

## BOOK REVIEWS

*Basics of Hebrew Discourse: A Guide to Working with Hebrew Prose and Poetry.* By Matthew H. Patton and Frederic Clarke Putnam. Edited by Miles V. Van Pelt. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2019, 288 pp., \$29.99.

*Basics of Hebrew Discourse* is authored by Matthew H. Patton (pastor of Covenant Presbyterian Church in Vandalia, OH) and Frederic Clarke Putnam (associate professor of Bible and liberal studies, The Templeton Honors College at Eastern University) and edited by Miles V. Van Pelt (Alan Belcher Professor of OT and Biblical Languages at Reformed Theological Seminary). This is the newest addition to Zondervan's popular *Basics of ...* language series and makes a significant contribution, not only to the series, but also to the fields of discourse analysis, Hebrew exegesis, and Hebrew language pedagogy. Written as a textbook for upper-level Hebrew students, the book is groundbreaking in that it brings together these three fields in a way that is easy to understand and is useful for students and their teachers.

The front matter for the book includes acknowledgments, a general introduction by Van Pelt, abbreviations, a table of grammatical terms, and a bibliography. The authors then divide the book into two main sections, with Patton discussing Hebrew prose and Putnam covering Hebrew poetry. The Hebrew prose section begins with an introduction and a chapter that covers discourse analysis in general. These are followed by chapters on discourse markers in Hebrew, verbal sequences in narrative and non-narrative, placing non-verbal elements before a verb, and verbless clauses. Subsequently, the last two chapters of the first section walk the reader through the process of systematically applying discourse analysis to Hebrew prose, focusing on relationships between clauses and including examples and discussion. The Hebrew prose section ends with a summary chart of topics related to prose discourse analysis.

The Hebrew poetry section by Putnam is organized by his systematic approach to doing discourse analysis on poetic texts. After an introductory chapter, Putnam addresses the process of poetic discourse analysis through the following chapters/topics: Glossing and Parsing the Poem, Poetic Lines and Structure, Verbal Forms, Type of Clause, Syntax, Semantic Cohesion, and Logical Cohesion. For each stage of the process, Putnam includes charts and examples to demonstrate how to carry out the step addressed in that chapter. After presenting all the steps, the Hebrew poetry section ends with a conclusion, examples, and two appendices, one briefly addressing the difficult issues related to poetic meter in Hebrew and one addressing the differences between gloss, meaning, and translation. The book as a whole ends with three indices: Scripture, Subject, and Author.

*Basics of Hebrew Discourse* is an important contribution to the field of Hebrew language and linguistics and has many strengths. As noted in the general introduction, one of the goals of this book is to fill a gap in Hebrew instruction and intro-

ductory resources (p. 11), and it certainly succeeds. The book is unique in its contribution, covering the relatively new and challenging topic of discourse analysis for students. The explanations and discussions clearly keep the student audience in mind, using simple, straightforward language and offering step-by-step instructions. In addition, the authors include occasional notes for teachers who would utilize the book in their courses. Another strength of *Basics of Hebrew Discourse* is its use of frequent examples that highlight the usefulness of the approach and help students understand how to apply the methodology. The audience will also find beneficial the authors' reuse of example passages in different chapters in order to demonstrate how different steps in the analysis process interact and reinforce each other in a given passage. While the intended audience of the book is primarily students, the authors demonstrate a strong awareness of and interaction with relevant scholarly literature on discourse analysis, including content footnotes that further explain certain ideas and/or choices made in the main text and pointing the audience to other resources for further details and discussion.

Overall, *Basics of Hebrew Discourse* is accurate, informative, and user-friendly. However, a few details could be improved. First, the outline formatting of some chapters is confusing. For example, in chapter 4, section IV, two different levels of subsections use the same denotation (Arabic numerals), making it difficult to know if the next subsection is part of the same level as the previous subsection. In addition to this issue, there are a couple cases of oversimplification in the discussion of the Hebrew verbal system. For example, Patton does not distinguish between *weqatal* and *waw + qatal*; both functions are brought together under *weqatal*. Another example is the combination of the *yiqtol* form with the volitives (cohortatives and jussives) with the result that the function of the verbal form (volitive or not) must then be determined by discourse analysis. While the morphology for these forms is often similar or identical, the functions are different enough that each function should be understood as something independent of the others.

These drawbacks notwithstanding, Patton, Putnam, and Van Pelt have given us a great resource for teaching Biblical Hebrew, especially for second year and beyond. Their work should be read by Biblical Hebrew students and teachers, as well as anyone else who wants a solid introduction to discourse analysis for Biblical Hebrew.

Jennifer E. Noonan  
Columbia International University, Columbia, SC

*God's Relational Presence: The Cohesive Center of Biblical Theology.* By J. Scott Duvall and J. Daniel Hays. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2019, 416 pp., \$34.99.

Those who value how good writing leaves little doubt as to what a book intends to convey will appreciate how Duvall and Hays begin their work: "Our *basic thesis* is that the Triune God desires to have a personal, encountering relationship with his people and enters into his creation in order to facilitate that relationship" (p. 1, emphasis added). In order to support their thesis, the authors work book by

book through the rest of the OT and NT, explaining how select portions of each book contribute to the theme of *God's Relational Presence*. As the secondary title of the book implies, the volume also proposes that the relational presence of God is the cohesive center of biblical theology, as this is "the heart of the Bible's overall message" (p. 325). The search for the center of a biblical theology, of course, has a long history with many solutions proposed, as the authors acknowledge. They have not attempted to argue why other positions are inadequate, but rather why God's relational presence brings cohesion to all the other proposals (p. 328). This volume joins an ever-growing canon of evangelical biblical theology, and this work will certainly push forward a conversation among those who approach biblical theology from a salvation-historical point of view.

With respect to argumentation, the authors do not consistently interact with other biblical theologies; rather, they follow the contours of the biblical text. Such an approach will be greatly appreciated by those who are either less concerned with its place in the discipline or well acquainted with biblical theology. This also makes it more accessible to pastors and students, while providing enough meat for well-informed OT, NT, and theological scholars. Though OT and NT scholars may question some of the exegetical conclusions that are made within the work, readers should agree the authors have done their due diligence to present a biblical theology of presence that represents deliberate interaction with the most pertinent English-language resources. They provide for the academy and the church a well-written and well-researched contribution to the field.

At the same time, the book does not pretend to be comprehensive in all areas of the biblical text. Given that the book intends to provide a complete-Bible survey of its theme, there is much material with which one might interact, and the authors acknowledge that the scope of their work is selective (p. 2). The biblical scholar—OT or NT alike—would certainly want to interact with the authors' conclusions. However, such comprehensiveness is the nature of biblical theology, which demands that its purveyors be astutely acquainted with a wide variety of material—the Scriptures themselves, the secondary literature of the OT and NT, as well as the broader biblical-theological discussion.

Their spiderweb analogy (pp. 4–5)—wherein the center they propose is not a hub but rather a web that brings other themes together even if in tangential ways—works well when considering a potential center for biblical theology, as it does not necessarily force the theme upon each book but rather looks to find where each work may contribute to the theme. However, even with this approach, some parts of the biblical text remain elusive. On the one hand, the wisdom books, while not completely sidestepping the theme, do not specifically take up the themes of other books in the same way. On the other hand, at least in one case, the Song of Songs, there is no contribution to be made. One might consider whether following the tripartite OT canon (instead of the traditional, Protestant canonical order) may have helped provide a more effective "web" that consolidates these disparate books into the canonical reading of the Writings. These would be helpful discussions for evangelical biblical theologians to continue having about how the books of the canon cohere and how such coherence contributes to biblical theology.

Without attempting to discount the excellent work Duvall and Hays provide, which will be rightly regarded as a must-read within the field, such works as this should also be considered as to how they push those within the discipline to think about their craft. It is in this spirit that I make the following observation. There may remain among evangelical scholarship a failure (perhaps unintentional) to articulate carefully the distinction between a center to the story of the Bible (meaning identifying how the main flow of salvation history coheres) and the presentation of what the biblical authors have done with their books. For example, the authors clearly state that the goal of biblical theology “is to seek to know God *as he has revealed himself to us through the Scriptures*” (p. 6, emphasis original). Yet, the discussion of God’s relational presence at times focuses on events, because “the immanence of God is a critical component of God’s revelation to his people” (p. 7). Key examples of these types of events would be God’s appearance to Moses and the people at Sinai. Without a doubt, this is true; God revealed himself to his people at any number of places, including ultimately through the incarnation of the Son. Describing events is not the same as giving an explanation of how the text has interpreted and presented the event. When the event becomes the focus, the text becomes the lens through which the history of God’s presence with his people is seen: “In this book we will track *the real and literal presence of God* in the midst of Israel as he dwells in the temple, later departs from the temple, and then returns in the incarnation” (p. 8, emphasis added). While not wanting to strain this observation too far, the point to be made is that this may lead to a methodological inconsistency wherein at times the task is tied specifically to authorially-intended textual structures (such as the intertextual dependence of Ruth, the Matthean *inclusio* of presence, or the canonical inclusion of the Garden), at times it surveys themes of a body of literature with little attention to the composition of books (such as the letters of Paul), and at times it consists of choosing some aspects of a book that contribute to the theme while bypassing larger textual structures and key passages (such as the book of Samuel, where there is no discussion of Hannah’s song and virtually nothing regarding the Davidic covenant in favor of a survey of the ark narratives). Yet, the authors do well to focus on the textual resonance of the three-part formula, “I will be your God; you will be my people; I will dwell in your midst.” Such intertextual observations seem to be a key tool in developing a biblical theology of our two-part canon. At the same time, a work such as this is by nature selective, highlighting the aspects of the biblical story that best support its thesis. Therefore, any potential observation of methodological inconsistency, while discrediting neither the work nor its helpful theological presentation regarding God’s relational presence, serves to call those of us who are concerned with an evangelical presentation of biblical theology to think carefully about the distinction between biblical theology as a presentation of the text as revelation and the text as a window into God’s revelatory presence.

Duvall and Hays have made a valuable contribution to evangelicalism. Not only does the volume extend an ongoing discussion of the center of biblical theology, it also does so by taking seriously a high view of the Scriptures. The volume is written by two highly esteemed scholars in their respective fields. In fact, one ad-

vantage of the book is that it brings together the expertise of its writers. It remains difficult, for example, for one who is primarily an OT scholar to be able to master the secondary literature of the NT to such an extent as to write about a center of biblical theology, not because there is an unfamiliarity with the NT text but rather because of the inability to be an expert in all areas such a study requires. Hopefully, this collaboration by Duvall and Hays will encourage other OT and NT scholars to work together on such endeavors for the good of the discipline and the church.

Randall McKinion  
Cedarville University, Cedarville, OH

*Bearing God's Name: Why Sinai Still Matters.* By Carmen Joy Imes. Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2019, 225 pp., \$18.00.

Building on her previous work (*Bearing Yahweh's Name at Sinai*), Carmen Imes has written an accessible introduction to the Sinai covenant in order to show its continuing relevance for Christians. The book's major theme is based on her assertion that the "Name Command" (Exod 20:7) should be translated "you must not bear (or carry) the name of Yahweh, your God, in vain" (49). Just as the priests bore Israel's name and served as his representatives to Israel (Exod 28:29), so Yahweh, through this command, called Israel to act as his representatives to the nations (pp. 48–52). Bearing God's name becomes the thread by which she connects Sinai to the modern believer; thus, her book might be characterized as a biblical theology of name-bearing.

Imes divides her book into two major parts. The first part ("Becoming the People Who Bear God's Name") deals with the biblical material from the exodus through Israel's departure from Sinai. Key foci include Israel's wilderness wanderings as Yahweh's training grounds for Israel (chap. 1), the law as Yahweh's gracious gift to Israel (chap. 2), and the role of the tabernacle with its associated sacrificial system (chap. 4). Chapter 3 ("Major Deal: Covenant as Vocation") forms the backbone of this material as Imes surveys the Ten Commandments, devoting the most attention to the "Name Command."

After a brief "Intermission," Imes turns her attention to the rest of the biblical story in the second part of her book ("Living as the People who Bear God's Name"). Chapter 6 ("Striking Out") moves from Israel's wilderness wanderings to Solomon's Temple building on Mount Zion with a focus on Yahweh's reputation among his people during certain key events (Conquest, Davidic Covenant, and Temple Dedication). Chapter 7 ("What Yahweh Sees") highlights Yahweh's concern for his reputation in the prophetic messages of judgement and restoration. She also argues that the prophets envisioned the new covenant as a renewal—not the end—of the Sinai Covenant (pp. 124–31).

The book's final three chapters trace the theme of name-bearing through the pages of the NT. Imes explains how Jesus, as the true Israel and one greater than Moses, lived "out Israel's vocation, showing us how it ought to be done" (p. 139). In a chapter entitled "Blob Tag" (ch. 9), she explains how the apostles elevated

Jesus's name "in ways reminiscent of the Old Testament's use of Yahweh's name" (p. 151) as they lived out their vocation as Jesus's representatives. In chapter 10, Imes addresses the relationship of Gentile believers to the Sinai covenant. She begins with Peter's application of Israel's covenantal titles to Gentile believers (1 Pet 2:9–10) and then discusses related texts in Acts (Peter's Vision and the Jerusalem Council). Like Israel, the church has been given an "invisible tattoo" of Jesus's name (p. 180) and "participates in his mission to bring blessing to all nations" (p. 182).

Imes has provided the church and the academy with a gift in *Bearing God's Name*. Her book is not only engaging, deeply personal, and well-illustrated, she also addresses key interpretive issues related to the law, and in so doing, is conversant with the latest in biblical scholarship. She provides helpful bibliographies at the end of each chapter and discussion questions for each chapter at the end of the book, and throughout the book, she includes text boxes with deeper discussions of relevant issues (e.g. "Seals in the Ancient Near East," p. 50). Above all, she accomplishes her goal of drawing her readers "into the biblical story" (p. 2), and she does so by persuasively showing "the enduring value of the Old Testament for the life of faith" (p. 3). Even those who disagree with her interpretation of the "Name Command" or her position on the continuing relevance of the Sinai covenant will find this book helpful for understanding the thematic unity of the biblical story.

Writing a book on Sinai is akin to holding an umbrella in an open field during a lightning storm. That I only have one criticism of the book highlights its strengths. Imes emphasizes the enduring value of Sinai for Christians throughout her book, but she devotes very little discussion to how specific laws might apply to modern believers (pp. 182–83). On a couple of occasions, she states that the sacrificial laws and laws related to Israel's ethnic separation are no longer operative (pp. 130–31, 161–62), and in her final discussion, she concludes that other laws "no longer function for us as they did for Israel" (p. 182). Regarding this latter category, she illustrates how Christians might apply a principle from Deuteronomy's parapet law (p. 183). However, she does not explain how "Sinai becomes our covenant too" at the level of the individual laws (p. 166). Her only advice is: "Other categories of law will need to be thoughtfully considered in relation to Israel's cultural context and our own" (p. 182). A more robust discussion of how believers might relate to the specific laws would have been helpful.

In conclusion, Imes's *Bearing God's Name* provides a helpful correction to the frequent misunderstandings of the OT that lead to a neglect of its message. Her engaging discussions, creative illustrations, and challenging applications commend this book to readers of all levels. Even those familiar with the Sinai narrative will no doubt benefit from her creative presentation of this material.

James M. Todd III  
College of the Ozarks, Point Lookout, MO

*From Adam and Israel to the Church: A Biblical Theology of the People of God.* By Benjamin L. Gladd. Essential Studies in Biblical Theology. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2019, 192 pp., \$22.00 paper.

In *From Adam and Israel to the Church*, the stated purpose of Benjamin L. Gladd, associate professor of NT at Reformed Theological Seminary, is to delineate the Bible's teachings—from Genesis to Revelation—regarding the people of God. In particular, he analyzes the people of God through the lens of the image of God (p. 4). Gladd writes his work within the framework of covenant theology: Israel and the church are not “two separate entities with two separate destinies” (p. xi). Israel and the church are united in Christ; the church, therefore, is the true Israel, made up of Jews and Gentiles (p. xi). Gladd states that his work is not a polemic against dispensationalism; rather, Gladd simply considers what the Bible teaches about the people of God throughout the OT and NT.

Gladd also expresses a second purpose for his book: to lay a foundation for future volumes in the series Essential Studies in Biblical Theology. The series “outlines major themes of the Bible from Genesis to Revelation” (p. 4). Gladd notes that several themes discussed in his book will be picked up in future works, including “temple, priest, king, prophet, creation, and redemption” (p. 4). According to InterVarsity's website, two additions to the series will appear in late 2020. One work will focus on the theme of the old and new exodus; the second work will focus on sin and restoration.

In his work, Gladd begins with the creation of Adam and Eve and their roles as king, priest, and prophet in the Garden of Eden (chaps. 1–2). The garden, argues Gladd, is God's temple on earth; God creates Adam and Eve in his image to rule as his representative on earth (pp. 9–10). In the temptation fall of Adam and Eve, Adam and Eve failed in their roles as prophet, priest, and king (pp. 23–24). With the fall of Adam and Eve, the image of God is not removed but perverted, and the roles of humankind as prophet, priest, and king are “now tools for destruction” (p. 33). However, God promises redemption in Gen 3:15 with a future king who will accomplish what Adam and Eve failed to do (p. 27).

After laying his groundwork in chapters 1 and 2, Gladd traces the theme of the image of God as prophet, priest, and king in the life of the nation of Israel (chap. 3) and its future restoration in the “latter days,” or the time of Christ (chap. 4). In chapters 5–7, Gladd demonstrates how Jesus is the last and successful Adam, the perfect image of God as prophet, priest, and king (p. 116). In chapters 8–10, Gladd directs his attention to the church as “little last Adams and true Israelites,” and how the church fulfills the roles of prophet, priest, and king (p. 116). Gladd concludes his book discussing the book of Revelation and the church's full restoration in the image of God (chap. 11), and practical applications on how the image of God affects the believer's behavior (chap. 12).

Gladd's contribution to the biblical theology of God's people is clearly and effectively written. The author expertly distills deep theological truths to reach his target audience—“beginning students of theology, church leaders, and laypeople”—without sacrificing depth and accuracy (p. x). Throughout the book, Gladd

weaves personal anecdotes and other illustrations to apply and clarify his points, and also provides charts to illustrate major themes. Gladd provides his readers a coherent description of the Bible's teaching on the image of God as prophet, priest, and king.

Much is to be commended regarding Gladd's thesis, although a couple of points could use clarification. First, Gladd contends the original creation was divided into gradations of holiness, similar to the temple. The Garden of Eden was the most holy, like the Holy of Holies in the temple. The outer world, then, like the outer courts of the temple, was less holy and contained "all that is unfit for God's holy presence in Eden" (p. 17). It would be helpful for Gladd to flesh this thought out in light of God's statement that all of God's creation was "very good" (Gen. 1:31). Second, Gladd notes that the serpent was part of the created world, and yet it was "unclean" and tempted Adam and Eve (pp. 22–23). In light of Gen 1:31, how would Gladd explain the existence of an unclean snake in a "very good" creation? What is Gladd's opinion on Satan's role in the temptation?

Gladd's book is a welcome addition to the discussion of the image of God. *From Adam and Israel to the Church* is an excellent and accessible resource for pastors, Bible study groups, and Christian college and seminary teachers.

Richard C. McDonald

The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, KY

*The Gospel According to Eve: A History of Women's Interpretation.* By Amanda W. Benckhuysen. Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2019, x + 262 pp., \$25.00 paper.

What does the Bible teach about women—their value, calling, and contribution to the family, church, and society at large? In response to interpretations that have subordinated women and circumscribed their participation in different spheres (p. 1), Amanda Benckhuysen, professor of OT at Calvin Theological Seminary, offers a reception history of women's interpretations of Genesis 1–3 and the application of their readings to a variety of theological, ecclesial, and social issues. Observing that women's interactions with this text have too often been neglected, Benckhuysen endeavors to recover the voices that affirm women's humanity and equality through engagement with the Bible's opening scenes.

The result is not disinterested history: Benckhuysen positions her work as a rejoinder to evangelical theologies and politics that prohibit women's ordination, associate the feminine with childrearing and the home, and pivot between objectifying women and blaming them for men's sexual sin, expressing the hope that her work will "enhance this conversation, deepening our understanding of the Scriptures and opening our eyes to what the Scriptures say and don't say about gender distinction" (p. 3). The book covers the writings of over sixty women across seventeen centuries, with each chapter surveying interpretations of Genesis 1–3 with respect to a specific aspect of the female experience.

Orienting readers to the principal text, chapter 1 identifies several features of Genesis 1–3 that generate diverse interpretations—the sequence of creation, the



definition of *'ezer*, and the meaning of God's judgments in 3:14–19. The author introduces early interpreters, including women who variously advanced negative appraisals of Eve (e.g. Aelia Eudocia Augusta's [c. 401–460] rendering Eve responsible for casting many into hell) and more positive readings (e.g. Hildegard von Bingen's [1098–1179] sympathetic characterization of Eve as the serpent's victim).

Chapter 2 explores interpretations that defend women's worth and dignity, such as Isotta Nogarola's (1418–1466) clever riposte to the tendency to attribute greater blame for the fall to Eve than if women are deemed the inherently inferior sex, then the superiorly-endowed Adam must be the more culpable agent (pp. 30–31). Chapter 3 examines readings that advocate for women's education, and chapter 4 focuses on interactions with Genesis 1–3 that relate to the divine intention for marriage and the calling of wives and mothers. Mary Astell (1666–1731), for example, argues that the judgment of Gen 3:16 that "he shall rule over you" is properly understood as a prediction of sin's corruption within marriage rather than a divine prescription for husbands' subjugating behavior.

Chapter 5 takes up readings that draw implications for women's preaching and teaching, highlighting many women interpreters' utilization of concepts of creational equality and appeals to the woman's serpent-directed enmity in support of women's participation in the pulpit. Chapter 6 charts women's contributions to children's educational materials that commend positive attitudes toward women through reconsiderations of Eve. Advocacy for social reform unites the treatments of chapter 7, exploring how women's understandings of Genesis 1–3 have been leveraged for the sake of women's rights, suffrage, and political involvement in abolition and labor reform. Chapter 8 treks through the rise of feminist criticism to majority world interpreters, observing how women have critiqued patriarchal cultural attitudes by appeal to the Bible and how interpreters have critiqued the alleged patriarchy of the biblical text itself. A conclusion offers lessons to be learned from the survey, followed by discussion questions and biographical sketches of each female interpreter treated.

As reception history, Benckhuysen's work is a valuable contribution that succeeds in retrieving seldom-heard voices. Some of the figures are intensely idiosyncratic: Antoinette Bourignon (1616–1680) fashioned herself as a second Eve who would hasten the return of Christ (pp. 119–20, 239–40). Others offer insights of moving profundity, as with Elizabeth Clinton's (c. 1574–c. 1630) reflection on God's provision through the female body, which Benckhuysen summarizes thus:

Breast milk is a sign of God's faithfulness to and provision for the very young, whose life is willed by God....When mothers nurse their children, then, they receive that provision, that gift from God. In this way, breastfeeding is an act of piety. It is a way of opening oneself up to God's grace and provision and acknowledging that our lives, and more particularly, the life of the child, are in God's care. (p. 103)

Hearing the treatments of Genesis 1–3 from Christian women across time affords readers the opportunity to examine how sex, culture, and experience influence one's approach to the text and to benefit from the exegetical, theological, and social

perspectives that emerge from these women's peculiar concerns, sensitivities, questions, and lives.

Benckhuysen's framing of issues and assessment of interpretations, however, are likely to raise questions, especially among readers who disagree with her egalitarian reading of Scripture and corresponding aim for the book. For example, Benckhuysen describes complementarianism as claiming that "to practice social, political, or ecclesiastical equality between men and women is to capitulate to the whims of culture and to disregard Scripture" (p. 200). While there are undoubtedly those for whom this broad statement is true, there are also multitudes of nuanced complementarians who would find their views unrepresented by such a generalization. Discussing women's preaching, Benckhuysen credits interpreters' egalitarian conclusions to "the stirring of the Spirit in their hearts which opened their eyes" (p. 110) but by contrast attributes denominations' reticence to make and maintain institutional changes along this trajectory to "the pull of cultural patriarchy" (p. 134). Elsewhere, Benckhuysen reflects critically on historical attitudes toward marriage that foregrounded familial alliances, social stability, and women's role in childbearing and -rearing (pp. 84–85) and suggests that one female writer's contention that bodily differences render particular duties fitting for men and women is due to "stereotypes about women based on their physiology" and an "imagination about gender roles ... constrained by historical and cultural forces" (p. 178). One wonders, though, to what extent such evaluations are themselves shaped by historical and cultural forces, by the assumptions and expectations of a modern society wherein ubiquitous contraception, shifts in the dominant forms of labor, and myriad technological advances create synthetic modes of sameness and distance men and women from the creational realities, sex-specific potentialities, and necessary forms of social organization that earlier generations took for granted. One of the ways in which a history of women's interpretation may challenge the contemporary church is by exposing the unexamined contours of the modern imagination and calling us to reckon with the testimony of the body and the structure of creation, which many complementarians and egalitarians alike have overlooked.

*The Gospel According to Eve* presents women's interpretations that should be heard, considered, interrogated—not least where those interpretations collide with our assumptions and the sensibilities reinforced by modern ways of being.

Trevor Laurence  
Catechesia Institute, Winston-Salem, NC

*The Moody Handbook of Messianic Prophecy: Studies and Expositions of the Messiah in the Old Testament.* Edited by Michael Rydelnik and Edwin Blum. Chicago: Moody, 2019, 1433 pp., \$39.99.

Does the OT speak of the Messiah? If it does, *how* does it do so? In this volume, Michael Rydelnik and Edwin Blum gather arguments and exegetical studies that passionately answer the former question in the affirmative and provide a roadmap to reflecting on the latter question. In the first part of the *Handbook*, six-

teen entries of varying lengths engage a series of methodological issues that inform an examination of the Messiah in the OT (pp. 21–239). These range from the titles that relate to messianic prophecy, text-critical issues, interpretive approaches, the OT's use of the OT, the NT's use of the OT, and the history of reception (e.g. in intertestamental, rabbinic, Aramaic, and medieval Jewish literature).

The bulk of the following collection consists of hermeneutical and exegetical treatments (pp. 239–1338). The textual material covered includes individual texts (e.g. Gen 3:15), larger sections (e.g. the Servant songs in Isaiah), groupings of texts (e.g. the psalms of Ascent), and the message of smaller books (e.g. Ruth, Ecclesiastes, and Song of Songs). The scope of these studies moves across the OT from the Pentateuch (7 entries), the prophetic history (5 entries), the prophets (42 entries), the Psalms (20 entries), and the rest of the Writings (11 entries).

Two elements that signal the interpretive perspective of the volume are John Sailhamer's reprinted article "The Messiah and the Hebrew Bible" (pp. 41–61) and Rydelnik's orienting essays ("The Messiah and His Titles," pp. 29–39, and "Interpretive Approaches to Messianic Prophecy," pp. 73–91). After noting the tendency within some quarters to downplay or deny the messianic nature of the OT, Blum and Rydelnik observe that there remains "the need to reclaim and explain messianic prophecy" (p. 25). They also articulate three of the shared starting points undergirding each part of the volume: (1) that the Scriptures are the inspired and authoritative Word of God; (2) that the Hebrew Bible reveals the Messiah in individual passages and also *as a whole*; and (3) that the prophetic authors *understood* that they were writing about the Messiah (pp. 25–27). In this way, they argue that "Jesus' perspective on the messianic nature of the inspired Word of God steered all of [their] work" (p. 27).

Rydelnik argues further that "there indeed was a clearly intended messianic message in the Hebrew Bible" (p. 29). Minimally, the term "Messiah" refers to "an individual, uniquely consecrated to the service of God" (p. 30). Broadened further, the messianic expectation included complementary concepts like a king from the line of David, an eschatological deliverer and ruler, and a redeemer that will save the people from sin (pp. 30–31). When understood in light of related titles for this coming one (e.g. "son of God," "son of Man," "prophet like Moses," "one shepherd"), a well-developed understanding of the coming Messiah emerges (pp. 33–39). The Messiah is "this King that the Hebrew Bible foretells, through prophetic prediction and pattern" (p. 33). Rydelnik summarizes that the contributors of this volume utilize "an expansive approach to the issue of messianic prophecy" (p. 38) and do not limit their analysis to locations where the specific term "messiah" is found.

In his article, Sailhamer provides a reflection on the hermeneutical issues involved in perceiving "the Messiah and the Hebrew Bible" (pp. 41–60). A key focus for Sailhamer is to establish the nature of the relationship between the Testaments. He argues that "the NT is not so much a *guide* to understanding the OT as it is the *goal* of understanding the OT" (p. 47). "Unless we understand the OT picture of the Messiah," Sailhamer contends, "we will not understand the NT picture of Jesus" (pp. 47–48). Accordingly, "the OT, not the NT, is the messianic searchlight" (p. 48). A foundational assumption in this approach is that the OT "not only *predicts*

the coming of a Messiah,” but also “*describes and identifies* that Messiah” (p. 49). In other words, in the Prophets and the Writings, “we find a full and detailed *exposition* of the Pentateuch’s messianism” (p. 50).

In this intertextual exposition, then, “the OT messianic hope is extended and deepened to the point at which we find it in the NT” (p. 50). When the NT authors speak about Jesus as the Christ, Sailhamer reasons, “they build on and develop the messianic vision that is already present in the earlier texts” (p. 58). Consequently, the OT books are “messianic in the full NT sense of the word” (p. 59). In fact, Sailhamer concludes, “the messianic thrust of the OT was the *whole* reason the books of the Hebrew Bible were written” and represents “the deep-seated messianic hope of a small group of faithful prophets and their followers” (p. 59).

This comprehensive vision of how the OT speaks of the Messiah on its own terms guides the textual and biblical-theological reflections in the rest of the *Handbook*. Within this shared set of convictions, there is space given for different emphases and direct dialogue. One such area relates to the nature of typological interpretation. Sailhamer tends to avoid this interpretive category (e.g. see his characterization on pp. 44–47). While there is a general caution regarding the use of typology as an overarching theological grid for understanding the NT’s use of the OT, there are several places in this volume where typology is affirmed, connected to the textual work of biblical authors, and utilized as an important tool in understanding the Messiah in the OT.

For example, Seth Postell articulates an understanding of typology as a compositional strategy within the OT itself. Noting that “the OT’s design was to prepare its readers for the future through careful meditation on the past” (p. 161), Postell argues the NT authors were “continuing a pattern that had already been established in the OT” (p. 162). Authors like Matthew, Paul, and the writer of Hebrews provide interpretations that are “a natural and expected extension of the typological interpretations” of figures like Adam, Moses, Israel, and the tabernacle (p. 162). Similarly, Glen Kreider considers the types of the Messiah as prophet, priest, and king (pp. 135–44), and Robert Cole affirms the typological interpretation that is “ubiquitous and deliberate throughout the entire Hebrew Bible,” including the Psalter (p. 557, n. 37). In this vein, while both see a strategic relationship between Matthew 2, Hosea 11, and Numbers 23–24 (“Out of Egypt I called my son”), Rydelnik disagrees with Sailhamer on the nature of this connection (pp. 52–53, 106–9, and 115, n. 20; see also the discussion of Sailhamer’s understanding of the Song of Songs, pp. 130–31 and 769–83).

Another clear example of difference and dialogue relates to the messianic message of Deuteronomy. Daniel L. Block argues that Deut 18:15 is not directly messianic (“a prophet like Moses”) but also maintains that Deuteronomy provides a “Mosaic paradigm of kingship” in Deut 17:14–20. The articulation of kingship found here, Block concludes, anticipates the righteous kingship of the Messiah (pp. 315–22). In the following entry, Jim Sibley argues against this view, concluding that Deut 18:15–19 is “a messianic prophecy that speaks directly and solely of the coming deliverer, later known as the Messiah” (p. 338).

In relation to the broader field of scholarship, this volume represents a wide-ranging reference work that comes from a distinctive starting point. The areas of dialogue noted above are on a small scale and under the umbrella of a clearly articulated understanding of how the Hebrew Bible works and how it speaks about the Messiah. The alternative positions criticized most frequently are historical-critical approaches that reject any form of messianic expectation. Consistently critiqued, too, are evangelical positions that primarily understand the messianic nature of the OT as generated by NT authors (*sensus plenior*, double fulfillment, etc.).

There are also a variety of methods and modes of analysis at play throughout the volume, from narrowly textual to overtly theological. Josh Matthews, for instance, provides a close reading of Jer 31:31–34, highlighting the relationship between the old and new covenants in both the Pentateuch and Jeremiah as a whole (pp. 1035–47). T. Desmond Alexander examines the covenant with Abraham in specific texts like Gen 12:1–3 but also within the shape of the book of Genesis (pp. 259–70). Walter Kaiser discusses 2 Samuel 7 and the covenant with David in relation to the book of Chronicles and inter-linked Psalms (pp. 385–97). Randall McKinion analyzes the composition of the Psalms of Ascent (Psalms 120–134) and also the effect of their strategic arrangement within the Psalter (pp. 711–26).

This type of textual and theological analysis forms the heart of this substantive collection of studies. In contrast to the “messianic minimalism” the contributors critique, this volume represents a theoretical and exegetical argument for a kind of messianic maximalism. Accordingly, those who ask, “How would one arrive at this position?” and “What would it look like to do exegesis and biblical theology on this basis?” will find here a thorough and reflective resource.

Ched Spellman  
Cedarville University, Cedarville, OH

*The End of the Beginning: Joshua & Judges.* By Johanna W. H. van Wijk-Bos. Eerdmans: Grand Rapids, 2019, xiv + 351 pp., \$29.99 paper.

*The End of the Beginning* was written as “the first volume of A People and a Land, a multi-volume work on the historical books of Joshua, Judges, Samuel, and Kings” (back cover). The other two volumes, one on 1–2 Samuel and one on 1–2 Kings, are scheduled to be published in 2020. In this first installment, Johanna W. H. van Wijk-Bos focuses upon “the story of Israel from the entry into Canaan up to the time of Samuel. [She] weaves together the memories of ancient Israel’s past into a story that speaks to the traumatic context of postexilic Judah” (back cover).

Van Wijk-Bos earned two degrees in theology at the University of Leiden and is the first woman to receive academic tenure at Louisville Presbyterian Theological Seminary, where she taught OT for forty years. Van Wijk-Bos serves in the Presbyterian Church (PCUSA) and has written dozens of articles and books, including *Making Wise the Simple: The Torah in Christian Faith and Practice* and *Reading Samuel: A Literary and Theological Commentary* (back cover).

For van Wijk-Bos, the purpose for writing *The End of the Beginning* was to reacquaint the reader with Israel's path as they entered, settled, lost, and were exiled from the land promised by God. She offers that "the history we find here may not be the history as it would be written today in the modern world. It is nevertheless history in the sense of a people writing in its past" (p. x). Further, by following Martin Buber's translation methods, van Wijk-Bos seeks to draw the reader into the alien world of the Hebrew Bible by providing a close translation that emphasizes original Hebrew word order along with the resulting alien tone and voice (p. xi–xii).

Van Wijk-Bos wrote *The End of the Beginning* "as a scholar of the Bible with deep commitments to feminism and issues of gender and to analysis of patriarchal structures and ideologies" where "women's voices and the roles they play in the various accounts have received special attention" (p. x). Furthermore, as a child of WWII "attentive to the historical Christian dishonoring and victimization of the Jewish people," van Wijk-Bos intended "to be respectful toward a part of Scripture that describes a history of which Jews are the direct descendants" (p. x).

A second purpose of *The End of the Beginning* "is to present exactly the multiplicity of voices which the collectors of this material let stand" (p. xii). While noting that a modern reader may struggle with a text "that sets the reader on a course that opens up in different directions" (p. xii), van Wijk-Bos states that "our task is in the end not to agree or disagree [with the voices] but to enter into the text with our questions and, in our very questioning, tentatively find a way forward, drawing closer to the presence of the Most Holy" (p. xiii).

*The End of the Beginning* approaches the books of Joshua and Judges separately. In each, van Wijk-Bos organizes the books into rather large portions labeled "cycles." For instance, in the book of Joshua the divisions are as follows: Cycle I: Crossing and the Conquest (Joshua 1–12); Cycle II: Occupation (Joshua 13–21); and Cycle III: Conflict and Unification (Joshua 22–24). The book of Judges is also explained in three cycles: Cycle I: Setting the Stage (Judg 1:1–3:6); Cycle II: Oppressors and Saviors (Judg 3:7–16:31); and Cycle III: To Do What is Right (Judg 17–21). Also included are introductory and summary chapters titled "Introduction," "Looking Back" (Joshua), and "Taking Stock" (Judges).

One of the strengths of *The End of the Beginning* is van Wijk-Bos's introduction to the historical books (Joshua, Judges, Samuel, and Kings). Her easy style of writing, use of personal story, and lucid explanation drew me into the book quickly and kept my attention. The explanation concerning the historical nature of the "Historical Books" (pp. 2–3) was extremely helpful, probably one I will use in future class settings. Furthermore, after a personal illustration from her upbringing in early, post-WWII Netherlands that included singing the song "Every Man" (p. 5), van Wijk-Bos masterfully explains the writing and final editing of Joshua and Judges:

Like all peoples, the ancient Israelites had their stories; like all peoples, they had songs that endured in recorded memory. These songs and stories, told at festive gatherings and family and religious celebrations, were perhaps written down at some point in the early period of ancient Israel's existence. Within the framework of the larger historical collection, Joshua and Judges tell stories of their great past, their mighty battles, and their flawed but larger-than-life superheroes.

These are the stories that later combiners and editors collected and arranged into their final form for a new context in which the community that produced the narratives was once again at home, but not in a way it had once envisioned. (p. 6)

Amid the in-line commentary, van Wijk-Bos offers several guiding summaries. These summaries constitute a real strength of the book. While the sectional commentary is what one might expect, the summary sections are unusually strong. This is not intended as a criticism of the formal commentary. However, when she summarizes, van Wijk-Bos captures the heart of the texts with lucid, articulate precision that was not quite as evident within the more formal commentary sections.

Arguably, *The End of the Beginning* is not comprehensive enough to be a stand-alone textbook. Missing are major discussions included in more comprehensive commentaries such as authorship, outline, form, rhetoric, or style. But van Wijk-Bos has produced a rich, thought-provoking commentary I would highly recommend as a complementary text. Van Wijk-Bos has caused me to think about and deeply rethink about a text I have taught for years.

Chet Roden

John W. Rawlings School of Divinity, Liberty University, Lynchburg, VA

*Ezekiel: A Focused Commentary for Preaching and Teaching.* By John W. Hilber. Cascade Books. Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2019, xv + 268 pp., \$34.00.

Engaging Ezekiel is a daunting exercise for everyone, including those with advanced theological education. Many commentaries on Ezekiel, therefore, either take the professorial (critical, verse-by-verse exegesis) or the pastoral (uncritical, chapter-by-chapter exposition) road—both of which are needed. Hilber's commentary lives up to its subtitle, which claims the book is for preaching and teaching. The title also defines it as "focused," but I am not sure how this distinguishes it over many others. This appears to be defined in the Introduction (p. 1), where the author states that his purpose is to provide a focus on the central message for God's people. Regardless, it successfully helps fill the gap between the two contrasting directions just named, and provides a beneficial blend of interpretation and application. There appears to be a publishing trend of late to produce exegetical and expositional hybrids (cf. the Kerux series from Kregel), but this is far from being exhausted to date. This commentary is a welcome member of this growing number of books that seeks to bridge the interpretive camps often distinguished by *what the text meant* then and *what the text means* now.

The commentary attempts to divide the prophecy into "teachable units" that typically cover one chapter as a whole or part of two chapters, and only twice 3–4 chapters, and finally once (at the end) 6 chapters. These follow the order of the biblical book, and result in 36 "chapters," although not labeled as such. A notable feature of each is the theological bridge from expositional to practical matters. Especially notable and commendable for a commentary with mainly a pastoral, although well-informed, level is the inclusion of background illustrations that utilize ANE texts to clarify the cultural setting of biblical passages when appropriate. For

too long, even academic evangelical interpretation has ignored the indispensable exegetical value of the contextual cultural hermeneutic. This is a refreshing and surprising addition by the author.

While commentaries normally move from the beginning to the end of a biblical book, one wonders if a topical approach might not have been more conducive to pastoral appropriation, since Ezekiel is not chronological anyway, allowing the teaching that the book supports to be more church-related than academy-related. Even the sectional titles often express the content in terms of a lesson, such as “The Impotence of Materialism,” and “God’s Relentless Love.” Following the “Contents” page is a useful list of “Special Topics” such as “Cherubim,” “Literal or Literalism,” and “A Future Temple?” (stated as a question). The Introduction avoids critical issues debated by scholars and focuses on practical features of the commentary, along with a brief summary of Ezekiel himself and the message of his book as a whole. Each section presents, in order, a one-sentence summary of its message, key themes, its context in Ezekiel, interpretive highlights, special topic (usually), (theological) bridge to application, and the focus of application.

A significant aspect of Hilber’s approach is his care to allow the OT text (in this case that of Ezekiel) to speak in its ancient context to its contemporary audience without falling prey to what plagues much traditional OT commentary—that of valuing the text mainly or only when it links to a NT theme. Notable in this respect is how the author appeals to the ANE setting and Hebrew text to demonstrate why the popular, and sadly still existing, idea that Satan is the subject of Ezekiel 28 is incorrect, even impossible. This is not new, and more academic sources are cited, but the hope is that this book will be used by those who might avoid more technical commentaries and at long last join the ranks of those who understand why the wording of especially 28:11–19 was (in the idioms of Ezekiel’s time) obviously applicable to a human king, and then abandon the use of this passage as a source for Satanology. As Hilber wisely and thankfully reminds his readers in the Preface, people do not like having their words used out of context, and this is equally true for the biblical authors (a contextual hermeneutic that seems to be lost on many conservative or traditional commentators). Hilber’s advice (p. 8) about using several translations (NIV, NASB, NRSV), however, is too modest (although it does mix evangelical and mainline, formal and dynamic equivalence). Essential also is a Jewish version (e.g. JPS), LXX translation (e.g. NETS or Lexham), and a Catholic Bible (e.g. Jerusalem), to access the broadest set of translation options (especially if the original languages are not used by the preacher or teacher). Many readers will enjoy the author’s concise and clear method of handling interpretive options by expressing his conclusion and reasoning on an issue often in a couple of sentences, while directing those who want an extended discussion and details to other sources (e.g. his explanation of the rod in 7:10–11; p. 44). Others will miss having the debate fleshed out more fully with exegetical tidbits and pros and cons enumerated (at least in footnotes or endnotes if not in text), but this (for a book as large as Ezekiel) would come at the price of this commentary’s compact presentation and practical emphasis. Still, as in this case, the author inspires confidence in his exegetical skill by basing his decision on the poetic parallelism and immediate



context, which sometimes even eludes authors of more ponderous volumes, who can sometimes (like those with less academic qualifications) allow traditional or theological bias to override the ancient literary and life settings of a passage. Hilber demonstrates a welcome sensitivity to such matters. Although not a comprehensive contribution to the Ezekiel academy, the author successfully provides (as purposed) a source of information about Ezekiel appropriate for application to teaching and preaching.

W. Creighton Marlowe  
Evangelical Theological Faculty, Leuven, Belgium

*Ezekiel 38–48: A New Translation and Commentary.* By Stephen L. Cook. Anchor Bible Commentary 22B. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2018, xxii + 338 pp., \$65.00.

With *Ezekiel 38–48*, Stephen L. Cook completes in a noteworthy manner the Anchor Bible three-volume commentary on Ezekiel that the late Moshe Greenberg began and was unable to complete before his passing. Although offering a different perspective than Greenberg, Cook follows in his steps with a final-form reading of the book of Ezekiel, an understanding of Ezekiel's unique patterns of composition (rather than concluding that the book contains a multitude of strata), and his extensive quotation of ancient Jewish sources. The overall perspective of the commentary is that Ezekiel's book demonstrates a Zadokite perspective in line with the Holiness School. Cook examines Ezekiel 38–39 as an eschatological and "proto-apocalyptic" battle between good and evil. He sees the final vision of Ezekiel 40–48, the temple, not as a blueprint for physical construction but as a utopian textual "map" or a literary "icon" to encourage the audience in exile. In line with the conception of God among the Holiness School, Ezekiel 40–48 describes an anthropomorphic presence of YHWH coming to inhabit the new temple.

The introduction of the commentary explores the literary character of the chapters, their place in the context of Ezekiel's book, the historical and social contexts, and the theology of the chapters, and then concludes with brief comments on the author's translation philosophy. Unlike many introductions, this one does not plumb the history of interpretation on critical issues such as the book's authorship and redactional history. Cook sees the authors of Ezekiel 38–39 and 40–48 as the same. The prophet Ezekiel wrote the core of these texts in Babylon, with slight work by editors soon after, and then some significant expansions by a later Ezekiel school, with a *terminus ad quem* of 515 BC. Literarily, for Cook, the Gog of Magog battle and final temple vision cohere with each other and with the rest of the book.

After the introduction, the book provides the translation for all of Ezekiel 38–48. However, the respective translation later reappears at the head of each of Ezekiel's sections. The rest of the work consists of notes and comments divided by sections. The notes and comments begin with Ezekiel 38–39. Cook argues, "It is misguided to reduce texts such as Ezekiel 38–39 to mere hyperbole or 'poetry'" (p. 79). On the other hand, he critiques interpretations that immediately apply the texts

to contemporary political events. He calls Gog a “mythic-realistic entity” of archetypal proportions (p. 78) that presents a window into a transcendent reality. In short, Gog represents the archetypal villain, the great dragon (cf. Ezek 28:16; 38:4). Cook also focuses on intertextuality such as Ezekiel reusing Isaiah 14, and later Scripture passages also echoing Ezekiel 38–39. Cook places Ezek 38:18–23 and 39:11–16 together as later expansions that “display a notable radicalization of eschatological fervor” (p. 90). Throughout his discussion Cook uses the term “millennial” without providing a definition (e.g., p. 13). The reader is unsure as to how “millennial” aspects of the vision are different from the “eschatological” characteristics, or whether Cook intends them as synonyms.

The greater portion of the commentary examines Ezekiel 40–48. Cook admirably presents concise notes and discussion of the entire vision, a passage full of textual difficulties and theological conundrums. Only Cook’s overall arguments can be presented here. Cook holds that Ezekiel describes a vision of a “transfigured” temple, a glimpse of the final reign of God, but not its final realization (p. 126). The presence of sacrifices, for example, shows that the vision is a literary utopia rather than realized eschatology (p. 198). He states, “Ezekiel’s literary temple ... will not, and cannot, be built” (p. 185). The temple lies atop a cosmic mountain (Ezek 40:20), a *Weltberg*. The altar “corks” the cosmic chaos of the waters (p. 268), which then trickle out to give life (Ezek 47:1–12). The life-giving river flowing from the temple and the straight boundaries of land also lead to a utopian interpretation. Within the inner sanctuary, God’s tangible presence (*kabôd*) resides permanently (p. 187). Cook writes, “I propose a model of ‘hypostatic union’ that allows for deity to add to its nature a terrestrial body but not thereby reduce itself fully to this embodiment” (p. 188). YHWH’s presence seeps outward to sanctify the land (p. 201). Ezekiel’s vision, then, serves as a journey akin to a mandala, a mental walk through a labyrinth into the “sacred center” (p. 174).

The leadership described in the vision presents a major point of contention among scholars. Unlike most scholars, Cook holds to the presence of a head priest. He argues that the chief or prince is a counterpart to the priest in leading the political realm, rather than being a mere “mock king.” Also, while numerous scholars see a punishment of Levites in Ezekiel 44, Cook sees a restoration of Levites to their former position. The Zadokite priests lead the cult, a narrowing down of the Aaronic priesthood by the Holiness School. As to the overall treatment of the vision, although Cook extensively interacts with critical scholars who see the text as blueprint, he does not address the arguments of those who see this as a millennial temple. Cook’s interpretation, though, helpfully considers many ANE parallels throughout, such as the Mari palace and Gudea Cylinders.

Cook’s commentary usefully majors on Ezekiel’s (and/or the Zadokite school’s) theological agenda rather than focusing on issues of historical, textual, or redactional criticism. The author provides a detailed look at the text and continues the work of scholars like Greenberg who read the work in its final form and as postdating P and H. He also adds a potent boost to the growing number of scholars who do not see the temple vision as intended for physical construction, though his explanation of a heavenly archetype is not completely convincing in every detail.

In addition, some readers may prefer Cook's translation style, which uses modern conventions such as "feet" instead of "cubits," but this reader found the style more difficult since other translations use the standard nomenclature. A unique aspect of the work is that Cook uses modern technology to produce very good diagrams and illustrations that illumine the text. Instead of printing many of these diagrams in the text, however, the reader has more work to do by needing to type in the appropriate link online.

Having long worked in the field of Ezekiel studies, Cook is more than qualified to write this volume. He presents an impressively concise volume that joins the top ranks of modern commentaries that set the standard for all who undertake Ezekiel studies. Though scholars will likely not agree on all points, they must have Cook's work on hand when exploring the final chapters of Ezekiel. Due to its theological focus and clear writing, pastors also do well to consult this work in exploring Ezekiel's text.

Drew N. Grumbles

Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary, Wake Forest, NC

*Amos, Jonah, & Micah.* By JoAnna M. Hoyt. Evangelical Exegetical Commentary. Bellingham, WA: Lexham, 2019, 880 pp. \$54.99

JoAnna M. Hoyt's *Amos, Jonah, & Micah* is the twelfth print volume to be released in the planned forty-four volume Evangelical Exegetical Commentary series (EEC) edited by H. Wayne House, General Editor, and William D. Barrick, OT Editor. Moreover, each volume in this series is also available digitally upon publication. Hoyt is a visiting professor at Dallas Theological Seminary and an adjunct professor at the Graduate Institute of Applied Linguistics.

The EEC series has a stated commitment to a careful, evangelical exegesis of the biblical text affirming "historic, orthodox Christianity and the inspiration and inerrancy of the Holy Scriptures ... while utilizing historical-grammatical and contextual interpretative methods" (p. xi). *Amos, Jonah, & Micah* surpasses the commitments of this series, particularly in its extensive and careful examination of the grammar and syntax of the Hebrew text, as Hoyt employs discourse linguistics as her major interpretive lens.

The commentary is appropriately balanced for the prophets under consideration (332 pages for Amos, 203 pages for Jonah, and 285 pages for Micah). However, the introduction to Jonah is much longer than the others (76 pages for Jonah vs. 28 pages for Amos and 32 pages for Micah). The introductory material is insightful as it covers the standard fare related to authorship, dating, setting, and audience. The introductions also provide helpful discussions of the text itself, matters of intertextuality, literary genre, unity, structure, and theology. The vast majority of the commentary is spent wrestling with the Hebrew syntax, grammar, literary structure, and word usage of a passage, sometimes supplementing "Additional Exegetical Comments" on particular issues after the verse-by-verse commentary. Also, following the verse-by-verse commentary, are two further sections for "Biblical Theologi-

cal Comments” and “Application and Devotional Implications.” In the “Biblical Theological Comments” section Hoyt places passages into the wider story of the history of redemption as it occurs in the OT and the entire biblical canon. This section is Christologically focused and attempts to draw out themes and types that lead eventually to Christ and the gospel. The “Application and Devotional Implications” are a nice addition to the extensive exegesis and are timely. Both the biblical-theological and application sections are short (usually a paragraph or two) and occasionally simplistic in comparison to the extensive exegesis, leaving the reader wanting more.

The EEC’s commitment to careful exegesis defines the commentary in several ways. First, Hoyt has a consistent preference for the MT as received and goes to every effort to understand the text as it is written. Throughout the commentary Hoyt builds well-evidenced and reasoned arguments for understanding the MT without the need for emendation. In fact, in only a few places does Hoyt propose an emendation, and that again is based on solid evidence and reasoning (e.g. pp. 117–20, Amos 3:11; pp. 239, 245–47, Amos 6:12; p. 662, Micah 2:12c–e).

Second, Hoyt is not afraid of the variation of literary style that may occur in a passage. Instead, she comfortably and convincingly understands the variation in speech not as an indicator of a disrupted text, but as an author-intended part of the complex rhythms of the literature. The thorough arguments in favor of the MT and variation in literary style are significant in making this work valuable for the evangelical scholar.

Third, Hoyt meticulously translates each Hebrew word based on usage, context, and history to convey an accurate meaning for the modern reader with significant results. As an example, her translation of the hiphil of  $\text{שָׁלַח}$  in Jonah 2:3[4] as “You abandoned me” coordinates better with the sentiment of Jonah 2:4[5] and better highlights Jonah’s attitude towards Yahweh (pp. 456–58). As Hoyt works with the text, she relies heavily on the LXX and the Targums for comparison of translation to great effect. However, sometimes in Hoyt’s fastidiousness to convey each word meaningfully, her word choice may overcomplicate the meaning or take on an awkward shade of meaning. For example, in Amos 2:7c she translates  $\text{אֶל-הַנְּעִרָה}$  as “to an extravagant feast” instead of some variation of “to the girl” (pp. 88–92), possibly softening the passage. In Jonah 1:6, the verb  $\text{נָרְדָם}$  in the captain’s question is translated, “Why are you *hibernating?*” (p. 432), an odd statement on human deep sleep. At other times her translation may be overly nuanced, such as her decision to translate the key word  $\text{גָּדוֹל}$  in Jonah as “important” (p. 358) instead of the more traditional “great” in relation to the city of Nineveh (cf. Jonah 1:2; 3:2, 3; 4:11). “Important” seems to fit least in the context of the last half of Jonah 3:3 given the tension between what God is saying and the comments on the size of Nineveh (cf. Hoyt’s comments on Jonah 3:3, p. 477).

Overall, the commentary makes several significant contributions to the study of Amos, Jonah, and Micah. In Amos, Hoyt provides a thorough discourse analysis of the literary structure of the judgments against the nations in Amos 1:2–2:16. Furthermore, she provides several helpful alternative translations to traditional readings such as in Amos 5:25. Here Hoyt translates the verse as a conducive ques-

tion that takes a positive answer instead of seeing a rhetorical question that anticipates a negative answer. Reading Amos 5:25 as a conducive question with a positive answer sets the reader up for the highlight of Israel's syncretism in Amos 5:26 (pp. 204–5, 209–16) that brings new clarity to the text.

In Micah, Hoyt makes a significant contribution through her radical adherence to the MT. This is particularly exemplary in her translation and exegesis of Mic 1:10–16 that many scholars believe needs significant reconstruction and emendation. Hoyt finds a way through the text to a very thoughtful interpretation with the recognition of significant wordplay in the text that highlights the sin throughout Judah (pp. 602–24). Similar attention to the MT can be seen in Hoyt's translation of the woe oracle in Mic 2:1–11 as well.

In Jonah, Hoyt makes a significant contribution by arguing for a less traditional interpretation of two key sections of the book. First, Hoyt understands Jonah's psalm in Jonah 2 as self-righteous, displaying an unrepentant attitude. Hoyt gives extensive evidence and reasoning why the psalm should be read in this light, but also realizes that the interpretation of the attitude of the psalm is also dependent on the readers' interpretation of the whole book (p. 465). Furthermore, it could be added to Hoyt's assessment that understanding the speaker of the psalm as self-righteous and unrepentant determines the reader's understanding of the book as a whole, making this a key exegetical decision for interpretation.

Second, the most surprising contribution in this commentary is Hoyt's interpretation of Jonah 4:11. Going against the majority of traditional interpretation, Hoyt argues extensively for Jonah 4:11 to be interpreted as a declarative statement instead of an interrogative statement (pp. 504, 513–26). She interprets the verse as follows, "But I, I will not have compassion on Nineveh, that important city, which has more than 120,000 people who do not know how to follow my laws, or *even its* numerous animals" (p. 516). Hoyt builds her case on: (1) the missing interrogative marker in v. 11; (2) the general syntax of the sentence comparing Jonah and Yahweh; (3) lexical issues surrounding the word **חַוֵּס**, "compassion"; (4) the use of a future yiqtol verb to compare Jonah's movement in regard to the plant in v. 10 with "Yahweh's future lack of movement in regard to Nineveh"; and (5) the use of the phrase **לֹא חַוֵּס**, "no compassion," that appears in the wider prophets as a signal of Yahweh's unwillingness to relent on executing judgement (pp. 516–17). Hoyt further supports her interpretation with the fact that Nineveh was destroyed in 612 BC. For Hoyt, the declarative ending gives a harsh theological truth that Yahweh will not always show mercy that counters, in her view, Jonah's self-righteous, arrogant, orthodox, rebellion (pp. 517–18). Her translation and understanding of this verse are uncomfortable, as Hoyt notes, though she goes on to support her distinct interpretation with compelling arguments to support her alternative ending of Jonah (pp. 518–21). In sum, Hoyt recognizes the weight of opting for a translation that departs from the traditional understanding, and yet ultimately points out that either translation makes a true theological statement about Yahweh; Yahweh shows compassion and/or Yahweh does not always show compassion (pp. 520–21). Hoyt makes a persuasive case for her translation of Jonah 4:11 and her case should be given serious consideration.

Overall *Amos, Jonah, & Micah* is a great addition to the scholarship on these three prophets. The commentary is an exceptional example of a well-evidenced and reasoned evangelical discussion of the biblical text that provides thought-provoking translation and engaging exegesis that bears much fruit. This is an important work for anyone wants to consider an alternate reading of Jonah or deeply consider the Hebrew text of Amos, Jonah, and Micah.

Jared C. Jenkins  
Gateway Seminary, Ontario, CA

*The State of New Testament Studies: A Survey of Recent Research.* Edited by Scot McKnight and Nijay K. Gupta. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2019, xiv + 496 pp., \$42.99 paper.

In 2004, Baker Academic published an excellent overview of *The Face of New Testament Studies*, edited by Scot McKnight and Grant Osborne. Contributors surveyed the state of the art in Jewish and Roman backgrounds, five hermeneutical topics, three areas of Jesus research, and twelve individual books or groups of books in the NT. Now McKnight has teamed up with Nijay Gupta to produce what is intended to be a similar survey as we head into the 2020s. It also has a chapter on Roman backgrounds, but Jewish backgrounds have been replaced by the theme of women in the NT world. General hermeneutics, Greek, and the OT in the NT appear again, but social-scientific interpretation and textual criticism have been replaced by Gospel genre. The section on Jesus has been expanded to Jesus, Paul, and NT theology, with six topics, while the individual book studies have been slightly shrunk. Presumably the changes reflect the areas the editors believe are today's cutting-edge topics. It does seem a bit odd, though, to lose the Jewish backgrounds and to have NT eschatologies and ethics singled out for special treatment without any overview of the numerous full NT theologies that have appeared over the last decade and a half.

Greg Carey's study of the Roman world appropriately focuses particularly on the upsurge of interest in empire criticism, with a side glance at the way American governments have recently acted imperially. In her chapter on "Women in the Jewish, Greco-Roman, and Early Christian World," Lynn Cohick ranges widely to treat not just standard topics but also Qumran, Gnosticism, and the Acts of Paul and Thecla, along with observing the changes in the guild from her student days to the present. Dennis Edwards's chapter is innocuously entitled "Hermeneutics and Exegesis," but it is actually a survey of postmodern trends, especially in the various advocacy movements such as African American, womanist and feminist, Latino and Latina, and postcolonial methods. The survey is almost entirely about theories and methods without actual illustrations, which is perhaps a little ironic since most of these movements emphasize beginning with praxis and prioritizing it above theory. En route it is almost shocking to read that some postcolonialists exclude native American interpretations precisely because they are native! On the use of the OT in the NT, Matthew Bates navigates the growing complexity of intertextual methods

as he supports an approach to interpretation that takes not just historical and literary contexts into account but also other co-texts and post-texts that independently treat the same OT passages. He thus wants to advocate for what he calls diachronic as well as synchronic intertextuality. Wes Olmstead underlines the influence of Richard Burridge's classification of the Gospels as Greco-Roman *bioi* but pleads for a bit more of the *sui generis* approach if for no other reason than that the object of these biographies (Jesus) is himself *sui generis*. For the study of Greek, Dana Harris offers an accessible and balanced overview of the developments and debates surrounding verbal aspect, discourse analysis, and deponency.

Rebekah Eklund tackles "Jesus of Nazareth," treating criteria of authenticity, social memory and oral tradition, issues of Gospel sources, eyewitness testimony and preserving the gist of things, early Jesus devotion, and "The Eastern Jesus" (by which she actually means perspectives that are not white, male, and Eurocentric, since many of them are still North or South American). Oddly, we get next to nothing about the actual results of the third and fourth quests (I agree with Paul Anderson that the SBL John, Jesus and History Seminar over the past fifteen years has indeed begun the fourth quest) or their portraits of Jesus. David Capes appropriately highlights the rapid growth of divine identity Christology, to which he himself has made important contributions, in his superb treatment of NT Christology. Michael Bird gives key nuggets from his book on Paul as an anomalous Jew to show him navigating Jewish, Greek, and Roman worlds. This is the one chapter that is less an overview and critique of scholarship and more a synthesis of the author's already published positions in interaction with others. (Yet we do get Bird's characteristic humor, e.g., Paul "nowhere tries to organize a cabal for the Judean People's Front, nor does he signal agendas analogous to #OccupyRome or #SlaveLivesMatter.") In contrast, Michael Gorman, also a major player in Pauline studies, really does give a sweeping overview of the landscape of Paul's theology, with a special focus on Wright, Campbell, and Barclay, even while briefly noting his own contributions, albeit modestly understated.

The strengths and weaknesses of Patrick Mitchel's chapter on NT eschatology both stem from his profession as a systematic theologian. He is completely abreast of the literature in the field but adds the contributions of recent systematians, which either adds to (integrationists' opinion) or subtracts from (purists' opinion) the overall effect. Gupta stays almost entirely at the level of synthesis or systems in scanning NT ethics, leaving him only one paragraph to list specific key ethical themes.

If there is a weaker section in this volume, and it is in no way glaringly weaker, it is the collection of chapters on the Gospels and Acts. Sometimes it is because the authors are much more selective in the areas of research on which they comment; sometimes it is because, in their healthy stress on new methods and historically marginalized interpreters, they seem to ignore some important mainstream developments altogether. Rodney Reeves does this the least with his essay on Matthew, though only by squeezing more into the subsections of Christology, use of the OT, and discipleship than might typically be found there. Jin Young Choi so focuses on newer approaches (literary, sociological, and ideological) that classic historical and

theological studies receive short shrift. Drew Strait has a good section on Luke's Christology but otherwise all his topics are literary, sociological, or ideological, including a good treatment of empire criticism. Alicia Myers on John includes almost none of the standard theological topics but excels with literary- and imperial-critical ones. She does acknowledge the work of the John, Jesus and History seminar, but only in the context of source criticism and notes none of the rest of the burgeoning "new look on John" (as John Robinson dubbed it years ago). Finally, Joshua Jipp is the most self-consciously selective, admitting how much he has passed over, but he handles well what he chooses to treat: "Acts and Judaism," "Acts and Greco-Roman religion and culture," "masculinity and ethnic reasoning," and "the portrait of God."

A more balanced coverage mostly returns when we come to the chapters on the rest of the NT, except that only Romans gets its own treatment among Paul's letters. McKnight covers the waterfront here, however, and arguably as well as anyone in the volume, though some of it seems unnecessarily repetitive after Gorman's overall chapter on Pauline theology. David Moffitt reminds us of how much new material there has been on Hebrews, related to its background, theology, rhetoric, specific passages, and especially its use of the OT. Mariam Kamell Kovalishyn has quickly established herself as the new "go-to" scholar on James in many academic circles, and she covers everything one should expect. Her final sentence, however, seems odd. Using Elsa Tamez's salutary warning against allowing James to be "intercepted" by those who have other agendas than James's own concern for the marginalized agrarian workers in his churches, she writes, "James risks continuing to be intercepted by those who would hear it well" (p. 424). However, those who would hear it well will not do this; it is those who are not willing to hear it as James intended it who intercept it, deflecting and blunting its force for well-to-do North Americans.

Abson Joseph offers a good balance between studies on 1 or 2 Peter using more traditional methods and those employing newer ones and is a rare but welcome contributor who also reflects on recent commentaries on both letters. Toan Do offers a disproportionately detailed survey of studies on John's epistles (mostly 1 John), given the entire lack of anything comparable on most of Paul's epistles. Perhaps it is because he stresses that one should study each of the so-called Johannine writings individually. One footnote seems unusually dogmatic, especially for a volume that appears to prioritize evangelical or moderate contributors, when it declares, "I deny any possible authorial relationship between Revelation and the Johannine writings" (p. 449, n. 20). Michael C. Thompson, finally, competently summarizes recent scholarship on Revelation, highlighting in closing how little recent discussion deals with the classic approaches of historicism, preterism, futurism, and idealism. "Not only have those categories proven unhelpful in exegeting the texts; modern interpretations have also demonstrated that Revelation is much more fluid and dynamic than such classifications allow" (p. 475).



Overall, this is an exceedingly helpful collection of essays to orient readers to the *status questionis* of the NT guild today.

Craig L. Blomberg  
Denver Seminary, Littleton, CO

*An Introduction to the Greek New Testament, Produced at the Tyndale House, Cambridge.* By Dirk Jongkind. Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2019, 124 pp., \$14.99 paper.

For those working within the field of textual criticism or directly on Codex Sinaiticus, Dirk Jongkind is a familiar name and likely a familiar face, too. He is the Academic Vice Principal and Senior Research Fellow in NT Text and Language at Tyndale House, Cambridge. He published the important *Scribal Habits of Codex Sinaiticus* (Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias, 2007) and many other wide-ranging articles on manuscripts and textual criticism. Along with Peter J. Williams, Jongkind is one of the primary architects and driving inspirations behind the recently produced critical edition of the Greek NT at Tyndale House.

As the title suggests, the publication of this book follows and works in tandem with the *Greek New Testament Produced at Tyndale House* (THGNT). It is a nice touch by the publishers at Crossway to produce both works about 7¾ inches tall and 5¼ wide. The book is short, at 124 pages, including acknowledgments, a glossary, and indices. In that space Jongkind covers a wide range of material in eight chapters: (1) Your Greek NT and the Manuscripts; (2) Practicalities (i.e. how to read the apparatus); (3) Manuscripts; (4) How Decisions Are Made (i.e. how to handle variants); (5) Why Not the Textus Receptus?; (6) Why Not the Byzantine Text?; (7) Biblical Theology and the Transmission of the Text; and (8) Where Do We Go From Here?

The purpose of the book is to tell the story behind the making of the THGNT and help readers enjoy the edition “without any nagging and distracting questions about the text or the edition” (p. 18). Therefore, in this small book, Jongkind has two primary aims. The first is to give some background and insight into the thinking of the editors of the THGNT. The second is to provide an apologetic for the textual and editorial decisions that were made.

Since readers will be familiar with a lot of the material, I want to focus on the features that make the THGNT unique. In chapter 2, Jongkind explains how to use the critical edition and some of its unusual features. Readers of critical editions will immediately notice the simplification of the apparatus. This editorial move stands in stark contrast to the need for whole books being devoted to deciphering the coded enigma that is the apparatus of the Nestle-Aland text. Jongkind offers an explanation and defense for this simplification.

In defense, the simplification of the apparatus is consistent with the stated aims of the THGNT. The editors want to present readers the NT in an unobstructed manner. As Jongkind says, “the text of the New Testament is the most important part of the edition,” which is also why the introduction and acknowledgments are in the back (p. 27).

The explanation for the simplification concerns the material used in producing the text, or more importantly, the material not used. A revealing statement is that “we (editors) do see it as our task to reflect the earliest manuscript tradition” (p. 35). This is an important insight because it indicates what evidence the THGNT prioritizes, namely, the most ancient manuscripts. Therefore, the THGNT does not use every possible piece of evidence; they do not cite lectionaries, patristic material, or non-Greek translations (pp. 30–34). Jongkind states there are three types of material used in the THGNT: “(1) all papyri, regardless of age; (2) all majuscules from the fifth century and earlier; and (3) a selection of later manuscripts,” which includes eleven majuscules and two minuscules (p. 48).

Some critics may think the material limitation impairs the accuracy of the text, and, while I do not think it does, such an assessment of the text is not directly part of this book review. In the end, Jongkind explains that the THGNT aims to present a critical edition of the NT that reflects the earliest circulated text into the hands of readers without unnecessary distractions.

Chapter 2 also describes and defends some of the unique features. First, and most obvious, the books of the NT are in a different order. The Pauline letters do not follow immediately after Acts. Instead, they come after the Catholic Epistles, save Hebrews. Jongkind explains that this different order is used in the most ancient codices (pp. 35–36).

The THGNT paragraphing is also different from other Greek editions—and English translations for that matter—because the editors are trying “to adopt the positions of paragraphs from the oldest witnesses” (p. 36). The adoption of the ancient paragraphing includes having the first letter of the paragraph ekthetic (i.e. extending into the left margin). Many readers will find this to be an aesthetically tasteful feature that, if nothing else, captures a historical feature of the NT transmission history.

The third unique feature worth highlighting is the variation in spelling (pp. 37–39). While their choices are consistent with historical scribal practice, some readers may find it works against the goal of making the NT accessible to the most people, even those who are just learning the language (p. 18). Many of those who learn Koine for theological studies, namely, preachers, pastors, and students of the NT, are unlikely to benefit from having spelling variation.

Lastly, in contrast to adopting the ancient practices of paragraphs and spelling variation, a surprisingly absent feature is the *nomina sacra* in an ancient form. Jongkind discusses the unique orthographic feature that appears in even the earliest NT manuscripts but does not explain why it is not adopted for the THGNT (p. 42). Perhaps the challenge is typesetting or other logistical matters. However, using the ancient scribal practice would be a great feature to include in subsequent editions.

Chapter 4 covers the common tasks of textual criticism. Jongkind shows his expertise and hands-on experience in this chapter. He discusses the evidence available today, insights into individual manuscripts, textual family lineage, and insights into scribal behavior. In an age where awareness of variants is expanding to those beyond the field of textual criticism—even to popular outlets—the delicate explanation of textual variation is important. For this reason, chapter 4 explains, “How

Decisions are Made,” and is the longest (pp. 65–85). Jongkind explains that the THGNT performs a balancing act of the available evidence, including internal (copying process, scribal performance, harmonization) and external considerations (comparing the manuscript readings).

Chapters 5 and 6 address the highly charged issues of the Textus Receptus (TR) and the priorist view concerning the Byzantine text form. Very few scholars hold the latter position, but Jongkind strikes an irenic tone in stating that the THGNT believes an eclectic approach is better for arriving at the original form of the NT. As for the former position, Jongkind displays himself as a scholar who also has a concern for the church and matters of faith. He evidences a sensitivity to the TR and KJV-only position but concludes that the beliefs are not based on material evidence but on a particular *a priori* position concerning providential preservation (pp. 89–90).

The last substantive chapter is “Biblical Theology and the Transmission of the Text.” While the chapter is short and may feel a bit underdeveloped, Jongkind offers an important aspect of textual criticism. A chapter on theological reflection is something text critics in the past did, but which they have not done for many years. Jongkind makes the provocative conclusion that textual variants and the need for eclectic textual criticism are not something to bemoan as a theological problem. Rather the resurrection of Jesus and the “dispersed situation of the people of God” are part of the cause and yet factors that are inherently good (pp. 107–8).

One problem that readers may feel is the tension in the book between, on the one hand, explaining and defending the THGNT and, on the other hand, trying to introduce the field of textual criticism more broadly. Since some knowledge of the latter is important for appreciating the former, the tension makes certain sections feel too rushed or cursory. However, readers who want what the book promises, *An Introduction*, will appreciate siding with brevity.

Lastly, while not wishing to distract from the intended goals, some interaction with other modern critical editions would have been appreciated. That is not a critique, but it is worth noting that the book really exists and only exists as a companion to the THGNT edition.

Overall, I think the goals of this book are achieved. Jongkind is able to present material in a rich and colorful way without assuming prior knowledge of the field of textual criticism or the process of making a critical edition. The intended audience for the book is “all who have the privilege to learn” Greek, “even if you have only just started learning” (pp. 17, 18). The book does a fine job of introducing the THGNT and offering an explanation for the unique contributions of the edition. In conclusion, Jongkind is a highly respected academic in his field who offers readers an excellent introduction to the THGNT.

Chris S. Stevens  
McMaster Divinity College, Hamilton, ON, Canada

*An Analysis of the Attributive Participle and the Relative Clause in the Greek New Testament.* By Michael E. Hayes. Studies in Biblical Greek 18. New York: Peter Lang, 2018, xxiii + 380 pp., \$94.95.

In this dissertation-turned-monograph (Ph.D. at Concordia Seminary, St. Louis; James Voelz, adviser), Michael E. Hayes analyzes every attributive participle and relative clause in the Greek NT in order to prove his hypothesis that they do not function as equivalents in this corpus of literature. Drawing on the linguistic distinction between restrictive and nonrestrictive modification, Hayes shows that attributive participles function restrictively about 85% of the time, while relative clauses that modify subjects function non-restrictively (providing additional information) about 80% of the time. Relative clauses that modify other positions (direct object, indirect object, etc.) are evenly split between restrictive and non-restrictive function, because in Koine Greek attributive participles only modify the subject position. As a result, relative clauses are the only alternative for modification for other positions.

Many Koine grammarians in the past have equated attributive participles and relative clauses indirectly if not directly, assigning similar English structures as acceptable translations and either disregarding the restrictive/non-restrictive distinction or listing both Greek structures as equally likely to be restrictive or non-restrictive (pp. 4–17). Hayes’s work lends credence to the suppositions of several more recent scholars, including Richard Young and James Voelz, who propose that these two syntactic constructions serve different semantic purposes within the Greek NT (p. 28).

Hayes organizes his work in six chapters plus two appendices. The introductory chapter (chap. 1) contains the typical dissertation introduction categories, including the thesis, status of the question, necessity of the study, methodology employed, etc. He presents definitions for restrictive and nonrestrictive as linguistic categories for noun modification from a 1980 dictionary of linguistics. Restrictive modifiers give essential information such that the “identity of the head [noun] is dependent upon the accompanying modification. ... [N]onrestrictive modifiers add nonessential descriptive detail to their heads but do not limit, specify, or identify them; they can be eliminated from the sentence without changing its basic meaning” (p. 3). This restrictive/non-restrictive distinction forms the foundation of Hayes’s research, with every attributive participle and relative clause being labeled in one of these two categories. One potential problem with this research is evident in the publication years of all the linguistics research that Hayes cites (mostly 1980s, but some early 2000s as well). More recent publications indicate a swing toward seeing restrictivity on a continuum instead of as a dichotomy (see, e.g., Markku Filppula, Juhani Klemola, Anna Mauraanen, Svetlana Vetchinnikova, eds., *Changing English: Global and Local Perspectives* [New York: Mouton De Gruyter, 2019], 97, who cite research going back to 1980 showing the continuum view rather than a dichotomy view for categories of restrictive and non-restrictive). This might solve some of Hayes’s “ambiguous” examples (pp. 215–16, 220–21) as well as provide impetus for more nuance in translation.

Chapter 2 concerns restrictivity in general and contains more precise definitions and explanations of its function in several languages, including English and Modern Greek. Chapter 3 then delves into restrictive clauses in the Greek NT and contains a narrative summary of Hayes's findings. He discusses examples of restrictive attributive participles and relative clauses, explaining why he made decisions based on exegetical (semantic) arguments. Overall, 84% of attributive participles are classified as restrictive, with about 98% of attributive participles lacking articles being restrictive. The outlying syntactic construction is the *substantive + article + participle* pattern, with only 59% of these categorized as restrictive (pp. 85–119). Later, Hayes explains that this is due to the many divine names and other proper names modified with this syntactic pattern (p. 216). Reorganizing the monograph from dissertation format to deal with issues logically would help prevent repetition of information and “dangling topics” that are not resolved until much later in the book.

Chapters 4 and 5 follow the same pattern but deal with non-restrictivity, so that chapter 4 gives general linguistic guidelines for the issue while chapter 5 contains summaries of non-restrictive participles and relative clauses in the Greek NT. The findings in chapter 5 again bear out Young's and Voelz's suppositions, with one important caveat. For relative clauses modifying a subject, at least 80% qualify as nonrestrictive. However, for relative clauses modifying any other parts of the sentence (direct or indirect object, possessors, etc.), the findings vary greatly, and summing all others together, the relative clauses not modifying a subject are fairly evenly split between restrictive (48%) and non-restrictive (52%) (pp. 159–92). Hayes later presents the Accessibility Hierarchy to explain these findings, since relative clauses can modify almost all positions (subject, direct object, indirect object, oblique, and possessor), while attributive participles can only modify subjects (the highest position on the Accessibility Hierarchy).

After trudging through mountains of statistics and swamps of syntax, the reader is rewarded with a vast expanse of interesting conclusions in chap. 6. It would be beneficial for this sixth chapter to be published as an article summarizing the highlights of this research in order to make the findings more accessible to all. Although the result of 84% restrictive attributive participles and 80% non-restrictive relative clauses could be considered helpful in judging a debatable instance of one of these constructions in the Greek NT, Hayes is able to take the discussion several steps further by analyzing the reasons for and patterns of the exceptions. His stellar and insightful analysis demonstrates the old adage that “the exception proves the rule.” For attributive participles, nearly all those that function non-restrictively modify proper names, usually the divine name, and a few others modify personal pronouns. These participles might be better labeled as substantival participles in apposition and may be adding emphasis to the *par excellence* of their referent (pp. 216–17). For subject relative clauses, most that function restrictively are due to verb tense issues, particularly with clauses that contain a future verb. A few other exceptions occur when *ὅστις* is used to distinguish from *ὅς* and when generic nouns such as *ἄνθρωπος* and *γυνή* are modified (pp. 213–15). For both attributive participles and relative clauses, some other exceptions are due to a Se-

mitic *Vorlage* where the author has tried to match the syntax of the original language, and a few exceptions seem to be simply ungrammatical (pp. 214–15, 220–21).

The appendices are nearly worth the expensive sticker price of the book for commentators and translators. Though of course one might quibble with one or two decisions (Do the participles modifying ἔθνη [nations/Gentiles] really function restrictively in Rom 2:14 and 9:30? Possibly, but it depends on one's understanding of Paul's argument throughout the letter [see pp. 106–7]), overall Hayes provides a meticulous analysis that is exhaustive in its breadth. Appendix 1 contains all adjectival and many adverbial participles in the Greek NT, giving verse, text, case, function, formation pattern, and (non-)restrictivity labeling for every participle. Appendix 2 then has every relative clause in the Greek NT, with its verse, text, case (of the relative pronoun), function (of the construction), formation pattern (of the clause), position (of the modified noun), and (non-)restrictivity labeled.

Generally, this monograph reads like a dissertation and suffers from the drawbacks of that genre. Some crucial ideas are reserved for the final chapter, most particularly the discussion of the Accessibility Hierarchy. His explanation is only a few pages long and arguments throughout the book would have benefitted from an introduction to the Accessibility Hierarchy in chapter 1. Instead, one must read time after time that relative clauses are nonrestrictive “when both constructions are grammatically and stylistically feasible” (p. 38), basically shorthand for when relative clauses modify subjects. Another “dissertation defect” is that the writing throughout is rather plodding and dry. Unfortunately, one benefit of a dissertation format—footnotes instead of endnotes—does not survive into the monograph, so that the reader must flip pages back and forth constantly to source ideas.

Overall, Hayes presents a compelling case for basing a decision on the restrictivity of the attributive participles and relative clauses in the Greek NT on syntactical instead of semantic grounds. Previously, exegetes found it necessary to analyze each instance individually and rely solely on semantic context for each determination. According to Hayes's work, unless an exceptional issue occurs, attributive participles are overwhelmingly restrictive and subject relative clauses nonrestrictive. The syntactic rule in Koine Greek seems to be on the whole well formed and well followed by authors of the Greek NT, and thus translators and commentators would now be well advised to consider that rule in their work.

Allyson Presswood Nance  
Shorter University, Rome, GA

*John the Baptist in History and Theology.* By Joel Marcus. Studies on Personalities of the NT. Columbia, SC: The University of South Carolina Press, 2018, x + 278 pp., \$59.99.

In this work, commissioned by the late D. Moody Smith, Duke Divinity School professor Joel Marcus argues that beginning in the first century “there was serious competition between followers of the Baptist and followers of Jesus ... and

this competition has thoroughly affected the presentation of John in our main source, the Gospels” (p. 9). Though this thesis guides the work as a whole, the argument for it is confined to an initial, brief chapter. The remaining five chapters do not so much develop the thesis as presuppose it. Instead, these chapters take up the quest for the historical Baptist, mirroring the conventional critical approach to the quest for the historical Jesus as taken, for instance, in J. P. Meier’s multi-volume work, *A Marginal Jew* (New York: Doubleday, 1991–2001; New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2009–2016). This includes a fundamental skepticism about the Gospels, which he regards as historically useful only after the layers of theological interpretation that have “encrusted” the Baptist’s image have been stripped away (p. ix), using the standard criteria of authenticity. Marcus acknowledges the criticism of these criteria that have led many to abandon or severely qualify them but still proposes to use them as “general guidelines” (p. 3). This seemingly moderate posture becomes in practice a rigorous—some would say ruthless—application of one criterion in particular: the criterion of dissimilarity with Christianity. Thus, the role of the opening chapter’s thesis about competition between the followers of the Baptist and the followers of Jesus is to guide the recovery of the historical reality buried within the Gospels’ “tendentious” presentation of John as a forerunner of Jesus, the Messiah. Material in the Gospels that challenges the thesis is either excised or given a meaning it does have within the Gospels. Though the Gospels are remarkably adroit in distorting history to mask embarrassing facts, the survival of a few inconvenient truths (such as John’s baptism of Jesus) indicates that there was “a limit to the malleability of tradition” (p. 119).

This approach to history results in a reconstruction that differs dramatically from the Gospels on which it primarily depends and opens the door to conclusions that many would regard as speculative. The second chapter revisits the debate about whether John was once a member of the Jewish sect that founded a community by the Dead Sea. Marcus concludes that he was and that it was from this community “that John learned to hope for an imminent end of the world” (p. 45). John broke from this community when he came to believe that he and not the community was the Isaianic voice crying in the wilderness and that the necessity of repentance had to be announced to everyone, even Gentiles. In chapter 3, Marcus argues that John saw himself as the Elijah whom many Jews believed would “return from the dead” (pp. 9, 113) before the end of the world.

In the fourth chapter, Marcus contends that John believed his role as the returning Elijah was to bring about a definitive, eschatological purification. John does this through his ministry of baptism, which he regarded as “a sacrament of salvation” —not simply preparation for eschatological salvation but its realization. John believed in a coming Messiah but did not entertain the possibility that Jesus was that Messiah (chap. 5). At best, John may have regarded the miracle-working Jesus, “his erstwhile disciple,” as an Elisha-like figure. Marcus allows that the evidence for an Elisha-like eschatological figure in pre-Christian Judaism is “slight” (p. 88), though it would be more accurate to say that the evidence is altogether absent. Still Marcus maintains that the Elijah-Elisha typology provides a way of holding together the disparate conclusions that John did not disparage Jesus but that the two men

regarded each other as competitors. In the final chapter, Marcus considers the significance of John's death at the hands of Herod Antipas. He regards the Synoptics' gruesome account of the death as "too good (or too bad) to be true" (p. 112) but affirms the reason given by Josephus: Herod feared John's influence on the crowds. John's apocalyptic movement not only anticipated the imminent collapse of the world's structures but also may "have united Jews with Gentiles—a dangerous mix for Antipas" (p. 112). That hypothesis leads to another. In denouncing Antipas's illicit marriage, John "may have intended to ignite a metaphorical firestorm that would soon be confirmed and completed by a literal firestorm from heaven instituted by God's baptizer-in-fire, Messiah" (p. 112).

Set within the context of Marcus's repeated description of John as a prophet of the imminent end of the world, this final statement bears a remarkable resemblance to Albert Schweitzer's famous depiction of Jesus's conscious provocation of the circumstances that led to his death: Jesus "lays hold of the wheel of the world to set it moving on that last revolution which is to bring all ordinary history to a close. It refuses to turn, and he throws himself on it. Then it does turn; and crushes him." According to Marcus, however, John does more than prophesy the end of the world. Though he attempts to provoke the advent of messianic judgment, John regards *himself* as the decisive agent of eschatological salvation already come. Only a punitive cleanup operation remains for the Messiah.

All of this feels quite removed from the widely held view that both John and Jesus are to be understood within the context of Jewish national restorationism. On that count, Marcus's account seems slightly revanchist in distancing John's apocalypticism from the prophets' hopes for Israel's restoration. At the same time, Marcus constructs a trajectory flowing out from John into a shadowy sect of Baptist loyalists for which the evidence turns out to be far weaker than their supposed impact on the Gospels would seem to require. It is possible that groups who cherished the memory of the Baptist persisted beyond the lifetime of the Baptist (cf. Acts 19:1–7). However, there is ample reason to doubt that the continued existence of a loyalist sect was the major worry for the Gospel writers that Marcus suggests. The evidence he marshals for the ongoing significance of such a group in the second century is alarmingly thin, confined to the fourth-century Pseudo-Clementines (which indicate that some disciples of John made messianic claims for him) and to the gnostic Mandaeans (who praised John as a prophet and disparaged Christ as deceiver). Mention of such a group is strangely absent from clearly second-century texts. Nevertheless, Marcus believes that the Pseudo-Clementines "probably" depend on earlier Jewish-Christian sources. He locates the origins of the Mandaeans prior to the third century but does not note that their primary literature dates from more than a millennium later. Marcus presumably knows this and admits that there is no evidence for a direct connection between the Mandaeans and the Baptist movement. Still, he conjectures that "the early Mandaeans, perhaps, had enough contact with these Baptist sectarians to know that they exalted John and opposed Christian claims for Jesus" (p. 21). The evidence he presents, however, serves not so much to demonstrate that the Mandaeans exalted John as that they derogated Jesus; John remains simply a prophet. Even on the shaky supposition that such



views can be traced back to Baptist loyalists in the second century, they do not map back to John who, on Marcus's own account, did not disparage Jesus as a deceiver and did not claim to be the Messiah.

Marcus's treatment of this material is meant to substantiate the claim that the various self-abnegations of the Baptist in the Gospels are Christian fabrications designed to win Baptist loyalists to Jesus. We get at the history behind the Gospel narratives when we hear the Baptist protest too much. In John 3:28, the Baptist tells his disciples, "I am not the Christ." This, for Marcus, proves the existence of late first-century disciples of John who believed that he was. Yet how would late first-century Baptist loyalists have come to such a belief? Could it have derived from John? No, Marcus argues that John preached a coming Messiah. Where, then? Marcus does not say. As Josephus attests and the Gospels assume, execution was the definitive refutation of messianic claims. And yet for Marcus, first-century disciples of John managed to innovate messianic claims about an executed figure who did not make such claims for himself.

Central to Marcus's view of John is that the Gospels deliberately obscured embarrassing truths about John, except when they did not. Thus, the embarrassing fact of John's baptism of Jesus remains. But if Christians have often found this embarrassing, what exactly is the evidence that the Gospel writers did? In fact, they insist on it, as evidenced by its presence throughout the tradition. Perhaps the chief value of Marcus's book is that it forces us to grapple with the crucial, *soteriological* role that John and his baptism play within the Gospels. In our interpretation of the Gospels, we need not deprive John of his role in order to preserve the exclusive saving significance of Jesus's death and resurrection. Rather, we must understand John's *soteriological* role—not least in his baptism of Israel's messianic representative—in order to see clearly the exclusive saving significance of Jesus' subsequent baptism into and out of death. As Jesus said, "Elijah does come first and restores all things. How then is it written that the Son of Man must suffer many things?" (Mark 9:12). Here Jesus poses not just a hermeneutical question but a theological one. If the Baptist is the agent of Israel's restoration, why must the Messiah be crucified?

Marcus's account betrays no doubt that what he has given us is anything less than pure, objective history. However, Marcus is uneasy about whether a book like this has any place in Christian theology. With uncommon candor he asks, "Should historical work . . . weigh heavily on the conscience of a scholar who claims to be a Christian? By writing a book like this one, has he helped make theological students unfit for their ministry (assuming that any of them read it)?" (p. 118). Modernist to a fault in his historical method, his rather more postmodern theological sensibilities step in to save the day. Seemingly unaware of the massive impact that his hermeneutical stance has had on his reading of the sources, he describes his book as simply a set of historical "observations." Christians should not flinch from such challenges to the claims of Scripture "because the truth is the truth" (p. 118). The Gospels are such a mash of discrepancies and disagreements that they invite ongoing debate "and this conversation can be seen as part of the continuing process of revelation" (p. 118). The Gospel accounts reveal a process of theological evolution

in which “memory and meaning are transfigured by later events” revealing “dimensions of the faith that were unclear to earlier generations” (p. 119). Though the language resembles that of Marcus’s Duke colleague, Richard Hays, the resemblance is superficial. The transfiguration Hays speaks of “is in no sense a negation or rejection” of Israel’s story but the continuation of that story in events that permit readers to grasp the ultimate significance of what lay before (Richard B. Hays, *Reading Backwards* [Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2014], 106). Marcus, by contrast, has in mind a “transfiguration” in which historical truth must be suppressed in the interests of theological truth that emerges with each new movement of the Spirit. He compares this to the change in theological convictions about slavery (which Christians once justified by exegesis that Marcus judges correct) or homosexuality. Historical truth, it seems, is objective, but theological truth shifts. So “sticking by traditional answers may sometimes strangle the Spirit” (p. 119).

There is much to be gained from Marcus’s learned and frequently provocative engagement with both primary and secondary sources. For those interested in the Baptist, the eleven (!) appendices and 100 pages of detailed footnotes and bibliography alone may justify the price of the book. However, readers unpersuaded by the unmoored theological commitments of the author are unlikely to be persuaded by the historical “truth” they produce.

Steven M. Bryan

Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, Deerfield, IL

*The Gospel of John in Modern Interpretation*. Edited by Stanley E. Porter and Ron C. Fay. Milestones in NT Scholarship. Grand Rapids: Kregel Academic, 2018, 249 pp., \$25.99.

Graduate students of a previous generation, preparing for comprehensive exams in NT studies, spent many a late night reading and rereading N. T. Wright’s new edition of Stephen Neill’s book *The Interpretation of the New Testament: 1861–1986* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988). This book served, for many, as a wonderful summary of the development of the discipline. Just last year, Scot McKnight’s and Nijay K. Gupta’s book *The State of New Testament Studies: A Survey of Recent Research* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2019) was published—a text of almost 500 pages that surveys “six major trends in the current state of NT scholarship” (p. 1). Together, both books provide a broad summary of how the discipline has developed over the last 160 years—important resources for graduate students. We must emphasize here, however, that both books provide just that: a summary of the development of NT studies as a discipline.

Now enters a new series of books—the Milestones in NT Scholarship series—with Stanley E. Porter and Ron C. Fay serving as general editors. The stated goal of this new series is to fill “a necessary place between a proper biography and a dictionary entry” (p. 9) by selecting modern NT interpreters that have made significant contributions to the study of the NT, corpus by corpus, and giving a detailed overview of their life and work. The first volume of this new series, *The Gospel of*

*John in Modern Interpretation*, summarizes the personal history and contribution to Johannine studies of eight significant scholars in the modern era. The eight scholars are B. F. Westcott, Adolf Schlatter, C. H. Dodd, Rudolf Bultmann, J. A. T. Robinson, Raymond E. Brown, Leon Morris, and R. Alan Culpepper. Each of the eight interpreters has a chapter devoted to him, submitted by a notable NT scholar in his or her own right. So, for example, the chapter on the conservative German NT scholar Adolf Schlatter is written by Covenant Theological Seminary's Robert Yarbrough, who is known in part for his work in making German NT scholarship accessible in English. The chapter on Leon Morris is written by Midwestern Baptist Theological Seminary professor and *JETS* editor Andreas J. Köstenberger, who himself is a prolific Johannine scholar, making him a suitable choice to assess the significance of Leon Morris's work. The origin of this first volume in the Milestones in NT Scholarship series was a set of papers given during the meetings of the ETS in 2014 and 2015.

In the preface of the book, the editors present a brief argument as to why these eight scholars were chosen as the focus of this volume. They agree that they could have easily added to the list of eight, which could have resulted in a massive volume, but they were also satisfied with the eight scholars who were chosen. Why? Because, they argue, these eight scholars "represent various current issues in Johannine scholarship of their times" (p. 13). Not only that, but they represent "a variety of methods," and they either serve as significant "innovators" or even as a "defensive response" against certain trends in the discipline (p. 13).

After an introductory chapter that traces chronologically the development of trends in Johannine studies from the late 1800s to the present, Porter contributes a chapter on the British scholar B. F. Westcott. Porter's thirty-five-page essay provides an overview of Westcott's early life and education, followed by a discussion of Westcott's relationship with the other two members of what has been called "the Cambridge triumvirate" (Westcott, J. B. Lightfoot, and F. J. A. Hort). The bulk of Porter's chapter on Westcott discusses the content of the latter's commentary on the Gospel of John, which adopts many more conservative and traditional lines of interpretation in response to the views propagated by the form of German historical criticism dominant at the time.

Yarbrough's chapter on Adolf Schlatter is a wonderful introduction to the one scholar who is probably the least familiar of the eight explored in this text. When one thinks of German biblical scholarship in the late 1800s and early 1900s, one would most likely think of names associated with liberal historical criticism not biblical conservatism. Schlatter, however, was a prolific German biblical scholar and represents the best of German conservative scholarship during this time period. Next to his massive commentary on Matthew's Gospel, he is perhaps most well-known for his important commentary on the Gospel of John (titled *Der Evangelist Johannes: Wie er spricht, denkt und glaubt* [Stuttgart: Calwer, 1930]).

Next is a chapter on C. H. Dodd by Beth M. Stovell of Ambrose University College and Seminary (Calgary, Alberta). Stovell highlights the significance of Dodd to the debate on the Fourth Gospel's eschatology—Dodd's view is that John's Gospel promotes "realized eschatology"—and the author also discusses the im-

portant contribution of Dodd to intertextuality issues. One notable absence in this chapter is any mention of Dodd's and Morris's important debate on the meaning of *hilasterion* ("propitiation" vs. "expiation"). Granted, the term *hilasterion* does not appear in John's Gospel, but it is found in 1 John and thus is relatable to important debates in Johannine studies.

Of course, any study on modern interpreters of the Gospel of John must include a chapter on Rudolf Bultmann, and this text includes an essay by Bryan R. Dyer of Calvin College. Dyer surveys the major influences on Bultmann's scholarship, including the history-of-religion school, existentialism, and dialectical theology. Rightly, Dyer concludes with John Ashton that "in spite of his [Bultmann's] pre-eminence, every answer Bultmann gives to the really important questions he raises—is wrong" (p. 120). However, one curious conclusion drawn by Dyer at the end of his chapter is that Bultmann's program of demythologizing is misunderstood by conservative interpreters. Dyer writes, "While demythologization is commonly seen, especially in conservative circles, as disruption or even corruption of the text, I hope that Bultmann's desire for the Christian proclamation of God's salvific work through Christ to be heard shines through" (p. 138–39). Dyer goes on to write, "Bultmann was not interested in discrediting or diluting the gospel message" (p. 139). This is a rather charitable assessment of Bultmann—perhaps more charitable than most evangelical interpreters would want to grant.

The next two chapters focus on J. A. T. Robinson and Raymond E. Brown, the first written by Porter and the second by Joshua W. Jipp from Trinity Evangelical Divinity School. Porter's thirty-page chapter on J. A. T. Robinson is titled "John A. T. Robinson: Provocateur and Profound Johannine Scholar." The title captures well the colorful career of Robinson, who was conservative on some issues and liberal on others. For example, Robinson was conservative with regard to authorship and dating issues in Johannine studies (Robinson is famous for his pre-AD 70 date for the Fourth Gospel) but on other issues he was a theological liberal (as represented in his famous book *Honest to God* [Philadelphia: Westminster, 1963]). Jipp's chapter on Brown highlights the important role that Brown played in the development of the Johannine community authorship thesis—a thesis that has more recently fallen on hard times as even the one-time-adherent-turned-critic Robert Kysar admits.

Andreas J. Köstenberger's chapter on Leon Morris reminds us that, ultimately, Christian biblical scholars engage in their work primarily as a way to understand the text as the inspired, authoritative word of God. Morris's work on the Johannine literature was unique in his day. His work was during the early years of neo-evangelical scholarship, a time when evangelicals were attempting to break out of the fundamentalist "box" and reengage the broader scholarly world while still holding fast to the historic faith. Many critical scholars of Morris's time simply rejected his work—he was seen by them as too archaic and was even sometimes derided as being pre-critical. Yet his scholarship was a detailed broad engagement of various views, demonstrating breadth and depth, while at the same time drawing conclusions that were commensurate with his evangelical worldview perspective. He became a role model for younger evangelical scholars.

The last scholar treated in this text is an essay on R. Alan Culpepper, written by Ron C. Fay. Fay's treatment is a helpful overview of the influence of Culpepper's role in the rise of narrative criticism. Culpepper's *Anatomy of the Fourth Gospel* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983) remains an important ground-breaking work that explores the Gospel of John as story. A four-page final chapter, summarizing key findings in the book, concludes the book, along with standard Scripture and author indices.

As indicated at the beginning of this review, the first volume in this new series will be helpful to graduate students reviewing key figures in modern Johannine interpretation. As the series progresses and new volumes are added, theological librarians will also find each one to be a helpful addition to their collection. We look forward to the second volume in the series coming out in late Fall 2020 or Spring 2021, a volume on modern interpreters in the study of Luke-Acts.

C. Scott Shidemantle  
Geneva College, Beaver Falls, PA

*Reading Romans with Eastern Eyes: Honor and Shame in Paul's Message and Mission.* By Jackson Wu. Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2019, xi + 231 pp., \$20.00 paper.

What do shame and honor have to do with Paul's mission? Everything, if you ask Jackson Wu. For decades anthropologists and missiologists have argued that the shame-honor motif serves as a pivotal paradigm for understanding an Eastern mindset. In his newest book, *Reading Romans with Eastern Eyes: Honor and Shame in Paul's Message and Mission*, Wu makes a similar kind of claim, based on Romans. A strong educational background in biblical studies completed in the West combined with twenty years of cross-cultural living and teaching experience in the East makes Wu uniquely qualified to write this groundbreaking book.

Wu's study explores Paul's message, especially as articulated in his letter to Rome from an honor-shame perspective. This important book adds to the recently emerging conversation on glory in Pauline studies (e.g. see the work of Newman, Gaffin, Morgan and Peterson, Berry, Burton, Jacob, Sivonen, Jackson), stimulates fresh thinking on the honor-shame cultural framework up until now often relegated to studies by missiologists, and engages the ongoing discussion on the relationship between salvation paradigms of shame-honor and guilt-justification in Paul.

The purpose of the book is to answer the following question: "How did Paul's theology [in Romans] serve the purpose of his mission within an honor-shame context?" (p. 3). Even though the book is not a commentary, its twelve chapters are divided by the order found in Romans. Wu starts his exploration in chapter 1 by providing an Eastern lens to read Romans. According to Wu, although the contemporary Eastern and ancient perspectives are not equal, there are significant similarities. Most importantly, they are both "shame-honor cultures" that emphasize *tradition* (stability), *relationship* (loyalty, collective identity), and social *hierarchy* (position and authority). "These three factors shape a person's social status or 'face'" (p. 13). Wu insightfully contrasts the ascribed honor, prioritized by East

Asians, from the achieved honor, preferred in Western contexts (p. 15). By engaging with recent scholarship, he also introduces the massive honor-shame theme found in the Bible, especially in Romans.

In chapter 2, Wu shows how Paul's "missionary agenda is embedded within pastoral concern for the Romans, which is couched in the larger narrative of Israel's history" (p. 26). Paul communicates indirectly to address the problems in the church in Rome: their misplaced identity (idolatry) is an obstacle to God's mission. Rather, believers' collective identity in Christ, namely the correct view of the church, should shape their sense of the mission.

Chapters 3 through 6 explore Romans 1–4 in light of an honor-shame perspective. Wu shows how Paul's view on sin is rooted in idolatry that is demonstrated in both the life of Adam (i.e. humanity) and Israel, by exchanging the glory of God for created things. Human beings are not fulfilling their vocation as a reflection of the glory of God. The consequences are brutal: impurity and shame before God, "losing face," seeking face by people pleasing (pride), dishonor before disobedience, and chasing a name for themselves (chap. 3). Additionally, ethnic pride—categorizing people as "us" vs. "them," "insiders" vs. "outsiders"—is the fruit of sin and shame (chap. 4). Yet these categories are removed in Christ: "God does not disregard collective identity; he reorients it." (p. 61). In chapter 5, "Christ saves God's face," Wu describes the work of Christ in terms of honor-shame: "The shame of Christ vindicates God's honor ... Christ's sacrifice saves God's 'face'" (p. 81). In chapter 6, in explaining justification from an honor-shame perspective, Wu emphasizes the importance of the *how* and *who* of justification by faith in Christ. "*How* individuals are justified is an implication of Paul's main point: *who* can be declared righteous" (p. 86). Certainly, he can expect pushback to statements like this from those who understand Paul with an old perspective lens.

Chapters 7 to 9 investigate Romans 5–8 from an honor-shame perspective. Chapter 7 "presents Christ as a 'filial' son, who faithfully restored honor to God's kingdom and restores the human family" collectively (p. 4). Chapter 8 is a rich exegetical, theological, and devotional feast on glory. "Christ was honored through shame; therefore, God's people will be honored through shame" (p. 121). Wu challenges the traditional reading of Romans 7 (see chap. 9) by "arguing that Paul does not prioritize the individual and guilt" (p. 129). Rather "I" refers collectively to Israel during the Exodus, and consequently Paul's view of humanity is more optimistic than often argued by Western theologians. Even though he has many helpful insights from the text, not every exegete will agree with everything that Wu says in this chapter.

Chapter 10 examines how the OT, especially Isaiah 28, 41, 45, and 50, shapes Paul's use of honor and shame in Romans 9–11. Although he misses Marilyn Burton's recent detailed study *The Semantics of Glory: A Cognitive, Corpus-Based Approach to Hebrew Word Meaning* (Leiden: Brill, 2017), Wu shows convincingly how the Lord saves his people through the faithful covenant-keeping king. God rescues his people from shame into his glory.

Chapters 11 and 12 talk about the ethical implications among God's people. They have been freed from competitive practices for status and self-exaltation to

honor Christ, and consequently to honor others above themselves. This enables them to live as a humble and unified and harmonious society where relationships flourish, even among people from diverse social backgrounds.

Wu is not a stranger to controversy, claiming that others have misrepresented glory-shame theology ([www.patheos.com/blogs/jacksonwu](http://www.patheos.com/blogs/jacksonwu)). In addition, his earlier groundbreaking book on the same motif, based on his dissertation, *Saving God's Face: A Chinese Contextualization of Salvation through Honor and Shame* (Pasadena, CA: WCIU, 2012), received criticism for overly academic language and for his polarizing views between justification and shame language. *Reading Romans with Eastern Eyes* is, however, constructive in voice, generous and irenic in tone, non-provocative in its approach, and accessible to all readers. It is not meant to stir a polemic but to serve as a fresh and prophetic voice in the West about a neglected aspect of salvation: from shame to glory. The author succeeds in this purpose with distinction. Wu's book is a vital voice in response to an imbalanced reading that focuses solely on the legal justification aspect in Romans. He is careful *not* to set the justification legal language and the shame-honor motif as competitive hermeneutical keys. He does not seek to deny or minimize the doctrine of legal justification found in Romans either. Rather, his aim, which he fulfills successfully, is to elucidate the importance of the honor-shame motif.

Wu's work is not without some weaknesses. First, at times, he may underplay the historical Western understanding of glory-salvation. Certainly, the doctrine of union with Christ, including its emphasis on glorification (including deification) has been present in various Reformers' writings (e.g. Luther and Calvin) and later Lutheran and Reformed readings of Paul for centuries, as recent scholarship has confirmed. Second, focusing merely on a collective honor-shame perspective may minimize the individual's need for legal approval before a holy God. To be sure, the author's purpose is not to try to silence other motifs and themes (especially imputation); rather, he presents the book of Romans from one major neglected perspective. Third, and perhaps most substantially, the scope of Wu's book lacks linguistic exploration on glory. Should the examination include primarily a single lexeme, *doxa*, or comprise several lexemes that share the same semantic domain? Also, Wu focuses on the *honor* aspect of glory in Romans to such a degree that he overlooks at least the possibility that it may also carry the meaning of *visible manifestation and presence*. Wu omits this controversial topic even though he must have been aware of it after reading Newman and Jacob.

Despite of these minor shortcomings, the book is captivating reading and enlarges the reader's capacity to reflect on the glory of God, individual and corporate shame, and a collective aspect of salvation from a neglected point of view. Well-placed (but not over-used) personal and cross-cultural stories at the beginning of chapters add flavor and contribute to the readability of the book. A helpful discussion guide, up-to-date bibliography, and carefully crafted indexes (author, subject, Scripture) make the book even more accessible and user-friendly. Wu's book is well researched with a judicious use of quotations and informative (yet not overly long) footnotes, which are filled with recent literature on the topic. His ability to interact

with recent biblical scholarship, compare missiological ideas between East and West, and engage readers' hearts is stimulating and refreshing.

No serious Pauline student or scholar can afford to miss reading this book. Indeed, all people in the West are encouraged to engage with it. Not often is a book as exegetically vigilant, theologically sound, missiologically eye-opening, and devotionally heart-warming. This book fulfills all those aspects. You will never quite read Romans, Paul, and the whole Bible with the same lens after interacting with the ideas found in *Reading Romans with Eastern Eyes*.

Mikko Sivonen

Agricola Theological Institute, Helsinki, Finland

*Colossians and Philemon*. By G. K. Beale. Baker Exegetical Commentary on the NT. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2019, xxvi + 514 pp., \$54.99.

This scholarly commentary on the Greek text of Colossians and Philemon by Gregory Beale, Professor of NT and Biblical Interpretation at Westminster Theological Seminary (Philadelphia), reflects the author's interests in the use of the OT by the NT and in the biblical-theological concept of the temple as God's earthly dwelling place.

Contents include an introduction (pp. 1–21) and commentary on Colossians (pp. 23–365), introduction (pp. 367–74) and commentary on Philemon (pp. 375–437), and five excursuses (pp. 439–57). The latter cover: the invalidity of using linguistic features as criteria of authenticity, defining what constitutes an OT allusion, Christ's messianic rule over the Gentiles as an OT mystery, circumcision and uncircumcision as symbolic of spiritual realities even in the OT, and the implications of Paul's view of slaves for today.

Paul himself authored Colossians, according to Beale. Critical objections to apostolic authorship (vocabulary, style, development of ideas) fall short. Owing to the distance of Rome from Colossae, Beale leans toward a provenance from Ephesus in the early 50s rather than from Rome in the early 60s, despite the lack of evidence for an imprisonment of Paul at Ephesus; about the place of writing, however, Beale finds it admittedly "hard to be confident" (p. 8). The syncretistic teacher(s) at Colossae invited people to seek God's presence by practicing Torah regulations for the tabernacle/temple—dietary rules, festivals, sabbaths—while mixing in an idolatrous element of angel veneration. Beale's literary determination that "the main point and goal of the body of the letter" falls on Paul's instruction to pray for the spread of the gospel (Col 4:2–6; see p. 21) may strike readers as eccentric.

As in his commentary on the Revelation to John, Beale pursues every imaginable allusion to the OT in Colossians with maximizing vigor. For the Apocalypse such an approach is appropriate. It is questionable in Colossians, an epistle containing not a single OT citation. Does Paul's use of "saints" in the greeting (1:2) allude to Daniel 7 (p. 26)? Does the gospel's fruitfulness "in all the earth" (1:6) hark back to the creation mandate in Gen 1:28, suggesting that the new creation is now inaugurated (pp. 41, 48–50)? Need we trace Paul's prayer that the Colossians be filled



with “all spiritual wisdom and understanding” (1:9) to a cluster of OT passages (Exod 31:3; 35:31–2; 1 Kgs 7:14; Isa 11:2–3) that “enforce the theme of the temple” (p. 55; cf. pp. 68–72)? Does Paul’s positive injunction to “buy up the time” (4:5) really recall Nebuchadnezzar’s impatience with the delaying tactic of his magicians (Dan 2:8; see p. 344)? These few instances give the flavor of Beale’s method. Just occasionally he betrays awareness of “the risk of overanalysis” (p. 206).

God’s presence with humanity in the incarnate Son of God brings to fulfillment the deepest meaning of the OT temple. Beale’s unique thesis is that Paul in Colossians pits this truth against a Judaizing ritualism. So Beale perceives in Col 1:19 and 2:9, where Paul says the fullness of deity was pleased to dwell in Christ, not only assertions of Christ’s ontological deity, but quite specific overtones of Christ being the new temple whom God fills (citing Ps 68:16–17 [LXX 67:17–18]; Isa 6:1, 3; Ezek 43:5; 44:4; see pp. 108–10, 125–28, 176–78). The goal of Christ’s reconciling work, to “present” believers holy and blameless and irreproachable before God (1:22), uses “the language of acceptable sacrifices,” not of justification as such (p. 115). When Paul encourages his readers to remain “founded and steadfast” (Col 1:23), Beale hears this as offering assurance that they, being in Christ, are metaphorically part of the sacred precinct (p. 117). Paul’s exhortation that his readers remain “rooted” and “built up” in Christ (2:7) continues the “temple imagery” (p. 173). For believers to be “filled” in him (2:10) identifies the church with the temple (p. 179). All this is “to counter the errorists’ claims that they experience visions of and participate in the worship of the heavenly temple” (p. 180), a reconstruction that Beale bases largely on his interpretation of the enigmatic and much disputed clause  $\alpha \dot{\epsilon} \acute{\omicron} \rho \alpha \chi \epsilon \nu \acute{\epsilon} \mu \beta \alpha \tau \epsilon \acute{\upsilon} \omega \nu$  in Col 2:18. This he takes to describe the opponents’ claim to have entered by means of abstentions into the innermost sanctuary of heaven in ecstasies (pp. 227–37). What unites the strictures of the false teaching mentioned in Col 2:16, 21–3—and what the vast majority of commentators have failed to notice—is that the purpose of these OT rules was “to enable the Israelites to become clean and be able to enter into God’s temple” (p. 215).

Have these nuances waited for so long a time to be discovered by a sensitive piece of detective work, or have the commentator’s research interests colored his exegesis? If, after all, in Paul’s context the notorious NT *hapax legomenon*  $\acute{\epsilon} \mu \beta \alpha \tau \epsilon \acute{\upsilon} \omega$  should have the sense, not of *enter in* but of *stand on*—a sense not noted in BDAG but attested in classical sources (see Liddell-Scott, Thayer, and Moulton-Howard ii §118[b])—then for the opponent to “take his stand on” visions would have a parallel in the following participial clause, “vainly puffed up by his fleshly mind” (Col 2:18), and this would be antithetical to “holding fast to the Head” as the authority who coordinates and nourishes Christ’s body (v. 19). However, in that case the heavenly temple would vanish from relevance to the heresy, and the tenability of Beale’s many proposed allusions to the true temple would hang on the slenderest of threads.

Regarding Paul to Philemon, likewise sent, Beale surmises, from Ephesus in the 50s, Beale is reluctant to embrace the customary view that Philemon’s slave Onesimus was a runaway thief. He prefers the scenario that Onesimus sought out Paul to mediate for him with his master, his offence lying simply in going absent

without leave (pp. 368–70). In view of contemporary analogies this is possible; the letter does not inform us of the exact nature of Onesimus's fault. Once again readers may be surprised to learn that the epistolary argument points to Philemon's refreshment of Paul's heart (v. 20) as its main point and goal (p. 374).

Paul's coy manner makes it hard to be sure how much he was hinting Philemon might do to refresh him. Paul's only explicit request is that the master welcome back his slave, now a newly born Christian brother through Paul's evangelistic influence (v. 10), and allow Paul to pay any outstanding damages (vv. 17–19). Should Philemon consider bearing the loss without applying to Paul for redress? Release Onesimus from service at home in Colossae to return to Paul as his personal assistant on Philemon's behalf? Manumit Onesimus altogether? Again and again, Beale speaks as though the middle of these options was quite clearly Paul's drift. That may be so, but is Paul piling on pressure for Philemon to take a particular course of action, or is he throwing out suggestions? Could Paul be leaving the entire range of possibilities open to give Philemon complete freedom to choose in what way to "do even more than I say" (v. 21)?

Throughout the commentary Beale's canvass of existing literature is painstaking and puts the reader in a position to assess debatable points in light of all opinions, while offering his own independent line, always worth weighing. Especially to be commended is Beale's sure finger on the Christological phrases "image of the invisible God" and "firstborn of all creation" (Col 1:15). It has proven all too tempting for commentators to take "image of" to mean the incarnate Son makes God visible. But at the opening of this cosmological half of the so-called hymn (vv. 15–17), the Son's incarnation, essential for verses 18–20, is not yet in view. Verse 15 refers to the eternal state that antedated Christ's role as creator, for logically (ὄτι, v. 16) his universal creatorship explains the former verse (pp. 91–92). Therefore, in verse 15 "he is" is a timeless present (p. 81), "image of ... God" denotes homogeneity, not visibility (p. 84), and "firstborn of all creation" the priority of his being generated, to the fiat by which he called the world into existence (pp. 88, 96). But why must Beale burden his discussion by harping on an Adamic background for both phrases (pp. 80–91) that is unnecessary for his sounder exegesis, forcing him into convolutions like "the incarnate Christ is the perfect ectypal image reflecting his preincarnate archetypal image" (p. 82; cf. p. 85)?

On the whole Beale's assiduous commentary on Colossians and Philemon maintains a high standard of faith working itself out in precise scholarship. Even if one remains unpersuaded by some of its peculiar accents, it offers a broad perspective and plenty of grist for thought and merits a strong commendation.

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

*1 and 2 Thessalonians*. By Nijay K. Gupta. Zondervan Critical Introductions to the NT. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2019, 320 pp., \$44.99.

This new series from Zondervan (Zondervan Critical Introductions to the NT) will provide readers with a resource that allocates critical information (hence the series title) for a given biblical book into a single volume. As a result, researchers will have a veritable springboard from which to leap into the deeper study of both the biblical text and the various contexts one must consider when exegeting the text. Volumes in this series will essentially offer book-length discussions of issues that may receive only brief treatments in heftier tomes, such as many shorter NT introductions or commentaries, while offering more digestible discussions of these matters than longer, more technical series. This varies depending on the series, of course, but this series will provide a needed resource for those who may not have the means of securing more critical commentaries where extended discussions on these matters are typically housed. Furthermore, there may be readers who do not feel they *need* a lengthy, critical commentary, but would still like something academic and accessible.

Assuming that this pilot volume serves as the blueprint, the books in this Zondervan series will explore the following topics: (1) textual criticism; (2) backgrounds; (3) themes; and (4) history of interpretation. The book is set up so that, in cases like this when there are multiple letters, each letter is treated individually under the same general headings. Beginning with textual criticism, Gupta delves headlong into an area of exegesis that perhaps many dread. Working from the text of the NA<sup>28</sup>, Gupta capably guides the reader on a truncated jaunt through the witness to the text of 1 Thessalonians, as well as some of the pricklier text-critical questions, on which he offers brief statements of the problem. Gupta offers more information in the following section, which concerns the textual integrity of the text. The first letter to the Thessalonians is a case in which textual integrity is not really questioned in scholarship anymore, which Gupta notes. Despite this, Gupta offers a couple of pages on one of the lingering questions of yesteryear's scholarship, namely, the interpolation theory swirling around 1 Thess 2:13–16.

Much like the question of 1 Thessalonians' textual integrity, there is also no serious concern about Paul as its author, and so only a brief overview of this question is covered. More detailed are the matters of genre, style, structure, and sources, all of which are debated issues in the scholarly literature. This chapter concludes with a helpful table of how several scholars break down the letter's structure (pp. 41–46).

Chapter 2 probes the world behind Paul's letter, and it is a highlight of the book (as is its counterpart for 2 Thessalonians on pp. 197–229). Gupta addresses a number of factors related to the first letter's background, but he devotes the first half of the chapter to a triad of important issues: Thessalonica's religious environment, the presence of Jews in Macedonia, and the role of Acts in constructing the historical situation behind 1 Thessalonians. Gupta then turns his attention to several *interpretive* matters derived from the text: persecution, eschatological anxiety, and the parousia, with brief notes on some of the minor issues that surface as well.

Following this, Gupta offers one of the more helpful elements in this book—a summary of major works on Thessalonians in recent decades. Citing the comparative sparseness of works devoted solely to the Thessalonian correspondence and the issues therein, Gupta summarizes these important works vis-à-vis the background questions noted previously (i.e. Thessalonica's religious environment, the presence of Jews in Macedonia, and the role of Acts). This section alone is worthwhile of any reader's time, especially those who are doing more in-depth research and would like a pointer to some critical works. In a section summarizing such important works as those by Jewett, Barclay, Ascough, Nicholl, Malherbe, Still, and Donfried, it is a bit surprising that David Luckensmeyer's important monograph *The Eschatology of First Thessalonians* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2009) is not listed. I suspect authors must exercise a good deal of restraint to stay within the publisher's requirements, and this may have been why it was not included. It is thankfully located in the bibliography.

Chapter 3 is concerned with the various themes that pervade the correspondence (e.g. eschatology, hope, etc.). Here Gupta examines these themes in brief but provides readers with enough discussion to prompt them to further study. Adequately footnoted, Gupta works his way through various thorny issues with aplomb.

Chapter 4 will also be of great service to readers as it provides a concise history of interpretation for the letters. The breadth of this chapter (and its counterpart for 2 Thessalonians) is obviously scaled down to provide a sort of birds-eye view of the letters as major interpreters have read them throughout history. While quite expectedly Gupta addresses early church writers such as Ignatius, Irenaeus, and others, and later interpreters like Martin Luther and John Calvin, it was refreshing to see a brief section on "non-academic uses of 1 Thessalonians." Though only a couple of pages in length, it is good to see how biblical texts may have inspired others outside of academia and thus remain tethered to those outside of academia. This chapter concludes with a section like that found in chapter 3, namely, a discussion of major works on Thessalonians. This section, however, is considerably shorter, but still provides useful information. The second half of the book mirrors the first and is concluded with a robust bibliography and indexes.

The question will certainly arise about the necessity of such volumes—are they *really* necessary? Considering the wealth of resources available to students of the Scriptures, is a series such as this really warranted? The answer will always be a resounding "yes." The Bible itself continues to be fertile ground for research and will likely always be so. Yet also important in this age of plenty is the value of perspective. Though many authors might share similar perspectives, no two are identical. It is of value, then, to hear what those voices might say. In between the larger edifices of agreement lie strands of unique perspectives, methods, and insights that another may not have had. This makes each individual work valuable (to varying degrees) and should continue to be a driving force in the publication of works that cover familiar ground, but yield different interpretations and applications.

Those who have read Gupta's works in recent years know that he is a careful and judicious scholar, characteristics that seep through every page of this work. As with any volume like this, there will be plenty of points on which readers will invar-

iably disagree; however, Gupta has no ax to grind here and offers a rather balanced treatment of evidence. He does not shy away from his position on the issues discussed herein, but neither does he yield to heavy-handedness to make a case. He presents the evidence (fairly, in my opinion) and makes his position known on that basis. Interactions with scholarship are peppered throughout this work and each is conducted with critical eyes and a respectful tone. Gupta does not delve into matters that are trivial or granular, but focuses on the more pressing issues that are more critical to the letters.

In this initial volume, Nijay Gupta capably braves the waters of Thessalonians research and gives readers a treasure trove of relevant and current research. Gupta accomplishes this without seeking to supplant previous volumes of similar scope and certainly not those whose pages greatly exceed this volume. As described earlier, this series will serve as a springboard for additional research, and this volume in particular will be sufficient by itself as a tool to understand better Paul's letters to the Thessalonians. Gupta has provided a volume that will certainly serve as a trustworthy and reputable starting point for further study. Well researched and adequately footnoted, Gupta's work is a fine first step for this series and has set the bar rather high for subsequent volumes.

D. Jason Gardner  
Dallas Theological Seminary, Dallas, TX

*Faith as Participation: An Exegetical Study of Some Key Pauline Texts.* By Jeanette Hagen Pifer. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2/486. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2019, xiv + 258 pp., €79.00 paper.

This book is a study of the concept of faith in Paul's theology with an eye toward the broader (and more debated) issues about the center of Paul's theology, the *πίστις Χριστοῦ* construction, and the relationship between divine and human agency in Paul's soteriology. With such a broad scope it may be surprising to hear that this is a published dissertation (under the guidance of John Barclay), but Pifer navigates the issues well by focusing on her specific question about the nature of faith in 1 Thessalonians, 1–2 Corinthians, and Galatians, and then showing the implications of her exegesis for these broader issues. These issues are significant after all because they are part of the reason that human faith has been so downplayed in the modern study of Paul, as Pifer rightly observes (p. 1). Many have argued that justification by faith is less central in Paul's theology than participation or union with Christ, that *πίστις Χριστοῦ* refers to Christ's faith or faithfulness rather than our faith, and that any human agency in salvation (including our faith) is competing with divine agency rather than compatible with it. Pifer's study of faith in letters that are rarely considered in these debates brings more perspective to the issues by showing that, for Paul, human faith is not at odds with gracious divine agency, Christ's saving work, or participation with Christ. On the contrary, she argues, "faith is, for Paul, the mode of self-negating participation in the prior gracious work of Christ" (p. 228).

Pifer's study begins with an introductory chapter and then three chapters respectively addressing faith in 1 Thessalonians, 1 Corinthians, and 2 Corinthians. Next comes what is probably the most important chapter in the book, her study of Gal 2:15–21. I say that it is most important because this is the chapter in which she draws on her insights from the previous chapters to address the πίστις Χριστοῦ debate, the question of divine and human agency, and the center of Paul's theology. This chapter also interacts deeply with the commentaries on Galatians written by J. L. Martyn and his student M. de Boer, both of whom argue strongly for the idea that πίστις Χριστοῦ refers not to our faith but to Christ's faith or faithfulness in the cross. A final exegetical chapter studies faith in the rest of Galatians 3–6, and the concluding chapter of the book synthesizes Paul's concept of faith and teases out Pifer's thesis in Romans and Philippians.

Paul's concept of faith is developed inductively through Pifer's careful exegesis of Paul's letters. Somewhat unique to her study is attention not only to πίστις and its cognates but to conceptual parallels in Paul's letters. In 1 Thessalonians, we learn that faith is "vibrantly active" in that it produces work (1 Thess 1:3). Yet it is an "active passivity" that "receives" the gospel or the prior gift of grace (1 Thess 1:6; 2:13). Faith is dynamic in that it "has the potential to grow or to wane" (p. 52), especially as it encounters suffering. In addition, it is participatory in that it is "the very means by which the Christ-event [his death and resurrection] envelops others" (p. 60). In 1 Corinthians 1–2, we discover that faith is "self-negating" and boasts only in the Lord (p. 71). In 1 Corinthians 15, we learn that faith is "a continuous self-involvement in a new reality in Christ" (p. 78; "standing in" and "holding fast") and that it finds its objective basis in the resurrection. In 2 Corinthians, we see again that faith is "self-negating," confident not in one's own ability but in God, and also that it is "Christologically shaped" in that our confidence toward God is "through Christ" (2 Cor 3:4) and assured by his resurrection (pp. 96, 116, 117). My summary here does not do justice to the nuances of her exegesis to which I would point readers for more depth. Pifer synthesizes the Pauline conception of faith in the conclusion as "at once both self-negating and self-involving dependence on Christ. Faith is self-negating when the believer looks away from the self, discovering his or her insufficiency, weakness, and neediness. . . . At the same time, faith is a participation in Christ" (p. 219). Pifer's synthesis helps us to see how human faith for Paul is not a self-achieving, anthropocentric work, an important concern of Richard Hays and others who hold the "faithfulness of Christ" (subjective genitive) view of πίστις Χριστοῦ. I wondered, though, if her positive appraisal of Bultmann's view of faith in Paul (e.g., pp. 150–51) should be tempered more by Hays's concerns about its strong orientation toward self-understanding rather than the story of Christ.

One of Pifer's most significant contributions, in my view, is her deep interaction with the powerful theological arguments of Martyn and de Boer, which are rooted in the text of Galatians. Pifer runs through the typical arguments, pro and con, for the πίστις Χριστοῦ debate, as she must. Yet she moves beyond these arguments to a make a compelling theological argument for the objective genitive view ("faith in Christ"), which is rooted in her exegesis of 1 Thessalonians and 1–2

Corinthians. What Pifer shows is that the theological concerns of Martyn and de Boer, who want to emphasize divine priority in salvation, are not in fact compromised by reading *πίστις Χριστοῦ* as a reference to our faith in Christ. “We have consistently seen that faith is not a condition or human accomplishment in Paul’s view. Nor does faith disparage the priority of divine action” (p. 147; note that I would qualify that Paul does actually present faith as a condition for salvation [e.g. Rom 10:9], but not in the sense that it is a pre-condition or human accomplishment that earns salvation). Human faith does not compete with God’s grace in salvation but rather is self-negating and reliant on God’s prior grace in Christ. Scholars sometimes fail to grasp just how theologically motivated (and motivating) the subjective genitive or “faithfulness of Christ” view is. It is not a view that can simply be addressed by grammatical arguments. It is a powerful vision of Paul’s theology that must be addressed with compelling theological arguments. Pifer’s reflection on the concept of faith in Paul’s theology and on its relationship with divine and human agency is a significant contribution toward this end.

One point on which I was not fully convinced was the relationship between faith and participation in Paul’s theology. I think she convincingly demonstrates that faith is closely and integrally related to the concept of participation in or union with Christ (e.g. Gal 2:19b–20). Thus she rightly concludes that justification by faith and participation with Christ are not two separate lines of thought as they are often presented (others have noted this as well, e.g. Wolter). Our faith is as much part of union with Christ as it is part of justification for Paul. However, I was not fully convinced that this close relationship between faith and participation demonstrates that faith *is* participation with Christ for Paul or that they are “two sides of the same coin” as she says several times (pp. 114, 152, 166, 171). Perhaps it is better to see faith as the *means* by which believers participate in the death and life of Christ, as Paul seems to say of himself: “It is no longer I who live, but Christ who lives in me. And the life I now live in the flesh I live *by* faith” (Gal 2:20). Pifer also uses this language occasionally. For example, she writes that “this mode of participatory existence [in the sufferings of Christ] is experienced by faith” (p. 114; see also the above quotation from p. 60).

In conclusion, this is a carefully written dissertation that makes a unique contribution while not shying away from addressing the large and important issues in Paul’s theology. Pifer addresses the major theological concerns of the subjective genitive view of *πίστις Χριστοῦ* and shows that we can hold to the focus on Christology, participation, and the priority of divine agency in Paul’s theology without throwing away the importance of our faith—or, in her words, our “self-negating and self-involving dependence on Christ” (p. 219).

Kevin W. McFadden  
Cairn University, Philadelphia, PA

*The Making of Christian Morality: Reading Paul in Ancient and Modern Contexts.* By David G. Horrell. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2019, xxiii + 264 pp., \$45.00 paper.

This volume comprises ten essays by eminent British scholar David Horrell that span over two decades of his engagement with the Pauline corpus. Though these essays vary widely both in methodology and content, they collectively offer a panoramic window into Horrell's thought space concerning Pauline ethics and by doing so illustrate how Christian moral thought may be articulated via social-scientific, historical, and synthetic approaches. Whether this is carried out successfully in each essay, or even within the bounds of faithfully exegeting biblical texts, will be discussed below. Yet, the value of compiling these approaches in a lucidly written single volume cannot be overstated.

Part 1 contains four essays that evaluate the socio-historical context of early Christianity. In chapter 1, Horrell builds upon Richard Bauckham's provocative insights concerning the likely (universal) audience of the four Gospels to argue for a corollary scenario with Paul's epistles; namely, that they were not limited to "Pauline communities" but rather were widely distributed amongst first-century Christian congregations. Internal evidence from Paul's letters is offered to undergird this thesis, including the presence of competing influences in single congregations (e.g. Peter, Apollos, and Paul in Corinth) and the absence of multiple communities existing within the same city. Though Horrell is careful to note the presence of diversity in the early church, he suggests that the term "Pauline" Christianity is not as helpful as delineating differences between "Corinthian Christianity," "Thessalonian Christianity," and so on.

In chapters 2 and 3, Horrell critiques the "new consensus" in NT studies that argues that some early Christians—such as Gaius (chap. 2) or Philemon (chap. 3)—were members of the Roman elite. This is noteworthy, as scholars assuming this framework have sought to explain the dynamics of Christian gatherings through the lens of "sumptuous villas" (p. 38), which would have only been owned by the ultra-wealthy. Against this position, Horrell proposes that, while some early believers may have been members of a "middling group" (p. 62; i.e. individuals living above sustenance levels), none were part of the wealthy ruling class.

In chapter 4, Horrell traces the usage of *ἀδελφός* and *οἶκος* as descriptors of Christian communities across the Pauline corpus. In letters he accepts as genuinely Pauline, he finds the greatest use of sibling language, whereas in "pseudo-Pauline" letters he finds that sibling language dramatically decreases in favor of *οἶκος* imagery. His ultimate conclusion is that the transformation of the early Christian community from an egalitarian community of siblings to a traditional hierarchical structure that subordinated women and slaves is "epitomized in the phrase 'from ἀδελφοί to οἶκος θεοῦ'" (p. 95).

Part 2 comprises three essays that historically contextualize Pauline ethics in order to illumine underlying theological orientations. In chapter 5, Horrell reimagines Rudolf Bultmann's seminal imperative/indicative distinction through the lens of identity to explain the 1 Corinthians 5 excommunication narrative. For Horrell, indicatives "express the terms in which the identity of the community is defined,



while the imperatives call for action to reflect and sustain that identity” (p. 110). Crucially, he claims that Paul’s cultivation of a unique group identity for the Corinthian church (holy) was based on an ethical norm (sexual impropriety with one’s mother-in-law) that is not distinctively Christian but rather shared with Jewish and Greco-Roman sources. This focus on “shared moral consensus” anticipates Horrell’s synthetic work in chapters 8–10.

In chapters 6 and 7 Horrell examines two test cases—food that has been sacrificed to idols and the Philippians 2 Christ hymn—to propose that Paul favors “relational morality” (p. 127) over absolute ethical pronouncements. For Horrell, Paul prioritizes “other-regard” as a moral imperative that is not concerned with the theological legitimacy of one’s actions but rather grounded Christologically in humility and self-abasement. In chapter 6, he also emphasizes the relationship between an individual’s body and Christ’s—specifically, he claims that Paul exhorts his audience concerning what their bodies are united with as opposed to avoiding physical items in and of themselves. For Horrell, Paul’s focus on bodies, both individually and collectively, is foundational to his conception of group identity. This emphasis on bodies, especially the boundaries (or lack thereof) of Christ’s body, is central to Horrell’s eco-theology in chapters 9 and 10.

In part 3, Horrell brings Paul into conversation with contemporary ethical debates *via* theological models proposed in part 2. In chapter 8, Horrell asks how reading Paul may fruitfully contribute to the ongoing liberal-communitarian debate in political theory, which pits the notion of universally held moral principles against the formative influence of specific traditions upon ethical frameworks. Here, Horrell argues that, since Paul’s desire for ecclesial particularity is grounded in an appeal to shared moral norms, his theology offers three modes of engagement with broader society, two of which are amenable with liberal sensibilities.

Chapters 9 and 10 represent a key focus of Horrell’s ongoing study of Paul, as evidenced by his previous monographs *The Bible and the Environment* (London: Equinox, 2010) and *Greening Paul* (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2010). In chapter 9, Horrell asserts that the new perspective on Paul was not so much a retrieval of Paul’s historical context but rather a (right) reaction to the effect of post-Holocaust realities upon biblical interpretation. In the same vein, he argues for a rereading of Paul in light of another pressing reality—the current ecological crisis. To do so, Horrell first notes two favorite texts of eco-theologians—Rom 8:19–23, which relates the groaning of creation and believers, and Col 1:15–20, which introduces a cosmic Christology that encompasses “all things”—before turning to 2 Cor 5:18–20. Here he suggests that the cosmic nature of Christ’s reconciliatory act can include and logically extends to environmental concerns. Held in tandem with the creation-human salvific relationship in Romans 8 and the broadening of the boundaries of Christ’s body in Colossians 1, Horrell concludes that the other-regard Paul calls for between believers extends to all of creation, both human and non-human. This argument is recapitulated in chapter 10 within the context of itemizing other eco-theological approaches. Ultimately, he concludes that “God’s act of cosmic reconciliation in Christ should stand as a doctrinal lens at the center of an ecologically reconfigured Pauline theology” (p. 227).

Overall, this volume contains excellent examples of mainstream critical biblical scholarship—as John Barclay notes in his foreword, “these essays demonstrate the very best of what it is to be a biblical scholar in the early twenty-first century” (p. ix). For readers who have a low view of biblical inspiration or authority, Horrell’s essays will likely prove to be enlightening, deftly argued, and brimming with possibility.

Yet, for evangelical readers, issues exist that may call his conclusions into question. Most notably, Horrell expresses a dim view of individuals (such as Wayne Grudem; pp. 205, 228) who argue for a systematic biblical ethic—in his words, “only a naively biblicistic approach would pretend either that the Bible alone could supply such a model, or that a biblical perspective could somehow trump contemporary critical debate” (p. 166). Hence, he is willing to prioritize contemporary concerns above Scripture itself. For example, when articulating his eco-theology, he notes that it requires “substantial and constructive development beyond, even against, Paul” (p. 227).

Issues also exist within individual essays. In chapter 3, Horrell’s depiction of Philemon’s socioeconomic status is argued nearly entirely from silence. Where he does deal with textual evidence, which favors Philemon being wealthy, he dismisses it through conjecture and dubious appeals to statistical likelihood (p. 58). In chapter 5, Horrell generalizes his insights about 1 Corinthians 5 to argue that Paul’s formation of group identity is primarily based upon shared ethical norms. Yet, this is clearly not the case when Paul further defines their holy identity in terms of particular ethical norms (e.g. lawsuits between believers or “societally acceptable” forms of fornication in 1 Corinthians 6). Finally, in chapters 9–10 he relies upon strained conceptions of Christ’s body (Colossians 1), his reconciliatory act (2 Corinthians 5), and the relationship between the salvific drama of humans and non-humans (cf. Rom 8:19–23) to rationalize human attentiveness to ecological affairs only to later acknowledge that the Bible cannot be used to justify such concrete actions. After reading these chapters, my question was: Why does biblical rationale need to be grasped for when contemporary concerns or scientific insights are necessary to support such actions and in some cases supersede the intended message of Scripture?

The above critiques are not meant to dissuade readers from reading this volume. Rather, this volume is an invaluable resource for upper-year undergraduate and graduate biblical studies students to expose them to multiple modes of critical biblical scholarship. Moreover, within the sphere of eco-theology, I fully expect Horrell’s work to advance dialogue between Pauline texts and science, albeit in ways that are speculative and likely against Paul’s authorial intent.

Michael M. C. Reardon

Wycliffe College, University of Toronto, Toronto, ON, Canada

*Reading Revelation in Context: John's Apocalypse and Second Temple Judaism.* Edited by Ben C. Blackwell, John K. Goodrich, and Jason Maston. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Academic, 2019, 204 pp., \$21.99 paper.

This third volume in Zondervan's Reading in Context series edited by Ben C. Blackwell, John K. Goodrich, and Jason Maston includes twenty chapters by competent scholars on the book of Revelation. Each chapter "(1) pairs a major unit of Revelation with one or more sections of a thematically related Jewish text, (2) introduces and explores the theological nuances of the comparator text, and (3) shows how the ideas in the comparator text illuminate those expressed in Revelation" (p. 27). The goal is to provide a nontechnical resource "for beginning and intermediate students to assist them in seeing firsthand how Revelation is similar to and yet different from early Jewish Apocalypses and related literature" (p. 28). There is no unified methodological or theoretical orientation to the volume or sustained overall argument; each chapter simply illustrates similarities and differences between Revelation and its literary context. Some of the chapters advance an argument but others simply compare and contrast. Each contributor focuses on a different chapter in Revelation.

Several features seek to make this volume accessible to students: (1) The introductory chapter by the editors provides a basic introduction to Revelation and Second Temple Jewish history and literature. (2) Bolded technical words and phrases in the text are linked to a glossary. (3) Footnotes are sparse, but each chapter concludes with a five-to-ten item bibliography split between critical editions of the Jewish texts and secondary literature on Revelation for further research. (4) The chapters are short and average seven pages each. The space constraints imposed on the contributors strengthen the book in regard to its target audience; the chapters are tight and concise with few unnecessary words. This brevity reduces the value of the volume for advanced researchers because there is much more that could be said in each chapter. However, in contrast to many books that are unnecessarily verbose, it is generally better to be short and leave the reader wanting more than to be long and leave the reader wanting less.

Benjamin E. Reynolds compares the depiction of Daniel's Son of Man in the Parables of Enoch with Revelation 1 and argues that, although the Parables present the figure as preexistent and participating in eschatological judgment, Revelation's Son of Man "may be understood as a more exalted figure than that of the Parables, perhaps even sharing in the divine identity" (p. 43). Mark Mathews considers perspectives on poverty and wealth in the Epistle of Enoch and Revelation 2–3 to argue for fundamental continuity. The Epistle of Enoch considers the rich to be categorically wicked, and John encourages Christians to reject riches and embrace a marginalized position in the present age. David deSilva explores the ascent to the heavenly throne motif in the Testament of Levi and Revelation 4. The heavenly ascent of Levi commissions him for priesthood and vengeance against Shechem, while in Revelation it leads to the commissioning of the Lamb to initiate God's final judgments of the world. Dana Harris discusses creature imagery for the Messiah in 4 Ezra and Revelation 5 and notes that the messianic lion in 4 Ezra "achieves

justice without the clear use of political or military force” (p. 62). In Revelation it is the vulnerability and weakness of a lamb and not the power and strength of a lion that defeats evil.

Ian Paul juxtaposes the approach to martyrdom and resurrection in 2 Maccabees and Revelation 6. They agree on the virtue of suffering unjustly, the justice and sovereignty of God, and the certainty of judgment, but “at key points Revelation offers a radically different theological understanding. God’s judgment will come after eschatological delay, and will be effected by God alone and not by military or political action. Atonement is achieved by the suffering of Jesus alone, yet the suffering of his people follows his example of patient endurance” (p. 71). Ronald Herms investigates how both the Psalms of Solomon and Revelation 7 develop the motif of the sealing of the servants of God: “In John’s cosmology, sealing (or marking) is presented as an inevitable, universal human experience—and yet, the final outcome of which group readers (and others) might find themselves among is more an open question in Revelation than in Psalms of Solomon or Ezekiel” (p. 78). Jason Maston explores heavenly silence in the Testament of Adam and Revelation 8 to suggest that the silence in heaven is imposed so that God can listen to the prayers of the martyrs; the silence assures readers that God has heard the prayers and would act. Ian Boxall compares creaturely imagery in the great tribulation in the Animal Apocalypse and Revelation 9. Animals symbolizing angelic-human hybrids are linked to a broken creation, and the messianic animals (a white bull and slaughtered lamb respectively) bring final resolution. John Goodrich considers how heavenly beings carry heavenly books in Jubilees and Revelation 10. In regard to both Moses and John, “receipt of a heavenly book from a heavenly mediator conveys remarkable authority, causing the message and its messenger to become barely distinguishable” (p. 100).

Garrick Allen compares the man from the sea in 4 Ezra with the two witnesses in Revelation 11. The militaristic Messiah of 4 Ezra contrasts with the passive resistance of the slain lamb and the prophetic witness of the two witnesses. Archie Wright uses the rebellion of the Satan figure in the Life of Adam and Eve to provide perspective on Revelation 12. In both texts there is a hierarchy of heavenly beings and Satan deceives and seeks to destroy humanity because of his exile from heaven. Jamie Davies explores the function of blasphemous beasts in 4 Ezra and Revelation 13 to argue that “both portray empire in bestial and arrogant imagery ... [and] the primary reference for this imagery is found in the first century, not the twenty-first” (p. 121). Ben Blackwell argues that the Damascus Document and Revelation 14 both have similar perspectives on the “two-ways tradition and the topic of overlapping agencies” (p. 129). Benjamin Wold compares the plague septets in combination with the theme of deliverance from exile in Words of the Luminaries and Revelation 15–16 in order to draw attention to subtle themes of community living in exile.

Edith Humphrey describes the use of women as archetypes of rebellion and repentance in Joseph and Aseneth and Revelation 17. Both Aseneth and the villainous woman personify “a human group: those who repent and those who rebel” (p. 138). Cynthia Long Westfall studies the economic critique of Rome in the Epis-

tle of Enoch and Revelation 18. Both texts associate wealth and luxury with oppression, idolatry, and violence, but Revelation does not give authority to the readers over Rome at its fall. Michael Gorman juxtaposes the messianic conquest of God's enemies in Psalms of Solomon and Revelation 19 to argue that the blood in Rev 19:3 is Jesus's own blood; he thus conquers by his performative speech. Elizabeth Shively compares the redemptive judgment of fallen angels in the Book of the Watchers and Revelation 20. Jonathan Moo explores the image of the paradise city in 4 Ezra and Rev 21:1–22:5. Revelation, unlike 4 Ezra, indicates there is hope for the nations, and there is a stronger element of continuity in Revelation between the present and future age. Sarah Underwood Dixon considers how narratives of angel worship function in the Apocalypse of Zephaniah and Revelation 22. Both texts stress monotheistic worship, but in Revelation Christ is elevated "to the same divine status as God the Father" (p. 180).

The contributors are highly competent, so that even advanced readers will pick up new insights and perspectives. The lack of an overall argument is somewhat disappointing, but the essays accomplish the book's goal of highlighting points of similarity and dissimilarity. A concluding essay could have provided comments on the cumulative effect of these similarities and dissimilarities. How does the big picture formed by these points of contact influence how we should read John's Apocalypse? Although aimed at both beginning and intermediate students, the discussions are likely too dense for beginning students, and this volume would be more appropriate for upper-level students.

Alexander E. Stewart

Tyndale Theological Seminary, Badhoevedorp, The Netherlands

*The New Testament and Intellectual Humility.* By Grant Macaskill. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018, viii + 270 pp., \$85.00.

Macaskill achieves his goal of demonstrating that the NT Scriptures form and foster intellectual humility within Christian communities. He begins the book with key and pointed questions regarding how the NT might shape the intellectual identity of its reader-audience and what this so-called intellectual humility actually entails.

In studies of intellectual humility, the concept of such humility is a reflection on what it means to be a humble thinker. Given that Christianity has traditionally regarded intellectual humility as a virtue, the NT must have played a vital role in the formation of intellectual humility within the Christian community. Macaskill points out that much of academic research into intellectual humility has neglected the indispensable role played by sacred texts in the process of character formation for a humble thinker. While Macaskill draws upon recent studies in the science and philosophy of intellectual humility, he argues that the NT presents intellectual humility as a quality that is distinctively generated from the believer's union with Christ, the one who is the paragon of perfect humility and yet is also the object of worship.

Macaskill explores his thesis throughout the book. In the first half of the book, which explicates concepts, Macaskill gives a bird's eye view of the topic of intellectual humility as a quest of science and philosophy and presents his thesis that Christian intellectual humility should be examined on a Trinitarian and Christological account of virtue. He offers a concise overview of the biblical concept of humility portrayed in the OT as a necessary backdrop of the NT. In this effort, Macaskill pays attention to biblical descriptions of wisdom as something suggestive for reflection on intellectual humility. In his elaboration on the apocalyptic Paul, Macaskill explores the continuing importance of the OT to the apostle's moral theology, especially the lasting significance of the wisdom tradition in the OT to Paul's thought and therefore to Christian theologies of intellectual humility.

The characteristic usage of intellectual life and humility in the OT links humility to poverty, which implies that true humility means a total submission to and reliance upon God. After setting up the OT's background on intellectual humility as a theocentric virtue, Macaskill transitions into the discussion of intellectual humility in the NT writings. Macaskill emphasizes the need for an appropriately developed account of personhood and agency due to the socio-relational aspects of intellectual humility, and he considers that the personhood of Jesus Christ, operating through the Holy Spirit, serves as a determinative factor for the identity of all Christians on the grounds that this Christocentric identity is the only source of both epistemic and volitional humility. The author argues that Christian intellectual humility requires a believer's acknowledgement of the limits of human potential to know God due to earthly finitude and the distortive power of sin and also humanity's participation in a new eschatological reality revealed through Jesus Christ. Macaskill is convinced in that the apocalyptic character of the NT is relevant to the discussion of intellectual humility since the revelation of God in the person of Jesus is intended to bring about a new eschatological reality that characteristically transforms the way in which intellectual humility has been traditionally perceived. In a similar vein, Macaskill brings our attention to the incarnation of Jesus Christ as the platform for the discussion of Christian intellectual humility. For Macaskill, Jesus Christ is the embodiment of divine wisdom or God's mind (Matt 11:25–30), which is contrasted with human wisdom or the human mind (1 Cor 1:18–2:10). The author interprets the incarnate God as the quintessential manifestation of divine humility and finds the kenosis hymn of Phil 2:1–11 as its key biblical text, since it is particularly attentive to Christ's humility of mind, namely, intellectual humility. Christ's humility as it is seen in Philippians 2 implies selflessness and self-giving servanthood, not limitation or deficiency, and this sets the tone for a Christian life that depends on the proper employment of intellectual humility.

In the second half of the book, Macaskill examines the Christian practices that call for the employment of intellectual humility. Practicing intellectual humility is a necessary and inevitable part of the Christian life within all activities of faith that require the mind of a believer to be rightly ordered with respect to God. The expression of intellectual humility becomes most evident in deliberate volitional activities of faith such as patience and gratitude, which are both manifested in prayer, because these volitional activities stem from the humble acknowledgment of the

lordship and the goodness of God. Macaskill's discussion on intellectual humility and the practices of faith expressed in prayerful patience and gratitude recognizes that the materialization of intellectual humility cannot be isolated but is expressed through and nurtured by other practices of faith.

According to Macaskill, a proper attitude of intellectual humility within the Christian community is fostered by the sacraments of baptism and the Eucharist. Given the fact that Christian intellectual identities are critically dependent on the personhood of Jesus Christ and are communally oriented, the sacraments are essential for building and feeding intellectual humility since they enact the believers' union with Christ. Macaskill renders a viewpoint on the sacraments that Christian intellectual humility is meant to be Christocentric, not autonomous from the constitutive identity of Jesus Christ, and therefore Paul's emphasis on the communal and eschatological aspects of the sacraments shed light on Christian intellectual humility. Since the person of Jesus, the sacraments, the community of faith, and intellectual humility theologically converge in the practices of faith, Macaskill concludes that the sacraments properly practiced and guided by Christocentric intellectual humility imply union with Christ and the eschatological identity of the church.

Macaskill also addresses the indispensable place of intellectual humility in the reading and teaching of Scripture. Intellectual arrogance is irrelevant and even antithetical to Christian identity, since Christian communities collectively and individuals within them are the very object of divine critique. Christian communities are guided and transformed by the teachings of Scripture, which deliberately oppose intellectual arrogance, selfishness, and syncretism, all of which lead people to use their minds in isolation from God. In this way, intellectual humility is understood as a required trait for authentic Christian identity. According to Macaskill, the new Christian identity that emerges from Christ-inspired intellectual humility yields a fresh openness to truth, which in turn produces knowledge, perception, and volition.

Macaskill expounds the distinctive Christocentric and Christomorphic character of humility by showing that the common framework within which the NT writers espouse the notion and practice of intellectual humility is the divine economy shaped by the sacrificial love of Jesus Christ and the believer's union with Christ through the work of the Holy Spirit. For this overall thesis, Macaskill perceptively demonstrates how the NT Scriptures might form and foster intellectual humility within Christian communities and also presents the distinctive representations of intellectual humility offered by the NT writers. According to Macaskill, the NT writers promote the idea that intellectual humility is a true Christian virtue and that the possession of this virtue affirms a believer's rightful place within the divine economy as humility of mind is a characteristic of Jesus Christ.

The noticeable strength of Macaskill's work is that it aptly discusses the potential relevance of constructive theological study concerning intellectual humility not only for the Christian community but also for the general public. Macaskill's in-depth knowledge of current interdisciplinary study on intellectual humility serves him well in his attempt to locate the discussion of Christian intellectual humility within a broad picture of human intellectual history. Overall, Macaskill's mono-

graph demonstrates that the NT's presentation of intellectual humility is distinctively Christocentric and Christomorphic and that a theological discussion of intellectual humility is constructive for a wider audience.

Inhee C. Berg (Inhee Cho)

Concordia University of Edmonton, Edmonton, AB, Canada

*Exalted Above the Heavens: The Risen and Ascended Christ.* By Peter C. Orr. New Studies in Biblical Theology 47. Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2018, xvii + 238 pp., \$25.00 paper.

In *Exalted Above the Heavens*, Peter C. Orr presents a study of “Jesus as he is now” (p. 1), in other words, between his exaltation and return. As Orr notes in the introduction, whereas much attention has been devoted to Jesus’s past and future work, his exalted state is a less developed area of theology. This monograph, which includes some condensed portions of Orr’s *Christ Absent and Present* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014), explores this somewhat neglected sub-epoch of redemptive history. After a brief introduction (chap. 1), the work follows a topical plan, focusing on the exalted Christ’s identity (chaps. 2–4), location (chaps. 5–8), and activity (chaps. 9–10). A final chapter summarizes the argument and reflects on its implications.

Orr investigates the identity of the exalted Christ in relation to the earthly Christ (chap. 2), the Spirit (chap. 3), and the church (chap. 4). In chapter 2, Orr begins by noting two important aspects of identity: singularity (what makes a person unique) and relationship (how a person relates to others). Orr argues that there is both continuity and development of identity between the earthly Jesus and the risen and exalted Jesus. He explores three areas in which Jesus’s identity seems to develop (the disciples’ need for revelation in order to perceive the risen Jesus, Jesus’s new name, and his new status) and concludes that Jesus’s identity remains the same with regard to his singularity but changes with respect to his relationships. In chapter 3, Orr explores the relation of the exalted Jesus to the Spirit in the letters of Paul and the Gospel of John. He contends that while the Spirit mediates Christ’s presence in Paul and John, neither author collapses the distinction between Christ and the Spirit so as to negate Christ’s absence. Chapter 4 focuses on the relationship between the exalted Christ and the church in 1 Cor 12:12 and a number of other Pauline texts. Orr here argues that while Paul does not present the exalted Christ as identical with the church, he does portray Christ as having a different and closer union with the church in light of his exaltation.

In chapter 5, Orr begins his treatment of the exalted Christ’s *location* by considering the absence of Jesus in relation to his ascension and exaltation. He demonstrates that Matthew, Luke–Acts, John, and Hebrews present the exalted Jesus as both absent and yet in some way present with and accessible to believers. Chapter 6 turns to the nature of Christ’s exalted body. Orr here argues that Luke (Luke 24:36–43), John (John 20:24–29), and Paul (1 Corinthians 15; Rom 8:29; Phil 3:20–21) all envision the exalted Christ as “possessing a discrete, distinguishable body



that cannot be collapsed into the Spirit or the church” (p. 114). In chapter 7, Orr explores the issue of Jesus’s bodily absence in Paul (Phil 1:21–26; 1 Thess 4:15–17; 2 Cor 5:6–9; Rom 8:34). He concludes that Paul presents the exalted Jesus as absent from believers by virtue of his individual human body, which prevents him from being simultaneously seated at the Father’s right hand in heaven and present on earth. Chapter 8 considers the epiphanic presence of Christ. Orr argues from 2 Corinthians that Paul presents the exalted Jesus as being made present to believers in a mediated yet powerful and transformative way through Paul himself (2 Cor 2:14–17; 4:7–12), the Corinthians (2 Cor 3:1–3), the Spirit (2 Cor 3:18), and the gospel (2 Cor 4:1–6).

Chapters 9 and 10 treat the activity of the exalted Christ on earth and in heaven, respectively. In chapter 9, Orr examines Acts, Paul’s letters, and Revelation 2–3 to show that Christ, while absent, is active on earth, causing the progress of the gospel and sustaining the lives of believers through visions, the Spirit, and the apostles. In chapter 10, Orr turns to Christ’s heavenly activity, which he discusses under two headings: “acting as God” (receiving and answering prayers) and interceding (offering prayers). Orr addresses the first topic briefly, surveying a variety of texts from Acts and Paul, and spends most of the chapter on the second issue, providing extended discussions of Rom 8:34 and Heb 7:25.

In chapter 11, Orr concludes by summarizing the argument and reflecting on the theological and pastoral significance of Jesus’s ongoing humanity, his bodily absence and mediated presence, and his continuing activity on behalf of believers.

This volume has many strengths. Orr’s subject requires him to treat a wide range of NT texts, and he handles this task well, moving comfortably between the Gospels, Acts, Paul, Hebrews, and Revelation. Throughout, he engages with key secondary literature, particularly when discussing more contested passages, and is careful to show why he takes the interpretations that he does. On the whole, Orr’s exegetical conclusions seem judicious, and the overall portrait of the exalted Christ that he paints is compelling. Although Orr’s goal seems to be more to synthesize the biblical data regarding the exalted Jesus than to introduce new interpretations of individual passages, there are some exegetical and theological gems along the way. For example, I found the two aspects of identity (singularity and relationships) that Orr mentions and his judgment that the exalted Jesus’s identity remains the same with respect to his singularity but changes with regard to his relationships to be an interesting way of preserving an orthodox Christology, while still granting some ontic weight to the exaltation. His discussion of a possible allusion to Isa 53:12 in Rom 8:34 and how this impacts the nature of Jesus’s intercession (pp. 186–89) also appears to be an original contribution.

These substantial strengths notwithstanding, there are a few weaknesses worth mentioning. First, for a work that focuses on a sub-epoch of redemptive history rather than on a book or corpus, *Exalted Above the Heavens* seems excessively weighted toward Paul. Chapters 7 and 8 focus exclusively on Paul, and the apostle’s writings play a significant role in most of the other chapters. Of course, this could simply be because Paul has more to say about the exalted Christ than other NT authors do, but one has to wonder if some important material has been overlooked.

For example, the index notes only two references to John's letters. The two passages noted, 1 John 1:9 and 2:1, seem to deserve a substantive discussion, but they receive only parenthetical references. Similarly, there is no extended discussion of Rev 5:1–8:1, which seems important for understanding the exalted Christ's activity. To be fair, one cannot discuss everything, but a better balance of Paul vis-à-vis the rest of the NT would be desirable.

Second, while I found myself in agreement with Orr's overarching argument, I was left wondering, "What is new here?" Orr's exalted Christ has an identity that is transformed in terms of his relationships (but not his singularity), is distinct from the Spirit and the church, possesses a physical body that is absent yet present in a mediated sense, and acts in a variety of ways to save humans. In other words, he is just as I (and I suspect many evangelicals) would expect. Of course, to have all of this demonstrated in detail is well worth the price of the volume, but I do wonder if elements of Orr's thesis might be developed for further insight. For example, what do we really mean when we speak of mediated or epiphanic presence? Are there parallels from the OT, early Judaism, or the Greco-Roman world that might help us understand these concepts? How does Jesus have a physical body in heaven? What does this imply about heavenly space? Such questions press at the bounds of what the NT authors explicitly say (and perhaps what humans can understand), but to answer them on some level seems important if we wish to comprehend the exalted Jesus more fully.

In sum, Peter C. Orr's *Exalted Above the Heavens* is a thoughtful and compelling study of the exalted Jesus, an underexplored subject in biblical theology. Orr is to be commended for producing a work that will serve as a valuable resource for scholars, pastors, and serious laypeople and will constitute the starting point for future research in this area.

Caleb T. Friedeman  
Ohio Christian University, Circleville, OH

*John the Theologian and his Paschal Gospel: A Prologue to Theology.* By John Behr. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 2019, 388 pp., \$120.

In his newest volume, Father John Behr, recently appointed Professor in Divinity at the University of Aberdeen and former Professor of Patristics and Dean at St. Vladimir's Seminary, offers a work on the Gospel of John that is both multi-layered and interconnected. The present volume represents a symphonic exercise, to borrow Behr's own analogy (p. 331), wherein he seeks to "put into dialogue various readers of John, ancient and modern ... with ultimately a *theological* goal" (p. vii). In so doing, this work defies the neat categorization that commonly attends the contemporary disciplines: biblical studies, theology, historical theology, and philosophy. Rather, Behr seeks to explore John's "stereoptic vision" (p. 309) by maintaining the three-stranded and integrated cord of "historical investigation, scriptural exegesis, and philosophical reflection" (p. 323). To further articulate this theological

goal, it is helpful to attend to the sections of the book's title in which Behr effectively provides a roadmap for the work that follows.

*John the Theologian*: Behr frequently criticizes historical presuppositions that lead to the common though errant fascination in contemporary Johannine scholarship to "get to 'the real John,' or John as remembered and read by his 'school,' of the Gospel as read (and to some extent co-authored) by its original 'community'" (p. 39). All of these unduly historical approaches, according to Behr, impose upon John our own questions and thus receive our own presupposed answers. Our goal, on the contrary, is to "consider how [John] in fact conceives of his task, that is, how [John] understands the discipline of theology" (p. 12). Behr undergirds this point by quoting Origen's reflection, "We might dare say, then, that the Gospels are the firstfruits of all Scriptures, but that the firstfruits of the Gospels is that according to John, whose meaning no one can understand who has not leaned on Jesus' breast nor received Mary from Jesus to be his mother also" (*Comm John*, 1.23). It is only by attending to John's own theological-scriptural presentation of the crucified Lord—by leaning with him and receiving with him—that we, too, become the Lord's "beloved disciple."

*His Pascal Gospel*: As we read the Gospel from John's theological perspective, we find, according to Behr, that "the Gospel, together with its Prologue, in fact pivots upon the Passion—it is a 'paschal Gospel'" (p. 5). That is why, in Part Two of his work, Behr unfolds two themes in John from a cruciform perspective: "The Temple and the living human being, the glory of God, are thus brought to perfection with Jesus' own word from the cross, 'it is finished'" (p. 244).

Attending to the inherent theological framework, Behr argues that John's Gospel proceeds through the Temple feasts providing the reader with a *de facto* "tour of the tabernacle": "We are given a spring of living water (Jn 4:15–15; 7:37–9), resembling the bronze laver (Exod 30:17–21); the heavenly bread (Jn 6:22–71), as the manna which was kept in a jar in the ark (Exod 16:33) and the bread of the Presence lying on the golden altar (Exod 25:30); the light of the world (Jn 8:12) as the golden lampstand (Exod 25:31); and Jesus himself, offering prayer for his disciples to the Father (Jn 17:1–26)" (p. 192).

Still, it is at the cross where we are "at the most holy place itself" (p. 193). Therefore, the titles "Son of Man" and "Logos" find their context, not in Gnostic redeemer myths as made popular by Bultmann, but when Christ is lifted up or exalted on the cross: "The identity of Jesus and, or rather as, the Word of God is revealed, or rather wrought, upon the cross. The abasement of the cross is not, therefore, a kenotic concealment of his divinity in a state of dereliction abandoned by God, but is instead the fullest revelation of his divinity" (p. 24). And it is at the cross that we see the completion of the divine project of humanity. Behr summarizes, "Pilate's statement, 'Behold the human being' (Jn 19:5) refers back to the purpose of God stated in Gen. 1:26, and is completed in Christ's Passion, and in those following him in martyrdom" (p. 218). Accordingly, it is only as Jesus gives his assent to the will of God as the Son of Man in descending to the cross that he is in fact exalted and completes the human project left unfinished in the creation narrative. And it is only when we add our own "let it be" to the divine will in our faith-

ful witness to the crucified Lord, taking up our own cross, that we, likewise, become human—"only by being a witness, a martyr, will we likewise be born into life" (p. 197).

*A Prologue to Theology:* To conclude Part Two, Behr spends an extended treatment on John's prologue. He points out that the predominant contemporary interpretations of the prologue, diverse as they may be, find their connection in a common understanding of the "logos" influenced by the historical emphases maligned above. These interpretations treat Scripture as a strictly historical narrative, from the Old Testament to the New, and "entail a parallel narrative of the Word of God, from his existence with God to, at a later time, his Incarnation as 'an episode' in his biography" (p. 22). Within this framework the historical chronology of the prologue is thought to be out of order and the verses about John the Baptist misplaced. However, as Behr argues, if we presuppose that John is primarily a paschal Gospel, the prologue is "best designated as a paschal hymn" (p. 270), representing three "summaries" of the Gospel.

To begin, the first verse is in itself an epitome of the whole. Following Chrysostom, Behr notes that the verse consists of three short affirmations: existence, relationship, and predication (p. 259). He gives a full summary, with supplemental notes in parentheses: "Jesus is in first place on the cross, as the head of the body, as the king in authority upon his throne, and as the source and fulfillment of all things (a non-temporal understanding of *archê*); he is going through the cross, to the God and Father (sense of movement-towards implied in *pros*, as seen also in 14:12, 28; 16:10, 28; also 16:5, 17); and, as the crucified and ascended one, he is confessed as God (*theos ên ho logos*)" (p. 260). Verses 2–5, then, represent an expanded version of the same summary. Centering in verses 3–4, *panta di autou egeneto* should not be understood with reference to the creation of the universe but as concerning everything that came to pass through Christ in the glorious plan and project of God to make a "living human being" accomplished on the cross. The section of verses 6–18 is even more expanded with a chiasmic structure, beginning and ending with the Baptist (Behr, following Origen, attributes vv. 16–18, as well as v. 15, to John the Baptist). This portion is "a third summary of the Gospel . . . with the world's rejection of Christ at the crucifixion as its centre and climax (vv. 10–11), followed by the baptism and the Eucharist now offered to those who receive him and follow him on his path of *martyria* (vv. 12–14), so becoming a human being enlightened by the light that is Christ (vv. 15–18)" (p. 269).

In his interpretation of the prologue, Behr introduces two of his more provocative or, as he himself labels them, "bold" arguments (p. 5). He notes that the use of the common phrases "pre-incarnate" or "pre-existent" has entailed a "very serious" theological mistake in that "the very subject of Christian theology has changed from Jesus Christ, the crucified and risen Lord proclaimed by the Gospel" (p. 16). Such terms not only entail "the problematic ascription of temporality to a divine subject" (p. 23) but also present the subject of the Gospel as a "fleshless" Word behind or without the cross of Christ, as Gregory of Nyssa criticized Apollinarius. However, if we understand John as a paschal Gospel, we realize "the unchanging identity of Christ is given upon the cross, which, in this sense, is not only

a lens but also a prism, refracting the Passion of Christ throughout all aspects of the divine economy” (p. 28). Therefore, as Athanasius does in *On the Incarnation*, John likewise “understands the incarnation already in terms of the cross,” establishing that “the one on the cross is in fact the Word of God” (p. 15). This cruciform perspective, in turn, allows us to read in John’s prologue, the paschal hymn, the sole subject of the crucified and risen Lord, Jesus Christ, and not a “pre-incarnate” Word—a phrase that, Behr notes, abounds in secondary scholarship but that he has yet to find in patristic literature (p. 22). Behr, quoting Cyril, concludes, “One is the Son, one Lord Jesus Christ, both before the incarnation and after the incarnation” (p. 17).

Second and concomitantly, a historical interpretation of the prologue operating “under the shadow of the ‘history of dogma’ approach” (p. 3) imposes our definition of incarnation onto John’s Gospel. This imposition presupposes verse 14 of the prologue (“and the Word became flesh”) to refer solely to the birth of the divine Word from Mary as a mere “episode in the biography of the Word” (p. 3). In contradistinction, Behr looks within John’s Gospel for the proper context in which to interpret what is meant by “became flesh” in the prologue. He finds that referent in John 6, in which Christ himself offers a whole meditation on what his flesh is. But even in chapter 6, the focus is on the future—the flesh and blood he “*will* give for the life of the world” (5:51). Even in John 6, we see Jesus proclaiming that he must ascend the cross before he can descend as the heavenly bread wherein we “feed on his flesh” and abide in him and he in us (6:56). Therefore, the “Word became flesh” of 1:14 is referring to Christ who, ascending the cross and then descending in the Eucharist, dwells *in* us and we see his glory. This interpretation, according to Behr, both makes sense of the prologue and fits with early Christian reading that, beginning with Irenaeus, understands the incarnation as “the ongoing embodiment of God in those who follow Christ” (p. 5). Behr summarizes, “The ‘Incarnation’ is not a past event, reconstructed by a historicizing reading of Scripture, but a participation in the life-giving flesh of Christ, incorporated as his body in the life of witness or *martyria*” (p. 323).

Behr concludes his work by presenting John’s Gospel as a prologue to theology because, if we start with John as *the* theologian, his theological vision laid out above undergirds Behr’s three fundamental principles for theology: (1) “The one Lord Jesus Christ with whom theology is concerned is always the crucified and risen one as proclaimed by the apostles in accordance with the unveiled Scriptures, enfleshed in the broken bread and those who partake of his life-giving flesh” (p. 324). (2) “In and through the Passion, the one Lord Jesus Christ becomes, as human, that which he, as God, always is” (p. 326). (3) “This one Lord Jesus Christ shows us what it is to be God in the way he dies as human, simultaneously showing us what it is to be human” (p. 327).

It is for this reason that Behr’s exploration in the Gospel of John represents a clear introduction into Behr’s own methodology. Throughout his work, Behr seeks to consistently follow the aforementioned three principles as well as to hold together the three strands of theological engagement. He concludes the volume by offering a summary of the positions evident in his own program: “The site of the

theologian, then, is undoubtedly historical, but also inescapably exegetical and phenomenological: standing, as John the theologian, at the foot of the cross—the definitive Apocalypse of God, unveiling the Scriptures and ourselves” (p. 331).

This approach and these emphases make Behr’s volume distinct from other contemporary feature-length works on John. Behr explicitly states that his work seeks to explore the “relationship between scriptural exegesis and theological discourse” (p. vii), but those expecting a traditional commentary or extended Greek exegesis will find the disappointment and confusion of which he warns in the preface (p. vii). Also, those wanting engagement with contemporary New Testament scholarship—as seen, for example, in Richard Bauckham’s treatments—will likewise be frustrated. Behr provides a telling methodological contrast in this quote concerning a specific disagreement: “While Bauckham styles his interpretation ‘exegetical,’ it is clear that he is working in a historical key. ... There is another possible approach, equally exegetical but taking its lead from the Gospel of John ... that could properly be called a theological interpretation” (p. 97).

Behr does, however, advance detailed and technical historical arguments to identify the author as John the elder and not John the apostle, the son of Zebedee known from the Synoptic Gospels (pp. 44–63). He does likewise to establish the Quatrodeciman (Saturday) observance of the Christian Pascha. Behr uses both contested points—the author being the “high priest of the Christian mystery, the one wearing the *petalon*, initiating the celebration of Pascha” (p. 97) and Jesus being crucified on the day when the Passover lambs were slain (pp. 82–92)—to undergird his presentation of John’s work as a paschal Gospel. These points, however, are controversial in contemporary scholarship, and Behr’s selective historical-critical appeal could engender the criticism that he is attempting to have his cake and eat it, too. In addition, readers from a less liturgical tradition will pause at his treatment of the Eucharist as Christ “enfleshed in the broken bread” (p. 324), the location of the “ongoing embodiment of God” in the church (p. 5), as well as his emphasis on Mary. These differences, however, are to be expected.

The anticipated focus of criticism, then, concerns his theological interpretation of John’s Gospel. Behr enjoys being provocative, and this work proves to be much the same. It represents not only a retrieval of patristic theological interpretation of John but one done with an eye, it seems, to intentionally “tweak the nose” of emphases and methodologies present in contemporary scholarship. For some, especially from a more historical-critical leaning, his interpretive framework, hermeneutic, and textual conclusions will provoke to offense. For others, those of a more interdisciplinary and integrative approach, Behr’s particularities will engender challenging insights. Regardless, in *John the Theologian and his Paschal Gospel*, Behr proves, once again, to be a serious student of Scripture, a sympathetic reader of the early church, and a fresh theological voice, with his present volume representing Behr’s own harmonious and unique contribution to the ongoing symphony of Johannine scholarship.

Stephen R. Lorange  
Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary, Wake Forest, NC

*Total Atonement: Trinitarian Participation in the Reconciliation of Humanity and Creation.* By W. Ross Hastings. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books/Fortress Academic, 2019, 294 pp., \$115.00.

Ross Hastings is a professor of theology at Regent college in Vancouver, British Columbia. In his most recent work, *Total Atonement: Trinitarian Participation in the Reconciliation of Humanity and Creation*, Hastings assesses the leading models of atonement theology. In the introduction, Hastings addresses his motivations for the book: to defend penal substitution and expound atonement theology positively. His thesis contains several major points: “Atonement entails (1) the totality of creation *and* redemption; (2) the totality of the persons of the triune God; (3) the totality of the history of Jesus Christ ...; (4) the totality of many biblical and theological motifs; (5) the totality of participation ..., which frames and undergirds all models ...; and (6) the totality of its provision for the reconciliation and redemption of all humanity and all creation” (pp. 1–10).

Essential to understanding this thesis is the definition of participation, consisting of two points. Hastings’s first point is “the participation of God the Son in our humanity, by way of the incarnation, and then in our sin and guilt and captivity and alienation and death, leading to life and reconciliation and freedom and justification and purification.” The second point is “human participation in that extant reality of salvation in the Son, by the regeneration and indwelling and empowerment of the Holy Spirit, by grace through faith” (p. 6).

In Part One, containing the first three chapters, the author focuses on the Christological nature of the atonement. In chapter one, Hastings affirms both the filial/ontological and the juridical/forensic aspects of the atonement. He argues the basis for these two components lies in the participatory framework of atonement theology. If participation is the framework that undergirds all models of atonement, then through participation Jesus reconciles believers both ontologically and forensically, restores them in relationship to God, and pays their sin debt.

In chapter two, Hastings lays the groundwork for his argument. He argues that through recapitulation—Jesus’s becoming the head of humanity after Adam’s failure to be a sufficient head—Jesus not only pays humanity’s debt but also restores their ontological nature marred by Adam’s fall. Hastings interacts with Karl Barth, Dietrich Bonhoeffer, and Bruce McCormack. He notes both forensic and filial themes in Barth’s work on the atonement, summarizing them in this way: “It is in that *person* [Jesus] that the forensic transaction could be effected. And its aim is filial also: it is for the making of humans into what they were intended to be as image-bearing human persons” (p. 33). Hastings recognizes the same themes in Bonhoeffer’s *Ethics*: “Behold the man who has been taken to Himself by God, sentenced and executed and awakened by God to new life. ... God’s love has become the death of death and the life of man” (p. 34). McCormack’s contribution consists “in demonstrating the crucial importance of the specific ontology of the person of Christ and the triune nature of God to an understanding of the atonement” (p. 34). Hastings offers this summary: “atonement is accomplished in the person of Jesus

Christ, in union with the Father and Holy Spirit, and in union with humanity. Participation is thus the framework for atonement” (43).

Hastings’s focus in chapter three is on the Trinitarian nature of the atonement. The atonement was accomplished through all three persons of the Trinity. Thus, the common objection to penal substitution—the so-called “divine child abuse” argument—is refuted. While some caricatures of penal substitution promote this view, a nuanced argument that holds two important Trinitarian doctrines in tension leaves no room for it. The two doctrines are (1) appropriations, that while the persons of the Trinity work together in every *ad extra* work, in the economy some actions are appropriated to one person of the Trinity more than but not in exclusion from the others; and (2) indivisibility within the Godhead, that the Trinity always functions as a unit that cannot be divided. As applied to the atonement, these two doctrines converge to underscore the fact that the Son willingly sacrificed himself in obedience to the Father, their wills being one.

Chapter four begins Part Two, which establishes the participatory framework of the atonement. Hastings uses chapter four to define his terms. He distinguishes between doctrines, models, and theories, but chooses “model” to describe the many theories of atonement and “framework” as the term to describe the model that undergirds all of them.

In chapter five, Hastings discusses the soteriological centrality of union with Christ in terms of two tenets. The first tenet is the incarnation. It is significant that Christ’s two natures are unified in order that he can be the mediator between God and humanity both forensically and ontologically. The second tenet (made possible by the first) is believers’ union with Christ and thus union with the triune God through the Spirit.

Chapter six begins Part Three with an overview of some biblical metaphors for the atonement: Abraham’s sacrifice of Isaac, the Passover, the Levitical offerings, the Day of Atonement, the Passion narratives, and some references in Acts and other New Testament texts. According to Hastings, each of these serves as a separate metaphor that legitimizes the many models of the atonement.

Chapters seven through ten explain the models of the atonement (excluding penal substitution, to which several subsequent chapters are devoted) and the arguments of theologians who advocate them. Chapter seven presents the moral influence model. Held by Abelard, Kant, and Tillich, this view argues that the atonement of Christ is inspirational in nature, purposing to show believers what to imitate. While Hastings agrees that the life and values of Jesus as displayed in his atoning work are to be imitated by Christians, he argues that “imitation without participation is futility” (p. 134). Without participation by faith, imitation is both an impossibility and “a new legalism” (p. 134).

In chapter eight, Hastings outlines the views of T. F. Torrance, John McLeod Campbell, and Karl Barth; the three hold the vicarious humanity view. This view seeks to establish that the atonement is more than a transaction of the guilt of sin for the righteousness of Christ. It is also the reestablishment of the full ontological sense of humanity. Jesus does this with love, not only judgment. While this view maintains somewhat of a substitutionary nature for the atonement, it focuses pri-



marily on Jesus's role as representative for humanity. Though it falls short in its understanding of participation, its emphasis on the ontological aspect of the atonement supports Hastings's thesis.

In chapter nine, the author discusses the "ransom and satisfaction as recapitulation or theosis" model. The ransom model asserts that Jesus's death was a payment to Satan for his control over humanity. The recapitulation aspect of the ransom model adds that Jesus, in paying the ransom to win back humanity, becomes the new head of humanity. The theosis component is that of deification or "participation in the life of God." Hastings evaluates David Bentley Hart's assessment of Anselm's *Cur Deus Homo*. Bentley argues that Anselm's theory of atonement is not best understood as simply substitutionary but as a vicarious representative "atoning for the disobedience of the rest of humanity but not in forensic terms. ... This is not so much a penal payment for guilt accrued, but a gift which overcomes all debts on the part of humanity" (p. 186). Hastings concludes that while Hart (through Anselm) responds to the West's over-emphasis on the forensic component of the atonement, more is still needed to describe a model of "total atonement" (p. 189).

Chapter ten is about the *Christus Victor* model (193–208). Scholars such as Gustaf Aulen, N. T. Wright, Greg Boyd, and Hans Boersma propound versions of this model, which in general views the atonement of Christ as primarily a defeat over sin, death, Satan, and evil. Proponents see the atonement as victorious instead of sacrificial. While Hastings agrees that Christ's triumph over death is certainly victorious, he argues still that the texts (Col 1:13–15; Heb 2:5–18) most often used to support the *Christus Victor* model really show a "kaleidoscope of motifs" (p. 194). Hastings does not reject *Christus Victor* (or, for that matter, the other models); rather, he contends that it needs to be placed within the framework of participation to make sense.

Chapters eleven through fourteen are dedicated to the penal substitution model. Chapter eleven's focus is its history. With origins in Justin Martyr, Athanasius, Eusebius, Anselm, and Aquinas, the doctrine of penal substitution, according to J. I. Packer, is the "distinguishing mark" of evangelicalism (p. 209). Since the times of these early theologians, penal substitution has become the primary model of the atonement held by Reformed theologians and evangelicals. Hastings offers several reasons for this preeminence and aptly responds to the caricatured versions sometimes attacked by contemporary theologians.

Hastings continues with penal substitution in chapter twelve by highlighting its major proponents. John Stott contends that substitution is the theory that lies behind all the "consequences of the cross" (p. 230). Jada Strabbing combines the participatory model with penal substitution. J. I. Packer argues that the mystery of the combination of justice, wrath, mercy, and love found in the cross is part of what makes it glorious. Hans Boersma brings attention to the hospitality of the atonement from a "New Perspective" position. Fleming Rutledge argues that penal substitution bound with other models serves to debunk many caricatures of the mode. Adam Johnson places penal substitution within biblical theology, showing

how it is interwoven throughout the whole Bible. Lastly, Thomas McCall defends penal substitution by solving the problem caused by the cry of dereliction.

Chapter thirteen answers this question: Is penal substitution the model that “holds all others together”? Using Roger Nicole’s work *The Glory of the Atonement*, Hastings argues that while this model is the linchpin of the doctrine, all the models discussed constitute the whole picture of a total atonement. Penal substitution gives all the other models proper grounding for their contribution to this total view.

In chapter fourteen, Hastings addresses why participation is the framework for the other models. Some theologians like Tim Bayne and Greg Restall argue that it is best to view the models as a kaleidoscope: because there are many effects of sin, there are many models to address those effects. While Hastings agrees in part, he thinks it better to link penal substitution and all the models of the atonement to their grounding in the framework of participation.

In the last chapter, Hastings summarizes his thesis as it applies to the church. He first underscores the importance of participation for theological anthropology. As God’s image-bearers, people must participate in the life of God to fully bear his image. He contends that Jesus’s incarnational participation with humanity, and our union to him through participation, is what enables the effects of the atonement. The catalyst of this communion is the work of the Spirit in Trinitarian context. Lastly, Hastings urges that this total view should lead Christians to celebrate the atonement through participation with renewed joy.

Hastings’s contribution is significant and has many strengths. It does not simply contend for one model of the atonement over others but makes sense of all the models and their scriptural support. Another strength is Hastings’s apt and thorough assessment of classical and contemporary atonement scholarship. His evaluation reveals the lacunae of each model and rectifies those lacunae with *Total Atonement*.

Another significant strength is Hastings’s way of keeping redemption tied to creation, thus setting the groundwork for what the atonement accomplishes judicially and filially. He points out that God not only relates to humanity as judge but also as Father; thus, the atonement needs to reconcile humanity to God as sons, not just restore innocence. Hastings could bolster his argument by considering further biblical language and NT terminology for conversion and believers. “Born again” as a description of conversion, “adoption” as a description of what was accomplished in redemption, and “brothers and sisters” as the common description of what believers are in relation to one another, all describe something filial: a restoration to the sonship broken at the fall. This would support Hastings’s thesis.

This massive work is in an incredible contribution to the field of atonement scholarship. Hastings proposes a framework that answers the objections of opponents and fills in a gap in recent scholarship. Professors and students of atonement theology should read this book.

Jerrica Baxter

The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, KY

*Nietzsche, the Aristocratic Rebel: Intellectual Biography and Critical Balance-Sheet.* By Domenico Losurdo. Translated by Gregor Benton. Leiden: Brill Academic, 2019, 1075 pp., \$448.

In 2002, the Italian scholar Domenico Losurdo published an academic bombshell: *Nietzsche, il ribelle aristocratico. Biografia intellettuale e bilancio critico* (Torino: Bollati Boringhieri, 2002). The book was picked up by a German publisher and appeared as the two volume *Nietzsche, der aristokratische Rebell* (Berlin: Argument Verlag, 2009). Now the overdue English translation has appeared from Brill of Leiden as a book of well over a thousand pages. While the cost of the hardcover volume is prohibitive for most people, Brill has promised to produce a paperback edition costing \$50 in November of this year. It will then be well within the reach of most readers and scholars.

Usually reviewers end their review with a comment like “this book ought to be in all college and seminary libraries.” In this case, that comment is coming first because this is a truly groundbreaking work that challenges the dominant view of Nietzsche (1844–1900) as found in universities as well as among many general readers.

The evidence presented is devastating for people who consider Nietzsche to be a progressive thinker who simply exposed the hypocrisy of his time through brilliant metaphors like his use of the term “slavery.” Losurdo shows this view is wrong because the concept of slavery runs through Nietzsche’s entire work as a necessary reality of social life. For Nietzsche, it is “nature as such” that condemns “the mass of humans” to slavery (p. 355).

This long, densely argued, and complex book is rich in references to Nietzsche’s contemporaries and packed with citations from his works and unpublished papers. It uses original source materials to show that Nietzsche cannot be read as an abstract series of intellectually stimulating ideas taken out of their original context. Rather, Nietzsche intended his writings to provide a practical response to the world in which he lived. As such they address real-life situations involving social and political developments requiring aristocratic governance grounded in slavery.

To appreciate the thrust of Losurdo’s argument, it is best to begin by reading Harrison Fluss’s short but insightful “Introduction to the English Language Edition,” which sets the stage for what follows. That done, the reader needs to skip to the back of the book and read the two-page “Abbreviations Used in Citing Nietzsche’s Writings.” This enables one to appreciate the immense effort Losurdo made in developing his arguments that are rooted in Nietzsche’s published and unpublished writings.

To understand the importance of Losurdo’s work, it is useful to survey the history of Nietzsche’s reception in the English-speaking world. Today, there is no doubt that Nietzsche is one of the most influential writers since the Enlightenment, but it was not always so.

Nietzsche’s popularity in America and Britain developed slowly and relatively late. In the nineteenth and early twentieth century, his work was generally ignored or regarded unfavorably. It slowly gained popularity among a small group of intel-

lectuals. Throughout the 1930s, his reputation continued to grow until World War II, when Nietzsche was identified by many English-speaking intellectuals as one of the main sources of Nazism. Therefore, for the next thirty years after 1945, his works were shunned by many scholars who, to put it bluntly, saw him as the intellectual father of National Socialism.

Things began to change in the mid-1970s, largely owing to the work of Princeton philosopher and former German Jewish refugee Walter Kaufmann (1921–1980). Although first published in 1950, his book *Nietzsche: Philosopher, Psychologist, Antichrist* did not really take off until it appeared as a paperback in 1974. In it, Kaufmann argues that Nietzsche's "Nazism" was the product of the influence of his sister Elisabeth Förster-Nietzsche (1846–1935); the elitist, and somewhat mystical, writer Stefan George (1868–1933); and the official National Socialist philosopher Alfred Baeumler (1887–1968). All three, Kaufmann claims, misunderstood and distorted Nietzsche's ideas for their own ends.

Furthermore, it was pointed out that most early Zionists, such as Theodor Herzl (1860–1904) and the later founders of the state of Israel, were avid readers and followers of Nietzsche. As a result, the argument that the Nazis misunderstood and misused Nietzsche came to dominate academic discussions of his significance and work. As a result, writers (e.g. Alfred Baeumler), who before 1939 were widely seen as the leading experts on Nietzsche, were dismissed as crude propagandists who distorted his true meaning. More recently, Max Whyte pointed out that prior to this point, Baeumler and writers like him were widely regarded as good scholars who made major contributions to Nietzsche studies.

In the process, whole new areas of scholarship that are deeply embedded in Nietzsche's ideas, such as postmodernism and postcolonialism, developed. At the same time the work of writers such as Karl Jaspers (1883–1969), Martin Heidegger (1889–1976), and Hans-Georg Gadamer (1900–2002), all of whom drew on Nietzsche's ideas, became increasingly popular and contributed to a surge in research that was grounded in his work.

Against this background, Losurdo argues that most readers of Nietzsche's work have been sold a bill of goods. Rather than beginning with the interpretations of men like Kaufmann, Losurdo starts his study by examining Nietzsche's unpublished writings. There he discovered a decision Nietzsche made in the early 1870s to take the advice of his friends Richard Wagner (1813–1883) and his wife Cosima (1837–1930). They advised Nietzsche to mute his vitriolic criticisms of Jews to avoid being dismissed as a blatant anti-Semite.

As a result, Losurdo is able to demonstrate that Nietzsche deliberately created the impression that while he as a young man had embraced a venomous anti-Semitism, he later changed his mind as he came to appreciate the Jewish contribution to human history and culture. But this is not entirely true. Rather, it served to mask his fundamental and lasting anti-Semitism.

Using archival documents and primary sources, including Nietzsche's letters that have been largely ignored by other scholars, Losurdo shows that Nietzsche retained his virulent anti-Semitism throughout his life. If this was overlooked, it is because Nietzsche claimed to admire some periods of Jewish history and aspects of

Jewish culture. Nevertheless, and despite some genuine appreciation of carefully selected aspects of Judaism, Nietzsche continued to believe that “the Jewish prophets were primarily responsible for the ‘slave revolt in morality’” (p. 466).

Furthermore, Losurdo shows that Nietzsche saw the Jews as stirring up social unrest “for more than two millennia” in what eventually became the Western world (p. 469). For this reason, Nietzsche rejected the classical Greek philosophical tradition because it developed ideas that were like those later found in Christianity. In his view, classical philosophers perverted what he saw as good in earlier Greek thought.

For a short period of his life, it seems that Nietzsche believed what was bad about the Jews could be bred out of them while their good characteristics, such as their will to survive, provided a way of strengthening aristocratic German blood lines through intermarriage. Therefore, he proposed that Prussian aristocrats marry wealthy Jewesses to create a eugenics program that would strengthen their grip on power.

Losurdo’s discussion of Nietzsche’s work, based on archival evidence, shows that from the beginning of his writing career, Nietzsche’s main concerns were social issues and politics, not philosophy. In fact, what Nietzsche saw as the idiocy of emancipation movements dominated his thinking. As a result, he saw all forms of emancipation as destructive of aristocratic culture.

Losurdo demonstrates that Nietzsche’s hostility to emancipatory movements was experiential in nature and not metaphorical. During his teenage years, Nietzsche became obsessed with what he saw as the destruction of aristocracy and its replacement by the pseudo-civilizations of the masses, which were “faded copies of great men ... and resistance to the great” (p. 204). For him, the major symptom of this absurd destruction was the emancipation of both slaves and women, which he described as a “slave revolt” promoted by socialism.

Nietzsche viewed slavery in the United States as a failure because of its leniency towards slaves and its tendency to educate a selected number of them. To counter this failure, Nietzsche proposed a “new slavery” imposed by brute force (p. 383). In his thought, “Christianity, French Revolution, and socialism” were “three stages in the slave revolt” (p. 387). These intellectual movements found expression in abolitionism, which was “stupid and criminal” because it went against the order of nature (p. 389).

Significantly, when Nietzsche spoke about *Übermensch*—those who are of a higher order, super humans, whom he contrasted with slaves and slavery—he was not speaking or writing metaphorically. Rather, the terms and examples he used were intended to change contemporary politics and society. As noted, Nietzsche saw his contemporaries as addicted to “modernity,” which he defined as a commitment to “the emancipation of the masses” (p. 105). In short, Nietzsche was totally committed to the ruthless rule of an elite aristocracy. At the same time, he feared and hated democracy which gave power to the masses.

Rather surprisingly, as Losurdo points out, Nietzsche developed a sympathy for the Christian doctrine of original sin; indeed, for a short time, he saw it as useful in creating “a dyke to hold back the optimistic and socialist time” of the age. As

a result, in his early years, “Nietzsche seemed” interested in creating a new form of Christianity purged of its humanitarian elements (p. 52). This interest soon passed, and he came to see Christianity as “a part of the religions of the learned” that were “incapable of instigating and motivating a community” of aristocrats. Therefore, it had to die (pp. 52–55).

Related to this was Nietzsche’s view that a “natural hierarchy” exists among men that no amount of education can change (p. 105). Therefore, to provide education to the lower orders was to invite rebellion, because most people were “born to serve and obey” (pp. 105–6). What was needed, Nietzsche argued, was an authentic aristocratic culture that expressed the essence of Germanness. This authentic culture was to be built on “the ruins of civilization” and “characterized by ‘pre-established harmony’ between leader and led” (p. 107). Here, as in many other places throughout the book, Losurdo’s presentation of Nietzsche’s views echoes later developments within National Socialism and extremist political movements of today.

In developing his argument, Losurdo dismisses claims that make Nietzsche’s sister the source of his appeal to the Nazis because of her supposed anti-Semitism. He shows that she was not particularly anti-Semitic or “a forger of the Third Reich” (pp. 711–14). In making his case, unlike many writers, Losurdo has no time for the argument that the use of Nietzsche by the Nazis can be dismissed as a misappropriation of his work for their own ends. There is no doubt in Losurdo’s mind that the Nazis knew their Nietzsche and knew him well. Therefore, Losurdo shows how many of their actions, ideas, and programs (e.g. their radical eugenics program) were directly inspired by Nietzsche (pp. 711, 725, 807–21).

Before ending this review, it is important to point out that Losurdo was an Italian Marxist intellectual and active communist. Such an admission may well turn off some evangelical Christians and other Americans, but it ought not. He was not the fashionable Marxist of British and North American academia. Rather, Losurdo embraced an old-fashioned form of communism that valued scholarship and respected historical sources. In this respect, he was similar to the British Marxist historian Christopher Hill, whose work inspired a renaissance of Puritan studies in both America and Britain. Like Hill, and unlike fashionable Marxism, Losurdo valued truth.

The case Losurdo makes is very well argued and documented. By taking seriously archival sources that most other scholars have ignored, he is able to provide the context for Nietzsche’s published works. In so doing, Losurdo shows that Nietzsche, many of his friends, and his contemporaries shared a common admiration for aristocratic power and a hatred of democracy and mass society. He does so by carefully reading Nietzsche’s personal correspondence, notes, and unpublished documents. These provide a necessary background to Nietzsche’s published works and move the reader away from abstract speculations. In them Nietzsche clearly expressed his intent to promote social and political change, not abstract ideas woven together by philosophical musings.

In conclusion, this is an excellent, if long, book. For some people, it may prove a difficult read because the print is so small. Brill would be advised to in-

crease the print size and follow the German example of publishing it in two volumes if for no other reason than the German edition is far easier to hold when reading. That said, it is a very important work that both evangelical Christians and secular readers interested in philosophy and religion need to know about and study carefully.

Irving Hexham  
University of Calgary, Calgary, Canada