxi). Wilson presents Hebraic tradition to enlarge our conversation with Jews that can possibly lead to a greater appreciation of the Jewish origins of Christianity.

To make his case, Wilson divides his book into five parts: “Theological Sources and Methods,” “People of God: an Abrahamic Family,” “God and His Ways,” “On Approaching God,” and “Moving into Future.” In part 1, he begins by calling for greater maturity in theological reflection, especially in the area of deep and intellectually informed faith. This faith must be based on the Hebraic heritage in the same way it was with the writers of the NT. They had the OT as their primary source, so they quoted the Scripture and respected it. We should not, therefore, make an interpretative judgment on the OT. Rather, we should hear it in its historical and canonical context. Wilson is helpful in outlining hallmarks of Hebraic theology and uncovering its roots. But then he goes on emphasizing the need to know not only the OT, but also the Mishnah, Talmud, and Codes. He claims, “Judaism serves to keep Christianity grounded in this world by addressing the most challeng-

ing of human needs and real-life problems” (p. 37). It is true that most Christians are not familiar with the early rabbinic sources and remain uninformed about the biblical origins of their belief system.

Part 2 focuses on the people of God that had its beginnings in the Abrahamic family. Wilson earlier published a book entitled *Our Father Abraham: Jewish Roots of the Christian Faith*, and much of his research for that book is presented in this section where he asserts that “all Christians are spiritual Semites, for they share in the inheritance of Abraham’s family” (p. 65). I do not think the apostles and other leaders of the early church would object to this statement. In fact, returning to our Hebraic roots would correct some shallowness and superficiality of modern church, especially in the area of church membership. Nowadays people become members of a church for social-psychological reasons, for the pastor’s ability to communicate with them (usually to their likings), for a certain kind of music, or for the cultural environment they enjoy. There is a need to recover our understanding of biblically authentic Christian thought and practice by going back to Abraham, whose name is mentioned seventy-two times in the NT. The significance of Abraham must be viewed from Paul’s perspective as the father of all who believe (Rom 4:11).

Part 3 deals with God and his ways. The lack of knowledge of the OT can distort the picture of God. We must not overlook the work of God throughout thousands of years of Jewish history. This knowledge is available to us in Jewish writings that document experiencing God in a personal way. Wilson illustrates the uniqueness of Yahweh by writing about three differences between the God of the OT and the other gods: personal vs. impersonal, invisible vs. visible, and prohibition of images vs. embrace of images.

What is the most important teaching that Jews and Christians have in common? Wilson understands it to be the fact that we are created in the image of God. He quotes Ben Azzai, who placed high emphasis on the likeness of God in man, “If you cannot respect the Divine image that you are made in, the odds are that you will not be able to respect the Divine image in others” (p. 157). Going back to Genesis, we can join Jews to reflect and inspire each other to positive actions that would please our Creator. Closely connected with being created in the image of God is our resistance to idols who compete for our attention in our modern world. Christians can learn from Jews to detect and reject idolatry. In the Western world, materialism is the most subtle idol to which Christians seem to give in while ignoring God’s commandment. Another idol is self-love that leads to pride, arrogance, and self-worship. Wilson mentions also a rigid biblicism as an “idolatry of the book,” and finally, seeking a political cause over respect for human rights. Knowing that we are not protected from giving in to idolatry, we need to teach again how God showed his displeasure toward idolatrous people in the OT.

“On Approaching God” is the title of Part 4. This is, in my judgment, the most valuable section for the present-day church. Wilson states correctly that “the biblical basis of worship is theological, not anthropological” (p. 179). The early church patterned its worship after the synagogue because the first two decades of church life was a movement within Judaism. Under the reign of Constantine, house churches developed into large congregations that demanded church buildings to

accommodate large crowds. Laity was separated from clergy. Non-Jews became leaders in the church and they “de-Judaized” the order of worship. A dangerous phenomenon occurred when worship was viewed as a mere *quid pro quo*. Wilson defines it as “a thing (of value) is taken in return for something else (of value)” (p. 188). The prophets of the OT opposed such an approach to worship. Rabbi Joseph B. Soloveitchik describes the danger of *quid pro quo* for the modern world of religious thought, “Western man diabolically insists on being successful. Alas, he wants to be successful even in his adventure with God. If he gives of himself to God, he expects reciprocity. He also reaches a covenant with God, but his covenant is a mercantile one. In a primitive manner, he wants to trade ‘favors’ and exchange goods. The gesture of faith for him is a give-and-take affair and reflects the philosophy of Job which led to catastrophe—a philosophy which sees faith as a *quid pro quo* arrangement and expects compensation for each sacrifice one offers” (p. 188). Many Christians in the Western world bought into this formula and left smaller churches for megachurches where they feel some success, but do not necessarily contribute to the growth of God’s kingdom. They are not taught that God called them to faithfulness rather than to success. They are to live sacrificially for Christ who sacrificed himself for them. The spiritual satisfaction and contentment are experienced in the service of the Lord without demanding something in return. Listening to the prophets of old can provide a necessary correction for the *quid pro quo* of the Canaanite pagan worship that is prevalent in our times.

Part 5, the final part, is about moving into the future. Wilson blames the church for a spirit of triumphalism and arrogance that can be seen throughout the history of Christian-Jewish relations. Such attitude culminated in the Holocaust when most Christians remained indifferent, even apathetic. This tragic event happened possibly because of the supersessionist spirit of Western Christians. Wilson quotes Karl Barth in hope of correcting these supersessionist ideas, saying, “Without any doubt the Jews are to this very day the chosen people of God in the same sense as they have been so from the beginning, according to the Old and New Testaments. They have the promise of God; and if we Christians from among the gentiles have it too, then it is only as those chosen with them; as guests in their house, as new wood grafted onto their old tree” (p. 248). God has not given up on his chosen people. They are firmly included in the happenings of the last days.

As a pastor, I agree with Wilson concerning his assessment of the lack of knowledge of the OT and other Jewish sources among Christians. Too many pastors preach predominantly from the NT and so we must not be surprised by this phenomenon. It is my hope that *Exploring Our Hebraic Heritage* will get wide circulation and application. It is not a highly technical book that would be difficult to read. It also presents helpful study questions after each chapter that would be suitable for a group discussion.

In some parts of the book I felt like I was reading material that would be appropriate for an introduction to the OT. Some editing of the text would make for a shorter book that would not discourage busy people. However, I realize that those who are not informed might need that elementary material included.

What I really appreciated were those numerous quotations from rabbis and Jewish scholars. Reading their opinions and commentaries was refreshing and at times uncovering new ideas already existing in the Jewish mind. But the highlight of the book for me was the analysis of the synagogue worship that can provide much-needed correction for the present-day churches.

Josef Solc
Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary, Wake Forest, NC

Biblical Theology, vol. 1: *The Common Grace Covenants*. By Jeffrey J. Niehaus. Wooster, OH: Weaver, 2014, 364 pp., \$29.99 paper.

Jeffrey Niehaus has constructed his biblical theology around discussion of the major covenants God established to administer and advance his kingdom. This first volume focuses on the common grace covenants: the Adamic and the Noahic. A subsequent volume will examine the special grace covenants: the Abrahamic, Mosaic, Davidic, and New. For Niehaus, the covenants are the unifying theme of the Bible because “the whole Bible is a product of the covenant relationships God has instituted among humans” (p. 2). God has implemented the common grace covenants as a foundation for his salvific special grace covenants, and these covenants are all part of God’s one program of redemption.

Niehaus explains that the creation or Adamic covenant established humanity as vassal rulers over the created order. Created in God’s image, humans reflect God both in form and in function, and God commands the first couple to multiply and to rule over the earth (Gen 1:26–28). Placed in the garden-temple of Eden, Adam is also given the priestly role of serving God and the prophetic function of proclaiming God’s word. The one negative command is that Adam is not to eat from the tree. Niehaus rejects the older understanding of the Adamic covenant as “a covenant of works” and argues that like all divine-human covenants, it is an arrangement that reflects both grace and works. The Adamic covenant has commands and conditions that require obedience, but God also initiates this covenant by grace and provides forgiveness and continuation of the covenant provisions when the vassals break his commandments. Despite human sinfulness, the creation covenant remains in effect for as long as the creation endures.

The word “covenant” does not appear until Genesis 6, but Niehaus argues that Gen 1:1–2:3 reflects the same suzerain-vassal relationship between God and humanity that is found in second millennium BC Hittite treaties (p. 37). Niehaus also points to other passages he believes reference the creation covenant. Jeremiah 33:20–26 compares Yahweh’s faithfulness to the Davidic covenant with his commitment to his “covenant with the day and night” that established the laws of nature. Hosea 6:7 also suggests a creation covenant between God and humans by comparing Israel’s covenant unfaithfulness to that of Adam. Niehaus argues that even if “Adam” is the name of a town in Israel, it would still literarily recall Adam’s infidelity. Niehaus points to the repetition of the command for Noah to “be fruitful and multiply” (Gen 9:1) from Gen 1:28 as reflecting a renewal of the Adamic cove-

nant. Niehaus clearly demonstrates covenantal elements in the relationship between God and Adam, but there seems to be need for more explicit biblical evidence for establishing the existence of the Adamic covenant or arguing that all of God's relationships pre- and post-fall are based on covenant.

Niehaus develops the Noachic covenant as a renewal of the original creation covenant. There are slight modifications to the Adamic covenant in light of the conditions of the fall. God puts the fear of humans on all animals to help restore human dominion and imposes the death penalty on any who shed human blood in order to restrain evil (Gen 9:5–6). Since the Noachic covenant applies to all humanity, the death penalty for murder remains in effect today.

God maintains and renews his covenant commitments with humanity in the context of human sinfulness and rebellion, and Niehaus provides chapters on the narrative of the fall in Genesis 3, the sin and heritage of Cain, and the reasons for the Flood. As a result of the fall, Adam surrendered suzerainty of the earth over to Satan, who has established his own demonic princes and rulers over the nations to act in opposition to God's kingdom purposes. Cain and Lamech reflect the behavior of those who act as vassals of Satan. The judgment of the Flood was necessary to rinse the earth of its pervasive evil and to give humanity a fresh start. The Adamic and Noachic covenants are not redemptive or salvific in and of themselves, but God acts redemptively in maintaining these covenants, preserving a godly line through Seth and raising up a righteous covenant mediator in Noah.

Niehaus makes a helpful contribution to the study of the biblical covenants in several ways. By focusing on common grace covenants, Niehaus gives attention to covenantal aspects of the Bible that are often ignored in similar studies. Niehaus also explores larger questions regarding how God relates to all of humanity in the realm of common grace. Niehaus argues for common grace as the source of Cain's idea to build a city (based on a heavenly archetype) and the other cultural advances in Genesis 4. He also explores the work of God in establishing nations and governments, in empowering rulers to accomplish divine purposes, and in his use of angelic intermediaries to provide oversight of the nations.

Niehaus also contributes to a richer understanding of the larger metanarrative of the Bible by exploring how biblical eschatology is rooted in the Adamic and Noachic covenants. The failure of the first Adam and the corruption of God's creation would ultimately lead to a second Adam and a new heaven and new earth. The experience of God's presence lost when Adam and Eve are expelled from Eden would be restored in the eschatological new temple (Ezekiel 47) and new Jerusalem (Revelation 21–22). The covenant with Noah brings renewal and a new creation, but the earth continues to groan in its fallen condition. Isaiah 24:1–5 reveals a final judgment of all the earth for violation of the "everlasting covenant," which must refer to the Noachic covenant made with all humanity rather than the Mosaic covenant made exclusively with Israel. The inhabitants of the earth will be judged for polluting the earth through bloodshed, immorality, and idolatry. The NT also views the judgment of the earth as prefiguring the final judgment of all humanity in the last days (cf. Matt 24:37–38; 2 Pet 2:5).

Niehaus develops his theology of the common grace covenants in connection with careful analysis of Genesis 1–11 as his foundational text. Niehaus effectively engages ancient Near Eastern background materials and offers helpful discussions of a number of difficult interpretive issues like the identity of the “sons of God” in Gen 6:1–4. He repeatedly reminds his readers that the “laconic” nature of the texts in Genesis 1–11 create ambiguities that should lead to caution when theologizing on this part of Scripture. Complementarians and egalitarians alike could learn from his restraint when discussing gender issues related to Genesis 1–3.

Niehaus states that he seeks to write a biblical theology that is accessible to anyone with a college education. His simple and engaging writing style makes this work accessible to non-specialists. He has purposely omitted numerous footnotes and technical discussions, but provides an extensive bibliography for further reference. Niehaus views the OT and NT as theologically unified and engages in Christological reflection on OT texts at a number of places.

The biggest drawback of this work is the inclusion of a number of excurses that often digress from the larger argument of the book (cf. his discussion of N. T. Wright’s view of righteousness and justification near the beginning of his chapter on the Noahic covenant). Despite similar digressions at other places, Niehaus has provided an insightful treatment of the Bible’s covenantal theology.

Gary E. Yates

Liberty University Baptist Theological Seminary, Lynchburg, VA

Illustrated Bible Survey: An Introduction. By Ed Hindson and Elmer L. Towns. Nashville: B&H, 2013, xii + 607 pp., \$49.99.

To write a survey of the whole Bible is a daunting task and then, on top of that, to limit it to just over 600 pages is nearly impossible. Yet these authors have attempted to do just that. The field of OT and NT surveys is quite full, but few have tried to combine them into one book (cf. Orrin Root and Eleanor Daniel, William Hendriksen, Ronald F. Satta, and John Balchin). Ed Hindson and Elmer Towns state that their purpose is to provide a “college-level textbook that is accessible to students and laymen alike” and to leave the more technical discussions for seminary- and graduate-level works (p. xi). This is certainly a laudable goal, but unfortunately some of the authors’ discussions are so abbreviated and simplistic that they actually give the wrong impressions.

Before we point out some of the weaknesses of this survey, let’s note some of its strengths. This Bible survey is visually appealing and well illustrated with almost 200 pictures and over 135 charts or maps. Some of the pictures are particularly helpful and well placed, such as the picture of Mt. Tabor in the discussion of Barak and Sisera (p. 108) and the picture of the Harod Spring in the discussion of Gideon (p. 109). The descriptions of the biblical books follow a similar format, presenting “Key Facts,” “Background,” “Author,” “Outline,” “Message of the Book,” “Practical Application,” and “Further Reading.” However, because few of the books sug-

gested for further reading were published after 2000, these bibliographies are already a bit dated.

An important discussion missing from this resource is a section that explains how the OT and NT fit together. It would have been helpful to explain how the OT laid the foundation for what would be fulfilled in the NT (Matt 5:17–18). For example, the sacrifices stipulated in the OT provided a foundation to understand Christ's sacrifice on the cross. Hindson and Towns assume many OT passages have their fulfilment in the NT, though they rarely explain how or why. The authors' statement that "Jesus referred to all three sections [the Law, the Prophets, and the Writings] and declared that they were all about him (Luke 24:44)" (p. 23) is neither accurate nor an adequate explanation of what Jesus is saying.

While the authors have touched on the introductory matters of canonicity ("How We Got the Bible") and hermeneutics ("How to Read the Bible"), an eighteen-page summary of these important topics is hardly enough. The authors are forced to simplify the issues to such an extent that the discussion is only marginally helpful at best and, in some cases, painfully inadequate. For example, in the single paragraph that describes how the OT canon was formed, the authors make the statement, "The process by which the Old Testament books came to be recognized as the Word of God, and the history of how these books were preserved and handed down through the generations enhances our confidence in the credibility of the Old Testament as inspired Scripture (2 Tim 3:16)" (p. 1). One would think that this paragraph followed an explanation as to how God maintained the accuracy of the biblical texts through the transmission process, but there is no explanation of such a process that would help to assure the reader of the accuracy of Scripture.

A more blatant oversimplification is the paragraph describing how the OT books were selected (p. 3). This paragraph deals only with the Pentateuch and then claims that in Deut 18:15–22 God promises to raise up a "succession of prophets 'like Moses,'" but this is not what the passage promises. It states that God will raise up a prophet (singular) like Moses, not a succession of them.

Another difficulty also appears on page 3, where the authors mention questions regarding the canonicity of some of the books of the Writings that remained "until the Council of Jamnia in AD 90." Jack P. Lewis has argued convincingly that there never was a "Council of Jamnia" and that, while questions may have arisen in Jamnia, they had little effect on the formation of the canon ("Jamnia Revisited," in *The Canon Debate* [ed. L. M. McDonald and J. A. Sanders; Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2002] 146–62). It is difficult to know exactly when the OT canon was closed, but the evidence suggests it was complete before about 200 BC, for the Prologue to Ecclesiasticus, written about the mid-second century BC, mentions a Greek translation of "the Law itself, the Prophecies, and the rest of the books" (NRSV). This statement implies a collection of books was in existence.

Minor wording adjustments could have provided a more accurate evaluation of the actual state of things. For example, the authors' definition of textual criticism is "the science that enables scholars to determine and establish the wording of the original text" (p. 5). A more accurate definition would be "and establish the *most plausible* original wording of the text," for it is almost impossible for the textual

critic to be 100 percent certain that we have the “original wording of the text” in cases where manuscripts significantly disagree. Some statements are too strongly asserted, such as if the autographs remained, “they would have been venerated and worshipped” (p. 7). Or, when the authors are looking to affirm the accuracy of the text, they claim that “it should be remembered there are close to 5,000 Greek manuscripts” (p. 7). Actually it is closer to 5,880 manuscripts, but an additional explanation should be provided that the majority are fragments of texts, so that the reader does not form the misimpression that we have available close to 6,000 complete manuscripts of biblical books.

On a lesser note, some of the illustrative pictures could have been more appropriately placed in the text. For example, the picture of a rabbi (this should actually be a scribe) copying Hebrew Scripture (p. 2) is in a section talking about the Greek Septuagint instead of the section on the previous page that actually speaks about scribes copying Scripture. Similarly, the picture of a Lachish ostracon (p. 236) would have fit much better closer to Jeremiah 52, which actually mentions the destruction of Jerusalem (p. 241; for further examples, see “Arab farmer plowing,” p. 206; “Jewish men dancing,” p. 207; and “the broad wall,” p. 218).

Another lesser drawback is that Hindson and Towns often assume the main character of a biblical book is its author, even when the biblical text does not explicitly state this. Also, when Hindson and Towns acknowledge that a book is anonymous, they nonetheless offer suggestions as to its authorship (e.g. pp. 103, 112, 118, 127, 163).

It is an unquestionably difficult task to write a single-volume, college-level survey of the entire Bible that provides sufficient necessary information in a way that is accurate and understandable. While this survey’s pictures and charts are helpful, it lacks the necessary breadth of information needed to lay a sufficient foundation for the college student and layperson alike.

Paul D. Wegner

Golden Gate Baptist Theological Seminary, Mill Valley, CA

Engaging the Christian Scriptures: An Introduction to the Bible. By Andrew E. Arterbury, W. H. Bellinger Jr., and Derek S. Dodson. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2014, xii + 276 pp., \$26.99 paper.

A trio of authors has combined to produce a Bible primer from a critical perspective. Andrew E. Arterbury serves as associate professor of Christian Scriptures at Truett Theological Seminary, Baylor University. W. H. Bellinger Jr. is the W. Marshall and Lulie Craig Chairholder in Bible, professor of religion, and chair of the Department of Religion at Baylor. Derek S. Dodson serves as senior lecturer in religion at Baylor.

In a well-written and engaging style, this book blends the topics of Bible introduction and Bible survey. As an introduction, it touches on the areas of canonicity, textual criticism, higher criticism, and archaeology. As a survey, it covers issues

of authorship, dating, structure, theme, and Bible backgrounds (i.e. history, culture, and geography).

Following the prolegomena, each chapter discusses a major section of Scripture, whether the Pentateuch, Prophets, Writings, Gospels and Acts, Paul and Pauline tradition, or the General Epistles and Revelation. One chapter addresses the intertestamental period (chap. 5). The chapters conclude with a list of suggested resources for further reading. Maps, illustrations, and sidebars frequent the pages, and indexes of Scripture and subject cap the volume.

Insightfully, the authors draw out some of the literary aspects of the biblical books. For instance, the treatment of Genesis 12–50 recognizes the eminence of the Abrahamic covenant throughout the ancestral narratives: “This theme of the ancestral covenant promise and counter theme of threats to the promise provide the tension that drives the plot of this section of Genesis” (p. 38). Other examples of helpful literary observations include the sin-punishment-grace pattern in Genesis 2–11 (p. 33), the literary structure of Kings (p. 79), and the play on the name Onesimus (“useful”) in Phlm 10–11 (p. 224). On the other hand, the authors appear to question the historical accuracy of the Gospels when they assign them to the genre of “ancient biography,” which was “not written to be objective” (p. 149).

Regarding canonicity, the Hebrew Bible “took its final form in the second century CE” (p. 6), while the NT canon “may not have been finalized until the fifth or sixth century” (p. 7). In order to discern the canon, early Christians employed the criteria of “apostolicity, universality, and traditional use” (p. 9). By contrast, Gleason Archer contends that “the only true test of canonicity is the testimony of God the Holy Spirit to the authority of His own Word” (*A Survey of OT Introduction* [rev. ed.; Moody, 2007] 67). Moreover, the authors suppose that the literary superscriptions of the psalms reveal the liturgical collection rather than the author (pp. 107–8). In support of the authorship stance, see James Thirtle’s *The Titles of the Psalms: Their Nature and Meaning Explained* (New York: Henry Frowde, 1904).

The authorship and dating of biblical books and events coincides with critical scholarship. Concerning the composition of the Pentateuch, the authors focus on the final form of the text, but occasionally speak of origins, such as the Priestly tradition in Genesis 1 and the genealogies of Genesis (p. 44). In stride, they seem comfortable with the notion that “Genesis 1 and 2 provide two creation accounts” (p. 31). Furthermore, their support of a thirteenth-century-BC exodus (pp. 36, 66) creates a problem when they come to the dating of Jericho’s demise, since “the excavation of Jericho demonstrates ... the city was not occupied during that time” (p. 68). Additionally, given that the book of Job reached its final form after the sixth century BC (p. 118), Job 7 alludes to Psalm 8 (p. 16). Other scholars maintain the reverse—that Psalm 8 alludes to Job 7.

On the NT side, anonymous second-generation Christians wrote the Gospels between AD 65 and 90 (p. 143). The Synoptic Problem, according to the authors, finds a resolution in the Farrer Theory, which upholds Markan priority without relying upon the existence of Q (p. 153). Pseudonymous NT epistles may include Ephesians (p. 227), Colossians (p. 233), 2 Thessalonians (p. 232), the Pastoral Epistles (p. 229), 1 Peter (p. 247), and 2 Peter and Jude (p. 250). The authors present 2

Corinthians as a composite document (p. 222). The Gospel of John and the letters of John “probably did not come from the same author” (p. 147). Specifically, “the author of Revelation was most likely an itinerant prophet whose preaching circuit included the seven churches addressed in Revelation” (p. 254).

Arterbury, Bellinger, and Dodson limit the foretelling of events to “the immediate future related to its ancient audience” (p. 81). Judah’s demise in the sixth century BC signaled the “beginning of the end of prophecy” (p. 94). Consequently, “a predictive approach to Revelation misunderstands the purpose of Revelation” (p. 253). In addition, an acceptance of *vaticinium ex eventu* characterizes the work. Since “the book of Daniel was almost certainly composed in the midst of [a] second-century-BCE context” (p. 131), the composer could recall the four corrupt kingdoms depicted therein—Babylon, Media, Persia, and Greece (p. 123).

As for other distinctive interpretations, Paul in Romans 7 uses the first person singular to “create a dramatic effect” rather than to speak autobiographically (p. 219). In the Gospel of Matthew, Moses typifies Jesus (p. 161). The authors lean toward the south-Galatia theory (p. 205).

In terms of page count, the primer lacks balance, favoring the NT over the OT. Although the OT exceeds the NT in length and number of books, 117 pages expound the NT, while only 106 pages illumine the OT.

The authors succeed in publishing a “manageable, accessible, and affordable textbook that aims first and foremost to benefit students rather than their professors” (p. xi). Their intended audience includes collegians and seminarians enrolled in a one-semester introductory Bible course. Because the volume foregoes footnotes, endnotes, and depth of discussion, an undergraduate setting seems most appropriate. Professors can acquire online access to a test bank that corresponds to the book. Read alongside Scripture, this supplementary textbook engages readers who desire to gain exposure to critical viewpoints and practices in biblical studies.

Mark A. Hassler
The Master’s Seminary, Sun Valley, CA

The Lost World of Adam and Eve: Genesis 2–3 and the Human Origins Debate. By John H. Walton. With a contribution by N.T. Wright. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2015, 248 pp., \$17.00 paper.

In this sequel to *The Lost World of Genesis One: Ancient Cosmology and the Origins Debate* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2009), John H. Walton further develops his innovative interpretation of the opening chapters of Genesis. Walton’s central argument is that the focus of Genesis 1–3’s intended message lies not with the material origins of the cosmos and humankind but with their function and ordering. He seeks to demonstrate the text’s functional focus via a study of the various lexical and conceptual elements within Genesis 1–3, supported by comparisons with ancient Near Eastern texts (predominantly Mesopotamian and Egyptian, with little reference to Hittite, Ugaritic, or Persian texts). Walton acknowledges that ancient and flawed conceptions about material origins may be implied in the worldview

behind Genesis 1–3; however, he claims that material concerns are excluded from the focus of the text, which is limited to God’s proper ordering of the universe and humanity.

Following a brief introduction, the book’s chapters are arranged as twenty-one “propositions” concerning Genesis 1–3. Proposition 1 outlines how we should read the Bible as an ancient text. Propositions 2–5 deal with Genesis 1, repeating some of the ground covered in *The Lost World of Genesis One* in order to introduce Walton’s function-centered interpretation. Proposition 6 examines the use of *ādām* in Genesis 1–5, noting its sense as representative of all humanity when used with the definite article. Proposition 7 defends the thesis that Genesis 2 is not a recapitulation of day six in Genesis 1, but occurs later in time. While Walton sees Gen 1:26–27 as dealing with the initial creation of a group of humans, he views Genesis 2 as the establishment of Adam and Eve as the two priestly representatives for all other humans, placed within the sacred temple-like space of the Garden of Eden. In Propositions 8–12 and 20, Walton further develops his “archetypal” interpretation of Adam and Eve. While Walton affirms Adam and Eve were real, historic figures, he does not consider them to have been the first existing human couple but the first “significant” humans, footnoting his debt to Isaac La Peyrère’s theory of the existence of pre-Adamite peoples. Proposition 13 examines the use of the garden as an ancient Near Eastern motif for sacred space. Propositions 14–17 deal with Adam and Eve’s sin and its consequences for humanity. Propositions 18 and 19 examine Jesus and Paul, with the latter chapter including an excursus by N. T. Wright on Paul’s use of Adam. The book closes with a final proposition on the distinction of humans from other creatures based on the image of God, and a conclusion that considers the implications for creation care, ministry, evangelism, and the consistency of evolutionary theory and belief. Also included are a short glossary of terms and recommendations for further reading in place of a full bibliography.

In defending his interpretation of Genesis 1–3 as primarily concerned with function and order, Walton makes a series of bold reinterpretations of various lexical and conceptual elements. For example, Walton defines *bārā* (usually “create”) as “to order and arrange” and notes that *‘āśāh* (usually “made”) can sometimes, albeit not usually, involve “immaterial” objects (e.g. the Israelites, nations, the moon, constellations, wind, days, lightning). Walton ventures that the *rāqîa’* (usually “firmament”) might not refer to the solid dome of the sky, as usually held, but to the space beneath the dome in which creatures dwell. Likewise, Walton notes that the verb *yśr* (“forms”), employed in the account of Adam’s formation from dust, sometimes involves immaterial objects (e.g. the human spirit, events planned by God), and that “dust” itself is a trope for mortality, and does not involve literal dust. These examples demonstrate the pattern throughout the book, in which Walton’s most innovative interpretations have the effect of ridding Genesis 1–3 of any material aspect.

Walton has provided a creative and essentially cohesive interpretation of Genesis 1–3, but one that ultimately offers a less-than-convincing case. Even Walton acknowledges that he is only putting forward a “possible” interpretation, not necessarily a probable or better interpretation. His stated concern is to offer a way

to make Genesis 1–3 acceptable for those who hold to modern scientific theories about the material origins of the universe and humanity. Moreover, while Walton provides various reasons to select a functional rather than a material interpretation of the various terms and conceptions in Genesis 1–3, the cumulative effect of so many inventive interpretations places a large shadow over his functional emphasis. In addition, Walton’s distinction of material from immaterial elements in Genesis 1–3 and his emphasis on the latter (e.g. space, separation, time periods, wind, the area under the firmament) does not, as he appears to assume, necessitate his conclusion that these chapters display a *functional* emphasis. The presence of so-called immaterial elements may just as plausibly indicate that the text has some interest in explaining the origin of *both* material and immaterial elements in the universe.

It is also very difficult to justify the importance Walton places on viewing Eden as temple and Adam and Eve as priests—interpretations far outweighed by any indications within the text. The weakness is compounded by Walton’s claim that other humans were alive at the time of Adam and Eve, for whom the latter acted as priestly mediators. For if Adam and Eve’s role of priestly mediation is so central to their significance, why does Genesis 2–3 provide no hint of any priestly mediation carried out, no indication of the existence of people who were served by these alleged primeval priests, and no divine instruction to Adam and Eve regarding mediation? Walton’s theory that Adam and Eve are primarily to be viewed as priests is an elaborate construction that seems out of proportion to the admittedly present yet limited temple and priestly motifs within the text.

Nevertheless, there is much that is valuable in Walton’s book for laypersons, students, and all those interested in the Bible-versus-science debate. In addition, Walton’s reconsideration of key terms and concepts in Genesis 1–3 is challenging and worth contemplation by academic readers.

Deane Galbraith
University of Otago, Dunedin, New Zealand

The Psalms as Christian Lament: A Historical Commentary. By Bruce K. Waltke, James M. Houston, and Erika Moore. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2014, xv + 312 pp., \$28.00 paper.

Bruce K. Waltke, James M. Houston, and Erika Moore have penned *The Psalms as Christian Lament: A Historical Commentary* to unite the discipline of history of interpretation with modern exegesis of the text. Specifically, the authors study all but one of the seven penitential psalms (Psalms 6, 32, 38, 102, 130, 143), since they wrote on Psalm 51 in a previous volume. Thus the authors omit Psalm 51, while including Psalms 5, 7, 39 and 44 in the commentary. The authors divide their work in this way: James Houston provides the history of interpretation on a given Psalm, while Bruce Waltke writes the exegetical portions of the work. Erika Moore “wrote the exegetical portion for Psalm 39, did valuable editing, and prepared a glossary and indices” (p. xv).

With the exception of the introduction, each chapter splits into three parts. Part 1 carries the voice of the church, highlighting the reception of a particular psalm in the life and writings of an important figure in church history. The second portion carries the voice of the psalmist by freshly translating the text, footnoting relevant information. The third segment performs modern exegesis on the particular psalm, using literary, form, and rhetorical criticism followed by grammatical-historical exegesis.

Chapter 1 justifies a study on Christian lament, introducing the need and theology of lament. Since the authors wrote on the Psalms as Christian worship in a previous volume, they opted in this volume to “focus upon a further selection of Psalms of lament, which reflect upon the limitations, sufferings, fears, protestations, aspirations, as well as confession and penitence of the worshipper before God” (p. 7).

The following three chapters address Psalms 5, 6, and 7. Houston shows how Jerome used Psalm 5 as a polemical work against contemporary heresies (p. 22). One highlight of Waltke’s exegesis of the psalm is how he situates Psalm 5, canonically, within a collection of royal psalms (Psalms 3–5). In the following chapter on Psalm 6, Houston illustrates Gregory of Nyssa’s anagogical reading of the psalm—a reading that derives from a misunderstanding of the psalm’s superscription (p. 45). In contrast to Gregory’s anagogical reading, Waltke performs an historical exegesis of the psalm, although he dives into gematria to explain the psalm’s rhetorical structure through spiritual numbers (pp. 52–53). The next chapter details numerous royal readings of Psalm 7, including those of Chrysostom, Charlemagne, Alcuin, and Alfred the Great. Waltke ties Psalm 7 into the beginning of a collection of psalms, grouped together by praise for God (p. 83).

Chapter 5 presents Augustine’s *totius Christi* reading of Psalm 32, whereby the Psalms represent all people who are in Christ, followed by Waltke’s historical exegesis. The exegetical portion uniquely ends with a discussion on the doctrines of sin, punishment, forgiveness, and double agency. Chapter 6 presents a broad history of interpretation before Moore performs an historical exegesis of the text. The following chapter matches Erasmus’s pastoral theology to Psalm 39.

Chapter 8 voices laments from such notables as Origen, Thomas Aquinas, Martin Luther, and John Calvin, all of whom commented on Psalm 44. Chapter 9 exposes how different religious traditions viewed the concept of repentance in relationship to Psalm 102. The final two chapters study Psalm 130, highlighting the interpretations of Hilary of Poitiers and John Owen, and Psalm 143, presenting interpretations by Augustine, Denys the Carthusian, and John Calvin.

The Psalms as Christian Lament admirably mixes history of interpretation with exegesis. Every interpreter is situated in place and time, and thus studying history of interpretation uncovers blind spots for modern interpreters. In addition to Houston’s helpful history of interpretation sections, Waltke’s and Moore’s exegetical work helpfully describes and interprets the Hebrew Psalms.

However, the juxtaposition of history of interpretation with historical exegesis raises a number of questions. First, the book makes little connection between history of interpretation and modern exegesis. For example, in chapter 5, Houston ex-

pounds on Augustine's incarnational paradigm for reading the Psalms. The Psalms prefigure the life of Christ, and thus relate to all those who are in Christ. After presenting Augustine's reading strategy of the Psalms, Waltke begins a purely historical exegesis. No effort is made to integrate Augustine's incarnational reading with Waltke's historical reading. The upshot is that readers either need to intuit a connection between the two disciplines or conclude that Augustine's hermeneutic plays no role in modern interpretation, serving simply as an historical aside.

Adding to this disjunction, the book's chapter titles describe a topic concerning history of interpretation, but rarely does the topic pertain to the Psalm's historical exegesis. For example, chapter 7 is titled, "Psalm 39: The Lament of Silence in the Pastoral Theology of Erasmus." After skillfully presenting Erasmus's pastoral theology, the chapter turns to another topic of Psalm 39—David's suffering and his need to seek forgiveness from God.

The authors could have used the insights of reception history to bridge the gap between history of exegesis and modern exegesis. Indeed, reception history shows how the text's afterlife shapes interpretation of texts. Surely, the use of Psalm 32, for example, has been shaped by its use in the church. The authors could have teased out these connections to illustrate how exegesis and history of interpretation often complement each other.

But the impression given by the book is that modern exegesis gets it right, while previous generations have misunderstood the text. To cite one example, Houston dismisses Gregory of Nyssa's "intellectual apprehension of the biblical text," while lauding his pursuit of virtue (p. 46). The book can give the impression that modern exegesis and ancient exegesis are at odds.

With that said, Waltke, Houston, and Moore have served the academy and the church with *The Psalms as Christian Lament*. Contemporary Christians need to access the Psalms to learn how to lament. Indeed, one cannot think of a better way to use the Psalms as spiritual lament than by recovering the early church's use of them as Christian lament. This work will serve pastors who want to think critically about the text and how the text has been used through the centuries, as well as interested readers who want to understand the Psalms and their use of lament.

Wyatt A. Graham

The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, KY

Jesus the Messiah: Tracing the Promises, Expectations, and Coming of Israel's King. By Herbert W. Bateman IV, Darrell L. Bock, and Gordon H. Johnston. Grand Rapids: Kregel, 2012, 527 pp., \$36.99.

This multi-authored volume merits three separate reviews: one for Gordon Johnston's treatment of OT messianic trajectories; another for Herbert Bateman's analysis of relevant Second Temple literature; and finally a review for Darrell Bock's focus on Jesus as Messiah. Yet the work arguably has a single goal: to demonstrate a threefold reading strategy for making sense of the messianic claims of the NT (pp. 17–36). The approach explores messianic references for their con-

textual meaning in tension with their final canonical interpretation. Texts and themes are investigated along a three-part continuum: the OT situation, the intertestamental reflection, and the final NT coherence. Such a reading strategy could be helpfully applied to other canonical motifs. The book, a ten-year project, is the result of maturing evangelical scholarship in three areas: OT studies, Second Temple Judaism, and the use of the OT in the NT.

Gordon Johnston treats OT messianic trajectories in seven chapters. The scope is intentionally limited to royal or kingly messianic motifs. These chapters cover promises to the patriarchs (Genesis 12, 49; Numbers 24); the Nathan oracle (2 Sam 7:8–16); royal psalms (Psalms 2, 45, 72, 89, 110, 132); pre-exilic prophets (Amos 9:11–15; Hos 1:11; 3:1–5; Mic 5:2–6); Isaiah (Isa 9:1–7; 11:1–9; 11:10–16, along with the servant songs in chaps. 42, 49, 50, 52–53); exilic prophets (Jer 23:1–8; 33:14–26; Ezek 34:22–24; 37:24–25; chaps. 44–48; Dan 7:13–14); and finally the post-exilic prophet Zechariah.

Johnston's study highlights several points. First, there is a divinely ordained set of trajectories within the OT canon (beginning most clearly in Genesis 12) that will eventually culminate in the eschatological messiah. Genesis 3:15, since it is not directly relevant to the royal motif, is treated in a useful appendix. Second, the historical prophesies often applied to a near situation, but with "linguistic openness" that would allow a later narrowing to a single messianic fulfillment. Third, the growing expectation of an eschatological messianic figure was expressed through a variety of motifs (e.g. seed, son, temple, anointed, throne, etc.). Fourth, each of the OT prophets had only a part of the puzzle. For example, "Jeremiah spoke of the righteousness the Davidic figure to come would bring. Ezekiel highlighted the sacral role the Davidic figure will have in the true worship of God. Daniel made it clear that this figure, associated with the kingdom that God will build, combines human and divine features and comes with authority" (p. 189). Finally, as the OT canon closed, there was an intensified expectation. This included a focus on the coming of Yahweh as the universal eschatological King (pp. 188, 205, 209). Yet various elements of the puzzle had remained incomplete; for example, "how the royal house of David would fit with the future eschatological kingship of Yahweh was a mystery that was not yet explained" (p. 209).

In part 2, Bateman introduces the study of messianic expectations as they developed during the Second Temple period (chap. 8). He provides a list of the limited extrabiblical materials that mention a regal Messiah figure (chart, p. 214). Less than six percent of the Second Temple Jewish literature gave attention to the kingly Messiah motif (p. 213); nevertheless, out of this limited material came a variety of messianic paradigms (p. 215). Because the church has read this literature through the lens of the portrait of the Messiah in the NT, Bateman argues, there has been a failure to recognize the competing messianic portraits characteristic of this period. Bateman argues that some authors (e.g. Josephus and Jesus ben Sira) were indifferent to messianism; that for most of the Second Temple period messianism was dormant; and that competing messianic expectations arose during the Hasmonean and Herodian dynasties (152 BC–AD 70).

Bateman then treats various messianic titles found in the Second Temple literature. In chapter 9 he treats the term “Messiah”; in chapter 10 the titles “Branch” and “Prince”; and finally in chapter 11, the messianic title “Son.” After working carefully through the relevant texts, Bateman draws some helpful conclusions. First, while a variety of pictures of the royal Messiah emerge, there are three consistent features: the Messiah is most often seen as human (except *1 Enoch*; cf. 11QMelch), as a descendent of David, and as a military leader (p. 324). Second, there was an unresolved tension as to whether the fulfillment would involve a diarchy (a king and a priest) or a Davidic monarchy (p. 328). Third, there were unanswered questions: When would Messiah come? What would Messiah’s name be? How would Messiah function, as a warrior or in some priestly fashion (p. 328)?

Bateman points out that elements of the royal messianic picture were still missing (e.g. the concept of a suffering Messiah, a cosmic Messiah, a resurrected Messiah who would return to consummate his inaugurated kingdom, etc.; p. 329). The incomplete revelation of the OT and the varied trajectories of Second Temple literature needed the unifying factor that would only come with Jesus. This is what makes it odd that the final part of this work does not begin with an account of this arrival in the person of Jesus himself.

In part 3, Darrell Bock explains the rationale for his approach (pp. 331–36), which works backwards from the epistles, to the Gospels, and then to the historical Jesus. He covers the NT messianic theme in four chapters: (1) Revelation and the Catholic Epistles; (2) the Pauline Epistles; (3) Acts and the Gospels; and finally (4) the roots for the early church’s messianic claims in the teachings of Jesus himself. His fourth and final chapter also contains an extremely brief “synthesis” of the study (pp. 455–58).

Unfortunately the rhetorical power of the historical and canonical record for the royal messianic identity of Jesus is diminished by this decision to invert the treatment of the NT material. Bock acknowledges in his final chapter: “The issues examined here form the hub of understanding how the variegated portraits of Judaism began to fuse into a single portrait for the early church” (p. 444). This final chapter is “foundational” (p. 444). If the purpose of the book were to respond to that stream of NT scholarship that denies the historicity of Jesus’ purported messianic claims, then this move would perhaps have been justified. However, since the purpose of the volume is to trace, according to the threefold reading strategy outlined in chapter 1, the promises, expectations, and coming of Israel’s king, then why invert the order? Why abandon the careful tracing of the redemptive historical movement at the very locus of its most important moment, the actual coming of Israel’s king? Nevertheless, Bock’s treatment of the NT witness contains much useful material.

While this volume will undoubtedly be a valuable resource for students beginning to study the royal messianic identity of Jesus, the work suffers from an unfortunate number of embarrassing editorial problems. Many are minor, but some are significant (e.g. two chapter titles mentioned on p. 34 do not match the actual chapter titles; some editor comments were not removed, e.g. on p. 327 and else-

where). The lack of clear divisions in the body of the work between the separate parts can leave the reader confused.

The usefulness of this volume is further diminished by the lack of a bibliography. The problem is serious. For example, in the final chapter Bock directs the reader to a series of scholars who see little connection between the historical Jesus and the antecedent Hebrew Scripture, beginning with Crossan. However, the omission of a bibliography hinders the student from further follow-up. Even if one looks in the “Person and Subject Index,” none of the four authors mentioned can be found. Perhaps the reader will remember that Crossan was discussed at the very beginning of the work. There Bateman mentions that Crossan minimized Jesus’ Jewishness and cites his work in footnote 1. Yet here, too, there is an editorial problem. At the end of this footnote Bateman refers to other works and advocates of this view and directs the reader to “Appendix A.” However, this appendix is also missing. It appears that an original “Appendix A,” which is referred to again in footnote 2, eventually found its way into the book as two graphic inserts (pp. 18–19). This, along with other editorial messiness, will hopefully be corrected in future editions.

Daniel Ebert
Clearwater Christian College, Clearwater, FL

How Jesus Became God: The Exaltation of a Jewish Preacher from Galilee. By Bart D. Ehrman. New York: HarperOne, 2014, 404 pp., \$27.99.

How God Became Jesus: The Real Origins of Belief in Jesus’ Divine Nature. By Michael F. Bird, Craig A. Evans, Simon J. Gathercole, Charles E. Hill, and Chris Tilling. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2014, 236 pp., \$16.99 paper.

Bart Ehrman’s book *How Jesus Became God* is the most recent example of a scholarly tradition of books with similar titles (e.g. Richard Rubenstein’s *When Jesus Became God* [Orlando: Harcourt, 1999]) offering to explain how Christianity turned a simple itinerant Jewish teacher into the second person of the Trinity. In what may have been an unprecedented publishing event, a book by evangelical scholars critiquing Ehrman’s book was released on the same day, entitled *How God Became Jesus*. The concurrent publication of the rebuttal book was facilitated by the fact that its publishing house, Zondervan, is owned by HarperCollins, which published Ehrman’s book under the HarperOne imprint.

Ehrman’s thesis is that Jesus was not viewed, by himself or his disciples, as in any sense divine during his lifetime, but that belief in his divinity arose almost immediately after his disciples had visions of Jesus that they interpreted as meaning that God had raised him bodily from the dead. According to Ehrman, the earliest Christians thought Jesus had been exalted by God to a divine status at his resurrection, but this belief quickly morphed, resulting in the idea that Jesus was God incarnate.

The major premise of Ehrman’s case is that the category of divinity was an elastic one in the ancient world, even to some extent in Jewish thought, and so

first-century Christians were able to entertain quite different conceptions of what it meant to regard Jesus as divine or even as “God.” Ehrman presents three models of the divine human in Greco-Roman culture: “gods who temporarily become human” (pp. 19–22), “divine beings born of a god and a mortal” (pp. 22–24), and “a human who becomes divine” (pp. 25–38). He admits that the case of Jesus does not fit any of these: “I don’t know of any other cases in ancient Greek or Roman thought of this kind of ‘god-man,’ where an already existing divine being is said to be born of a mortal woman” (p. 18). He could have added to that sentence, “or Jewish thought.” Thus, Ehrman’s whole account of Christian origins rests on a shaky foundation. By his own account, the Christian view of Jesus—a view he admits emerged within twenty years of Jesus’ crucifixion—was literally unprecedented.

Having laid the foundation, Ehrman builds the house of his theory of Christian origins. Jesus was an apocalyptic preacher who mistakenly thought the end of the age was imminent and who hoped he would become the Messiah (a merely earthly king)—but *not* the “Son of Man”—in the impending age to come (pp. 86–127). Instead, he was executed by crucifixion and his body was probably not even given a decent burial, contrary to the Gospels (pp. 133–65). However, a few of Jesus’ disciples who had fled to Galilee had some visions of Jesus, perhaps of the type people sometimes have when they are bereaved (pp. 174–206). (The encounter with the risen Jesus experienced by Saul of Tarsus is conspicuously absent from Ehrman’s bereavement vision theory of the resurrection appearances.) The disciples, drawing on Jesus’ apocalyptic doctrine, inferred from their visions that Jesus had risen from the dead to an exalted, divine status in heaven not only as the Jewish Messiah but as the Son of Man and God’s adopted “son”—claims Jesus himself had never espoused. (Why the disciples, who had known Jesus personally, enthusiastically advocated a view of Jesus he himself would not have accepted is never explained.) Ehrman finds this earliest “exaltation Christology,” dating from the early 30s, in preliterary creedal statements imbedded in Paul (Rom 1:3–4) and Acts (2:36; 5:31; 13:32–33), even though he recognizes that neither Paul nor Luke held to this view (pp. 216–35).

Ehrman thinks this exaltation Christology developed with extreme rapidity into what is the more recognizable view of Christ. By the 40s or at the latest the 50s, some Christians thought Jesus had become God’s Son at his baptism or at his birth, while others, such as Paul, thought Jesus was God’s Son even before his human life, serving as God’s chief angel (pp. 240–69). This angelic incarnation Christology evolved before the end of the century into the idea of Jesus as God incarnate, seen especially in John and the deutero-Pauline Colossians (pp. 269–80). Christian leaders of the second and third centuries hardened this incarnation Christology into a standard of orthodoxy, rejecting Christologies of their day akin to those of the earliest Christians attested in various parts of the NT. This process of defining orthodoxy and condemning heresy eventually led to the formulation of the doctrine of the Trinity and its codification in the creeds of the fourth and fifth centuries (pp. 284–352).

Ehrman gets a surprising number of things right. Jesus was a real historical person. The NT Gospels are our best source of information about him. Jesus was

crucified at the order of Pontius Pilate and died on the cross. Some of Jesus' original followers sincerely believed not long afterward that they saw Jesus alive from the dead. The earliest Christians regarded Jesus as in some sense divine, and within about twenty years, even before Paul, at least some Jewish Christians believed that Jesus was a preexistent divine being. The belief that Jesus existed before creation as God (and yet not God the Father) arose even before the Gospel of John. One could hardly wish for more concessions from the world's most influential agnostic biblical scholar.

It is the task of the five contributors to *How God Became Jesus* to rebut Ehrman's contention that the divine Christology of orthodox Christianity evolved, albeit quickly, from an original doctrine of Jesus as an exalted human messianic figure. For the sake of space, only the chapters by the first four contributors, dealing with the background and NT texts, will be considered here.

Michael Bird's chapter responding to Ehrman's view of "divine humans" in antiquity makes a number of good points but says too little in the way of direct response to Ehrman. For example, he spends two pages discussing the angelic figure Metatron (pp. 31–33), which Ehrman never mentioned, while summarily dismissing the relevance of Philostratus's account of Apollonius of Tyana on the grounds of its lateness (p. 26), despite the fact that Ehrman makes Apollonius "Exhibit A" in his argument (Ehrman, pp. 11–18). Neither Bird nor any of the other contributors engage Ehrman's extended discussions of the relevance of the Roman emperor cult for the origins of belief in Jesus as divine (Ehrman, pp. 27–34, 48–49, 234–35). Most of Bird's response to Ehrman regarding angelic intermediate figures emphasizes Jesus' authority over angels (Bird, pp. 36–39). This line of argument fails to engage Ehrman's position, which is not that Jesus was viewed as simply one of the angels but that he was regarded as the *chief* angel, who would of course be over all of the other angels.

Bird's chapter on whether Jesus viewed himself as God (pp. 45–70) is better. He does an especially good job in rebutting Ehrman's claim that Jesus viewed himself as the future Messiah but not as the Son of Man (pp. 61–66). Unfortunately, Bird does not address Ehrman's basic characterization of Jesus' proclamation as that of an impending apocalypse that proved false when Jesus was executed by the Romans (Ehrman, pp. 99–112). Obviously, if Jesus' prophetic message was false, he could not really have been divine. Bird also misrepresents Ehrman as claiming that a saying of Jesus was authentic "only" if it was dissimilar to Christian belief (Bird, p. 50). In fact, Ehrman claimed that a saying was "more likely" to be historically authentic if it was out of sync with the conventional Christian belief (Ehrman, pp. 97–98). It should also be mentioned that many evangelicals will find Bird's assessment of the historical reliability of the Gospel of John to be too weak: "Many of its unique sayings about Jesus are probably based on a mixture of memory, metaphor, and midrash" (p. 68).

Craig Evans's treatment on the burial of Jesus is the standout chapter of the book *How God Became Jesus*. Evans rightly criticizes Ehrman's argument from silence regarding the omission of the name of Joseph of Arimathea from the pre-Pauline confession of Jesus' death, burial, and resurrection in 1 Cor 15:3–5 (pp. 90–91).

Evans shows, against Ehrman, that rabbinical and Qumran texts attest to the Sanhedrin taking responsibility for the burial of executed criminals (pp. 80–81, 88–89). This means that the supposed discrepancy between Acts 13:29 and the Gospel accounts of Jesus’s burial (even Luke’s account!) evaporates. Evans documents painstakingly from both literary and archaeological evidence that burial in a tomb was not, as Ehrman had argued at length, inconsistent with Roman policies and practices regarding criminals who were crucified (pp. 73–80, 83–86). This chapter alone is worth the price of the book. Regrettably, the book contains no response to Ehrman’s fifth chapter, in which he explains why he thinks the resurrection of Jesus cannot be accepted as fact on historical grounds and that Jesus’s appearances can be categorized as “bereavement visions.”

Simon Gathercole does a satisfactory job of critiquing Ehrman’s arguments for a primitive “exaltation Christology” that regarded Jesus as simply a man whom God exalted at his resurrection. He presents a brief overview of his argument for the preexistence of Jesus in the Synoptic Gospels and a brief but good rebuttal to Ehrman’s claim that in Mark Jesus was adopted as God’s Son at his baptism (pp. 96–99). Gathercole also shows that Ehrman’s method of extracting a non-Pauline Christology from Paul (Rom 1:3–4) and a non-Lukan Christology from the speeches in Acts (Acts 2:36; 13:32–33) is question-begging (pp. 103–10). The one issue here that does not receive attention is the virgin birth of Jesus.

Chris Tilling’s two chapters are frustratingly thin when dealing with the specific texts of the epistles covered in Ehrman’s corresponding two chapters. This is largely due to the fact that he devotes one of his chapters to global issues, critiquing Ehrman’s “interpretive categories” (pp. 117–33); although Tilling’s analysis here is helpful, it apparently left little time or room for engaging the texts. Ironically, Tilling faults Ehrman for not providing extended exegesis of NT passages other than Phil 2:6–11, a criticism that would apply more to Tilling’s material than to Ehrman’s (pp. 147–48).

Ehrman has done the church a service by reminding us that the issues of the resurrection of Christ and the deity of Christ are inextricably linked. He has also thrown down a challenge to Christian scholars to make the case for both of these truths in a fresh way that engages the evidence within a broader range of religious studies. Ehrman may be at his most polemically effective when he asks why we should believe in Jesus’ resurrection but not in modern stories of Jesus appearing to people or other seemingly supernatural visions, such as Marian apparitions. It is perhaps understandable why professional evangelical NT scholars skirt or simply miss these questions, which are never addressed in *How God Became Jesus*. That is too bad, because a critical engagement with those comparisons can only help the cause of Christian scholarship. In a society increasingly aware of the multiplicity of competing religious claims in the intellectual and spiritual marketplace, we cannot afford to ignore those questions.

Robert M. Bowman Jr.
Institute for Religious Research, Grand Rapids, MI

A Theology of Matthew: Jesus Revealed as Deliver, King, and Incarnate Creator. By Charles L. Quarles. Explorations in Biblical Theology. Phillipsburg: P&R, 2013, xvii + 220 pp., \$17.99 paper.

Charles L. Quarles is professor of NT and biblical studies at Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary in Wake Forest, NC. As part of the series Explorations in Biblical Theology, he has written an excellent introduction to the theology of Matthew's Gospel, one that is more comprehensive and conservative than the standard work in the field, Ulrich Luz's *The Theology of the Gospel of Matthew* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995). While throughout the book Quarles moves from biblical exegesis to theological reflection and practical application, he does not offer a mini-commentary (as does Luz, John Meier, et al.). Rather, he covers the first Gospel's main themes with a helpful topical framework.

Quarles summarizes Matthew's theology utilizing three important OT figures. Building on his brief overview of the Gospel of Matthew (covering authorship, date, provenance, audience, structure, and purpose) along with a survey of key theological themes and hermeneutical schemes (part 1), Quarles divides his study into Jesus as the new Moses (part 2), the new David (part 3), and the new Abraham (part 4). Each part is further divided into two chapters with the first covering exegetical parallels (i.e. Jesus with Moses, with David, and with Abraham) and the second covering the theological significance, including practical implications. He concludes by highlighting Matthew's high Christology, what Quarles terms "The New Creator: Jesus, our God" (part 5). "These Christological themes emphasize Jesus' identity as the Deliverer who rescues God's people from their sins, the King who rules over God's kingdom, the Founder of a new chosen people, and God with us acting to make his people new" (p. 30). This framework works as a straightforward and insightful way to summarize the material, while also emphasizing Matthew's important contribution to the Christology of the NT.

Beyond the helpful structure, readers will find a wealth of learning précised into palatable portions. Quarles's ability to simplify the complex is one of many reasons I use this book as a textbook for my "Exegesis of Matthew's Gospel" class. Other seminary professors and Bible school teachers will find both the structure (thirteen units: eleven chapters with an introduction and conclusion) and substance suitable for a course term. Moreover, the "Questions for Study and Reflection" at the conclusion of the book (pp. 195–201) are wonderful resources for personal reflection and classroom discussion.

I found Quarles's argument that "Matthew's primary concern is to reveal Jesus Christ, Son of David, Son of Abraham, Savior, Son of God, and Immanuel, to his readers" (p. 16) persuasive. Although Christology is at the center, this book is rightly titled a "theology" of Matthew, since it is from that Christological center that Quarles successfully includes, without subordinating or avoiding, the important themes of soteriology, discipleship, ecclesiology, and mission. Each section is balanced. He naturally moves from Jesus's identity with the Suffering Servant to the requirement of repentance and faith; from Jesus as the eschatological judge to the necessity of submitting to his authority; from Jesus's inclusion of the Gentiles

in God's redemptive plan to the obligation of evangelism and mission; from Jesus's deity to the compulsion of Christian worship. Amazingly, in under 200 pages, he covers the major themes, implications, and applications in Matthew's Gospel with clarity and conviction.

With these strengths in mind, I offer three minor critiques of this exceptional book. First, while Quarles touches on Jesus as teacher (in sections like "Jesus is Like Moses in His Teaching Ministry" [pp. 37–39], "The Background of Jesus' Teaching about the Kingdom Is the Book of Daniel" [pp. 87–88], and "Jesus' Words Demonstrate His Deity" [pp. 172–76]), he never covers in depth the great blocks of teaching material—the Sermon on the Mount (chaps. 5–7), the commission of the Twelve (chap. 10), the parables (chap. 13), the church discipline discourse (chap. 18), the Olivet Discourse (chaps. 24–25), and even the climatic Great Commission (28:18–20)—and their unique contribution to Matthean theology. More on this material would have strengthened Quarles's thesis and could even have been used to summarize it, since the Great Commission readily supports his main points:

pasa exousia → new David

panta ta ethnē → new Abraham

tērein panta hosa eneteilamēn → new Moses

egō meth' hymōn eimi pasas → new Creator

This is not to say he does not cover the teaching blocks in passing (see "Index of Scripture" [pp. 211–14]), merely that he does not emphasize, as I think he should, how Matthew's restructuring and expansion of the Markan material purposely highlights Jesus's role as teacher. As John P. Meier rightly notes, "Christ's teaching activity is carefully made the warp and woof of the first gospel" (*The Vision of Matthew: Christ, Church, and Morality in the First Gospel* [Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2004] 48). I wanted to see more of that theological tapestry.

Second, I found the terminology "new Creator" a confusing title to symbolize Jesus' divinity. Is Jesus not also the "old" creator ("God") of Genesis 1 (cf. Col 1:16)? Although Quarles explains the term (as does the book's subtitle: "Incarnate Creator"), I wonder if it would make better sense to either drop the "new"—make it a separate, unique, and climatic section ("the Creator Christ" perhaps?)—or go with something distinctly Matthean (although perhaps even more confusing) like "new Genesis." Quarles renders *Biblos geneōs Iesou Christou* (Matt 1:1) as "The book of the genesis of Jesus Christ" (see pp. 177–80), and he acknowledges that Jesus is the "new Genesis" who "performs the miracle of new creation, transforming his people from the inside out, so that they become the people he desires" (p. 193).

Finally, while his short section on Jesus as the fulfillment of OT prophecies is superb (pp. 27–29), I found his summary paragraph regarding Matthew's use of the OT overly simplistic. That paragraph ends, "The scriptural predictions perfectly matched the events that they foretold *without the slightest* modification" (p. 29, emphasis added). I take issue with Quarles's language, not his exegetical conclusion. I find Matthew's understanding of Jesus' fulfillment of the Law and the Prophets

quite complex, and some of the *modifications* he makes (from the LXX and the Hebrew alike) and the typologies he employs difficult to comprehend. I am not alone in my perspicuity *Angst*. The solutions are there, and Quarles points to them. I merely wish he showed us more about how he arrived there and how difficult a journey it was.

These minor issues aside, Quarles offers a succinct summary of Matthew's theology and makes a successful case for why the "modern church needs a good dose of the Gospel of Matthew" (p. 192). Because Matthew's Gospel "presents the essential truths of the Christian faith in powerfully compelling and beautiful ways," it will prove, as Quarles claims, to be "a great cure for doctrinal anemia" (p. 192). This is an invaluable book for laypersons, Bible students, pastors, and even long-time Synoptic scholars. Quarles's *Theology of Matthew* is a first-rate introductory theology to the first Gospel. It is a long overdue and needed contribution to Matthean and Synoptic studies, and indeed an "intellectual and theological feast" (Thomas Schreiner, "Preface," p. xiii) that will help allay the contemporary church's doctrinal deprivation.

Douglas Sean O'Donnell
Queensland Theological College, Brisbane, Australia

The Theological Role of Paradox in the Gospel of Mark. By Laura C. Sweat. Library of NT Studies 492. London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2013, xiv + 208 pp., \$120.00.

Laura Sweat's book, which began as a doctoral dissertation submitted at Princeton Theological Seminary in 2011, explores how the Gospel of Mark uses paradox to describe God's activity (pp. 5, 13). Paradox is not only "something contrary to expected opinion, or something surprising," but more significantly a "clash of equally valid, contrary claims" (p. 17). With this definition, Sweat contends that Mark develops a narrative in which statements that appear to contradict one another are nevertheless true at the same time, thus expressing in narrative form what is too vast for the human mind to understand concerning God's activity (p. 18).

Using classic historical-critical methods with a literary-critical emphasis (p. 9), the book provides exegetical grounding for broader theological concepts, including the mystery of God, but it also supplies some of the ways in which Mark describes this mysterious God (i.e. in paradoxes; p. 8). For Sweat, the only way to express this mysterious and sovereign God in a fallible, temporal world is through theological paradoxes that bring the focus on God's action (p. 27). In other words, it is through the juxtaposition of equally valid yet opposite claims that Mark describes God's activity (p. 19). In order to explore the Second Gospel's theological language, the book considers representative passages across the narrative, including the parables in Mark 4 (the first part of the book) and portions of the passion narrative in Mark 14–15 (the second part of the book).

The first part of the book discusses the three paradoxical descriptions of God's activity in the parables of Mark 4. These three paradoxical Markan categories concerning God's actions are as follows: (1) God's revelatory acts are consistently

accompanied by concealment. Mark 4:10–12, as an expression of paradoxical theology, describes God’s activity as a concealed or veiled revelation through the use of vague verbs, the function of the two nouns “mystery” and “parables,” and the presence of an ambiguous audience. Sweat takes the view that Mark 4:10–12 (a classic paradox of divine and human agency) shows how God hides and reveals the kingdom, the divine presence, and the roles that Jesus, insiders, and outsiders play in this unfolding drama (p. 62). (2) Divine action confirms yet counters Scripture. In light of Mark’s use of Isa 6:9–10 (specifically regarding the confirmation and reversal of the themes of blindness, deafness, and hardness of heart in both Isaiah and Mark, and regarding the setting of Isaiah’s passage in Mark), the book argues that even Scripture itself demonstrates a paradoxical understanding of God’s action, as God’s own words are at once fulfilled and emptied throughout the Gospel’s narrative (p. 63). (3) God’s actions indicate both wastefulness and goodness. In the parable of the sower (4:3–9) and its interpretation (4:13–20), the sower (a metaphor for God) scatters seeds that generate both significant waste and a good harvest (pp. 77–78). This paradoxical category occurs in the context of an ongoing, yet defeated, presence of evil (p. 9).

The second part of this book demonstrates that Mark’s paradoxical language is not confined to the parables discourse but rather is also widely attested across the passion narrative. In the events at Bethany (14:3–9), Gethsemane (14:27–42), Golgotha (15:22–39), and the empty tomb (16:1–8), Sweat observes the continuation of Mark’s depiction of God’s activity using the three paradoxes noted in Mark 4. In relation to the unnamed woman in Bethany (14:1–11), the paradoxical proclamations of waste and bounty seek to show that God’s actions are reflected on the human plane. By acting in ways that are paradoxically wasteful and good, the woman unknowingly mimics the action of the sower in the parables of Mark 4 (p. 114). In relation to Gethsemane, Sweat finds evidence of another paradox: God both confirms and counters Scripture, through the Zechariah passage on desertion (14:27) and Jesus’s assurance of restoration (14:28), as well as through Jesus’s prayer in Gethsemane (p. 115). Regarding Golgotha (15:22–39), Sweat comments that Mark’s narrative of the cross highlights how divine action is paradoxically wasteful and yet, in its eschatological context, also good (p. 157). Concerning the empty tomb (16:1–8), the book discusses two paradoxical expressions through Jesus’ absence at the tomb and the ambiguous figure of Joseph of Arimathea, thus showing the paradox of waste and goodness at work (pp. 163–64).

Sweat has produced a significant study of the theological outworking of paradox in Mark’s Gospel through the parable of the sower and some sections of the passion narrative. She does not track God’s identity and work through the verbal and dramatic instances of paradox in Mark, but through the theological lens of God simultaneously concealing and revealing, confirming and countering, and expressing wastefulness and goodness. In this way, the book carefully unveils the presence and absence of God in Mark.

One strength of Sweat’s analysis is her ability to resist the temptation to resolve the paradoxical language in the narrative. She realizes the readers’ inability to unpack fully the mysterious God, whose infiniteness is not simply greater than hu-

man finitude, but is also qualitatively different (p. 17). Throughout her book, Sweat aptly recognizes that in the Second Gospel God remains mysterious and that Mark continues to be an enigmatic and surprising book, which uses paradox to tell truths at a slant, “lest they dazzle readers with their brightness (9:2–8) or confound readers with their darkness (15:32–39)” (p. 9). I agree that paradox is not meant to be resolved but that it is designed to be recognized with appreciation for its tensive reality. The lure of paradox is to entice its readers to resolve the paradox. However, the Markan narrative defies such enticement and insists on being paradoxical until its enigmatic end. Mark speaks about God’s activity in a paradoxical manner up to the close of the empty tomb episode (16:1–8). Sweat allots a whole chapter (pp. 158–76) on this puzzling conclusion, showing how this episode is still couched in paradoxical language.

In her book’s introductory chapter, Sweat admits that she limits her analysis to representative passages from across the narrative, including both the parables discourse and portions of the passion narrative. She states, “Unlike previous studies of God’s activity in Mark which tend to include the entire narrative of the Gospel, the following exegesis focuses on select passages” (p. 8). Although she recognizes that paradoxical language is not limited to the parables of Mark 4, she also contends that the paradoxical language about God can be seen most clearly through them (p. 9). Sweat does bridge Mark’s paradoxical language from the parables in chapter 4 to the passion narrative in chapters 14–15 by investigating the parables of the tenants (12:1–11) and by comparing the poor widow who gave everything she had (12:41–44) to the unknown woman who anointed Jesus in Bethany (14:1–9). However, a tighter link between the parables and the passion narrative could have been further explored through the inclusion of more paradoxical episodes between these major passages. For example, the inclusion of the two feeding miracles of Jesus (6:30–44; 8:1–13) would have been illustrative of the paradox of wastefulness and goodness. Why the wasteful twelve basketfuls of broken pieces of bread and fish? Why the additional wasteful seven basketfuls of broken pieces of leftovers in the second miracle? Why such waste in the midst of two miracles expressing goodness in feeding five thousand and four thousand people respectively?

Sweat’s book significantly adds to the conversation of *theo*-logy in Mark (following Nils Dahl’s italicization for the study of what the NT documents say about God, as distinct from other theological explorations like Christology, ecclesiology, or eschatology). This contribution of *theo*-logy comes in the form of recognizing God’s presence and activity through the use of paradoxical language in the Gospel narrative. Sweat rightly observes that Markan scholarship on paradox has given much attention to Christology and discipleship to the neglect of *theo*-logy. Her insightful study on tracking God’s actions in the narrative moves the conversation on paradox forward by adding the *theo*-logy strand to the two strands of Christology and discipleship. As Sweat correctly writes, “Understanding Mark’s use of paradoxical language to describe God’s activity provides evidence for the unity of three strands of Mark’s narrative that have long been separated: discussions of God, Jesus, and the life of a disciple” (p. 181). I concur with Sweat that Mark intentionally intertwines these three strands in the Gospel through the language of paradox.

Sweat also makes a unique contribution in using paradox (along with parable and irony) in seeking to understand God's identity and actions in the Markan narrative. Combining literary and theological considerations is a helpful exercise in describing God's activity throughout the Second Gospel. Sweat fittingly argues that paradox, parable, and irony "have rarely been part of a discussion of the Gospel's understanding of God, or of the theology of the text as a whole" (p. 19).

Additionally, Sweat's study offers a fresh way to negotiate the seeming impasse in handling exegetically problematic passages in the Gospel (e.g. Mark's so-called "hardening theory" in 4:10–12, the role of both Jesus' disciples and his opponents in his passion and death, and Mark's enigmatic ending in 16:1–8). The paradoxical language in Mark serves as a tensive bridge that can help Markan scholars handle the "both-and" realities of the radically divided interpretive options for such problematic passages. As Sweat aptly comments, "What previous scholarship has not recognized, however, is that evidence for two primary options with the text of the Gospel may indicate the Evangelist's irreducibly paradoxical language" (p. 179). Sweat makes an important contribution by showing that problematic passages can lead to a greater appreciation for the baffling and enigmatic role of paradox in Mark's Gospel.

Narry F. Santos
Saddleback Church, Manila, Philippines

Rejected Prophets: Jesus and His Witnesses in Luke-Acts. By Jocelyn McWhirter. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2013, x + 144 pp., \$29.00 paper.

This short volume by Jocelyn McWhirter, associate professor of religious studies at Albion College, investigates a widely recognized theme in Luke-Acts, the presentation of Jesus and his followers as prophets. Her thesis is that Luke develops this prophetic portrait because the OT prophets set a precedent for three themes important to Luke's agenda: Gentile inclusion, Jewish rejection, and condemnation of the temple.

Although all four Gospels portray Jesus as a prophet, Luke has the strongest and clearest prophetic presentation. Like the prophets of Israel, Jesus performs miracles, predicts the future, illustrates oracles with parables, and performs symbolic prophetic actions. Luke also portrays Jesus' followers as prophets, beginning with Jesus' forerunner John and continuing with the roles of Peter and the other apostles in Acts.

Why this prophetic portrait? McWhirter claims that Luke is dealing especially with the failure of messianic events to play out as expected. Jesus was not a warrior, leading a Jewish army to defeat the Romans; he was an artisan from Nazareth, crucified by the Romans. Many of his followers had suffered similar fates. Most Jews had rejected his message, while Samaritans and even uncircumcised Gentiles were becoming his followers. Jerusalem and the temple had not been restored by the Messiah; indeed, they had been destroyed by the Romans.

To respond to these anomalies Luke develops three basic strategies. First, he writes an “orderly account” around the themes of Jesus’s death, acceptance of the gospel by Samaritans and Gentiles, rejection by the Jews, and activities in the holy city—showing how all these things were part of God’s purpose and plan. Second, Luke frequently introduces God’s own testimony to confirm Jesus’ messianic identity and mission to suffer and die. Third, and most importantly, Luke characterizes Jesus and his witnesses as prophets. The OT prophets fulfilled these same roles: ministry to the Gentiles, consistent rejection by Israel, and predictions of Israel’s judgment because of the nation’s disobedience. McWhirter points out that Luke’s agenda is similar to that of the author of 1 Maccabees, who wrote to defend the legitimacy of the Hasmonean dynasty over against claims of illegitimacy. He did so by modeling the deeds of the Maccabees after those of biblical heroes. Luke does the same, comparing the deeds of Jesus and the apostles to those of the prophets of old.

In chapter 2, “Messiah and Savior,” the author acknowledges that these prophetic precedents cannot address the chief objection to early Christian faith: that Jesus, a condemned criminal, is actually the prophesied Messiah. Luke confirms Jesus’ messianic identity in a variety of ways: the announcement by birth narrative characters, the testimony of John the Baptist, God’s own voice from heaven, Peter’s confession, etc. Yet how could Jesus be the Messiah if the Romans were still in power and the temple was in ruins? The answer appears in the birth narrative prophecy of John the Baptist’s father, Zechariah. The salvation Jesus the Messiah will bring is the “knowledge of salvation to his people by the forgiveness of sins” (Luke 1:77). Luke’s Jesus consistently fulfills Zechariah’s prophecy. He offers forgiveness to sinners, tax collectors, and even the criminal beside him on the cross. The death and vindication of the Messiah in the Gospels paves the way for Acts, where the church offers salvation through the forgiveness of sins. After his resurrection, Jesus explains that this mission has just begun: “Thus it is written ... that the Messiah is to suffer and to rise from the dead on the third day, and that repentance and forgiveness of sins is to be proclaimed in his name” (Luke 24:46–47).

In chapter 3, “Trustworthy Prophets,” McWhirter demonstrates how parallels with the prophets show Jesus and John to be trustworthy prophets. There are numerous allusions in Luke’s birth narrative to OT precedents, especially the birth of Samuel. The next three chapters (chaps. 4, 5, 6) concern Luke’s portrayal of Jesus as a prophet. Although Samuel provided a prophetic model for the birth stories of Jesus and John, his adult life does not set the same precedent. Instead, other prophets fulfill that role. In chapter 4, “A Light for the Gentiles,” the author shows how Elijah’s prophetic vocation parallels that of Jesus. God sends Elijah to a Gentile, providing the model for the extension of God’s salvation to all people. Like Elijah, Jesus resuscitates a stricken child and appoints followers who will receive his spirit. McWhirter traces a dozen or so similarities between Jesus and Elijah, many hinting at the expansion of the gospel beyond Israel to the Gentiles.

In chapter 5, “A Rejected Prophet,” McWhirter discusses the key Lukan theme of Jewish rejection of the gospel. Again, Luke uses prophetic parallels to explain the rejection of Jesus. The rejected Messiah was also a prophet, Luke af-

firms, and Israel already had a history of rejecting her prophets. While many OT prophets faced opposition and rejection, Luke points especially to Moses and Jeremiah. Moses' prediction that God would raise up a prophet like him is twice applied to Jesus, and Moses' rejection becomes a model for that of Jesus (Deut 18:15; Acts 3:22–23; 7:37). Jeremiah was Israel's quintessential rejected prophet. Like Jeremiah, Jesus warned Israel's leaders, predicted Jerusalem's destruction, and mourned over the city. Jesus' examination by the high priest has parallels to Jeremiah's interrogation by king Zedekiah (Jer 38:14–15).

In chapter 6, "The Doom of Jerusalem," McWhirter discusses the destruction of Jerusalem and the temple and its devastating effect on Jews and Christians alike. Luke makes sense of the horrific event by showing how the Lukan Jesus, like many of the OT prophets (Hosea, Zephaniah, Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel), repeatedly predicted Jerusalem's destruction. These events were not an accident of history, but God's judgment against the nation for rejecting its Messiah.

In chapters 7, 8, and 9, McWhirter turns to Luke's presentation in Acts. Chapter 7, "Prophets like Jesus," examines how, in scenes reminiscent of the Elijah/Elisha story, Peter and the apostles receive Jesus' spirit and perform his miracles. In chapter 8, "Rejected Prophets," we see the Jewish council rejecting the apostles in the same way they rejected Jesus and in the same way the Israelites rejected Moses. In chapter 9, the author shows how Spirit-filled prophets like Philip, Peter, and then Paul, took the gospel beyond its Jewish boundaries to the Samaritans and the Gentiles.

In a short conclusion, the author draws some implications for twenty-first century Christians. Luke's assertion that the destruction of Jerusalem was a consequence of Jewish rejection of the gospel seems far less relevant today in a post-Holocaust world, after seventeen hundred years of Christian dominance over Jews. Yet Christians today still need to hear Luke's prophetic voice as a message to them. "Luke's prophets recall the church to Jesus' mission—a mission to bring good news to the poor; to heal the blind, the lame, the lepers ... to seek out and to save the lost; to proclaim repentance and forgiveness of sins in his name to all nations" (p. 126).

McWhirter's volume is thorough and well argued, a good example of intertextual analysis. She identifies a number of prophetic parallels not noticed by other interpreters. The book's strength is its insights into Lukan theology and narrative purpose. The book has few weaknesses, though occasionally I had trouble following how particular points contributed to the overall thesis. The author seems sometimes to wander off into (interesting) exegetical discussions that distract from a systematic analysis of Luke's prophet theology.

At times, too, the parallels drawn between Jesus and prophetic precedents seem stretched. For example, the pouring out of the Spirit seems to have much more to do with eschatological renewal than the passing on of the prophetic spirit from Elijah to Elisha. I also found the author's assertion that Luke is writing to a predominantly Jewish-Christian audience less than convincing. She claims that questions like "Why was Jesus crucified?" "Why did he eat and drink with tax collectors and sinners?" and "Why was the temple destroyed?" are "Jewish questions

posed by Jewish characters” (pp. 123–24). Yet they could equally be posed by a predominantly Gentile, but mixed, community trying to exert itself as the true people of God over against the larger Jewish community. There seems to me far too much in Acts defending full Gentile inclusion to posit a predominantly Jewish-Christian audience.

These are small criticisms, however, for a very well-researched and well-written volume. This book will serve students well as a valuable contribution to Luke’s narrative theology.

Mark L. Strauss
Bethel Seminary San Diego, San Diego, CA

Paul and the Faithfulness of God. By N. T. Wright. 2 vols. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2013, xxvii + 1,658 pp., \$89.00 paper.

This much-anticipated “book” by Wright comes in two books, totaling 1,658 pages. The two books constitute the fourth volume in his larger project investigating the origins of the early Christian movement (Christian Origins and the Question of God). Since Wright has written at least three books on various aspects of Paul’s theology over the last few decades in anticipation of this fuller treatment, it is an understatement to note that the author has already contributed significantly to the field of Pauline studies. Not only did he play a leading role in the development of the “new perspective on Paul,” stressing a reading of Paul against his Jewish background, but he also pushed the field ahead to consider Paul against his imperial context—whether and to what extent Paul proclaims the lordship of Jesus Christ vis-à-vis the lordship of Caesar. Both of these aspects of Wright’s unique approach to Paul appear prominently in the present tome.

Much of what Wright presents here has been anticipated in a number of other publications, but there also is much that is new and the form of his argument will surely be reviewed by scholars in many venues and in various publications in coming years. The major thrust of Wright’s overall argument is that, while Paul is in thoroughgoing continuity with his Jewish heritage, he also transforms the pillars of Judaism and the faith of Israel in light of the work of God in Christ and the presence of the Spirit among the new creation people of God. In one of his many summary statements, Wright claims that

the hypothesis at the heart of this book is that Paul’s thought is best understood in terms of the revision, around Messiah and spirit, of the fundamental categories and structures of second-Temple Jewish understanding; and that this ‘revision’, precisely because of the drastic nature of the Messiah’s death and resurrection, and the freshly given power of the spirit, is no mere minor adjustment, but a radically new state of affairs, albeit one which had always been promised in Torah, Prophets and Psalms. The radical newness, then, does not alter the fact that Paul’s theology is still a ‘revision’ of Jewish theology, rather than a scheme drawn from elsewhere, as advocates of a non-Jewish Paul have regularly supposed (p. 783).

For Wright, then, Paul is reworking the essential aspects of his Jewish heritage, and this involved the invention of something new—"theology." That is, in order for Paul to understand for himself and translate to his churches the character of God's new work in the Messiah and the Spirit, he more or less invented a new discipline, or perhaps he took it to a new level (p. 404). Wright situates Paul within the world of the culture and religion of his day, along with a range of philosophical schools, and regards Paul as doing something similar yet distinct from the philosophical schools.

With regard to the content of Paul's "theology" and how he transformed his Jewish heritage, Wright argues that Paul transformed three essential elements—monotheism, election, and eschatology. Before embarking on these discussions, however, Wright sets the stage in the second part of his work, arguing that readers of Paul have to ask what Paul is writing about. Here, Wright makes an important contribution by claiming that Paul is speaking to and from the larger body of convictions about what the God of Israel has done in Jesus the Messiah to consummate the incomplete story of Israel. Paul is not "writing about" the relationship of individuals to God, letting them know how they can be saved and grow in their understanding of their newly established right relation (p. 490). For Wright, while individual relating to God is important, this is part of a larger framework, having to do with the creator God's mission to reclaim and transform his broken creation and to restore his purposes for it and for humanity through Abraham and Israel, and thus, the Messiah (pp. 475–537). Wright is well known for his big-picture thinking and it is on display here, to great effect.

Regarding Paul's transformation of monotheism, Wright builds to some extent on Richard Bauckham's work on monotheism, developing an eschatological monotheistic framework within which to understand Israel's faith. Israel did not merely confess that there was only one God, nor that their God was the one true God. They confessed faith in the singular Creator who would return to Zion as he had promised, vindicate Israel as his people, and restore the creation that belonged to him alone. The monotheistic faith of Israel is reworked in that "Paul saw in Jesus the shocking and explosive vision of *Israel's God returning at last, as he had always promised*" (p. 698, emphasis original). Beyond Jesus's merely having an identity as divine or as God himself, Jesus himself is the God of Israel returning to Zion to bring in the Kingdom of God and restore Israel. To confess faith in this figure, then, is to take upon oneself the yoke of the kingdom and commit oneself to the cause of the God of Israel revealed in Jesus the Messiah (p. 773).

The second revision of Paul's theology, for Wright, is the transformation of election, by which Wright means the identity of the people of God. The term had formerly applied to Israel's special relation to God and unique commission on behalf of the God of Israel to be a light to the nations (p. 775). This section of the work is quite large, running nearly three hundred pages, but it is here that Wright deals with some of the more controversial aspects of his reading of Paul. He treats justification by faith in Paul in some detail, along with the manner in which he regards Paul to have related the current identity of the people of God to historical Israel. In the past, some have accused Wright of "supersessionism," and his discus-

sion in this work will not satisfy those critics. Though he prefers to speak of “fulfillment” rather than “supersession” (pp. 809–10), he does not completely shrink from the charge of holding the latter, claiming that most sectarian groups within Judaism would be subject to the same accusation. That is, any group that maintained that it alone was faithful to the heritage of Israel, like Qumran, could be subject to the same claim (pp. 806–9).

The third major aspect of Wright’s conception of Paul’s reworked theology is eschatology. That is, the hopes of restoration for Israel and the return of Israel’s God have taken place in time in Jesus the Messiah and the Spirit. Wright, then, as with the previous two topics, describes how this works out in a variety of Paul’s texts.

The first thing that strikes anyone encountering Wright’s work is its size. It is massive and this will put off many students of Paul who simply will not make it through the entire work. This is unfortunate because many of Wright’s most refined statements on various aspects of Paul’s theology are found here, after years of honing his articulation of them. A second thing that strikes the persevering reader is the manner in which Wright both casts a big-picture reading of Paul and develops this reading in a range of texts from Israel’s Scriptures, Second Temple Judaism, and Paul’s letters themselves. It seems that Wright’s obvious strength is grasping the bigger picture, and students and scholars alike will benefit from these global proposals whereas there will obviously be much disagreement when it comes to finding this big picture in the particular texts.

It is refreshing to see that Wright has no time for the scholarly fashion that regards Ephesians as post-Pauline and that he views the consensus that Ephesians is not from the hand of Paul as having to do with little more than scholarly fashion (pp. 61–63). He has the sort of stature whereby he can afford to take on the guild and its opinions here, though this section discussing the sources of Paul is typical of the author’s writing style. In a section given to the topic of sources on Paul, his comments leave some lack of clarity on whether or not he fully accepts the thirteen letters or whether 1 Timothy fails to pass the test of authenticity. Further, it is likely the case that his elaboration of justification by faith, which he wraps within a larger discussion of the revision in Paul’s understanding of the identity of the people of God, will fail to satisfy his critics on that issue. In addition, those who take Wright to task for his supersessionistic tendencies will also be dissatisfied on this score.

As indicated briefly above, there is simply too much in this volume to focus on one topic to evaluate. It is an understatement to note that Wright has provided a vigorous reading of Paul that will give the guild of biblical scholars much to discuss over at least the next several years.

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

The Church according to Paul: Recovering the Community Conformed to Christ. By James W. Thompson. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2014, xiii + 289 pp., \$26.99 paper.

We live in an era where, seemingly, the church is increasingly losing its voice in the public square, even amidst a flurry of activity wherein churches seek to recreate themselves and to remain culturally relevant. As a result, churches operate as political action committees, corporations, and theater-like establishments, or they shift doctrinal stances to blend in more readily with modern culture. James Thompson, in his book *The Church according to Paul*, is concerned that such activity is derailing the community of faith from its primary mandate, namely, the transformation of churches into the image of Christ (p. 247). Thompson's purpose in writing is "to offer the theological foundation for the rediscovery of the church by examining Pauline ecclesiology within the larger framework of the apostle's theology" (p. 20). He maintains that such a study of Paul's ecclesiology offers needed insights for the church in a post-Christian world.

Thompson is professor of NT and Onstead Chair for Biblical Studies at Abilene Christian University. This book builds on the insights of two previous works entitled *Pastoral Ministry according to Paul* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2006) and *Moral Formation according to Paul* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2011). With his focus squarely on the notion of moral formation as the key enterprise of the church, Thompson takes up this work because he believes "Paul's voice is largely missing in recent attempts to redefine the church" (p. ix). As such, the Pauline corpus takes center stage as Thompson seeks to delineate a robust ecclesiology strictly in line with the apostle's teachings.

Thompson begins his work by dealing with Paul's earliest correspondence to the Thessalonians. Here, Thompson avers, Paul seeks to shape the identity of his readers by showing their link to Israel, and he also uses familial language to indicate the nature of relationships in the church. Chapter 2 is a key contribution, as the author demonstrates the linkage between Paul's Christology and his ecclesiology. Union with Christ serves as a ruling paradigm in Paul's writings, and Thompson shows that the believer's unity with Christ is the basis for the unity of believers with one another. From this identity in Christ, certain "manifestations" or practices elucidate the realities of what the gospel accomplishes in forming the church. Therefore in chapter 3, Thompson discusses the practices of baptism and the Lord's Supper.

In chapter 4, Thompson makes plain his corporate emphasis in conceiving of spiritual formation as primarily a community project. Looking back at its entrance into salvation and looking forward to its ultimate destination, the church is to be countercultural in the sense of continual transformation into the likeness of Christ, using a variety of spiritual disciplines. Chapters 5 and 6 deal with the "communal dimension" of Paul's doctrine of justification and the mission of the church, respectively. Thompson then delves into the idea of the church as both universal and local in chapter 7, acknowledging the importance of local churches while also urging stronger cooperation between churches to highlight their universal identity.

These sections demonstrate the emphasis Thompson places on the corporate aspect of the church.

The final two chapters focus on the legacy of Paul in his “disputed letters” and his understanding of church leadership. In the first of these chapters he labors to show the continuity and discontinuity between the earlier and later letters. Here he deals especially with Colossians, Ephesians, and the Pastoral Epistles. In the final chapter Thompson affirms a dialectical relationship between members and their leaders, recognizing the mutual exhortation that must take place between church members while also acknowledging the intentional selfless leadership of particular qualified individuals.

Thompson’s work offers an exegetically rigorous account of Paul’s ecclesiology. His chapter on leadership at the end of the book is worthwhile in reminding the reader of the proper role of leaders and church members alike in terms of authority and accountability. Readers may at times become frustrated by the lack of attention given to other segments of Scripture that may offer crucial supplementary content (e.g. the OT background of Passover to the Lord’s Supper could certainly receive a great deal more attention), but Thompson’s focus on Paul also serves as a great strength, since the details outlined from Paul’s writings exceed what is typically found in studies on ecclesiology. The approach taken by Thompson does not just note particular proof-texts regarding the church from various places in the NT but rather delves into the contextual realities of Paul’s epistles and thinks through how Paul’s theology affects his ecclesiology. Churches that are much more focused on pragmatic issues without giving proper attention to the ontological and theological realities that undergird ecclesiology will be helped in this regard.

Another helpful feature of this work is the way in which the author links ecclesiology tightly with Christology. Thompson helpfully argues that the body of Christ is an extension of being “in Christ,” and in this way he roots the people of God as a people through their union with Christ. Certainly a work such as Constantine Campbell’s *Paul and Union with Christ* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2012) has taken up this theme in various places. However, Thompson is to be commended for demonstrating that union with Christ is not meant merely about a personal relationship with God; it also entails the way in which God constitutes a people for his own possession.

This strength, however, gives rise to one of questionable features of the work as a whole, namely, the overemphasis on the corporate nature of ecclesiology and soteriology. This is most evident in his sections on spiritual formation (chap. 4) and justification (chap. 5). In terms of spiritual formation, Thompson states, “Paul envisions the transformation of the whole community as it progresses from the beginning to the end of its narrative. . . . He does not envision a church that facilitates the maturation of the individual, but envisions a community that grows into the image of Christ” (p. 125). While often the emphasis in spiritual formation has been overly individualistic, does this approach not tip the scales in the other direction a bit too emphatically? One does not give an account to God as a church, but as an individual (2 Cor 5:10), and therefore more of a balance is necessary here.

Similarly, Thompson goes too far in a corporate direction when discussing justification, and this is due to his affirmation of the New Perspective on Paul, which Thompson essentially assumes for his chapter on justification. Thompson works exegetically to make his points, but leaves a number of questions. For example, in claiming that Paul never describes the righteousness of God as the answer to the individual's guilty conscience (p. 129), does Thompson really do exegetical justice to the plight described in Romans 1–3 or the realities of 2 Cor 5:17–21? Is the new covenant only about “the remission of the whole nation's sins” and not the sins of individuals (p. 130)? Much ink has been spilt about this debate, but this viewpoint seems to be missing some key distinctions made in Scripture about righteousness and individual salvation. At the very least, more warrant is needed in this chapter to substantiate Thompson's claims.

This overemphasis does, in some ways, detract from the overarching theological realities portrayed in this work, but regardless Thompson has given his reader much to consider concerning ecclesiology in the Pauline corpus. It is a fitting sequel to his previous two books, with its focus on sanctification and on Paul's writings. In that way it is a unique contribution to the study of ecclesiology, and those looking for a book with this focus will be helped by many of the details given. For a broader perspective on ecclesiology, one could look also to *Sojourners and Strangers* (Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2012) by Gregg Allison or *The Community of Jesus* (Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 2013) by Kendall Easley and Christopher Morgan, which contains a helpful chapter on Pauline ecclesiology. Thompson has done a remarkable job in reminding us of our need for a robust ecclesiology. The ideal scenario would be that this work drives the reader back to the biblical text, as opposed to changing cultural trends, in seeking to formulate a steady God-glorifying theology of the church.

Jeremy M. Kimble
Cedarville University, Cedarville, OH

Paul's Financial Policy: A Socio-Theological Approach. By David E. Briones. Library of NT Studies 494. London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2013, xiii + 258 pp., \$112.00.

In *Paul's Financial Policy*, David E. Briones, Dean of Students and professor of NT at Reformation Bible College in Sanford, FL, offers an explanation for Paul's seeming inconsistency with regard to financial support from the Philippians and the Corinthians. Along the way, he shows why the highly influential patronage model, as it is applied to Paul's letters, is inappropriate. He offers a three-dimensional theological-relational matrix that sees God as the source of gift, Paul as the broker of *charis*, and his congregations as mutually obligated partners based on the way they live in accord with the gospel. This theologically and exegetically informed work provides an intriguing answer to the question concerning Paul's financial policy and offers a plausible resolution to the issue of his seeming inconsistency.

Chapter 1 introduces the study, one in which Briones sets out to show why the widely held patron-client model is often misunderstood within mainstream

scholarship. He quickly sets aside the psychological and economic approaches to the problem and opts for one with a combination of moral/ethical and theological foci. To this he adds a nuanced understanding of gift-exchange relationship that will allow a more reasonable explanation of Paul's refusal of support from the Corinthians and his seemingly culturally inappropriate lack of thankfulness in Phil 4:10–20. Chapter 2 seeks to set Paul in context by first addressing the way contemporary scholars conflate various forms of patronage into one model. He rightly brings to the fore various gift-exchange possibilities including father-child and teacher-pupil. Next, he addresses the way contemporary scholars misconstrue the idea of "gift," emphasizing purity as an intrinsic quality. He argues, by means of Seneca, that ancient ideas of gift involved "*other-oriented self-interest* and *mutual obligation*" (p. 56, emphasis his). The two concepts discussed in this chapter serve as key reference points for uncovering the relational matrix of gift exchange that undergirds Paul's financial policy with the Philippians, Thessalonians, and Corinthians.

Chapter 3 looks at Paul's financial policy in Philippians. Briones offers an alternative reading of the letter, one that casts doubt on approaches that read it through the *topos* of friendship. He makes a strong case that a two-way model of gift exchange misses what may be inferred in the letter, namely a three-way relational dynamic with God as the benefactor and Paul and the Philippians as alternating conduits of gift and suffering in the economy of *charis*. His reading of Phil 1:3–30; 2:25–30; and 4:10–20 engages with several scholarly debates while reinforcing the view that Paul's relationship with the Philippians via the triangular model is being undergirded by a full trusting *koinōnia*. Chapter 4 addresses why Paul did not accept financial support from the Corinthians, although he did from the Philippians. Briones rejects the all-too-often offered solution, that the Corinthians were trying to enmesh Paul in a patronage relationship; rather, Paul was simply following his previously established policy, one he also followed in Thessalonica, that is, not to accept financial support from a local group when beginning to preach the gospel to them. This is designed to keep them from thinking that Paul was (1) the source of the gospel; and (2) an itinerant Sophist or philosopher. This chapter offers a socio-theological reading of 1 Cor 1:4–4:21; 11:17–34; 12:12–31, in which Briones argues that the Corinthians also had several mitigating issues: they were operating in a two-way relational structure with Paul and other key leaders, but they had not interpreted these relationships in the three-way manner that the Philippians had. The Corinthians had left God as the source of gift and suffering out of the picture. Briones nuances his argument at this point and concludes that these issues had no bearing on Paul's financial policy since he followed the same framework in Thessalonica and Philippi, two locations that did not have these mitigating issues—but something changes when we come to 2 Corinthians. There Paul extends his initial policy into the future.

Chapter 5 uncovers, through an exegesis of 2 Cor 11:7–12 and 12:13–16a, why Paul extends the policy of refusing financial support from a local congregation beyond the initial period into the ongoing life of the community. Briones continues to argue, against the grain of contemporary scholarship, that Paul's policy is not based on the Corinthians' desire to make him their client. He contends that the

opposite is slightly more likely; they want to be under Paul and support him financially. This is based on their culturally-informed construal of his ministry, which led them to think that Paul was the source of the gospel. Paul, by way of contrast, would have none of it; he refused their overtures, and, according to Briones, would continue to refuse their financial support until he was able to see spiritual maturity on their part. Chapter 6 concludes that, with regard to the Philippians, Paul accepted financial support from them because they understood God as the third party in the gift-exchange, experienced the mutuality of gift and suffering, and participated in the outward-movement of the gospel of *charis*. These indicators of maturity were not present in the Corinthian congregation: they had misunderstood God's role as the third party in the gift exchange and exhibited continuing levels of spiritual immaturity based on their over-identification with social conventions present in Corinth, including their esteem for the super-apostles. Furthermore, because of their lack of faith and maturity they could not participate (at this point) in the progression of the gospel, though Paul held out hope that the situation would change. Briones then succinctly concludes that "the primary difference between the Philippians and the Corinthians concerns their social experience (or practical lifestyle) after accepting the gospel" (p. 223).

Briones has clearly picked up on a weakness in contemporary approaches to Paul as they draw on the resources of patronage to understand his letters. The inclusion of God into the exchange is a welcome addition to the discussion. Further, he rightly recognizes that Paul's financial policy is consistent with regard to the initial rejection of financial support from his congregations and that only later in the life of the community is partnership with Paul a possibility. Finally, seeing Paul as a broker, rather than a patron or a client, advances the scholarly conversation. A few questions may require further discussion, however. First, does viewing God as a benefactor help interpreters understand the financial policy? It would seem that the inherently exploitive nature of this categorization works against this claim, and there seems to be a lack of evidence for Paul seeing God in this way. Second, is the evidence strong enough to support the claim that Paul understood himself as a broker in this relationship? Similar concerns apply here. It would seem that Briones could push his claim further and reject the patronal framework completely rather than trying to rehabilitate it by letting in benefaction and brokerage through the back door. It seems on target to suggest that Paul sought to transform patronage, but in what way is difficult to describe (but see E. A. Judge, "Cultural Conformity and Innovation in Paul: Some Clues from Contemporary Documents," *TynBul* 35 [1984] 5–6). Finally, what is to be gained exegetically from Briones's socio-theological model? It is clearly theological but it is likely not sufficiently social to address the complexities of Paul's financial policy. It may be the case that drawing more on economic and social-scientific theories would have furnished language to describe phenomena in the text that would then provide insight into the way the text may be appropriated with regard to Paul's financial policy. These three questions are meant as appreciative critiques from one who thinks Briones has offered a way forward with regard to one aspect of Paul's financial policy. This book adds to a growing number of works dealing with Paul and economics and should be read

by graduate researchers and upper-level undergraduates interested in Paul's social setting. Further, contemporary debates concerning gospel-centered ministry may benefit from this work, since echoes of this discussion are present throughout. Briones represents an example of a researcher offering a study that has relevance for both the academy and the church, and based on that commendable feature, this book is well recommended.

J. Brian Tucker

Moody Theological Seminary, Plymouth, MI

1 Timothy. By Aída Besançon Spencer. New Covenant Commentary Series. Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock, 2013, xiv + 178 pp., \$22.00 paper.

Aída Besançon Spencer is professor of NT at Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary. She dedicates this volume to her husband, William David Spencer, who is also on the faculty at the seminary and with whom she has co-authored several books. They are both leaders in the egalitarian organization Christians for Biblical Equality. One of her earliest books, *Paul's Literary Style* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1984) was among the monographs published "under ETS sponsorship." Her most influential work is *Beyond the Curse: Women Called to Ministry* (Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1985). She serves as an ordained pastor at Pilgrim Church in Beverly, MA, and brings insights from her ministry to this commentary in applications called "Fusing the Horizons" (e.g. in "Applying the Order of Widows to Today" [pp. 134–35] and "Living with Wealth" [p. 163]). The New Covenant Commentary Series, edited by Michael E. Bird and Craig Keener, has drawn upon scholars with diverse, international backgrounds. Spencer relates (p. 1) that she was born and reared in Santo Domingo, the Dominican Republic, with a Puerto Rican mother and a Dutch father. She has ministered and written in Spanish.

Spencer accepts the Pauline authorship of the Pastorals, offering a variety of reasons for this position and citing many other scholars who agree (pp. 2–10). She fails to mention the important work of E. Earle Ellis and his idea of "preformed traditions" that Paul used, which could help to explain differences in vocabulary from other Pauline epistles (see appendix 4 "Traditions in the Pastoral Epistles" in E. Earle Ellis, *The Making of the NT Documents* [Leiden: Brill, 2007]). Although she cites his commentary in her bibliography, Spencer does not find it necessary to address I. Howard Marshall's proposal of *allonymity* for the authorship of the Pastorals, that is, the use of Pauline materials by one of Paul's disciples who attempted to be faithful to his master. For an excellent survey of the various issues in the authorship of the Pastorals, see I. Howard Marshall, "Recent Study of the Pastoral Epistles," *Them* 23 (1997) 3–29.

Spencer makes wide use of archaeological and inscriptional evidence as well as classical authors to introduce the setting of Ephesus and the significance of the worship of Artemis there. Following the suggestion of Sir William Ramsay, she interprets the bulbous objects on the image of the goddess, not as ostrich eggs as some have suggested, but as bee eggs (p. 15). For the background of Ephesus, in

addition to the works cited in her bibliography (pp. 167–72), one would also wish to note Clinton E. Arnold, *Ephesians, Power and Magic* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989); Helmut Koester, ed., *Ephesos: Metropolis of Asia* (Valley Forge: Trinity Press International, 1995); Richard E. Oster, *A Bibliography of Ancient Ephesus* (Metuchen, NJ: Scarecrow, 1980); and Mark Wilson, *Biblical Turkey: A Guide to the Jewish and Christian Sites of Asia Minor* (Istanbul: Ege Yayinlari, 2010).

The format of the commentary is highly readable, with the biblical text in bold, embedded in a clear exposition that notes grammatical and contextual factors, with footnote references for further study. On pages 22–23, Spencer gives Timothy’s background from the NT, and then adds that he was “clubbed to death for protesting the orgies associated with the cult of Artemis” according to tradition (p. 24). Spencer’s discussion of the Greek word *arsenokoitēs* for homosexual in 1 Tim 1:10 (p. 33) could have been enriched by reference to David F. Wright’s studies on this term, “Homosexuals or Prostitutes: The Meaning of *arsenokoitai* (1 Cor. 6:9; 1 Tim. 1:10),” *VC* 38 (1984) 125–53. Helpful charts are included such as the one listing the phrase “The Word is Trustworthy ...” in the Pastorals (p. 38). As an interesting example of the “Significance of Christ’s Birth,” Spencer relates the conversion of a Roman soldier through the faithful witness of Potamiaena, cited from the church historian Eusebius (pp. 41–42).

In commenting on 1 Tim 2:1–2, Spencer makes the observation (p. 47) that with respect to the Greek words for thanksgiving (*eucharistia*, *eucharisteo*), “Out of a total 53 New Testament references, 35 are used in Paul’s letters (66%).” Spencer characterizes (pp. 57–58) Paul’s command in 1 Tim 2:11 (“let a woman in silence learn in all submission”) as a “bold and radical command for Paul’s time.” She points out that in some contexts silence (Greek: *bēsychia*) had a positive connotation as the best way to learn. A chart of the “Teaching Word Family” in the NT is provided (p. 60). Spencer’s exposition of 1 Tim 2:12 is of the greatest interest inasmuch as this is the verse that has been used by complementarians to deny women a role as ministers or even as teachers in the church. She stresses the point that Paul uses the present tense, “I am not permitting” to indicate that his prohibition was limited to a particular situation in Ephesus and was not meant to be a command for all time (p. 61). She takes the verb *authenteō* in its negative sense to have Paul say that he is not permitting a woman “to domineer over a man” (p. 62). Noting that in some Greek texts *authentēs* can mean “murderer,” she concludes, “Thus, Paul would be prohibiting women from having absolute power over men in such a way as to destroy them” (p. 63). She makes the suggestion that Paul might have chosen to use the word *authenteō* as an allusion “to the traditional destructive pagan feminine principle at Ephesus” (p. 63). As to the enigmatic verse 1 Tim 2:15 that after Eve’s deception and sin a woman will be “saved” through childbirth, after a discussion of various alternative views, Spencer adopts the interpretation that the childbirth of the Messiah is intended (pp. 73–76).

In expounding the passage on godly overseers (*episkopoi*) in 1 Tim 3:1–16, Spencer asks, “Can women and single men ever be overseers?” and then answers, “First, Paul indicates that ‘anyone’ should aspire to ‘overseeing’ (3:1), thereby, opening up the positions to all” (p. 80). She provides a chart of the various transla-

tions of the Greek qualifying phrase *mias gynaikos andra* (literally “one-woman man”) in 1 Tim 3:2 and concludes that probably the translation “faithful in marriage” (CEV) or “faithful to their spouse” (CEB) renders best the intention of the more literal “a one-woman man.” It is of interest that Tertullian later took this phrase to mean the prohibition of “digamy,” remarriage after one’s spouse has passed away. Believing that some masculine pronouns should be interpreted in an inclusive sense, Spencer translates 1 Tim 3:4 “managing his/her own house well” (p. 86). Commenting on the verb *proistēmi* “to manage,” she states that “Phoebe, a ‘minister’ of a specific church, Cenchræe, is an overseer or leader (*prostatis*)” (p. 87). However, others would take Phoebe’s designation as a *prostatis* not so much as a “minister” but as a “benefactor” (see James D. G. Dunn, *Romans 9–16* [WBC 38; Dallas: Word, 1988] 888–89). On the reference in 1 Tim 3:11 to *gynaikas* (literally “women”), Spencer interprets this to be a reference to “female ministers/deacons” (p. 90). The NIV has “wives” with “deaconesses” as a marginal option. The NIV understanding is favored by William D. Mounce, *Pastoral Epistles* (WBC 46; Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 2000) 202–4; and by George W. Knight III, *The Pastoral Epistles: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1992) 171–73. The latter work is notably absent from Spencer’s bibliography.

On Paul’s admonition to Timothy (1 Tim 5:23) to stop drinking water only but to drink “a little wine,” Spencer notes (p. 141 n. 107) that for medicinal purposes “old Thasian wine was diluted twenty-five parts water and one part wine.” It should be noted that in antiquity only the barbarian Scythians drank wine “neat,” that is, undiluted. In addition, for the drinking of wine at meals, it was customary to use four to five parts of water to one of wine.

In an excursus, “Women Could Desire to be Teachers” (pp. 28–30), Spencer observes the limitations women had for education and noted how women teachers were absent from Jewish society and rare in Greco-Roman society. However, stressing the revolutionary attitude of Jesus, who welcomed women listeners such as Mary, and of Paul, who worked with women as co-workers, Spencer has an expansive list of possible women leaders/teachers from the NT such as Junia (Rom 16:7; see Eldon Jay Epp, *Junia: The First Woman Apostle* [Minneapolis: Fortress, 2005]). One may question the relevance of some of her classical examples such as Hypatia (p. 29), the famed Neo-Platonist teacher of mathematics and astronomy, who was killed by a Christian mob in Alexandria in 415 (see Maria Dzielska, *Hypatia of Alexandria* [Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1995]). On page 90, note 264, Spencer states: “Two female ‘ministers’ at Bithynia-Pontus in Asia Minor were tortured during Emperor Trajan’s reign (AD 98–117) as the leaders of their congregation.” This is a reference to the Younger Pliny’s famous letter (X.96): “This made me decide it was all the more necessary to extract the truth by torture from two slave-women (*duabus ancillis*), whom they call deaconesses (*ministrae*).” The Latin word *minister* does not mean the same as the English word “minister”; it meant a “subordinate, servant, attendant, assistant” (D. P. Simpson, *Cassell’s New Latin Dictionary* [New York: Funk & Wagnalls, 1968] 373). Paul’s declaration of the equality of Jew and Gentile, slave and free, men and women (Gal 3:28; cf. Col 3:11) was the revolutionary good news of Christianity that empowered women who were slaves

to serve as deaconesses in the church in northwestern Asia Minor by the end of the first century.

Though Spencer's non-conventional interpretation of Paul's epistle may not sway every reader, it may inspire women, who are now the clear majority in evangelical colleges and a growing number in seminaries, to aspire not only to study the Scriptures but to teach and preach them as well.

Edwin M. Yamauchi
Miami University, Oxford, OH

The Eschatology of 1 Peter: Considering the Influence of Zechariah 9–14. By Kelly D. Liebengood. Society for NT Studies Monograph Series 157. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014, xi + 251 pp., \$95.00.

Kelly Liebengood is associate professor of biblical studies at LeTourneau University. This monograph is his dissertation written under the supervision of Bruce Longenecker at the University of St Andrews. The goal of the study is “to discern what has shaped the author of 1 Peter to regard Christian suffering as a necessary (1.6) and to-be-expected (4.12) component of faithful allegiance to Jesus Christ” (p. 1). The author argues for the thesis that “the eschatological programme of Zechariah 9–14, read through the lens of the Gospel, functions as the substructure for 1 Peter's eschatology and thus his theology of Christian suffering” (p. 8).

To achieve this aim, Liebengood develops his argument in seven chapters. In chapter 1, he provides a survey of the history of research on suffering in 1 Peter before turning to discuss method. Building upon the studies of C. H. Dodd (*According to the Scriptures: The Sub-structure of NT Theology* [New York: Scribner, 1953]) and Richard B. Hays (*The Faith of Jesus Christ: The Narrative Substructure of Galatians 3:1–4:11* [Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1983]), Liebengood presents his approach for discerning a possible narrative substructure in 1 Peter (pp. 8–13). He limits the possible substructure to 1 Peter's eschatology and theology of Christian suffering, clarifying that he is “not attempting to explain the substructure of the letter as a whole” (p. 12). Liebengood then defines the key terms “allusion” and “echo.” He follows Ben-Porat in her definition of allusion (pp. 13–14) and provides his own for echo (“a sub-species of allusion—a more oblique sign or special signal that points to the influence of the precursor text” [p. 17]). He employs Hays's sevenfold criteria for detecting these (*Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul* [New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1989]).

In chapter 2, Liebengood examines Zechariah 9–14. He focuses “on the literary shape of these six chapters in their final form, drawing particular attention to the distinctive eschatological restoration programme” (p. 23). He concludes that

Zechariah 9–14 progressively reveals a complex eschatological programme that infuses and reworks earlier material from Ezekiel and Isaiah, and ultimately promises restoration for YHWH's people through the agency of the eschatological Davidic shepherd. Central to Zechariah's programme is the revelation that this eschatological Davidic shepherd will not usher in immediate peace and

prosperity. Instead, he will be rejected and killed; and his death will initiate a time of trouble for all of Israel, in which the remnant will be protected by YHWH as they endure fiery trials that will bring purity in preparation for YHWH's universal reign (p. 77).

In chapters 3–5, the author argues for allusions and echoes of material in Zechariah 9–14. Chapter 3 proposes that 1 Pet 2:25 alludes to Zech 10:2 LXX and 13:7–9. Liebengood suggests that the author used a catchword type of interpretation that linked Isa 53:5–6 in 2:24–25a with Zech 10:2 LXX, including “their wider-text plots” (p. 101). The wider-text plot of Zech 13:7–9 includes the restoration brought about by the stricken “Shepherd”; this has surfaced at 1 Pet 2:25b. Chapter 4 maintains that the “fiery trials” imagery of 1:6–7 and 4:12 derives from Zech 13:8–9. Since scholars have proposed other texts as the background for the fire and metallurgy imagery of 1:6–7, a significant portion of the chapter is devoted to exploring each of these in turn and arguing for why they are not as satisfactory as Zech 13:8–9 for explaining the language. Chapter 5 posits three further echoes to Zechariah 9–14 and its overall eschatological program (the “dispersion” and “sprinkling of [covenantal] blood” themes in 1:1–2; “house of God” in 4:17; the “under-shepherd” motif in 5:1–4).

Chapter 6 brings the findings of the study together to argue finally that “Zechariah 9–14 undergirds, supports, animates, constrains the logic of and gives coherence to the argumentative strategy of 1 Peter” (p. 218). The “implicit narrative found in 1 Peter parallels the distinct programme of Zechariah 9–14” (p. 219). The study is rounded out by a conclusion in chapter 7.

The study is competent, concise, and creative. The thesis statement is clear and the chapter outline flows logically from it and develops its argument. I did not detect a single typographical error.

The thesis that Zechariah 9–14 provides the eschatological substructure of 1 Peter's eschatology and theology of Christian suffering rests considerably on whether any actual allusions to Zechariah 9–14 are present in 1 Peter. If not, the thesis is weakened. This is because, while there may exist *conceptual* parallels between Zechariah 9–14 and 1 Peter and their wider text-plots, there nonetheless would then exist no genuine link in the form of *verbal* borrowing. As Dodd reasoned, if there is a substructure to NT theology, then like the tip of an iceberg it eventually breaks the surface, manifesting its commanding presence.

It should therefore be recalled that there are no quotations of Zechariah in 1 Peter. Leviticus, Isaiah, Psalms, and Proverbs are clearly cited, and there are clear allusions to Exodus. However, 1 Peter does not even contain any clear allusions to Zechariah (so also William L. Schutter, *Hermeneutic and Composition in 1 Peter* [Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1989] 35–41). As someone who has written about overhearing echoes of Scripture in a methodologically careful manner, I remain unconvinced that even one of Liebengood's five proposed allusions or echoes unmistakably derive from Zechariah 9–14. Despite his arguments, all five could have possible origins in other sources. For example, in chapter 3 Liebengood argues that the term “Shepherd” at 2:25b derives from Zech 10:2 LXX and 13:7. Yet, despite

statement to the contrary (p. 207 n. 96), in light of the fact that Isaiah 53 has shaped the immediate context, it is just as plausible that the larger program of Isaiah 40–55 stands as the source of all the imagery in 2:21–25. Together with Isa 53:6, the “Shepherd” imagery could just as likely be accounted for by allusion to Isa 40:11 (itself the climactic conclusion to the programmatic introduction of Isaiah 40–55). This text clearly depicts YHWH as the Shepherd leading his “flock” out of exile. Or 2:25 could be dependent upon the tradition that sourced John 21, where Jesus as the Good Shepherd (evoking John 10) reinstates Peter (!) and commissions him to be an under-shepherd who tends Jesus’ “sheep.” Finally, Liebengood insufficiently addresses the problem that Zech 13:7 LXX does not mention a single (good) “Shepherd,” but plural “shepherds” (in a possible reintroduction of the bad ones mentioned previously at 10:3; 11:3, 5, 8, 17 LXX). Since 1 Peter predominantly reflects knowledge of an LXX text-type (Paul J. Achtemeier, *1 Peter* [Minneapolis: Fortress, 1996] 6–7), this interpretive issue should have been addressed.

Despite this assessment, I nonetheless remain intrigued by the conceptual parallels between the eschatological program of Zechariah 9–14 and the eschatology of Christian suffering in 1 Peter. To pick up the metaphor once again, it does remain possible that—despite the lack of a confirmed sighting—a mountain of ice sits just under the waters. If this is the case, then other means are needed to detect its presence. Sonar equipment is required rather than binoculars. What I am suggesting is that Liebengood’s thesis may in fact have stumbled upon something, even though the iceberg may not have been sighted. The possible strength of the thesis then may rest upon two areas outside the support of questionable allusions. The first is Liebengood’s observation of just how significantly Zechariah 9–14 has shaped the passion narratives of the Gospels (esp. Mark, Matthew, and John; see Table 2.4). Such a significant use of a section of Scripture would not have gone unnoticed by other early Christian interpreters (cf. Zechariah’s use in Revelation). In addition, if the historical Peter sourced both 1 Peter as well as Mark’s Gospel (as early tradition indicates), then the influence of Zechariah 9–14 on 1 Peter becomes an even more tantalizing possibility. The second point is that Zechariah 9–14 does in fact make reasonable sense of 1 Peter’s eschatology of Christian suffering. Although creative, Liebengood’s thesis remains a genuinely plausible explanation as to the source of 1 Peter’s thought.

In summary, the subtitle accurately and modestly summarizes the study. The book “considers” the influence of Zechariah 9–14 in 1 Peter. It therefore stands as a contribution to the study of 1 Peter. It also raises fresh questions concerning the use of the OT in the NT, specifically in regard to the presence of possible OT narrative sub-structures shaping NT thought.

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

From Jesus to the Church: The First Christian Generation. By Craig A. Evans. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2014, xv + 188 pp., \$30.00.

The book is a revised collection of lectures Craig Evans gave for the Deichmann Lectures at the Ben-Gurion University of the Negev in Beersheba, Israel in May of 2010. The focus of the book is a historical account of the “first generation” of the church from Jesus’ entrance into Jerusalem in the spring of approximately AD 30 to the destruction of the Jerusalem temple in AD 70. Evans creatively places this story between the two individuals named “Jesus” and their predictions of the temple’s destruction: Jesus ben Joseph and Jesus ben Ananias. The conflict that Jesus initiated with the high priestly house of Annas upon his arrival into Jerusalem and its subsequent development up to the death of the presumably Christian Jesus ben Ananias on the verge of the fall of the temple is Evans’s plot line.

Chapter 1 addresses the question of the relationship between the NT church and ethnic Israel and its ancient covenants and promises. After surveying the issue in the teaching of Jesus, Paul, and the letters of 1 Peter and James, Evans concludes, “There is no indication . . . that the church, or assembly, of Jesus was thought to be divorced from Israel” (p. 36). The chapter’s discussion is wide ranging and full of interesting insights and interpretations that are unexpected, but inherently justifiable.

Evans usefully notes the parallels between the Qumran community and Jesus’ followers. In one such comparative section, after surveying some of the similarities, Evans states, “The coherence of the community and organizational language is remarkable,” and so “we see no radical, non-Jewish changes in the organization of the Jesus movement in its early years” (p. 21).

Also, in this chapter Evans speaks of Paul’s continuity with the same Jewish conceptions of the Jesus movement’s organizational structure and community life, noting the many parallels between the Scrolls and Paul’s language and structures. However, he unfortunately continues to promote the false idea that because Paul used the term “church” and not “synagogue,” he thought of these messianic communities as “outside the established synagogues” (p. 22). This oft-stated assumption is false because: (1) the Greek term *ekklēsia* was used to refer to synagogues in the pre-70 period; and (2) the friction that Paul regularly mentioned seems to suggest the opposite conclusion—remember his 39 lashings on five occasions at the hands of the Jews (2 Cor 11:24). He certainly did not receive those “outside” the synagogue social space.

By contrast, I was pleasantly surprised by two arguments Evans puts forward that some readers will surely consider novel, but that I think are right. First, Evans thinks 1 Peter was written to an audience “of whom most we should assume were Jewish” (p. 23) in light of a brief but useful survey of the phrase “to the exiles of the Dispersion” (1 Pet 1:1–2). I have held this minority position for over a decade. In speaking of the Letter of James, Evans takes the addressees to be Israel in the Diaspora including both Messiah believers and non-Messiah believers. He writes, “James’ manner of speaking suggests that he conceives of the Jesus community as standing fully in continuity with Israel” (p. 26).

Second, I have made this point elsewhere in reference to Paul and Matthew, but I commend Evans for his similar insight here concerning James and Paul. Evans cautions against a direct comparison between James and Paul because of their ethnically different audiences. He writes, “I wonder if Paul’s language and tone are different from those of James because Paul was the energetic ‘apostle to the Gentiles’ (Rom. 11:13; Gal. 2:8)? If Paul did not think conversion to Judaism was necessary for Gentiles to join the assembly of Messiah Jesus ... then we should hardly expect to hear him address his readers as the ‘twelve tribes of the Dispersion’ [as James had done in writing to Jewish believers in Jesus] (p. 32, last explanatory statement mine).

Chapter 2 is meant to carry the story forward. Evans describes the kingdom of God in the teaching of Jesus with a focus on the OT prophets of Isaiah and Daniel as the primary sources for Jesus’ teaching. This chapter did not deliver in the same way that the first one did. The discussion of the kingdom of God lacks connection with the content of the first chapter with its emphasis on the continuation of Israel. I was waiting to read how Evans understood the kingdom of God in light of his clear emphasis on the concrete nature of continuity with the Hebrew (and Aramaic) Scripture described in chapter 1. I was also surprised that Evans did not discuss or make reference to the pseudepigraphon *Psalms of Solomon* 17 in his presentation of the kingdom of God, although he makes reference to the document elsewhere (pp. 23, 22, 128). Nor did Evans make the connection between the universal kingdom of God and the imagination of the Psalmist in Psalm 72 in which David’s kingdom extends from “sea to sea.”

Chapter 3 addresses the topic of the place of James in the early church in Jerusalem. Evans marshals evidence from the NT concerning James’s emergence to prominence as the leader of the Jerusalem Jewish church. Furthermore, he notes the clear evidence for Paul’s deference and respect for James’s office. Evans’s chapter is clear and concise and should be enough to put to bed Baurian theories of the divorce between Paul and the Jerusalem leadership that continue to show themselves from time to time. While it is possible and likely that James and Paul did not see eye to eye on everything, there is no clear indisputable indication that they were not allies on the gospel and the apostolic mission to both the circumcised and the uncircumcised (Acts 15; Galatians 2). My only critique of Evans, although not insignificant, is his attempt to separate James and Paul on the question of the “works of the law” (*ergōn nomou*) having established their unity on the question of circumcision (pp. 74-77). This theme is further taken up in chapter 5.

Chapter 4 focuses on both the story of Phinehas and his influence on Second Temple Jewish thinking and the Scroll fragment 4QMMT. The chapter attempts to explain the differences between James and Paul on the question of the meaning of the “works of the law.” Evans importantly notes the two places in the Hebrew Bible that state that God “reckoned righteousness” to someone: Gen 15:7 and Ps 106:31, the former of Abraham and the latter of Phinehas. This chapter’s argument—however interesting in its content—fails to convince me that 4QMMT, in using the phrase “works of the law” with the verb “to reckon,” was drawing on the Phinehas tradition in exclusion of the Abrahamic one. This is cutting it too finely in

my opinion. In addition, the connection between Paul's use of the Greek phrase and its use in 4QMMT still remains open to a wide range of interpretations. I happen to find the New Perspective's attempt to assert it as a "true parallel" unconvincing in the argument of Galatians and Romans. In the end, I did not see with Evans the usefulness of the Phinehas tradition in clarifying the issue.

Chapter 5 presents the story of the 35 or so years between the entrance of Jesus of Nazareth into the temple and the Roman destruction of the temple. The argument of the chapter is that the story's primary plot is the conflict between the Jesus movement in Jerusalem and the high priestly family of Annas. Evans presents an interesting retelling of the familiar story in Acts by placing it within the well-documented (by Josephus) period of the middle of the first century. One is mindful through the chapter of the speculative nature of several aspects of Evans's reconstruction. Still, he is correct to state that he has made a "plausible" case. At the very least, I find his claim regarding the friction between the high priestly family and the early church in Jerusalem generally incontestable.

In the final chapter Evans addresses documents from the NT (Matthew, John, Revelation) as well as in the first decade after the destruction of the temple (Letters of Ignatius) in order to finish the story he has been telling. I might quibble over his interpretations of the texts he has studied—not least his insistence that John presumes the expulsion of the Johannine community in accordance with Martyn's thesis, which has been largely abandoned by most Johannine scholars today because of: (1) the problems dating the so-called *birkat ha-minim*; and (2) the speculative nature of Martyn's hypothesis. However, in the end, Evans has demonstrated the early Christian movement's Jewish roots and its continued dialogue with Judaism right through the catastrophe of the fall of Jerusalem and the temple, the latter point showing that Judaism was far from only Christianity's "background." One final comment about this chapter is necessary. Evans suggests that it was the Bar Kokhba revolt in the second century that caused "a church [to] emerge that stood outside and over against Israel" (p. 141). While there can be little doubt that the revolt had tremendous consequences for both Jews and Christians, evidence suggests that the fissure was not final for quite some time after the second century. Evans is, however, indeed correct when he states that the separation of the Christian church from Judaism was "not what Jesus envisioned" (p. 141). "What Jesus longed for, echoed in various ways by Paul and other leaders of the church, was for all humans—Israel and the nations—to embrace the rule of God and in time see the very cosmos itself liberated from sin and imperfection" (p. 141). The book concludes with a brief appendix that describes the root causes of the Jewish-Christian rift. For Evans, although there were a number of factors, the fundamental sticking points were the "simple facts that Jesus had been put to death and the kingdom of God had failed to materialize" (p. 145).

There is much to like about this book. It is interesting, informative, and written an accessible way for a wide range of readers. It provides a solidly plausible historical account of a period often misunderstood and unfamiliar to most readers of the NT.

Joel Willitts
North Park University, Chicago, IL

Sanctified by Grace: A Theology of the Christian Life. Edited by Kent Eilers and Kyle Strobel. Kindle edition. New York: Bloomsbury, 2014, 6659 Kindle locations, \$19.24 Kindle.

For nearly a century now, there has been a theological trend in which enthusiasm for the doctrine of the Trinity has been stirred up. In the past, Grenz (*Rediscovering the Triune God*), Kärkkäinen (*The Trinity*), and Welch (*In This Name*) argued that the doctrine of the Trinity suffered eclipse (decline and eventual neglect) and was later revived, but more recently Emery and Levering (*The Oxford Handbook of the Trinity*), Helmer (*The Cambridge Companion to the Trinity*), Holmes (*The Quest for the Trinity*), and Muller (*Post-Reformation Reformed Dogmatics*, vol. 4) have claimed that the doctrine was never eclipsed and thus the recent flurry of interest in the Trinity is part of a continuing historical dialogue. Regardless of which narrative is taken, proponents of both accounts agree that contemporary Trinitarianism is marked by a new enthusiasm for the doctrine. According to Grenz (*Triune God*), this stirring of enthusiasm for the Trinity took place in two main phases. The first phase ran from Barth's commentary on Romans (1919) to T. F. Torrance's *The Christian Doctrine of God* (1996) and involved reformulating the doctrine of the Trinity. The second phase runs from Gunton's *The Doctrine of Creation* (1997) to the present and involves applying the doctrine of the Trinity to other doctrines and issues. Eilers's and Strobel's *Sanctified by Grace* is a second phase work of contemporary Trinitarianism in which the doctrine of the Trinity is applied to sanctification. In accounts of Trinitarian sanctification, sanctification is viewed as an act not merely of the Spirit, but one in which all three persons of the Trinity participate.

The method outlined by Eilers and Strobel in the introduction is possibly the most significant contribution of the work. They argue for articulating the doctrine of the Christian life "in dogmatic key" that depicts the interplay between the Christian life and all other doctrines or "the *whole* of the Christian confession ... developed in the category of grace" or "oriented around the triune God of grace" (Kindle locations [K.l.] 155-56, 174-75, 229). In second phase works up to this point, the doctrine of the Trinity has functioned as Barth's "central organizing principle" (*CD* I/1, p. 303) or Jenson's "framework" for all of theology (*Systematic Theology* 1:154), and the Trinity has generally been considered in its interplay with a single doctrine at a time, such as sanctification. Eilers and Strobel's method makes two significant shifts with respect to this past approach. First, they shift from the Trinity to grace or perhaps the Trinity *and* grace as the central organizing principle(s) (K.l. 146-63, 229, 539-540). Second, they shift from considering the interplay be-

tween two doctrines (the Trinity and sanctification) to the interplay between multiple doctrines, namely, the interaction between the Trinity and the Christian life/sanctification with an individual doctrine or Christian practice in each successive chapter (K.I. 159-75).

There are three other aspects of their method that are not unique but that significantly impact the shape and content of this work. Eilers and Strobel claim their method of “dogmatic key” enables them to retrieve (as part of Webster’s “Theologies of Retrieval,” *The Oxford Handbook of Systematic Theology*) the connection in “classic theology” between doctrine and practice, which produced a theology “for the service of the church” (K.I. 181-87, 235-36, 4561-62, 4603-04, 4747-48). Again drawing on Webster (*International Journal of Systematic Theology* 2002), their method is worked out by using the theological tool of “sanctified reason” in contrast to “unformed natural reason” (K.I. 241-57). Finally, Eilers and Strobel’s doctrine of the Christian life in “dogmatic key” is articulated in four parts (doctrine of God, acts of God, means of grace, and practices of grace) consisting of essays by fifteen different experts in each field to which the Trinity and the Christian life/sanctification are related. As seems common in the contemporary trend of multiple authored books, the fifteen essays as a whole primarily address the individual agendas of the particular authors and only to varying degrees advance different aspects of Eilers’s and Strobel’s program, frequently by explicitly referring back to the introduction.

In regard to the book as a whole, Barthians, existentialists, Arminians, proponents of the new perspective on Paul, advocates of Hauerwas’s virtue ethics, exponents of Pannenberg and Multmann’s eschatological theologies of hope, and/or champions of Vanhoozer’s theodramatic proposal will find this book to be a delightful outworking of these ideologies to varying degrees. Those who recognize the biblical inconsistency of all or some of these ideologies will find *Sanctified by Grace* to be a quagmire of circumlocutions. This latter class of readers will only extricate their muddy boots by constantly shifting the book’s biblically inconsistent existential propositions back into the biblical language of ontology and comparing the results to the biblical text. For example, Eilers and Strobel define the Christian life in terms of Barthian existentialism: “‘The Christian life’ is theological shorthand for redeemed human existence” (K.I. 164-165, 167; cf. CD 4/II, p. 578; 4/IV, p. 45), and other authors speak of “existential appropriation” (K.I. 1156, 1264), “a new principle of existence” (K.I. 3026), “‘holiness’ denotes a state of creaturely existence” (K.I. 3341), and “the psychological and moral (or we might say existential) dimension of wisdom for holiness” (K.I. 5001).

In regard to the particulars of the book, some of the authors contributed to and others detracted from the agenda set forth by Eilers’s and Strobel’s introduction. A high point in the book is Sanders’s discussion of “the triune God” (chapter 1) in which he seems simultaneously to be continuing the project from his work, *The Deep Things of God*, and advancing Eilers’s and Strobel’s agenda by laying the Trinitarian foundation for the book and depicting the interplay between the “triune God of grace” and sanctification with adoption. Sanders argues that the eternal generation of the Son and eternal spiration of the Spirit define the Christian life as

“trinitarian adoption” in that the Son is sent to save as an act of grace because he is eternally generated as Son, and the eternally spirated Spirit indwells believers to unite them to Christ and his eternal filial relation to the Father, so that believers can participate in the divine life of the Trinity as adopted sons (K.I. 632-93). Willimon’s essay on preaching (ch. 14) does an excellent job of wedding doctrine and practice, particularly through his suggestions of how to practice listening to preaching (K.I. 5436-5551).

While Greggs’s essay on the church and sacraments (chapter 10) is helpful overall, his claim that “the Spirit, whose active presence *alone* is the condition of the church’s existence,” overemphasizes appropriation to the Spirit and detracts from the Trinitarian agenda of the book (K.I. 3760, emphasis added). Sonderegger’s discussion of creation and providence (chapter 3) seems to implement “sanctified reason” by omitting any Scripture references rather than using reason to interpret Scripture. The only biblical reference in her chapter is the phrase “the Genesis account,” followed by a few loosely paraphrased biblical allusions (K.I. 1332ff.). Sonderegger seems to base her doctrine more on Albert Camus’s novel, *The Stranger*, rather than on the Bible: “But we have only laid down here, led as it were by the hand of Camus, the presuppositions or general framework for Christian teaching on creation, its origin and governance” (K. I.1339). Her apparent use of “sanctified reason” will not motivate evangelicals to use this theological tool. Although Sonderegger’s lack of Scripture is more extreme than the rest of the volume, her writing is indicative of the minimal biblical interaction present throughout the book.

The book’s desire to eschew the modern rift between the academy and the church by connecting doctrine to practice is admirable but largely unfulfilled as the work’s dense theological style and Barthian conceptual background will likely make the volume almost impenetrable to most lay readers. Despite the book’s weaknesses, many of the essays are well written, clear, and contain valuable insights, such as Long’s historical discussion of sanctification as post-baptismal repentance, a concept largely absent from the discussion of sanctification/holiness in most of the major evangelical Bible dictionaries and encyclopedias (K.I. 5601-77).

Ronald M. Rothenberg
Grand Prairie, TX

A Brief Theology of Sport. By Lincoln Harvey. London: SCM, 2014, xxi + 130 pp., \$17.00 paper.

Why do people love sport? In *A Brief Theology of Sport*, Lincoln Harvey offers an answer which centers on the relationship between sport and our identity. While Harvey recognizes the connections that contingently exist between sport and war as well as the ways in which sport can unfortunately serve as a form of religion, he argues that it is most deeply and properly related to our true identity as creatures. This explains its popularity, and serves as a foundational insight for developing a theology of sport. The book is intended for helping those inside and outside of the church to understand their passion for sport from a Christian theological perspec-

tive. Harvey rightly observes that there is little in the way of contemporary theological engagement with sport. While there are books which focus on religion and sport, Harvey's concise book is unique as a Christian theology of sport.

The book's first part consists of a historical survey of the different ways that sport and religion have been related to one another in both theory and practice. In his discussion of ancient sports and religion, Harvey observes that historically speaking, both sport and religion are universally present, and they are intertwined. One example of this relationship is the game of *Tlatchtli*, an ancient ball game played in Central America. The game was a ceremonial ritual primarily intended to preserve life and honor the origins of this community. This is but one example of the connections between sport and religious ritual that can be found as one explores human history. The Greek Olympic Games included homages to Gaea, Pelops, and most importantly Zeus himself. The victorious athletes were heroes, but they were heroes who would offer sacrifices to Zeus upon receiving their victor's crowns. Roman sport and gladiatorial games also had religious significance, but instead of the gods they placed Rome itself, including its divinized emperor, in the place of worship.

Turning to the historical relationship between the church and sport, the perennial question is this: Should Christians be involved in sport? Historically, we find different answers to this question, including *opposition* to sport and *instrumental use* of sport. Christians in the era of the early church had to navigate cultures where boxing, wrestling, and chariot races were popular and attracted thousands of spectators. A primary problem with sport in this era was its explicit connection with religious rituals centered on other gods. The related dangers of idolatry led many believers to oppose sport; Tertullian, John Chrysostom, Clement of Alexandria, and Novatian expressed such opposition. And it was determined at the Council of Arles in 314 that believers who fraternized with gladiators and charioteers be excommunicated. Yet the early church existed in a time like our own, where sport enjoys immense popularity, and some—Paul and Chrysostom, for example—used images from sport in their teaching to encourage virtue and faithfulness. The final two chapters of part I include two case studies related to the manner in which the church has approached sport. The same historical pattern present in the early church's approach to sport is also present in the approaches of the medieval Catholic Church, the Puritans, and the muscular Christianity movement. In all of these eras, sport was *popular*, it was *opposed* by the church, and it was *instrumentally used* by the church.

Part II contains an analysis of sport and Harvey's positive proposal concerning a Christian theology of sport. He first offers a working definition of sport drawn from philosophy, sociology, and cultural history. From this discussion, several themes emerge with respect to its definition. Sport is a form of play that is free, physical, bound by rules, and is unnecessary but nevertheless meaningful to us. It is also important for Harvey's theological proposal, discussed below, that sport is autotelic. That is, sport is independent from the rest of life and its point is found within itself; it serves no external purpose. Sport, as a form of play, "is radically unnecessary but internally meaningful. It is free from the serious business of life" (p. 69). In order to extend these ideas and to construct a Christian theological un-

derstanding of sport, Harvey argues that we must first understand who we are, because sport is deeply connected with our identity.

In order to gain a Christian understanding of ourselves, Harvey rightly states that we must begin with the Christian belief that God created everything out of nothing. Prior to creation, nothing but God existed, and so nothing external to God impelled God to create. Neither did anything internal to God impel him to create. Rather, God freely chose to do so. And human beings are a part of that creation. Creation, then, was and is *unnecessary*, in the sense that God had no need to create. Yet God did create, and creation finds its purpose, its meaning, in Jesus Christ and his love. Creation, including humanity, is both unnecessary and meaningful, as is play. This reveals the fact that when we play we are expressing our creaturely identity as beings that are unnecessary but nevertheless meaningful in virtue of a loving relationship to God in Christ. Our identity as both unnecessary and yet meaningful creatures helps to explain many things, including the popularity of sport, as it also possesses these very qualities. Many outside of the church may fail to see it, as do many within the church, but when we play we “reverberate with ourselves. We chime with our being” (p. 84). With the above in mind, Harvey goes on to develop the heart of his proposed (and brief) theology of sport.

From a Christian perspective, sport is valuable because it expresses our identity as creatures. When it employs sport for other agendas, the church goes astray. Sport is not worship or evangelism, and neither should it be employed for these ends. As Harvey puts it, “The incorporation of external agendas pollutes sport, because sport is radically autotelic. It should therefore be left alone” (p. 89). This means that when Christians or others harness sport as an instrument for some external end, such as psychological health, expressing the freedom of our future eschatological existence in the kingdom of God, or as a form of worship and communion with God, a serious mistake is being made. When we do any of the foregoing, we treat sport too seriously and ignore its autotelic nature. Instead, we should conceive of sport as a liturgy, a liturgy of our own creaturely contingency. When we engage in sport as a participant or spectator, “we are simply facing inwards and bouncing up against ourselves. This makes [sport] a radically self-contained event, because it terminates on us—here and now—as we *are*. It is graced creatures living out grace” (p. 94). The upshot, then, is that when the church has distinguished worship and sport, it has been right to do so. As Harvey concisely puts it, “Worship is the liturgical celebration of who God is with us. Sport is the liturgical celebration of who we are by ourselves” (p. 94). Sport, then, is the one part of life that is not an act of worship. It is the realm of human life in which God steps back and generously, graciously, and gloriously allows us the space to play, to experience and celebrate our creaturely contingency. We, and sport, are unnecessary and meaningful.

A Brief Theology of Sport concludes with a discussion of the explanatory power of Harvey’s theological understanding of sport, focusing on seven issues: rules, competition, idolatry, sport and war, the professionalization of sport, gender and sport, and the application of qualitative distinctions to particular sports. These seven issues are also presented by Harvey as seven avenues for further thought that

Christians might fruitfully pursue as they seek to extend a theological understanding of sport. I found his brief discussion of idolatry to be of particular interest. Anyone familiar with contemporary sport knows that there are spiritual dangers and corrupting influences present in this realm of human life. Cheating, doping, a win-at-all costs approach, pride, and the lure of wealth and fame are all prominent features of contemporary sport. Harvey's theological proposal can explain why this is so, though, by moving beyond creation and considering the doctrine of the fall and its impact on sport. In the fall, humans chose to go their own way, to reject God and his love. We turned away from God in egoistic and self-sufficient pride. In our fallen world, sport can become idolatrous when it is not an expression of our true identity but of our corrupted identity. When this happens, sport becomes a form of self-worship. In light of this idolatrous tendency, the church is right to be wary of sport as an arena for an expression of our fallen identity. Nevertheless, sport can play an important role in a Sabbath-shaped life. In worship, we celebrate God, and in sport we can celebrate the unserious aspects of creation, including, by God's grace, ourselves. Worship and sport are distinct, but they both celebrate the unnecessary yet meaningful life that God has given us.

This concise book has many strengths. Given the lack of theological treatments of sport, the very topic of the book is a strength. In it, Harvey engages historical and contemporary thinkers from a variety of disciplines, including the growing literature in philosophy of play and philosophy of sport, as well as prominent theologians. There are endnotes for the scholar or specialist to pursue, but they are not needed in order to understand the argument and so others can safely ignore them. Along these lines, the book will be useful to pastors, educators, and sport practitioners interested in considering the issues it discusses. I also appreciated the seven further areas for further exploration offered in the final chapter. Given its relative brevity, it is a virtue of the book that these issues are discussed as potentially fruitful avenues for further thought and discussion.

The primary strength is that Harvey explains and extends a new and interesting thesis concerning the nature and value of sport from the perspective of the Christian faith. In an era where sport takes the place of religion for many people, and where Christians employ sport for external ends such as evangelism and community-building, Harvey offers an interesting and provocative contrasting view. At this point, I am agnostic with respect to the truth of the thesis of the book, but I am certain it deserves further consideration.

I would like to offer an objection to the view that sport should not be employed for any external agenda external. Perhaps instrumentalism in sport need not be a corrupting influence, if we consider the fact that something can be intrinsically *and* instrumentally valuable without such corruption occurring. Related to this possibility, in Book II of Plato's *Republic* (357a-358a), Socrates and Glaucon discuss the value of justice. Socrates claims that justice is valuable for its own sake and for its consequences. That is, justice is both intrinsically and instrumentally valuable. Other goods such as knowledge and health also have both types of value. A question worth pursuing further is whether or not sport can have both types of value as well, that is, can we not only value sport for itself but also as a means to some further

end or ends? On Harvey's proposal, the answer is clearly no, but one way to continue the discussion of theology and sport begun in this book would be to consider this possibility in greater detail. Perhaps sport is not purely autotelic. Christians might be able to see it as being intrinsically valuable, as Harvey argues, but able to serve instrumentally valuable ends as well, including physical and psychological health, character formation, and missional efforts. This is a possibility worth exploring further, with the relevant arguments and insights offered by Harvey in hand.

If a case can be made that sport can be instrumentally valuable without corrupting its intrinsic value as an unnecessary but meaningful form of play, it will still be the case that Christians should very carefully think through the instrumental yokes we seek to place upon sport. So, even if Harvey is mistaken that instrumentalism is always wrong—and I am undecided about this—one important lesson that could still be taken away from this book is that when we do put sport into the service of some other end, we should so carefully and thoughtfully, so as to avoid corrupting both sport and ourselves as we engage in this gift of play graciously given by God to us, his creatures.

Michael W. Austin
Eastern Kentucky University, Richmond, KY

Sojourners and Strangers: The Doctrine of the Church. By Gregg R. Allison. Foundations of Evangelical Theology. Wheaton: Crossway, 2012, 494 pp., \$26.99.

A plethora of books have been published in the last two decades about ecclesiology, many of which focus almost exclusively on the practical ministries, mission, and pragmatic functions of the church. What has been desperately needed is a work that focuses on the ontological realities that constitute the church, out of which the ministries arise. Gregg Allison, in his work *Sojourners and Strangers*, has produced such a work, with reasonable depth in the vast array of content covered, as well as with helpful pastoral applications along the way.

This book stands as the fifth volume in the series Foundations of Evangelical Theology. In this work Allison, Professor of Christian Theology at The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary and elder at Sojourn Community Church, garners for his readers a helpful synthesis regarding the new covenant people of God. While seeking to address a broad evangelical audience, dealing fairly with the broad spectrum of views, Allison writes as a confessional Baptist churchman and theologian. This does not detract from the value from the book, as the author deals with historical and denominational realities in an even-handed manner. This confessionalism functions as a strength to the book, challenging readers to examine their own views and to see this doctrine as having greater importance amongst the loci of theology.

This work is divided up into seven distinct sections. The first section deals with the foundational issues of ecclesiology, including various introductory and definitional matters (chapter 1), as well as the concept of covenant in relation to the church (chapter 2). In the first chapter, Allison begins by defining the church as

“the people of God who have been saved through repentance and faith in Jesus Christ and have been incorporated into the body of Christ by baptism with the Holy Spirit” (p. 29). The author also gives a summary statement regarding what he believes to be the seven attributes that define the church (these attributes receive further elaboration in subsequent chapters): doxological, or oriented to the glory of God; logocentric, or centered on the incarnate Word of God and Scripture; pneumadynamic, or gathered and empowered by the Spirit; covenantal, or gathered as members in new covenant relationship with God and others; confessional, or united by personal confession of faith; missional, or identified as divinely called and sent ministers of the gospel; and spatio-temporal/eschatological, or assembled as a historical reality while awaiting a particular destiny (31-32). From this vantage point Allison then works through the polity and ministries which the church should adopt and in which it should engage. As such, one can see that the basic orientation of this work is that “from the ontology or nature of the church flow the church’s functions” (p. 32).

Allison continues this chapter further defining his task. Solidly grounding his work in the sufficiency of Scripture, looking specifically at exegetical, biblical, and historical theology, the author argues for a robust ecclesiology. His methodology deals with issues such as continuity and discontinuity between the Testaments, dealing with prescriptive and descriptive language regarding the church, and various ways to approach the doctrine itself. Here he affirms his belief in a moderate discontinuity approach (essentially progressive dispensational), as well as a belief in the general normativity of the book of Acts, while noting not every detail is applicable to the church today (p. 46). As stated, Allison is taking an ontological approach to ecclesiology, as opposed to the functional and teleological approaches that have become so popular in our modern milieu.

In chapter 2 the author begins his ontological approach in earnest. Here Allison looks specifically at the church’s relationship to the covenantal realities laid out in Scripture. In a succinct, but helpful, section, Allison lays out the progression of the six covenants seen in Scripture, and concludes, “the old covenant, as a covenant that God established with Israel, failed because of their tragic failure to keep it; thus, it has been replaced by the new covenant, with a particular emphasis on the Holy Spirit, as the covenant that God establishes with the church” (p. 74). The author also discusses here the inception of the church, the relationship between the church and Israel, and the connection between the church and the kingdom of God, all from a perspective of moderate discontinuity.

The second section of this work goes into greater detail regarding the seven characteristics previously mentioned that constitute the church. Chapter 3 focuses on the origin and orientation of the church, discussing the idea of the church being doxological, logocentric, and pneumadynamic. Allison states regarding these attributes, “Because its very existence is due to the triune God and his salvific work through Jesus Christ the Son and in the Holy Spirit, the church directs itself to the glory of God, while focusing on the Word of God, always empowered by the Spirit of God” (p. 122). Chapter 4 attends to the gathering and sending of the church, namely that the church is covenantal, confessional, missional, and spatio-

temporal/eschatological. This, the author asserts, grounds the church as they seek to gather around a core confession, while also seeking to bring others to respond in faith to the gospel message.

Part three deals with how this vision of the church will be actualized, namely through the pursuit of purity and unity in the church (chapter 5) by means of church discipline (chapter 6). Allison defines purity in actual conformity to the seven attributes that characterize the church, and unity in gathering around a common confession and mission. The author asserts that the growth of the church is dependent on the pursuit of purity and unity. The maintenance of this purity is accomplished through the practice of church discipline. Allison defines discipline as “a proleptic and declarative sign of the eschatological judgment” (p. 200). He then covers this topic from both theological and pastoral vantage points.

After these more foundational pieces are in place, section four deals with the governance structures of the church. First, Allison defines the various offices of apostle (an office which is unique and ceased in the first century), elders, and deacons/deaconesses (chapter 7). He then describes Episcopalianism, Presbyterianism, and Congregationalism as differing approaches to church polity (chapter 8). Finally, the author makes a case for his approach to church governance (chapter 9): “a plural-elder led, deacon and deaconess-served, congregational church with strong connections” (p. 297). In this final chapter, Allison also makes a case for multi-site churches.

Section five addresses the ordinances of baptism (chapter 10) and the Lord’s Supper (chapter 11). Again, the author teases out the various positions on these matters, always carefully nuancing these approaches from an exegetical and historical point of view. Allison seeks to articulate a credobaptist position while also affirming a stance on the Lord’s Supper that affirms that it is a memorial, but also, “As Christ promised his spiritual presence to accompany his church as it carries out the Great Commission (Matt. 28:20) and as it engages in church discipline (Matt. 18:20), so too the Savior and all of the salvific benefits associated with his sacrificial death are present in celebrations of the Lord’s Supper” (p. 396).

The final two sections of this work deal with the ministries of the church and various concluding remarks. Here Allison defines what spiritual gifts look like in the life of the church, and also discusses what entails true ministry within the church, namely, worship, preaching, evangelism, discipleship, care, and relating to the world. He then summarizes the contents of the work and concludes, “the church is a paradox, making its pilgrimage in the world and living faithfully *coram Deo*—in the presence of God in Jesus Christ through the Holy Spirit—as ‘sojourners and strangers’” (p. 471).

The strongest aspect of this work is the fact that Allison does not follow what has been the trend in many modern ecclesologies. Instead of jumping straight into the function of the church, Allison offers a substantive prolegomenon and then delves into the ontology of the church, from which function springs. Regarding his prolegomenon, while various readers will undoubtedly disagree with his stance on continuity and discontinuity, or the degree of prescription and description in the book of Acts, Allison helpfully locates himself on these issues, such that the reader

is not left guessing at his perspective. Too often these issues are not handled overtly and thus assumed throughout the work, leaving readers to guess at the perspective of the author.

Ontologically, Allison teases out seven key attributes that should characterize the church. While this is a departure from the traditional marks of the church (one, holy, catholic, and apostolic), and from the Reformation distinctives (right preaching of the Word, right administration of the sacraments, exercise of discipline), Allison offers a compelling exegetical case to see these seven as true identity markers of the church. Especially helpful in this vein is Allison's attention to the concept of covenant and the tracing of the covenants throughout the canon. Based on this discussion Allison places the church in the midst of redemptive history and in relation to Israel to offer readers a thick contextual glance at how the church relates to the kingdom of God as seen throughout Scripture.

Another key benefit of this work is the amount of history Allison includes in his coverage of all the varying elements of ecclesiology. One can note from the footnotes that Allison draws rather extensively from his work *Historical Theology* to accomplish this part of the task. This is beneficial to the reader in that it allows them to note the historical progression of various points of doctrine, and see how certain denominational identifiers developed. Allison is even-handed in his treatment of the various viewpoints on these doctrines (e.g. transubstantiation, consubstantiation, spiritual presence, and memorial views of the Lord's Supper; pp. 372-86), while also clearly articulating his stance from a Baptist perspective.

Many other strengths of this work could be lauded as to its helpful contribution to foster solid ecclesiological moorings, but several potential weaknesses should be noted. Allison does make some doctrinal departures from what is typically considered the position of a Baptist ecclesiology. For example, Allison affirms a continuationist perspective regarding the spiritual gifts. I will not take the space to argue against this point per se, but two points should be noted. First, this is a doctrinal point typically dealt with in pneumatology, which Allison rightly affirms (p. 413 n. 1). If this is the case, however, it seems that it would be more beneficial to summarize these points on the spiritual gifts briefly, cite the key points and pages from pertinent works, and then spend more time on the actual ministries of the church. Second, if you are going to take this route it would be good to at least show some exegetical support for your position. Likely, Allison did not want to take the space to do this, and understandably so, but if that is the case it would seem the recommended summation would be in order.

Though certainly a contested point in Baptist circles, Allison also seeks to affirm and defend the existence of multi-site churches. The author does a commendable job in setting the stage by engaging the most recent literature on the topic, as well as offering a taxonomy of the various types of multi-site churches (pp. 310-12). He also seeks to offer exegetical support (which I believe the strongest I have read to date) and theological arguments for the legitimacy of such a structure. It is difficult, however, to accept such conclusions from the evidences Allison cites. First, for all the attention he puts on prescriptive and descriptive language in the beginning of the book, there is no discussion here, and these points he raises may be

seen as descriptive language of the genesis of the church and how it progressed outwardly in geographic concentric circles. Regarding his theological arguments, I am for the missional nature of the church, as well as its unity. I do believe, however, mission can occur perhaps more effectively by church planting, which is undoubtedly a biblical concept. Allison paints multi-site as being more local/regional, while church planting involves people who locate “a significant distance from the mother church” (p. 315). But could churches not be planted at times in relatively close proximity to the mother church, and could they not cooperate and work interdependently in similar ways to a seemingly paradoxical idea of “one church in multiple locations?” The end of this section, where Allison offers the example of his own church, is also unclear as to whether he thinks this is the only legitimate way to do multi-site, the most ideal, or merely one option amongst several (pp. 316-17). If multi-site is to occur, I appreciate his regional teaching-team model (for more on this subject see <http://www.9marks.org/journal/multi-site-churches>).

One final point to observe is Allison’s treatment of who can participate in the Lord’s Supper. He opts for a close communion approach, as opposed to closed communion, which again has been disputed by Baptists throughout their history. Thus, he affirms that communion is open to “baptized members in good standing in their respective churches” (p. 401). He makes some compelling arguments to support this view, but one facet I found that was not addressed here or really anywhere else is the pastoral task of shepherding a particular group of covenantal members. Granted, Allison does define shepherding under the responsibilities of elders as providing a Christ-like example, teaching God’s Word, warning members of dangerous doctrinal positions, and engaging in church discipline when the need arises. More attention on this last aspect would be helpful to the reader, thus thinking of discipline in both a formative and corrective sense. Certainly issues like close communion can be argued for, but one must also remember texts such as Heb 13:17, where church leadership is exhorted to keep watch over the souls of their members, because they will one day give an account to God for their shepherding. While not a pastoral ministry book per se, greater prominence could be placed on the shepherding ministry of the pastorate in relation to the Lord’s Supper (i.e. knowing the spiritual state of those who are partaking) and other areas.

With a work of this size, there will be quibbles with various points, but the overarching message of the book is one that should be lauded. *Sojourners and Strangers* could be placed alongside of such works as *The Church of Christ*, by Everett Ferguson; *Exploring Ecclesiology*, by Brad Harper and Paul Metzger; or *The Community of Jesus*, by Kendell Easley and Christopher Morgan. Due to its emphasis on ontological realities one could also compare Allison’s work to *People and Place*, by Michael Horton. It is an up-to-date treatment, detailing both historical and contemporary literature, as well as theological and pastoral concerns relating to ecclesiology. As such, this work is applicable to seminary students, scholars, and pastoral leaders who are seeking to teach about and lead churches in theologically-grounded ministry. Allison rightly reminds us that “ecclesiology may not be a doctrine of highest importance like theology proper or bibliology, but it is nonetheless of great importance, for this simple reason: the church of Jesus Christ itself is a necessary real-

ity. This fact propels the Christian doctrine devoted to the study of the church to a high level of prominence” (p. 59).

Jeremy Kimble
Cedarville University, Cedarville, OH

Cyril of Alexandria's Trinitarian Theology of Scripture. By Matthew R. Crawford. Oxford Early Christian Studies Series. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014, xi + 290 pp., \$125.00.

Cyril of Alexandria's Trinitarian Theology of Scripture is a revision of Matthew Crawford's dissertation completed under Lewis Ayres at Durham University in 2012. This monograph brings together two theological loci of interest to readers of this journal: the doctrine of Scripture and the doctrine of the triune God.

In the first chapter, Crawford introduces the subject of his investigation—Cyril of Alexandria's trinitarian theology of Scripture. Cyril's writings reflect the pro-Nicene theology(ies) that emerged in the latter half of the fourth century among Greek-speaking Christians in the East (as well as Latin-speaking Christians in the West). Pro-Nicene theology involved not only a distinct understanding of the triune God but also a “trinitarian” approach to Scripture. It is the latter emphasis which provides the point of departure for Crawford's study. Cyril was a prolific writer, and his exegetical and theological works offer a clear window into the trinitarian assumptions that shape his approach to Scripture. Framing the argument to be developed in subsequent chapters, Crawford explains that pro-Nicene theologies of Scripture focus on two basic movements: a divine movement toward humanity (i.e., theology of revelation) and the human encounter with divine revelation (i.e., theology of exegesis). Both movements possess a trinitarian shape: revelation comes from the Father, through the Son, and in the Spirit. Exegesis is caught up in a reverse movement: Spirit-empowered contemplation of the Son leads believers to the Father.

Crawford explores Cyril's theology of revelation in chapter two. On the one hand, Cyril emphasizes the fact that the Son reveals the Father. In this sense, his account of revelation is Christologically focused. On the other hand, he affirms that Father, Son, and Holy Spirit act inseparably. How does he simultaneously affirm both realities? Crawford argues that Cyril's theology of revelation holds together the Son as revealer of the Father and inseparable operation by means of a sophisticated account of trinitarian agency. Crawford begins by exploring the Son as revealer of the Father, focusing on three analogies that Cyril employs: the Son as the Father's messenger, the Son as the Father's Word, and the Son as the Father's pen. Next, he turns to Cyril's understanding of trinitarian agency. Like other pro-Nicenes, Cyril affirms that Father, Son, and Holy Spirit work inseparably and that inseparable operation reflects the essential unity of the divine persons. Inseparable operation, however, does not erase the distinction and order that exists among the divine persons. To the contrary, the distinction of persons is expressed in order of trinitarian operations: every action proceeds from the Father, through the Son, and

in the Holy Spirit. In the final section of the chapter, Crawford shows how Cyril's account of trinitarian agency shapes his theology of revelation. On the one hand, Scripture attributes revelation to all three divine persons: the Father (Matt 16:7), the Son (Gal 1:12), and the Spirit (1 John 2:27). On the other hand, the act of revelation reflects the eternal distinctions and order that exist among the three: the Son reveals the Father by the Holy Spirit. In sum, Cyril develops a theology of revelation that is "Trinitarian in structure and Christological in focus" (p. 11).

Having examined Cyril's doctrine of revelation, Crawford turns to the topic of inspiration in chapter three. The Holy Spirit takes center stage as one who inspires human authors to record divine truth. Crawford carefully situates Cyril's theology of inspiration in the context of earlier patristic discussions, drawing attention to the metaphors and analogies mediated to him by this tradition. In terms of the Old Testament, inspiration involved a "vision" given to the prophet by the Holy Spirit. The prophet, however, was not merely a passive receptacle of this vision; human agency played an important role as well. (Crawford notes that Cyril never discusses how divine and human agencies work together.) Cyril describes the New Testament authors as those who experienced "mystagogical enlightening from the Spirit" (p. 95). While the Spirit's work differs at various points in redemptive history, Cyril sees a fundamental unity throughout both Testaments in the Spirit's work of inspiration. In the final section of the chapter, Crawford argues that the Son/Spirit relationship plays a key role for Cyril in grounding the Christological unity of Scripture. Because Scripture is authored by one Spirit, it is one book. Not only is it one book; it also presents a unified witness to the person of Jesus Christ. Scripture is unified in its witness to Christ because "it has been spoken by the one Spirit who is consubstantial with the Son as his 'mind'" (p. 114). Hence, the spiritual origin and Christological content of Scripture flow from the unity and distinction of the Son and Spirit.

Building on the previous two chapters, Crawford explores the "Christological mediation" of Scripture in chapter four. He connects Cyril's theology of revelation (specifically Cyril's claim that the Son is the agent who reveals the Father by the Spirit) to the Alexandrian's understanding of inspiration (introduced in chapter three). Crawford makes two primary arguments. First, he demonstrates that Cyril understands inspiration to be an event in which the Son speaks to a human author by means of the Holy Spirit who indwells the author. Reading chapter three, one might get the impression that, for Cyril, inspiration is merely a work of the Spirit; however, as chapter four underscores, it is also a work of the Son (who is the voice of the Father). Scripture results from a "Trinitarian indwelling" in which biblical authors "are inspired when the Son dwells within them by the Spirit and thereby speaks to and through the human mediator" (p. 121). Second, Crawford argues that Cyril draws an important distinction between "prophetic indwelling" (i.e. the Son speaking to a prophet through the Spirit) and the incarnation. In the Gospels, the incarnate Son speaks not by means of a prophet but also through his own humanity. As a result, the Gospels possess a unique canonical status for Cyril (even though he views all Scripture as spoken by the Son and inspired by the Spirit). Cyril emphasizes the "soteriological immediacy of the divine Word" in the Gospels (p. 138).

Having examined Scripture as a divine movement from God to human beings, Crawford explores the church's experience with Scripture in chapter five. Just as revelation and inspiration are governed by the triune God, so also is the Christian encounter with God through Scripture. According to Cyril, Scripture is "a means of divine life" that nourishes the church by mediating Christ to believers (p. 146). The majority of the chapter focuses on Cyril's exposition of three biblical texts: Psalm 22 (LXX), Zechariah 11, and the feeding of the 5000 (recorded in all four Gospels). Breaking with earlier tradition that read this psalm psychologically (i.e. in terms of the journey of the soul), Cyril reads Psalm 22 as portraying the relation of Christ to the church. Christ is the shepherd who feeds his sheep with the "grass" of Holy Scripture and the "water" of the Holy Spirit. Cyril understands the shepherd in Zechariah 11 also to refer to Christ. Christ shepherds his flock using his "two staffs" (v. 7), which represent the Old and New Testaments. Cyril discusses the feeding of the 5000 in three of his commentaries (Matthew, Luke, and John). By reading this story in terms of the spiritual nourishment that Christ the Shepherd provides his flock, Cyril builds on a long history of exposition (e.g. Clement of Alexandria, Origen, and Hilary). Christ is both the bread that nourishes and the one who provides nourishment through the "five loaves" (representing the law of Moses) and "two fish" (representing apostolic and evangelical proclamation).

Continuing the theme of human encounter with divine revelation, Crawford examines Cyril's theology of biblical exegesis in chapter six. While Cyril's exegetical strategies reflect "the grammatical and rhetorical training of late antiquity," it is his theological vision (trinitarian in structure and Christological in focus) that "gives decisive shape to his understanding of exegesis" (p. 183). Exegesis happens in the Spirit. It enables one to contemplate the Son who ultimately leads readers to the Father. Cyril identifies two types of illumination reflecting the orders of creation and redemption. The first type of illumination (corresponding to creation) refers to the enlightenment of reason given by the Son to every soul at the moment it comes into existence. The second type of illumination (corresponding to redemption) is given only to those who have faith in Christ and are indwelt by the Spirit. The latter form of illumination is necessary in order for readers, by the light of the Spirit, to behold the Son and know the Father. While the Christological focus of Cyril's exegesis has been widely recognized, the trinitarian framework for this reading has not been adequately appreciated. Interpretation of Scripture reflects divine agency: Christ reveals himself by the Spirit so that readers can be led to the Father. The goal of exegesis is to grow both in virtue (reflecting the character of Christ) and knowledge. Beholding Christ is not an end in itself but ultimately leads readers to the Father.

In the final chapter, Crawford argues that Cyril's Trinitarian theology of Scripture represents one his most important contributions to the legacy of pro-Nicene theology. In Cyril's work, we see clearly that pro-Nicene theology was marked not only by a distinct doctrine of God flowing from the exegesis of biblical texts, but also a trinitarian understanding of the nature of Holy Scripture (reflecting that doctrine of triune God). Pulling together the threads of the previous chapters, Crawford summarizes Cyril's theology of Scripture. The central theme of Cyril's

theology is the person of Jesus Christ. This reality decisively shapes his theology of Scripture. Scripture is not merely a human book to be interpreted from a historical perspective; rather, Scripture is caught up in the drama of the triune God culminating in the revelation of Jesus Christ. As a result, pro-Nicenes like Cyril are not content to stop with what we would call the “original meaning” or “historical sense.” They want to press on to see the mystery of Christ in all of Scripture. The Gospels occupy a special place in the canon because in them we see the divine Son step directly onto the stage of redemption. Revelation and soteriology are held together for Cyril in the person of Christ who reveals the divine life and brings salvation. Scripture mediates life because it reveals the Son.

Cyril of Alexandria's Trinitarian Theology of Scripture possesses several strengths. First, Crawford explores an important topic, namely, the intersection of the trinitarian doctrine of God and the doctrine of Scripture. Second, by unfolding the Alexandrian's trinitarian theology of Scripture, Crawford makes an important contribution to our understanding of Cyril. Unlike the extensively studied trinitarian theologies of Augustine and the Cappadocians, Crawford's monograph represents the first work in English exploring Cyril's trinitarian theology. Not only does he carefully synthesize Cyril's thought (drawing on a wide variety of primary sources, including untranslated Greek and Syriac texts), but he also contextualizes Cyril in relation to fourth- and fifth-century predecessors and contemporaries (highlighting areas of continuity and discontinuity). Along the way, he critically engages contemporary scholarship on Cyril as well. Third, this book is carefully structured and well-argued. Crawford writes with great clarity, yet without losing the complexities and unresolved tensions in Cyril's thought. Fourth, Crawford expands our understanding of “pro-Nicene” theology. Importantly, he helps us see that pro-Nicene theology not only represented a particular doctrine of the triune God, but it also included a doctrine of Scripture given shape by that doctrine of God. Crawford's work substantiates the claim made by Khaled Anatolios in *Retrieving Nicaea* (and others) that we cannot understand the trinitarian theology of pro-Nicenes unless we see how their trinitarian doctrine is inseparably linked to other aspects of Christian faith and practice. Finally, although it is a historical work focused on the exposition of Cyril, this volume winsomely invites readers to consider the dogmatic significance of Cyril's trinitarian approach to Scripture (as well as his trinitarian theology). Not only does Crawford's summary of Cyril contain a compelling vision for the theological interpretation of Scripture; it also highlights areas where further constructive work is needed. In recent years, evangelicals have done a lot of work engaging the doctrine of the Trinity. More work needs to be done in developing an equally robust trinitarian theology of Scripture. From Crawford's exposition, it is clear that Cyril would be a helpful conversation partner for such a project.

The biggest limitation of this book is the price. The \$125 price tag will scare away many potential readers. At \$99.99, the Kindle price is not much more attractive. If you are a professor or student, encourage your library to buy a copy. It would make a great addition to advanced courses exploring patristic theology, the doctrine of the Trinity, the doctrine of Scripture, or even hermeneutics. Readers won't discover much criticism of Cyril in this volume. One of the great strengths of

this book is the way Crawford sympathetically enters Cyril's thought world and unpacks his theology in its fifth-century context. While Crawford does a great job contextualizing the Alexandrian's theology intellectually (especially in relation to the pro-Nicene tradition), he does not explore the socio-historical (ecclesial) backdrop for Cyril's trinitarian writings. Much work remains to be done on Cyril of Alexandria and we can be grateful to Crawford for introducing us to Cyril's trinitarian theology of Scripture in this excellent volume.

Keith E. Johnson
Reformed Theological Seminary, Orlando, FL