

BOOK REVIEWS

Hebrew for the Rest of Us. By Lee M. Fields. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2008, xvi + 281 pp., \$29.00 paper.

Lee Fields, associate professor of Bible and biblical languages at Mid-Atlantic Christian University (formerly Roanoke Bible College), has written a companion volume to the popular *Greek for the Rest of Us* by William D. Mounce. The purpose of the volume is “to enable English Bible students to maximize the benefit gained from using the many tools that exist to help bridge the language gap,” and the goal “is to move toward greater independence in Old Testament studies” (p. ix).

In a five-page preface, Fields discusses the rationale for mastering tools for OT study, the purpose, style, and scope of the book, expectations, “how to use this book,” and resources. Fields divides his work into six “Weeks.” Week 1 covers the Hebrew alphabet (chap. 1) and the history of Hebrew (chap. 2). Week 2 covers the Hebrew vowels (chap. 3) and “Canon, Text, and Versions” (chap. 4). Week 3 covers Hebrew roots, clauses, the waw, and prepositions (chaps. 5–8 respectively). Week 4 covers nominals, the article, case functions, and adjectives (chaps. 9–12). Week 5 covers verbs (generally), the perfect forms, imperfect forms, volitional forms, and infinitives/participles (chaps. 13–17). Week 6 covers word studies, study tools (both paper and electronic), and Hebrew prose and poetry (chaps. 18–21). Fields also provides three appendices: some Hebrew songs, a guide for doing word studies, and a table of figures.

Fields writes in a readable, non-academic, sometimes even entertaining fashion. He gives catchy titles to many of the chapters, like “Get the Point?” for the chapter on Hebrew vowels, “Yes, Virginia, There Are . . . Clauses,” “Where There’s a Will, There are . . . Volitional Forms,” and “To Infinitives and Beyond!” Several of the chapters end with a section called “Advanced Information and Curious Facts.” These briefly discuss issues like the meaning of 666 in the book of Revelation, the language Jesus spoke, reading from a Torah scroll, and whether or not the Hebrew word for God teaches the Trinity. This supplemental information is interesting and motivational for the student.

Having just used this book as a textbook in a class on “a practical approach to Hebrew,” I must say I encountered problems with the book that range from the merely frustrating to major methodological disagreements. Evidence of a lack of careful editing and proofreading abound. Fortunately, such errors can be corrected in subsequent printings, but my students did not have that benefit. Several examples will illustrate this. The numbering of exercises sometimes repeats the same number (pp. 9–10) or skips a number. Sometimes figures are referred to erroneously (p. 50) or are not labeled at all (p. 217). The exercises on page 61 (specifically 1.c.) contain a form that does not appear in the NIV Exhaustive Concordance. There are also misspelled words (“inseperable” and “seperable” on p. 92). The Hebrew word *‘am* is erroneously translated as “voice” (p. 109). On page 137, the illustration of the “article + noun followed by (anarthrous) adjective” construction (the second point of discussion), is wrong because the adjective in fact *does* have the article, and thus is confusing to students. Proverbs 18:10 is misquoted (p. 137), and the exercises for chapter 12 on adjectives and relatives only address relatives (pp. 144–45). On pages 179–80, the instructions to the exercises ask the student to identify the form, purpose, and aspect of the verbal forms, but the column heading for “aspect” is missing. On page 182, the Imperfect 3fp form is incorrectly identified as

3fs. Chapter 16, for some reason, has no exercises at all. Again, subsequent printing can correct these problems fairly easily.

However, several more substantial problems exist. Sometimes Fields gives too much information. For example, in the discussion of “verbs” in chapter 13, Fields tries to give the student all the nomenclature used to refer to verbals, including the *qtl/wqtl/yqtl* nomenclature, the suffixed/prefixed nomenclature, aspect names (Perfect, Imperfect, and Progressive), and “time names” (Past/Future/Preterite). This is simply overwhelming to the student of “pre-Hebrew,” and causes confusion.

Fields suggests a method of “flow charting” a passage, a kind of diagramming, that is computer dependent and confusing. Since the language being used is still English, it would be easier to have students chart a simple Subject/Verb/Object layout, then learn to put modifiers underneath with arrows pointing to what they modify. The format of the exercises is difficult. They cannot be torn out, but the students need the books to keep studying. It is difficult for a teacher to verify that the students are doing their exercises. Fields sometimes refers to a website, www.teknia.com, where the student can find the exercises and various other Hebrew helps, but as of this writing, those resources, for some reason, are not there.

For a reason I do not understand, the chapter on “Word Studies” is one of the last chapters in the book. Fields even writes, “Out of all the things covered in this book, the topic of word studies is probably the one people will use most often” (p. 222). Why, then, was this chapter not in its most logical position—immediately after chapter 5, the discussion of Hebrew roots? Fields’s discussion of word studies is careful, clear, and well done, and if placed earlier in the book, students could have been doing assigned word studies for weeks and gaining valuable experience. Also, it would have been nice to provide the student with a short list of common or important Hebrew vocabulary for each chapter as well as suggested passages to be read aloud from the Hebrew Bible (something my students enjoyed doing).

These criticisms notwithstanding, there is a need for a book like *Hebrew for the Rest of Us*, and with some revision, I think Fields’s contribution could be that book.

John C. Crutchfield
Columbia International University, Columbia, SC

A Modern Grammar for Biblical Hebrew. By Duane A. Garrett and Jason S. DeRouchie. Nashville: Broadman and Holman, 2009, \$49.99.

Duane Garrett of The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary and Jason DeRouchie of Bethlehem College and Seminary have together written a superb introductory grammar that is clearly presented and user friendly for both teachers and students of biblical Hebrew. *A Modern Grammar for Biblical Hebrew* is a complete revision of Garrett’s 2002 work, *A Modern Grammar for Classical Hebrew*, also published by Broadman and Holman. Those familiar with Garrett’s earlier grammar will notice the new volume has been arranged into 41 chapters and 8 appendices as compared with 62 chapters in the previous work. Further, Garrett’s 2002 text included student exercises at the end of each chapter, while the latest edition has placed all student exercises in a full-length workbook, which is sold separately.

As explained in the preface, chapters 1–26 cover the material typically introduced in a first-year grammar, including an introduction to weak verbs and derived stems. More detailed study of the Qal verb is given in chapters 27–30 and of the derived stems in chapters 31–35. Chapters 36–41 function essentially as an introduction to intermediate Hebrew, with an overview of the Masoretic cantillation system and a particular

emphasis on text syntax and literary structure at the discourse level. Appendix 1, “Basics for Using Your Hebrew Bible,” is alone worth the price of the book. Here the authors orient students to the modern editions of the Masoretic Text—the *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia* and the *Biblia Hebraica Quinta*—including the canonical ordering and book titles, the Masorah, and the Textual Apparatus. This appendix also includes a clear and succinct introduction to OT textual criticism.

One distinctive feature of *A Modern Grammar* is the introduction of many elements of Hebrew grammar in stages. For example, the authors introduce ten rules for accent shift and vowel formation in chapter 4 and then use these rules to explain many subsequent concepts, such as plural nouns (pp. 29–31), the Qal *qatal* conjugation (p. 53), construct chains (pp. 76–78), and pronominal suffixes (pp. 90–91). Similarly, the construct relationship between nouns is introduced in the very first chapter (p. 10) but is expounded further on pages 16 and 48 before a chapter-length treatment (pp. 74–80). The authors return again to discuss construct chains on page 93 in the chapter on pronominal suffixes and on page 102 in the chapter on adjectives.

Another distinctive of *A Modern Grammar* is the approach taken to teaching Hebrew verbs. The authors begin discussing Hebrew verbs early in the course of study, at chapter 6 (in comparison, Ross introduces verbs at chap. 10, Kelley and Pratico/Van Pelt at chap. 12). Unlike the recent Hebrew grammars by Ross and Pratico/Van Pelt, Garrett and DeRouchie use updated terminology for verbal conjugations, such as *qatal* rather than *perfect*, *yiqtol* rather than *imperfect*, and *wayyiqtol* rather than *waw consecutive*, though they do acknowledge that lexicons use the traditional terminology (p. 51). This allows for a clear explanation of the importance of perfect and imperfect aspect in their introduction of Hebrew verbs (see esp. pp. 35–39, 52, 60).

In chapters 6–7, students learn 31 Hebrew verbs as inflected vocabulary (mostly from weak roots) to allow them to begin to read complete Hebrew sentences in the workbook exercises, though fuller verb paradigms are not introduced until later (beginning in chap. 9, with the Qal *qatal* [*perfect*]). So in chapter 6, students learn the verb form פֹּלַץ with the gloss “(he) will fall” and the alternative translations “(he) should fall / used to fall / is falling.” The verbal root פֿלץ is learned in chapter 11, and a fuller discussion of I-Nun roots comes in chapter 20. One reason Garrett and DeRouchie introduce weak verbs early in the curriculum is to make the point to students that “weak” roots, which are far more common in the Hebrew Bible than “strong” roots, are not irregular but are very consistent in following the rules that govern their patterns (see pp. 50–51).

Nearly every chapter of the grammar includes diagrams, tables, and “blackboard” visuals to walk students step by step through the spelling and formation of Hebrew words and phrases. The diagrams of the seven major verbal stems on page 135 are particularly clear and helpful. The grammar also includes a CD with audio and PowerPoint files to assist students with mastery of the alphabet, vocabulary, and basic verb paradigms. Additional materials for instructors, such as quizzes, exams, and PowerPoint lectures, are provided on the publisher’s website.

DeRouchie and Garrett teach a “classical” pronunciation for biblical Hebrew, though they do note modern pronunciations in a few instances (e.g. pp. 3, 70). There is some potential for confusion among students if the instructor uses a modern Hebrew pronunciation in class or if any of the students know modern Hebrew. Most chapters in *A Modern Grammar* are on average between eight and nine pages in length, though chapter length and the amount of information varies significantly at times. For example, chapter 7 is less than three pages, while chapter 33 is a full 14 pages. Also, the authors delay introducing the definite article until chapter 8 and the conjunction until chapter 10, concepts introduced earlier in many other grammars.

I have used *A Modern Grammar for Biblical Hebrew* in both seminary and lay-level classroom settings in pre-publication draft form and now in the final, published edition.

Garrett and DeRouchie offer a well-conceived approach to teaching beginning Hebrew that guides students into intermediate Hebrew in chapters 36–41 and positions them well for Hebrew exegesis. This grammar should receive strong consideration as an introductory text for biblical Hebrew at the college or seminary levels.

Brian Tabb
Bethlehem College and Seminary, Minneapolis, MN

Greatness, Grace & Glory: Carta's Atlas of Biblical Biography. By Paul H. Wright. Jerusalem: Carta, 2008, 256 pp., \$50.00.

At first approach, the title of this work—*Greatness, Grace & Glory*—is intriguing and mysterious, and the subtitle, *Carta's Atlas of Biblical Biography*, only slightly less so. Author Paul Wright suggests that “great stories are told of great people” (p. 7). He asserts that the people, the place, and God’s purpose for putting his people in that place, are all inextricably intertwined (p. 249). However, the combination of greatness, grace, and glory never seems to be explained, and the title remains somewhat opaque.

The subtitle is more helpful. The book, according to the dust jacket, “represents a new and necessary genre in the field of biblical studies,” and suggests that it “is perhaps best described as a volume on applied or practical biblical historical geography.” Each of the twenty-three chapters of the volume focuses on one or more individuals in a particular place and time. For example, chapter 4 focuses on Deborah and Yael, and chapter 13 on Josiah. Not all the chapters deal with heroes of the faith. Chapter 16 details the family of the Herods and chapter 20 is devoted to Pontius Pilate. Nor do all the chapters restrict themselves to the events situated in the land of Israel. Esther (chap. 15) lives in Persia, and Paul (chap. 22) travels through much of the Roman Empire.

In each chapter, Wright retells the story of the individual(s) involved and draws in a wide-ranging array of background materials, from contemporary history and cultural backgrounds to the geographical settings of the events. Biblical texts and some supporting materials are cited parenthetically in a rust brown-colored type. At first I thought this would pose a distraction, but it actually proved a great benefit. The reddish color stands out sufficiently on the page to enable one to scan the page easily for references and yet is dull enough that the eye quickly learns to skip over it when reading. While there are a good number of references to ancient literature such as Josephus, Philo, and the *Mishnah*, Wright makes little or no attempt to provide similar support for historical and archaeological data. Since Wright’s aim is to serve as a storyteller for the “general reader” (dust jacket), the book is written in a very readable style. The way in which Wright weaves together the geography and history with the story of the biblical characters enables the reader to get a clear picture of the events described. The many fine color maps and photographs nicely support the text. One could wish for a Scripture index to make the references and illustrations more accessible.

Of course, the storytelling style with little documentation is a significant drawback for the serious student. Wright settles the date of the exodus merely by referring to the 19th and 20th dynasties of Egypt in which “no less than eleven Pharaohs bore the name Rameses” (p. 17). Regarding Josiah’s sphere of influence, Wright cites an ostracoon found at Mehad Hashavyahu that “contains the complaint by a farm laborer, employed in the harvest, that his garment had been taken from him” (p. 102). This Wright takes as proof that “the standards of justice advocated in the ancient Mosaic law formed the basis for complaint and redress” (p. 102). Without a reference to the complete text of

the fragment, it is impossible to tell whether the laborer actually alludes to the Mosaic law or to some prevailing custom that might or might not have been genetically related to it.

One other feature mars Wright's work. Wright has a tendency to analyze the motives of the characters. He admits in the introduction that this is part of his plan: "Such factors of real life, as they can be known through literary, geographical and archaeological data, when reasonably combined with a *common-sense approach based on observable patterns of behavior of people, groups and nation states in and around the Middle East today*, yields a certain familiarity—even a kind of intimacy—with the people of the Bible that is too often lacking otherwise" (p. 7; emphasis added). On this basis, Wright suggests that Jesus' trials probably did not occur in one night as the Gospel writers imply because nothing in the Middle East ever happens that fast (p. 196). Wright identifies Deborah as a "wise old village woman . . . the one to whom everyone comes for advice and who, through intuition, reputation and/or the spirit of God, is able to 'see' things others can't" (p. 30). However, he then suggests that many "practical" people of today might find her "a bit batty," a comment I am not sure the text bears out. By the same token, Sisera was not a frightened and exhausted warrior looking for refuge but someone who "looked for an easy conquest [i.e. Yael] lest he return to Jabin empty-handed" (p. 31). Likewise, David's motive in favoring Mephibosheth was nothing less than Machiavellian (p. 47); Hanani's visit to his brother Nehemiah was specifically to request royal intervention in the affairs of Jerusalem (p. 111); Esther's story is not-so-subtly merged with the history of the Holocaust (p. 120); John the Baptist's "righteous anger . . . must have been honed on the anvil of personal experience" (p. 149); and Peter had a desperate need to organize and control (p. 214). Perhaps Wright, the Executive Director of Jerusalem University College/Institute of Holy Land Studies, allows his familiarity with modern Middle Eastern issues to color his understanding too much.

Moreover, at times Wright seems to run contrary to the text of Scripture. In showing how Scripture often fails to name women in the narratives, he asks who the wife of Jeremiah was. Yet Jeremiah was explicitly forbidden to marry (Jeremiah 16). On more than one occasion, Wright implies that only John and some of the women were at the cross (pp. 197, 215, 243). However, Luke claims the disciples were present (Luke 23:49). In recounting the resurrection of Jairus's daughter, Wright points out the uncleanness that comes from being in a house where a dead body lies, but incomprehensibly attributes this only to "rabbinic law" (citing the Mishnah), rather than to the Mosaic law (Num 19:14–18).

While this book is unusual—perhaps unique—in its approach to historical geography, is well written and easily read, and contains many useful maps and photographs, its lack of documentation will limit its usefulness for the scholar, and its psychoanalytic approach to the biblical characters will necessitate its cautious use by the more general reader for whom it is intended.

Alan D. Ingalls
Baptist Bible Seminary, Clarks Summit, PA

The Old Testament: Its Background, Growth, and Content. By Steven L. McKenzie and John Kaltner. Nashville: Abingdon, 2007, 382 pp., \$32.00.

The Old Testament: Its Background, Growth, and Content is a 2007 contribution to the subject of OT Introduction written by Steven McKenzie and John Kaltner, Religious Studies Department faculty at Rhodes College, Memphis, TN. The authors cover the

subject matter of OT introduction under the headings of content, growth, context, and interpretation. These chapter divisions demonstrate the sensitivity of the authors to the historical, literary, and theological aspects of the biblical text. After examining the contents of a particular section of the Hebrew Bible, there is “a discussion of the evidence that points to the growth of that material by such means as editorial activity or the use of sources. The context section of each chapter attempts to place the biblical text, or some part of it, in its wider literary, social, geographical, or contextual context. Finally, some interpretative aspects of the material are identified and explored” (pp. 52–53). The subject of investigation is the Hebrew Bible arranged in the format of the Tanakh.

The objective of the book is accomplished in a manuscript of less than 400 pages. The authors never state their motivation for writing another introduction to the OT, nor do they establish the uniqueness of their approach in comparison to the currently available publications. In a market of textbooks produced with slick paper, colorful charts, study questions, CDs of additional materials, and interactive websites, Abingdon Press chose to use lightweight paper and black and white charts and pictures for this textbook. The McKenzie and Kaltner publication does include a ten-page bibliography arranged according to canonical divisions of the Tanakh. The bibliographic entries represent the standard scholarly works associated with each section of the Hebrew Bible from a less conservative perspective. The works of Young, Archer, Harrison, and LaSor-Bush-Hubbard are not included. There are no subject, name, or Scripture indices.

The dates cited in the book for the events referenced in the biblical material are generally conservative. The authors list six events and BC dates that are considered a framework for the historical context of the Hebrew Bible. They include: 925 for the invasion of Syria-Palestine by Shishak of Egypt; 721 for the Assyrian destruction of Samaria and the end of the Israelite kingdom; 586 for the Babylonian destruction of Jerusalem; 539 for the end of the Babylonian exile; 333 for Alexander the Great conquering Syria-Palestine; and 64 for the beginning of the Roman Empire (p. 30).

McKenzie and Kaltner handle the record of events in accord with the basic thesis of the Documentary Hypothesis. In the Pentateuch, the authors emphasize the presence of J and P material, since in their opinion the hypothesis is clear and well accepted. They leave open the more detailed questions associated with additional sources beyond J and P. The stronger, clearer affiliation of Deuteronomy with the Former Prophets results in its separation from the Pentateuch. The authors conclude that although the Torah was the first part of the Tanakh to be recognized by the Jewish readers as authoritative Scripture, it was not the first part to be written in its present form (p. 59).

The evolutionary development of the Hebrew Scriptures as presented in the Documentary Hypothesis sets the direction for how the origin, development, and dating of the remainder of the canonical text is handled. Joshua, for example, is purported as reaching its final shape after Josiah’s reign and perhaps after the beginning of the Babylonian exile (586 BC; see p. 151). As for the Latter Prophets, Isaiah is treated as a two-part composition, the first part of which developed from an eighth-century origin to the post-exilic period. According to McKenzie and Kaltner, “The evidence of that development is undeniable, and the work—as does the entire book of Isaiah—stands as a paramount example of the evolving nature of the Hebrew Bible” (p. 218).

The more valued sections of this work are the content and context sections of each chapter. In these sections, the authors demonstrate a mastery of the biblical text with their clear and insightful literary and linguistic observations.

The growth and interpretation sections of each chapter reflect a bias of the authors’ perspective. The creation account is interpreted as a theological rather than a historical account written by a priestly author (p. 65). The Genesis 2–3 account is treated as a story never intended to be understood as an actual set of events. The authors assert,

“The symbolic nature of the story would have been clear to its original audience from the very ‘names’ of its characters. ‘Adam’ and ‘Eve’ were not proper names in ancient Israel” (p. 70). The interpretation of the Hebrew patriarchs draws attention to the “late and artificial nature of at least some of the Abraham stories,” namely Gen 12:10–20, the first wife-sister story, and the Genesis 14 account of Abraham’s rescue of Lot (p. 91).

Regarding Moses and the Law, the authors conclude that the Ten Commandments do not go back to Moses’ time but “took shape over a long period of time” (p. 121). The history of the Former Prophets is acknowledged to be theological and prophetic, and ideologically in keeping with the book of Deuteronomy. However, the historical intent of these narratives is distinguished from an accurate historical account. According to the writers, the book of Joshua is an “idealized version of Israel’s entry into the land that is meant for a much later audience” (p. 155).

The foregoing citations are sufficient evidence to establish the direction and the primary contribution of McKenzie and Kaltner’s work. The authors are by no means sloppy with their scholarship nor are they careless in the application of their presuppositions to the text of Scripture. For this reason, the book is a valuable example of a source-critical approach to OT introduction. The book suffers for not giving attention to the declaration of Scripture regarding its nature and origin. Because of this the truth claim made in the various sections of the OT canon was not legitimately considered.

John F. Klem

Northland International University, Dunbar, WI

Old Testament Theology: A Thematic Approach. By Robin Routledge. Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 2008, 384 pp., \$32.00.

On the heels of the publication of the *New International Dictionary of Old Testament Theology and Exegesis* over a decade ago, Elmer Martens, a doyen in the evangelical world of OT theology, continued to steer practitioners in the field back to the biblical text. Martens asserted that biblical theology that magnifies God issues from text-laced exegesis, and robust worship that sustains the church flows in turn from a text-driven biblical theology. Robin Routledge’s 2008 work *Old Testament Theology: A Thematic Approach* (hereafter *OTT*) contributes further to this welcome trend.

In the preface, Routledge locates his book within the spectrum of works on OT theology. His intent is to offer a middle ground between efforts that lose accessibility by trying to do too much and those that are overly selective to the point of omitting essential data. The result is a compendious guide to the subject driven by an overt concern for the biblical text, governed by an explicit orientation toward canonical unity and intended as a pedagogical resource for ecclesiastical application.

OTT unfolds in ten chapters, beginning with Routledge’s critique of previous treatments and advocacy of his thematic approach. This opening chapter contends for the legitimacy of OT theology as a Christian pursuit, then traces the historical development of the discipline from pre-reformation dogmatism through postmodernism. He concludes with his own methodology, which emphasizes a biblical theological rubric integrating exegesis and synthesis of the text.

God’s person and his work of creation are the concerns of chapters 2 and 3. In “God and the ‘Gods,’” Routledge surveys the primary names of God, focusing particularly on El and Yahweh. The Kenite and “God of the fathers” hypotheses have no real basis in history, he concludes, nor did Israel borrow and adapt a Canaanite concept of deity. Rather, the monotheism of the patriarchs and Moses traces to the unique character of

God's revelation of himself in covenant forms. God displays his personal nature not in abstraction but by revelation in history as the text records it. In light of this recognition of God's personal nature, Routledge's Barthian depiction of God as "Wholly Other" would seem to need clarification.

Chapter 3, "God and His Creation," discusses the biblical account of origins as set against other ancient Near Eastern perspectives and concludes that Genesis 1–11 has a polemical function. Although Routledge's discussion of myth in the OT is a bit ambiguous, he rightly notes that Genesis does not borrow from neighboring traditions. However, in my judgment, his examination of OT cosmology in Genesis 1–11 fails to consider adequately the role of metaphor and gives undue weight to etymological conclusions. While he labels Genesis 1–11 "pre-history" (I would prefer "pre-scientific"), he rightly judges that the biblical account of creation centers on God.

Chapters 4–8 engage the theme "God and His People," with subheadings more closely defining each unit. His treatment of election and covenant in chapter 4 is one of the strongest sections of the volume, contending that all the major OT covenants display conditional elements since they involve a relational dimension. The fifth chapter, "Worship and Sacrifice," examines not only the structure and forms of the OT cult but also highlights divine *hesed*—"close in meaning to 'grace,'" he observes—in providing forgiveness. Routledge contends that atonement in the OT includes propitiation, the appeasement of divine wrath, and that the sacrifice is a substitute for the worshiper. God's revelation of himself through prophecy and wisdom is the subject of chapter 6. This linkage comfortably houses wisdom within the OT theological spectrum, a task many volumes on the subject find difficult.

The motif of "God and His People" continues in chapter 7 with Routledge's treatment of kingship in the OT. Here he highlights the covenant God made with David, emphasizing that this covenant serves as the basis for expecting the messianic king. Chapter 8 then analyzes ethical issues, contending that God's character forms the basis of biblical ethics in connection with law, narrative, prophecy, natural law, and wisdom. In chapter 9, "God and the Future," Routledge focuses on the themes of judgment and hope as they unfold in the Deuteronomistic history. Here he also explores the remnant and new covenant concepts as they impact OT eschatology. This section offers Routledge an opportunity to develop the messianic hope as unfolding primarily through the Davidic covenant, the Son of Man image, and the Servant of the Lord portrait. The totality of God's purposes in history converges in his plan that all the world's nations might acknowledge his holiness and glory. The final chapter of *OTT* concludes the work with a timely discussion of the "centrality of mission" that underlies all God's revealed purposes in history.

Routledge accomplishes his purpose of providing a reader-friendly, manageable OT theology suited for practical application in the life of the church. Assets of the book are many: insightful word studies; a literary sensitivity to the features of the biblical text; thorough bibliographic references in the footnotes; acceptance of historical accounts in the OT as accurate; recognition of often-neglected links between the Abrahamic and Davidic covenants, as well as between the prophets and the covenants; awareness of the continuity and discontinuity between the testaments, but stress on the continuity; and an efficient, lucid style that explains but does not belabor.

OTT is akin to John Sailhamer's *Introduction to OT Theology*, yet exhibits a more complete development of a canonical approach that recognizes both the descriptive and prescriptive role of the discipline. Routledge's thematic approach with God at the center is reminiscent of recent works by Paul House, Eugene Merrill, and Bruce Waltke. What sets *OTT* apart, however, is its less intimidating, more manageable style and organization. The evangelical tone of the work distinguishes it from the volumes of Walter Brueggemann and H. D. Preuss. Routledge is well suited for an upper-level college or

entry-level seminary course in OT theology, particularly one determined to take the biblical text seriously.

Garnett Reid
Free Will Baptist Bible College, Nashville, TN

Memories of Ancient Israel: An Introduction to Biblical History—Ancient and Modern. By Philip R. Davies. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2008, ix + 182 pp., \$24.95 paper.

Philip R. Davies is Professor Emeritus of Biblical Studies at the University of Sheffield, England. In this volume, he provides an investigation into cultural memory, discussing its usefulness for analyzing how ancient societies constructed their past.

The book begins with an introduction in which Davies defines significant terms, the most notable of which is “cultural memory,” which he defines as “stories about the past shared by people who affirm a common identity, and who use stories to reinforce that identity” (p. 12). He argues for a twofold historiographical approach that: (1) clarifies the relationship between the biblical narratives and what we can know about the past; and (2) investigates the cultural role of the biblical narratives as products of the past.

The rest of the book is divided into three main parts: “Resources,” “Strategies,” and “Reflections.” The first part discusses various problems related to the reconstruction of Israel’s history *vis-à-vis* the Hebrew Bible, archaeology, and epigraphic sources. Concerning the Hebrew Bible, Davies focuses on chronological discrepancies as well as parallel accounts, maintaining that ancient writers explained all events as originating with deity and were not necessarily concerned with what “really happened” (p. 38). He also argues for the existence of different “biblical Israels,” contending that each one reflects “different periods and viewpoints within the cultural history of communities that regarded themselves as Israel” (p. 56).

Next, Davies provides a brief history of biblical and postbiblical archaeology. He uses recent debates over the emergence of Israel and the existence of a united monarchy to argue for the subjectivity of excavation results and archaeology in general. Davies then turns to significant inscriptional evidence and its relationship to the Hebrew Bible. For nearly all of the inscriptions he examines, Davies maintains difficulty in interpretation, discrepancies with the biblical text, or the possibility of forgery. He concludes that the Hebrew Bible, archaeology, and epigraphic sources are not reliable foundations for recovering knowledge and facts to reconstruct Israel’s history.

The second part of the book begins with a discussion on cultural memory. Davies argues that “the writing of history, whether ancient or modern, is an act of recollection, and it produces what is, in form, a collective memory of the past” (p. 106). He maintains three distinct stages of cultural memorization in Israel: the nurturing of different histories by the various “biblical Israels”; the selective combination of these memories into narrative form by the biblical writers; and the reception of these memories by modern historians.

Davies next characterizes the acquisition of historical knowledge as subject to degrees of probability, contending that verification is possible only for broader historical phenomena. He suggests reliability is based on degrees of probability. Accordingly, one must ask whether a biblical text is attempting to describe the “real past” or not, and if so, whether that past is reliable or not.

Davies concludes the second part of the book with a characterization of the maximalist and minimalist schools of thought as two distinct poles of belief, credulity, and

skepticism. After summarizing developments in the history of scholarship that have led to the rise of minimalism, Davies critiques three recent works that adopt a maximalist approach: Jens Bruun Kofoed, *Text and History: Historiography and the Study of the Biblical Text* (2005); Ian Provan, V. Philips Long, and Tremper Longman III, *A Biblical History of Israel* (2003); and Kenneth A. Kitchen, *On the Reliability of the Old Testament* (2003).

Lastly, in the final part and chapter of the book, Davies reiterates the historiographical approach he has advocated throughout the book, requesting cooperation and understanding among scholars in the historical enterprise.

The general approach of Davies, particularly in the first part of the book, is to argue for the overall unreliability of the Hebrew Bible, archaeology, and epigraphic material based on specific problems with these sources. However, individual difficulties and complexities do not necessarily require the unreliability of the whole, nor should they necessarily lead to overall skepticism. Davies would have done well to interact more specifically with scholars who have argued that despite the difficulties these sources can prove reliable for historical reconstruction (e.g. William G. Dever, *What Did the Biblical Writers Know and When Did They Know It? What Archaeology Can Tell Us about the Reality of Ancient Israel*, [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001]).

Davies's analysis of the epigraphic material is also not without problems. Most notably, he curiously perpetuates an earlier suggestion of his (John W. Rogerson and Philip R. Davies, "Was the Siloam Tunnel Built by Hezekiah?" *BA* 59 [1996]: 138–49) that the Siloam Tunnel inscription dates to the Hasmonean rather than Iron II period, despite several significant responses to his original claim (e.g. Ronald S. Hendel, "The Date of the Siloam Inscription: A Rejoinder to Rogerson and Davies," *BA* 59 [1996]: 233–37; Jo Ann Hackett, Frank Moore Cross, Jr., P. Kyle McCarter, Jr., and Ada Yardeni, "Defusing Pseudo-Scholarship: The Siloam Inscription Ain't Hasmonean," *BAR* 23/2 [1997]: 41–50, 68).

Despite these significant shortcomings, this book provides a useful introduction to the investigation of cultural memory *vis-à-vis* the Hebrew Bible, a fairly recent field of study in biblical scholarship. More broadly, this volume offers an accessible summary of current issues in historiography and the Hebrew Bible. Because Davies approaches these problems from the revisionist or minimalist school of thought, this work offers a thought-provoking perspective to those who would approach biblical historiography from a more maximalist-orientated approach.

Benjamin J. Noonan
Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, OH

Great Prayers of the Old Testament. By Walter Brueggemann. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2008, 142 pp., \$16.95 paper.

In this new work, Walter Brueggemann seeks to use prayers from the OT to enliven the prayer life of modern believers. In an introduction, he notes that prayer "is the human reach toward Holy Mystery and Holy Ultimacy" (p. xi), but that "rational philosophical thought tends to destroy the essential presuppositions of a simple prayer" (p. xvi). Brueggemann wants to use ancient Israel's approach to prayer as a model because "it is not yet disciplined or restrained by the rational limits of modernity" (p. xix). Much Christian prayer is "far too polite and deferential," and Brueggemann sees a study of OT prayers as a possible antidote for such an anemic prayer life.

The body of the text consists of expositions of twelve prayers, including: "Abraham: Genesis 18:22–33" (pp. 1–10); "Moses: Numbers 14:13–23" (pp. 11–23); "Hannah: 1 Samuel 2:1–10" (pp. 24–35); "David: 2 Samuel 7:18–29" (pp. 36–47); "Solomon: 1 Kings 3:5–15" (pp. 48–57); "Jonah: Jonah 2:2–9" (pp. 58–67); "Jeremiah: Jeremiah 32:16–25" (pp. 68–77); "Hezekiah: 2 Kings 19:15–19" (pp. 78–88); "Ezra: Ezra 9:6–15" (pp. 89–98); "Nehemiah: Nehemiah 1:4–11" (pp. 99–110); "Daniel: Daniel 9:3–19"; and "Job: Job 42:1–6" (pp. 122–31).

The expositions are generally quite good, and Brueggemann brings out many subtleties hidden from general Bible readers within the Hebrew. There are, however, inconsistencies in the author's portrayal of God's character. Typical of Brueggemann, he often indicts God or portrays him as ambivalent, disinterested, or even corrupt. In the prayer of Abraham (chap. 1), he states that Abraham is the "senior party to the transaction," and that the initiative in the prayer is his alone. In Moses' prayer on behalf of the wayward Israelites (chap. 2), Brueggemann concludes, "It is evident in this exchange that Moses loves Israel more passionately than does YHWH," and that "Moses invites God into the unexplored territory of forgiveness and pardon" (p. 21). In the prayer of David (chap. 4), Brueggemann notes that the king celebrates YHWH's promise to make his "house" an abiding dynasty, but that the promise of YHWH fails at the exile (pp. 43ff.). Brueggemann suggests that without the insistent prayers of the people that YHWH be faithful to his promises to David, "divine persistence might have failed" (p. 46). It is David's prayer, and those of his people after him, that "evokes YHWH's abiding fidelity" (p. 47). Finally, in his discussion of the prayer of Job (chap. 12), Brueggemann portrays God as one whose wrath is "arbitrary" and that needs to be exposed "for what it is" (p. 130).

In other parts of the book, however, Brueggemann finds Yahweh to be a God of complete fidelity, grace, and compassion. In the discussion of Hannah's prayer (chap. 3), for example, YHWH is understood to be a God who "responds with generous gifts and astonishing reversals that break cycles of need, end seasons of abandonment, overcome situations of helplessness, and put Israel on a whole new course for life" (p. 24). And in later chapters, Brueggemann stresses the balance between YHWH's gracious fidelity and uncompromising sovereignty inherent within the formula from Exod 34:6–7 (e.g. p. 71).

Brueggemann brings the study to a close with a chapter entitled "Retrospect" (pp. 132–38), in which he summarizes the themes he has sought to bring out in the book. He notes, first, that while much of the church's articulation of God is "given in the more static terms of Western philosophy," this God is cast "in Jewish terms," which permits him to be "variously elusive, irascible, open to impingement, and capable of disjunctive response" (p. 132). Second, Brueggemann suggests that because of the character of this God, "the engagement of Israel in prayer is a genuine interactive dialogue" (p. 132–33). Third, Israel's prayers engage in full candor and "tell the truth about its life without camouflage or decoration" (p. 134). Fourth, Israel's prayers are intimate and personal (pp. 134–35). Fifth, the prayers of individual Israelites are grounded in the experience of the Israelite community (p. 135). Sixth, Israel's prayers are contextual (p. 135). And seventh, Israel's prayers are imperative (pp. 135–36).

Brueggemann's goal in this book is a worthy one. It is true that the situation of prayer in the context of Western theology, with its understanding of God's character as "omni" in every way, does often lead to the conclusion that "the impact of prayer is [limited to] the one who prays" and, as such, prayer is often "anemic and polite" (p. 133). Brueggemann's method of circumventing this kind of anemia, however, is sometimes problematic in that it compromises the character of God. For example, he concludes that "it is exactly that God *does not know* and God *is not present* that evokes much of Israel's

prayer" (p. 133). While pastors and professors may want to use *Great Prayers of the Old Testament* to glean ideas or as a starting point for further study, they may want to point parishioners and students to other resources.

Ralph K. Hawkins

Sack School of Bible and Ministry, Kentucky Christian University, Grayson, KY

Beginnings: Ancient Christian Readings of the Biblical Creation Narratives. By Peter C. Bouteneff. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2008, 240 pp., \$22.99.

Peter C. Bouteneff, Associate Professor of Theology at St. Vladimir's Orthodox Theological Seminary, presents in this book a thoroughly researched account and evaluation of the various interpretations of Genesis 1–3 by Christian writers of the first three centuries.

In chapter 1, the author indicates that although Wellhausen's Documentary Hypothesis has been debated and challenged, he is still influenced by it. He goes as far as to say that the Jews did not accept these chapters in their present form until the second or first century BC. But laying that aside, he goes on to describe what he sees as the narrative's logic and then deals with how the Septuagint deals with the passage, not only in its translation of Genesis but also in its translation of other OT and Apocryphal passages that mention creation, Adam, or the Fall. He cites many other writings, especially *Jubilees*, where details are omitted and others added to help support the author's agenda. The chapter concludes with a discussion of Philo's works and his dualistic anthropology and allegories.

Next, Bouteneff gives attention to Paul and the rest of the NT. He understands Paul as giving a brand new interpretation of Adam and Eden. He says Paul uses them to interpret Christ, or to discuss such things as gender and marriage. Like Paul, Luke contrasts the original creation with the new creation. Matthew and Mark see Genesis as recording universal creation. This is also seen in the Pastoral Epistles, which Bouteneff does not accept as Pauline.

From chapter 3 on, the book deals with second and third century authors, pointing out that in one or two generations after the apostles they developed "substantial theological principles that would endure for centuries" (p. 55).

Beginning with Justin Martyr, the book goes on to discuss the ideas of creation, Adam, and paradise held by twelve Church Fathers of the second and third centuries. Special attention is given to several: Theophilus of Antioch, who argued for the factual/historical nature of the narratives and that this was not compromised by his allegorical and typological interpretations; Irenaeus of Lyons, who purposed to show how Jewish Scriptures and the Gospels and Epistles, when properly understood, relate to each other; Origen, who brilliantly placed Scripture alongside classical literature and stirred great controversy because of his allegorical exegesis; Basil of Caesarea, who was a major figure of the Church and interpreted these passages both in and out of context, most often to make a moral point or to counteract Arian positions; and Gregory of Nyssa, who was concerned about distinguishing between God's timelessness and created chronological time as well as showing that God was not responsible for evil.

Bouteneff's concluding observations begin by recognizing that most of these Church Fathers used the LXX, had diverse contexts, diverse interests and concerns, and yet show points of remarkable unity. Most treat Adam as a real person, but also as a symbol of human nature. "None, however, considered that people were born guilty of the sin of Adam. Most treated allegory and typology as synonymous. Their example should

“cause those of us who seek fidelity to the fathers . . . to refrain from overly conflating Scripture with science, in order to bring realistic expectations to each. . . . If we follow the fathers, we will see the Genesis accounts as God’s uniquely chosen vehicle to express his truth about cosmic and human origins and the dynamics of sin and death, all recapitulated and cohering in the person of Christ” (p. 183).

The book is worth reading for its analyses of the interpretations of these Church Fathers. The appendix, bibliography, and index will also prove helpful for anyone studying this period.

Stanley M. Horton
Assemblies of God Theological Seminary, Springfield, MO

Leviticus. By Timothy M. Willis. Abingdon Old Testament Commentaries. Nashville: Abingdon, 2009, xxvi + 241 pp., \$35.00.

Timothy M. Willis, the Blanche E. Seaver Professor of Religion at Pepperdine University, has produced a short, readable commentary on the book of Leviticus. It is part of the Abingdon Old Testament Commentaries series based on the NRSV and under the general editorship of Patrick D. Miller of Princeton Theological Seminary. This series seeks to provide “compact, critical commentaries on the books of the Old Testament for the use of theological students and pastors,” as well as for “upper-level college or university students” and for “those responsible for teaching in congregational settings” (p. xiii). The authors of this series come from variety of ecclesiastical and confessional backdrops.

Willis generally takes a moderate-critical stance to Leviticus. Rather than dating the redaction of the earlier Holiness Code (H) together with the later Priestly Writer (P) to the period after the Babylonian exile as most source critics have done, Willis thinks H precedes Ezekiel and P precedes H (pp. xxi-xxii). His moderation also shows up in the respect he pays to contemporary conservative commentators (e.g. Gane, Harrison, Hartley, Wenham), whose views he often mentions alongside those of more strictly critical commentators.

The commentary proper analyzes each literary unit of Leviticus in three ways: Literary Analysis, Exegetical Analysis, and Theological and Ethical Analysis. The sections on literary analysis deal with questions of genre, structure, and style. These sections discuss things such as narrative formulas, major units, repetition of key phrases in the unit, and switching from singular to plural forms of the second person. One of the more insightful of these makes the observation that Lev 24:13–23 follows a fifteen element chiasmic structure with the *lex talonis* (vv. 19–20) at the center of the chiasm. There is also a helpful chart outlining the topics of Leviticus 19. Despite an occasional insight, these discussions are usually on the dry side and less helpful than the other sections of the commentary for the general reader. To be fair, this may have more to do with the nature of the material in Leviticus than with the author.

The sections on exegetical analysis concentrate on key phrases and issues in each passage. Where there are multiple exegetical possibilities, Willis often lists them with minimal discussion. For example, where the hand is laid on the animal designated for a burnt offering in Leviticus 1, Willis lists four possibilities of the meaning of that gesture (identification with the animal; identification of the person offering the animal; transfer of ownership of the animal to God; and designating the animal as set aside for sacrifice) without any discussion to determine which may be more probable. He completely omits—save for affirming that the gesture here is different than the similar

gesture with the Day of Atonement offering in Leviticus 16—the possibility affirmed by traditional commentators (e.g. Kellogg, Bonar) that the laying on of hands has to do with a transfer of sin from the offerer to the sacrificial animal to make atonement for the offerer. Likewise, concerning the “mercy seat” in Leviticus 16 he notes that some take this term simply to mean a “cover” while others relate it to the verb “to make atonement.” But Willis does not venture to give his opinion as to which of these is more likely. A similar thing happens in his discussion of the goat in the Day of Atonement ritual. Willis there mentions that “Azazel” may refer to “scapegoat” (the goat that escapes), may mean a hypothesized goat-demon named Azazel, may mean “for removal,” or may refer to a barren land to which the goat was driven. He finds all the views problematic, though he seems tentatively to opt for the goat-demon view despite the fact that this view is (as he put it) “unorthodox” and in contradiction with the teaching of the OT elsewhere.

The lack of discussion of exegetical matters is largely to be ascribed to the space limitations of a section-by-section commentary that only allows three to five pages of discussion per literary unit. For that reason many matters one might seek in a commentary are entirely omitted. For example, if one were to look for a discussion of the prohibition of “tattoos” in Lev 19:28—tattoos being a subject that comes up more often these days—one would search in vain for Willis’s discussion.

The sections on theological and ethical significance seek to bring out the contemporary relevance of the text. Thus, Leviticus 27, on redeeming votive offerings, leads Willis to discuss fulfilling voluntary gifts and commitments to God today. The year of Jubilee in Leviticus 25 leads to a discussion of overturning “the usual systems of privilege and self-advancement of the strong at the expense of the weak and vulnerable” (p. 218). The Day of Atonement ritual in Leviticus 16 leads to a discussion of everyone, and especially clergy, removing impurity from their lives.

These discussions of theological and ethical significance lean far more towards moral and ethical than the theological. A major weakness from a Christian-theological perspective of Willis’s commentary is that there is little attempt to integrate the theology of Leviticus into biblical theology as a whole. In particular, there is a paucity of references to the NT’s use of Leviticus, especially the use by the writer of Hebrews. The NT clearly sees the atoning sacrifices of Leviticus as typologically foreshadowing the atoning death of Christ. There is, of course, a danger of letting the teachings of Hebrews so influence one’s exegesis that one misses what the OT text actually says. On the other hand, Willis errs in the opposite direction by not sufficiently showing the ways the NT relates matters in Leviticus to the person and work of Christ.

Joe M. Sprinkle
Crossroads College, Rochester, MN

Psalms. By Geoffrey W. Grogan. Two Horizons Old Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008, xi + 490 pp., \$25.00 paper.

This second OT volume in the Two Horizons series features the work of Geoffrey Grogan—an appropriate choice, since this series is intended to bridge the divide between exegesis and systematic theology. Grogan has published in both areas, and his several past publications that focus on the psalms or on prayer have now coalesced in this commentary.

The commentary is divided into three major sections: Introduction, Exegesis, and Theological Horizons of Psalms. These are followed by a brief appendix entitled “Pre-

paring a Sermon on a Psalm" (really a case study using Psalm 8) as well as three indices: names, subjects, and Scripture references.

The introduction briefly treats textual criticism in Psalms and surveys poetic devices in the Psalter, especially parallelism. However, Grogan uses most of this section to treat various critical approaches that have been used during the last 150 years to interpret the psalms: source, genre/form, redaction, canonical, rhetorical/literary, and reader-oriented criticisms. The discussion is mostly a review of previous scholarship with a few observations by Grogan. These are easy to miss, but often worth noting. For instance, he notes that a weakness of redaction criticism is that "a versatile author is often a master of several styles, and distinguishing sources on the basis of stylistic criteria can be hazardous" (p. 20). The most helpful discussion is about canonical criticism and its contribution to understanding the final arrangement and shape of the book of Psalms. This is clearly one of Grogan's interests, as it plays an important role in both the Exegesis and Theological Horizons sections. Following the survey of these various critical approaches to Psalms, Grogan includes a short but helpful appraisal of them, with the helpful concluding thought that "the higher our view of biblical authority is, the more tentative we should be, lest we elevate some particular system of literary study to a position above the biblical text itself" (p. 33).

The introduction concludes with a short discussion of the contemporary use of psalms, which has remained fairly constant throughout time: for prayer (public and private), for worship (public and private), and to learn more about God's ways with his people. An excursus on the Davidic psalms rounds out the introduction. This is a very useful discussion of the possible meanings of the superscriptions that connect almost half of the psalms with David. Grogan deftly negotiates the various theories about these psalms' connection with David, favoring the view that they indicate Davidic authorship.

The Exegesis section is not a detailed commentary on each psalm, but tends to present a series of notes on the psalms. For most psalms this involves an introductory paragraph about the psalm, often including a discussion of its placement by the editor(s) within the larger collection. This is followed by short paragraphs discussing the psalm broken down into several sections. In a few cases where Grogan believes two consecutive psalms were originally one composition (e.g. Psalms 9 and 10), he treats them together. The reader looking for in-depth discussion of a particular verse or interaction with a particularly difficult exegetical problem will not find it here. Instead, Grogan gives us a more general discussion of each psalm and the flow of its thought and theology. Most helpful is his continual reference to how a particular psalm functions in the context of its neighboring psalms or how a psalm fits into a larger context that would be noticed by someone who is reading the psalms consecutively. This helps the reader understand the logic that may well have lain behind the Psalter's inspired final editor's decisions about the grouping and order of the psalms. It is clear from these comments that Grogan feels the present order of the psalms comes from post-exilic times, probably the Persian era, a topic he will return to in his discussion of the theology of the psalms (see especially p. 235).

The final and longest section of the commentary, "Theological Horizons of Psalms," is divided into three subsections. The first, "The Psalter's Key Theological Themes," is organized around Yahweh as both the source and topic of the psalms' theology. The psalmists not only assumed Yahweh was the only true God and Creator of the world, but they knew him by his revelation of himself in his great acts such as the exodus and the Sinai event and as the God who established his kingdom and temple at Jerusalem. From these common themes, Grogan demonstrates that the psalms, despite coming from several authors at various times in Israel's history, contain a common theology of a gracious God who is Creator, Redeemer, and Ruler. The author also develops a theme that he only touched upon lightly in the previous sections of the commentary—the

psalmists had an abiding faith that God would provide a messianic redeemer, and that this appears most clearly in the “royal psalms.” This messianic hope also is voiced clearly in the NT’s use of the psalms, which Grogan sees as a completely legitimate use of the psalms and in keeping with their theological message. This is shown in his comments on the psalmists’ hope for deliverance beyond death, “so that it is no surprise to find the NT applying it to the resurrection of Christ. Many modern commentators are reluctant to understand these passages this way and, it seems to me, tend to set aside this kind of interpretation of them too easily” (p. 291).

Grogan follows with a second subsection, a nice discussion of the psalms’ contribution to biblical theology including the topics of God and his revelation of himself in history, sin, suffering, prayer and worship, and the Messiah. This transitions nicely into his final subsection and its discussion of the relevance of the psalms to contemporary issues under the headings of God and creation, anthropology and sin, grace, the Holy Spirit, the church, eschatology, and Holy Scripture.

Grogan’s treatment will be welcomed by evangelicals on several accounts. He is not embarrassed to assert that the NT use and understanding of the psalms is correct. Nor is he shy in asserting that the psalms are ultimately messianic and fulfilled in Christ, though his discussion is not simply an assertion of this, but a well-informed and thoughtful discussion that draws this theme nicely out of the psalms’ own thought and the logical conclusion about the final shape of the Psalter by an inspired editor that assumed a messianic message was central to the psalms’ theology. Moreover, he is not afraid to assert that the psalms take an unequivocal moral stand due to God’s love and care for his creation and his redemption of humankind. Thus, he understands Psalm 139 as relevant to contemporary discussions of abortion and euthanasia.

There is much to be gained from this commentary. While at places it seems ponderous and slow-moving in its prose, its careful and wisely nuanced discussions are well worth reading and considering. Even when one finds oneself disagreeing with Grogan’s conclusions, they are not to be dismissed lightly and without good reason.

Andrew Steinmann

Concordia University Chicago, River Forest, IL

Psalms, Volume 3: Psalms 90–150. By John Goldingay. Baker Commentary on the Old Testament Wisdom and Psalms. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2008, 812 pp., \$44.99.

Lengthy or multi-volume commentaries on the book of Psalms are nothing new and almost unavoidable considering the size of the Psalter and number of psalms. Regardless, quality of commentary always outranks quantity as a measuring stick. While I have read only the final volume of John Goldingay’s three-volume commentary on the Hebrew Psalter, I affirm it to contain both quantity (750 pages) and quality of analysis in my opinion. The author’s attempt to cover so much material from numerous angles (textual, historical, theological, and practical) is appreciated, applauded, and admired.

Inevitably, as in all such global endeavors, all that can or should be said at times is cut short for time and space constraints, leaving the reader wishing for less rehearsal of *what the text says* and more of the author’s challenging reflection on *what the text means*. However, I do not say this to dissuade anyone from making use of this highly informative and insightful commentary (or set of three commentaries). If one has to tackle the entire Psalter, better to err on this side than that of what often has been superficial summations in order to avoid a large production.

This book, *Psalms 90–150*, is, as noted, the third of a three-volume set on the OT book of Psalms in the Wisdom and Psalms subcategory (edited by Tremper Longman)

of the Baker Commentary on the Old Testament series. Published in 2008, volumes 1 and 2 appeared in 2006 and 2007, respectively. This volume covers Books IV and V of the Hebrew Psalter, while the first volume dealt with Book I and the second with Books II–III. Before the commentary proper, an Author's Preface follows a Series Preface by the Editor. Those hoping for a digression at some point (in any of the volumes) into the current controversies over the whys and wherefores of the arrangement of the Psalter will be disappointed. Goldingay reveals right away his hesitancy about the value of this topic in his preface; however, he does supply a footnote listing a few notable publications on this issue, the latest being 1998. (Note: Interesting and new research on this is being developed on the Continent as I write, so stay tuned!) Thinking it involves too much speculation, the author admits the approach he favors, which alerts the reader to a major feature and the focus of his commentary: the individual psalm (p. 11). True to this focus, all that separates his preface from the commentary proper is an Abbreviations section, with no forays into introductory or background essays on Books IV–V. Kudos should go to Goldingay for not getting bogged down in speculations about sociological settings. His textual point of departure and mainstay is the MT of the Leningrad Codex as published in BHS. The regular use of Yhwh for the Divine Name is to be commended, in contrast to the dated and dubious Yahweh or the misdirection created by "LORD." On the other hand, I, for one, find it refreshing when someone is bold enough to posit a defensible translation of the Tetragrammaton rather than merely repeat one of the typical transliterations (cf. "Eternal One" of *The Voice: New Testament*, e.g. Heb 2:13 quoting Isa 8:17).

The commentary proper is organized systematically in three sections per psalm, moving naturally and progressively from Psalm 90 to 150, as follows: (1) author's translation with notes; (2) interpretation; and finally (3) theological implications. While the latter section is sometimes regrettably brief, Goldingay distinguishes his commentary by adding this thoughtful and often theologically compelling and practically challenging conclusion to each psalm. One concern, however, is that the distinction between the interpretation section and this implication section is not always clear. Comments especially that seem to belong to the latter appear in the former. But this is understandable since it is hard to divorce an application from a specific interpretation on which it is based. Also, almost any reflection on or explanation of the text is theological in some sense. In this regard, the attempt to create a separate theological conclusion to each psalm is sometimes artificial (even if the view expressed is admirable or accurate). The interpretation section is theological but the purpose is to move to *what the text means* as practical and contemporary implications from *what the text says* as contextual interpretation. Such a division is of course not always black and white, and both are theological.

Pastors and other Bible teachers especially will find this commentary valuable as a resource for personal Bible study, sermon preparation, or classroom lectures. It is up to date with current Psalms studies (citing recent articles in peer-reviewed journals and recent books and dissertations, including Hebrew philology), yet also is packed with citations and quotations from great commentators of the past, both Jewish and Christian. Philological analysis is attempted at times but limited in scope and depth, likely due to the attempt to provide so many different kinds of information, although references related to technical discussions are noted. References to parallel passages and relevant resources abound, including the Vulgate, LXX, Jerome, notable rabbis, Augustine, Luther, Calvin, and the Midrash and Targum of the Psalms. Closer to home, the *Book of Common Prayer* is often used. The lack of a theological or dating system *à la* grind is also in the book's favor.

In addition to being a gold mine of what others have said, worthy of much praise is the author's inclusion of his own fresh translation of each psalm—not because it is beyond reproof or a hands-down best translation (although I do not have numerous

arguments here) but mainly because it is included. Apart from this the commentary would be far less original and deserving of the “must-have” award. This is a feature that sets this commentary apart from those that so often in recent years have been based on a standard existing and popular English version.

Notable as well is the provision of a textual commentary on each translation, appearing as footnotes in each instance. These notes evince close and critical study of the MT and an acquaintance with the classic and relevant literature, past and present, traditional and contemporary (e.g. Dahood, von Rad, Gunkel, Kirkpatrick, Spurgeon, and Kraus). Variant readings in older versions mostly concern the LXX and Vulgate. There is not a lot here (apart from the occasional tidbit) for those interested in comparative and cognate Semitic linguistics, but naturally extensive treatments in this area belong to productions preoccupied with philology. At times the reader is, however, treated with an untraditional or novel idea, such as the suggestion that the repetition of “shout” may refer to a blast of musical instruments (p. 122). Other criticisms may not go beyond the level of quibbling, e.g. having to flip back to a glossary to read information related to superscriptions is unhandy; but then it does avoid redundancies in a lengthy treatise.

This is not a work to digest in large chunks at one sitting, but it has its value as a reliable reference whenever a particular psalm is being examined or exegeted. While this is not a devotional commentary, it does add a significant spiritual and application aspect to an otherwise exegetical exposition (making the hermeneutical spiral complete). This is refreshing since often when a strong devotional direction is added it is at the expense of top-rate exegesis. All in all, this commentary is highly recommended for pastors especially. Whether you or I agree or not with every translational or interpretational decision takes nothing away from the book’s overall value as a significant contribution to the current discussions and debates about the significance of the OT Psalter for Christian faith and practice. This is not the last but a lasting word on the Psalms.

W. Creighton Marlowe
Evangelical Theological Faculty, Leuven, Belgium

Isaiah 40–55: A Critical And Exegetical Commentary. ICC. By John Goldingay and David Payne. 2 vols. New York: T & T Clark, 2006, 368 and 381 pp., \$144.00 per volume.

John Goldingay is the David Allan Hubbard Professor of OT at Fuller Theological Seminary and David Payne was formerly Director of Studies at London Bible College. In the preface, they explain the interesting process that led to Goldingay and Payne working together on this set. Payne generated textual and philological notes for chapters 40–41 and passed those on to Goldingay. Goldingay then wrote the introduction and carried out textual, philological, literary, exegetical, and theological work on 40–55 and sent those to Payne, section by section. Payne added further textual and philological notes for chapters 42–55 for Goldingay to include in the volumes. The result involved too many pages for the ICC series, so Goldingay gathered the literary-theological material and published it in his *Message of Isaiah 40–55: A Literary-Theological Commentary* (New York: T & T Clark, 2005). Consequently, this ICC set of volumes emphasizes textual, philological, and exegetical observations. Volume 1 covers Isaiah 40:1–44:23 while the second volume entails Isaiah 44:24–55:13.

Although Goldingay and Payne do not reject the contribution of redactional-critical theories for exegesis, they treat Isaiah 40–55 as a coherent whole that plays a significant role in the book of Isaiah. They reject the notion of “the book of Deutero-Isaiah,”

although they do not regard Isaiah ben Amoz as the author of the entire book. They attempt to interpret Isaiah 40–55 as it stands without drawing heavily on redactional suppositions. With reference to the audience or date of Isaiah 40–55, their working hypothesis is that the book called Isaiah reached the form in which we have it in the late Persian or early Greek period and was written in Jerusalem. They recognize there is no hard evidence for this chronology or location, but point to various internal indicators that they conclude support this understanding. Consequently, this book does not address a particular audience or situation.

They view the text of Isaiah in similar fashion. They are very aware of the textual witnesses to the text of Isaiah but have no interest in ascertaining the book's original text. When they refer to "the text of Isaiah 40–55," they are focusing on the hypothetical pre-Masoretic Hebrew text of the Greek and Roman period (p. 15). They regard the Aleppo Codex, the Leningrad Codex, and the Cairo Codex as fundamentally reliable guides to the form of Isaiah 40–55.

They summarize the message of Isaiah 40–55 along five lines. First, the one who speaks to the prophet's community is "your God" (40:1). In other words, the committed relationship of covenant between Yahweh and Israel has not been dissolved but has been restored. Second, Isaiah's message concerns "my people" (40:1). Israel is a people who belongs especially to Yahweh. As part of this theme, Goldingay and Payne identify the servant of the servant songs as the nation of Israel, especially in the first servant song. The nation's task is to proclaim Yahweh's authority to the nations and to be a covenant of the people and a light to the nations. The fourth servant song (chap. 53) presents the servant against the backdrop of the interplay between the people and the prophet in the preceding chapters. No individual (including the Messiah) is in view in the servant songs. Third, "my people" is focused on Jerusalem-Zion (40:1). The city of Jerusalem is central to the hopes of the nation. Fourth, Yahweh's intention to restore Jacob-Israel so that it can function as his servant will find fulfillment in the future. In order to cope with the facts of the present, the prophet is to fulfill the role of Jacob-Israel as servant on an interim basis (Isa. 49:1–4). The prophet is summoned to be Yahweh's servant in order to bring back Jacob-Israel to Yahweh so that the nation itself can function as Yahweh's servant (p. 54). Fifth, the servant's ministry will not only benefit the nation/chosen people but many nations and kings.

Goldingay and Payne dismiss the category of "servant songs" insofar as this category suggests these passages have a separate identity from the surrounding passages. They treat them in an entirely contextual fashion. They also contend that these passages (42:1–9; 49:1–12; 50:4–9; 52:13–53:12) give lesson to the identity of the servant compared with the ministry of the servant. Consequently, their identification of the servant in these passages is somewhat hazy. They seem to identify the servant as the nation in 42:1–4 and the prophet in chapters 49, 50, and 53.

As with all ICC commentaries, Goldingay and Payne have provided their readers with an abundance of textual and exegetical information. They begin each major section with an overview of the structure and parallelism of the passages in that section. As they work through each pericope they generally begin each consideration of a verse or part of a verse with key structural features and then walk through passage, phrase by phrase. Sometimes at the end and at times sprinkled throughout their explanation they give careful attention to the contribution of the Versions: LXX, Targums, and Vulgate. Scattered throughout their treatment and located at the end of their treatment of a verse, they provide brief explanations of text critical problems, unique morphological issues, key etymological observations, and more. They set these comments off with a slightly smaller font. In addition to the full bibliography (33 pages) at the beginning of volume one, they conclude each major outline section with a short bibliography (usually about 2 pages), providing references not included in the larger bibliography.

These volumes on Isaiah provide the student of Scripture voluminous exegetical information. Goldingay and Payne give careful attention to key aspects of exegesis: rhetorical structure, meanings of words and phrases, key text critical variants, as well as the most important interpretive debates. They connect key concepts with other OT passages that make a similar point. They are abreast of modern as well as older biblical scholarship.

In spite of the set's many strengths, Goldingay's and Payne's conclusions about the authorship of the book do affect their interpretation in numerous places. While that is totally understandable, the reader must recognize when an interpretation significantly draws on the envisioned setting at least as much as the intrinsic date of the text. Even if there should not be a separate "servant songs" category (as Goldingay and Payne argue), I found their explanation of the identity of the servant somewhat convoluted and ambiguous. Also, they did not give much attention to passages that were problematic to their conclusion.

Regardless, these ICC volumes on Isaiah offer numerous insights into the meaning of Isaiah 40–55 and demand careful study by any student of the book of Isaiah. Unfortunately, the price tag for these volumes will discourage most students of Scripture from including them in their personal libraries.

Michael A. Grisanti
The Master's Seminary, Sun Valley, CA

Challenging Prophetic Metaphor: Theology and Ideology in the Prophets. By Julia M. O'Brien. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2008, xxii + 202 pp., \$24.95 paper.

The basic issue that Julia O'Brien addresses in *Challenging Prophetic Metaphor* is how the reader of the prophets should respond when the reader's ideology conflicts with the writer's. In other words, if one reads the text and discovers that he or she disagrees with the perspective of the author, is there still a possibility of salvaging the text and using it in theological conversation? O'Brien resolves this dilemma with the assumption that ideological criticism may, on the one hand, not allow the reader to embrace the teaching of the prophetic book, but on the other hand, may provide the catalyst for continuing evolution of one's ideological presuppositions. Ideological criticism offers "readers deeper insight into the cultural scripts that shape their own thinking and thus inform their responses to the text" (p. 60). Thus, as the prophets are read and the writers' faulty world view—particularly that of the outdated views of patriarchy—is encountered, the text forces the reader to look inward and discover where vestiges of these errors remain so that one's ideologies may continue to be honed. As a result, O'Brien attempts to walk a middle road between the conclusion of many feminists that the metaphors used by the prophets—e.g. God as husband, father, and warrior—taint the text to such an extent that it has little to no redeeming value and the conclusion of traditional OT scholarship that was unwilling to challenge the writers' ideologies. In challenging the latter conclusion, she states, "Perhaps abandoning the assumption that value goes hand in hand with assent will allow readers to find other forms of value in their engagement with the Prophetic Books" (p. 51). In challenging the former, she believes part of the answer is reading the text as literature and calls for "engaging [the Bible] as fully as we do other powerfully told stories, to read the Bible for all that it is worth" (p. 52). In other words, the modern reader sees and interprets life through the lens of literature even when there is no agreement with its teachings; we read with presuppositions dictated by our own and our culture's ideology.

Chapter 6, entitled “God as (Angry) Warrior,” gives an example of the author’s reasoning through these issues. After providing an extensive set of passages demonstrating the prophetic warrior motif, O’Brien shows how reading these acts of violence—acts that are personified as being poured out upon women—from the perspective of a feminist ideology leads to a rejection of the prophetic teaching. Whereas some embrace the teaching of books such as Nahum, a feminist certainly cannot because of its violence against women. However, the question remains as to whether she as the reader can find any redeeming value to this metaphor. In response to this, O’Brien concludes that the anger of God as portrayed in Nahum became an opportunity for her to explore how a modern understanding of anger “led me to clarify exactly what offends me about Nahum” (p. 121). Moreover, engagement of Nahum caused her to discover how the justice that is called for might benefit one group while bringing injustice upon another. Thus, her ideological criticism has not caused her to view justice from the biblical perspective, but rather to evaluate how her own concepts of justice may be inadvertently causing injustice to come upon another group. Reading Nahum has caused her to cry out with renewed fervor for “equal justice for all” (p. 123).

Although I will probably find little need for the book in my study, it did provide helpful insight into the mindset of those who approach Scripture in a manner quite different from my approach. For me, Scripture provides the basis for my faith and practice; for her, it is a work of literature upon which modern beliefs and practices carry on mutually-authoritative dialogue, for “the Bible can be engaged rather than simply obeyed” (p. xxi) and the text is “a resource for our lives, even when we cannot or will not submit to its claims” (p. xxii). For me, Scripture paints a picture of the real world to which I conform my views of reality, particularly of my relationship to the God who it presents as gracious and merciful and who provides salvation; for her, the OT presents the archaic practices driven by “problematic ideologies” that modern culture still struggles to overcome. Whereas I view Scripture as authoritative, she prefers not to speak in such terms, for “approaching the Bible in this way leads to theological dead ends and contributes to self-deception in interpretation” (p. 51). With such foundational differences in the way we read the text, I was not surprised by much of the content of the book. What baffled me as I read O’Brien’s interaction with Scripture was her purpose in doing so, for there seems to be little reason for her continued pursuit of reading the OT when the very fabric of its teaching—wisdom sourced in the fear of God—is rejected.

Randall L. McKinion
Shepherds Theological Seminary, Cary, NC

Basics of Verbal Aspect in Biblical Greek. By Constantine R. Campbell. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2008, 159 pp., \$16.99 paper.

Basics of Verbal Aspect in Biblical Greek represents the third volume on verbal aspect that Constantine Campbell, lecturer in Greek and New Testament at Moore Theological College, has published since 2007. In this volume, Campbell brings together the findings from his two previous works, which build on a non-temporal understanding of Greek tenses, and packages them as an introductory textbook. After an opening chapter highlighting the exegetical significance of verbal aspect, the book is divided into two major sections. Part 1 deals with verbal aspect theory. Campbell begins by defining verbal aspect and explains how it differs from tense and *Aktionsart* (chap. 1). This is followed by a helpful, concise treatment of the history of verbal aspect (chap. 2), an introduction to perfective (chap. 3) and imperfective aspects (chap. 4), and a discussion

of the much debated perfect tense (chap. 5). Part 2 shifts attention to the analysis of NT texts. In chapter 6, Campbell introduces readers to “verbal lexeme basics” and argues that “verbal aspect operates in cooperation with various lexemes to produce *Aktionsart* expression” (p. 55). Although this is a book about verbal aspect, *Aktionsart* is a major focus throughout Part 2. As he explains how the present and imperfect tenses (chap. 7), aorist and future tenses (chap. 8), and perfect and pluperfect tenses (chap. 9) function, Campbell also introduces a three-step method for isolating *Aktionsart* with each tense. The final chapter provides further instruction on participles and how verbal aspect impacts their interpretation. The book concludes with a helpful postscript that further clarifies Campbell’s use of spatial rather than temporal categories, material that many students will find useful to read after chapter 3. Exercises are included at the end of the final four chapters with answers located at the end of the book.

As Campbell notes, the literature on Greek verbal aspect to date has been highly technical and has had limited impact on how Koine Greek is taught, despite the broad consensus regarding the importance of verbal aspect. An introductory volume on this topic is thus welcome. Such a volume, however, will need to pass two tests to enjoy widespread use. It must present the material in a manner that will be readily accessible to students, and its treatment of verbal aspect must be convincing enough for scholars to adopt it as a textbook.

Campbell easily passes the first test. His explanations are clear, concise, and effectively illustrated. Although some may quibble with his handling of certain terminology, his presentation is consistent and pedagogically effective. The brevity of the chapters has the advantage of delivering the material in bite-sized chunks that will be easy to digest, while also making them reasonable as supplementary reading assignments. Although the amount of repetition (sometimes verbatim) can become tedious to the scholar, it will likely serve students well.

How well Campbell fares with the second test is a more complex question. His treatment of the perfective and imperfective aspects is well presented and generally consistent with the emerging consensus on these most common aspects. He draws heavily on earlier works throughout the book and makes regular use of the well-worn street parade illustration. His comments on the distribution of Greek tenses within narrative texts are helpful and a significant contribution. Campbell should also be applauded for his cautions against drawing inappropriate inferences from Greek aspect.

As the first attempt to produce a volume of this nature, however, it is not surprising that there are areas where the book could be strengthened or where some scholars will take issue with the analysis. Let me offer a few illustrative comments regarding how this volume could be improved and expanded in a second edition.

First, Campbell argues that the perfect tense is imperfective aspect, rejecting both the traditional view that it portrays action as past with continuing consequences and the more recent proposals that the perfect is stative aspect (McKay, Porter) or perfective aspect (Fanning, Olsen). Although we must acknowledge that no consensus exists on this issue and Campbell is careful to introduce the other views, his analysis relies far too heavily on the fact that the present and perfect tenses both occur primarily in reported discourse in narrative. (Note that the future tense, which Campbell maintains is perfective, also tends to appear in reported discourse.) Similarly, Campbell’s novel use of “heightened proximity” for the perfect and “heightened remoteness” for the pluperfect needs further substantiation. He makes little or no effort to illustrate how imperfective aspect and heightened proximity fit with the perfect tense or how the perfect tense correlates with prominence.

Second, some of Campbell’s claims need to be revised or eliminated. In his comments on infinitives used with $\delta\acute{\upsilon}\tau\acute{o}$, for example, he states that “the causal infinitive

explains the reasons behind various mainline actions, and thus this construction is unsurprisingly dominated by the present infinitive due to its imperfective aspect, in the same way that offline information is conveyed through imperfective aspect in the indicative mood" (p. 74). Is it verbal aspect, however, that marks this construction as supplementary or the causal construction itself? Indeed, in the LXX the aorist is nearly as common as the present with this construction. How does the aorist impact its meaning? Another example involves Campbell's association of progressive *Aktionsart* with the perfect tense. Although this potentially supports his view that the perfect is imperfective in aspect, the illustrative texts that are provided are ambiguous at best.

Third, while Campbell's exercises are generally very helpful, some should be eliminated or accompanied by further explanation. In his treatment of Rom 8:11, for example, Campbell maintains that the verb $\zeta\omega\pi\omicron\iota\eta\sigma\epsilon\iota$ is ingressive because it "refers to entrance into a state of being" (p. 146). It is the direct object, however, rather than the subject, that is entering a state. The subject's action appears to be punctiliar based on Campbell's definition on page 87. Regarding John 1:10, Campbell suggests that since the context of $\epsilon\gamma\upsilon\omega$ "allows entrance into a state," the verb should be viewed as ingressive (p. 145). The context, however, also "allows summary" (another of Campbell's categories). Similarly, in analyzing the aorist verbs in Rom 8:30, though Campbell views them all as gnomic (p. 147), one could easily conclude that the first five verbs are "summary" aorists that lead up to a final proleptic aorist. At the very least, students will need more guidance in how to work through alternative analyses. Care should also be taken to avoid the impression that Campbell's three-step approach is more objective than it is. Indeed, at times the three steps could be boiled down to the question of context. The fact that gnomic clauses occur with the perfect and future tenses as well as the present and aorist tenses, for example, suggests that verb tense has little bearing on this *Aktionsart*. Finally, given the focus of the book, it would have been helpful to provide exercises to help students grapple with the discourse functions of the various aspects, rather than simply focusing on *Aktionsart*.

By nature, an introductory textbook should major on consensus views. When consensus is not forthcoming, one can either refrain from producing such a work or forge ahead, as Campbell has done. Most scholars will find plenty of room for improvement in this brief volume. Nevertheless, *Basics of Verbal Aspect* fills a significant gap and provides a helpful starting point for teaching this important topic to students with a year or more of Greek, whether it is treated as an authority on every issue or utilized as a conversation partner.

Martin M. Culy
Briercrest College and Seminary, Caronport, SK

King and Messiah as Son of God: Divine, Human, and Angelic Messianic Figures in Biblical and Related Literature. By Adela Yarbro Collins and John J. Collins. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008, xiv + 261 pp., \$28.00 paper.

This volume contains essays originally delivered by Adela Yarbro Collins and John J. Collins at the University of Oxford in 2006. The essays focus on the specific subject of the divinity of Israel's king and the messiah. In contrast to many studies that depict the Jewish messiah as a strictly human figure (as opposed to the Christian messiah who is transcendent), this book endeavors to show that the divinity of the messiah has its roots in the royal ideology of ancient Judah, which in turn was influenced by ideas from

Egyptian mythology and then infused apocalyptic perspectives during the Hellenistic period. The authors wish to stress the Jewish context for Christian messianism, and they accordingly address the relations of kingship and messiahship to divinity.

The first four chapters are the work of John Collins and include: "The King as Son of God," which delves in the ideology of the royal psalms (chap. 1); "The Kingship in Deuteronomistic and Prophetic Literature," which shows the shaping of royal ideology in subsequent Hebrew literature and the rise of an incipient messianism in the Hebrew Bible (chap. 2); "The Messiah and Son of God in the Hellenistic Period," which narrates the propaganda of Hellenistic monarchs and the messianism of the LXX and DSS (chap. 3); and "Messiah and Son of Man," which gives an overview of the material in Daniel 7, 11QMelch, *Similitudes of Enoch*, and 4 Ezra 13, tracing the trajectory of attributing pre-existent, transcendent, and heavenly qualities to the messiah (chap. 4).

The last four chapters are written by Adela Yarbro Collins and include: "Jesus as Messiah and Son of God in the Letters of Paul," which relates Jesus' position of Son of God to his status as messiah (chap. 5); "Jesus as Messiah and Son of God in the Synoptic Gospels," which gives an overview of messianism in the first three Gospels and also argues against some recent attempts to find in the Synoptic Gospels evidence that Jesus was regarded as a pre-existent being (chap. 6); "Jesus as Son of Man," which looks at the Son of Man logia including their origination and apocalyptic meaning in the life setting of the historical Jesus (chap. 7); "Messiah, Son of God, and Son of Man in the Gospel and Revelation of John," which asserts that the Gospel of John and Apocalypse of John both present Jesus as divine and pre-existent, although in radically different modes (chap. 8).

There are several highlights to the volume. John J. Collins ably demonstrates that ancient Near Eastern writings and inscriptions did not always take the "divinity" of the monarch literally as making him a member of the pantheon; rather it often related more closely to the royal office of the king. The divinity sometimes ascribed to the Israelite king (e.g. Psalm 45) was part of the honorific titles attributed to oriental kings that was neither ontological, nor mere metaphor. In any case, the king never became an object of veneration in the Israelite cultus. He also traces ideas of pre-existence and angelic qualities applied to the messiah in the LXX and convincingly shows how 4Q246 might be among the earliest messianic interpretations of Daniel 7. Adela Yarbro Collins provides some helpful overviews of scholarship about the "Son of Man" and the issues that plague the study of the primary sources. Elsewhere she asserts that the attribution of the title "Son of God" to Jesus was not a product of much later Hellenized Christianity (under the influence of pagan mystery cults) but has its roots in a Jewish context related to messianism. Less convincing is Adela Yarbro Collins's claim that the Christ-hymn of Philippians attributes pre-existence but not deity to Jesus. She also contests Simon Gathercole's arguments about pre-existence in the Synoptic Gospels (though I think Gathercole's position is far more defensible than what she presents). What caused me concern while reading her chapter on the Gospel of John and Revelation was her claim that: "The Gospel and Revelation both present Jesus as pre-existent and as divine in some sense. In the Gospel, he is either an emanation of God or God's first creature, namely, the only-begotten god. In Revelation, the evidence suggests that he is God's first creature, namely, the principal angel" (p. 203). One can grant the subordinationist overtones of Johannine Christology (e.g. John 14:28) and the angelomorphic Christology embedded in Revelation (e.g. Rev 10:1–11), but this is juxtaposed with an explicitly divine Christology elsewhere in both works (e.g. John 8:58; 20:28; Rev 21:6; 22:13). In any case, her conclusions here are clearly contestable, and I much prefer the work of Larry Hurtado and Richard Bauckham on the developing Christologies of the early church, particularly in relation to Jewish monotheism and early Christian worship.

In sum, the authors have produced a fine volume that touches on an underappreciated area in biblical studies, namely, the relationship between kingship/messiahship and divinity. The various chapters are clear and well argued for the most part. It is a worthwhile volume to read for anyone with an interest in ancient kingship or NT Christology.

Michael F. Bird
Highland Theological College, Dingwall, Scotland

Q, the Earliest Gospel: An Introduction to the Original Stories and Sayings of Jesus, By John S. Kloppenborg. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2008, 170 pp., \$19.95 paper.

Its size, format, and title suggest that this book is a popular introduction to Q or the sayings of Jesus common to Luke and Matthew. Its content, however, suggests that the author has compiled various essays into a book. The first chapter might have been written as an introduction to the "sayings gospel": "What Is Q?" The other three chapters seem more like essays, however: "Reconstructing a Lost Gospel," "What a Difference Difference Makes," and "Q, Thomas, and James." This paperback also has an introductory chapter, a 22-page appendix that gives Kloppenborg's version of Q, a glossary of terms (for beginners?), a bibliography of primary texts and "studies," and eleven pages of notes (for specialists?).

The first chapter consists of 40 pages of text, fully a third of the contents of the chapters. Right at the beginning the author indicates why Q is a necessary hypothesis: "Scholars did not invent Q out of a fascination for mysterious or lost documents. Q is posited from logical necessity" (p. 2). Kloppenborg points out that the high degree of verbal agreement between Luke and Matthew on the material they share is at least as high as the agreement between works we know to have been copied from a source document. He briefly and with the help of charts and figures shows why so many scholars support the priority of Mark's Gospel. He then surveys the two-document hypothesis and follows his survey with a section on challenges to the two-document hypothesis (the two-Gospel or "Griesbach" hypothesis and Mark without Q) and shows with Gospel examples why he rejects the challenges. The chapter concludes with a clear explanation of the complexities and problems with the two-document hypothesis such as the Mark-Q overlaps and the minor agreements of Luke and Matthew against Mark. Finally, Kloppenborg points out that all hypotheses are scholarly theories, not fact. He admits that we can never know exactly how the Gospels were composed or even whether the evangelists wrote several drafts of their Gospels, and we do not have the "autographs" or original writings.

The second chapter explains how NT Gospel scholars have determined the contents of Q. Most scholars, from the late nineteenth century to the 1980s when Kloppenborg surveyed two dozen previous reconstructions of Q, accept a "minimal Q" of 235 verses. Kloppenborg himself, one of the major Q scholars in the world today and professor of religion at the University of Toronto, argues for a "modest expansion" of Q to 266 verses, which he gives in an appendix. To those who ask whether Luke or Matthew may have omitted some of Q, the author says, "there is reason to think that they did not omit much" (p. 45). He then tackles the more difficult question of whether one evangelist omitted a unit from Q and that the other preserved. The International Q Project or IQP published a thorough analysis of Q and determined that it consisted of about 4,500 words or some 260 verses. The remainder of the chapter discusses such issues as whether

Q was oral or written, whether Q was the first Greek Gospel, who wrote Q, and whether Q should be considered a "Gospel."

The third chapter is a subtle and detailed analysis of how and why Q is a different Gospel. It bears all the marks of an essay that had been written for a journal, unlike the first two chapters. In it, for example, he spells out explicitly the "five striking features of Q that distinguish it from Mark and its Synoptic successors, Matthew and Luke" (p. 65): (1) it was a rural, Judean Gospel; (2) miracles are less prominent in Q; (3) Q is silent, but not completely, about the death of Jesus and its significance as expiation; (4) Q focuses on a general resurrection but not the resurrection of Jesus; and (5) the ethics of the kingdom in Q involve subsistence and debt, taxes, local solidarity, and deliberate inversions.

The fourth and final chapter is the most technical. Kloppenborg says we really do not know why Q disappeared, though Kilpatrick and others have argued that since it was absorbed into Luke and Matthew, there was no reason to keep it. However, Kloppenborg notes that the same thing did not happen to Mark, since more than 90 percent of Mark was absorbed into Luke and Matthew. The author also rejects James D. G. Dunn's suggestion that Q disappeared because of its questionable contents or theological deficiency. Yet Luke and Matthew preserve more of Q than they do of Mark. Kloppenborg rejects outright the idea that Q has "gnosticizing distortions": "there is no evidence of this at all" (p. 99). He finally concludes that the disappearance of Q may be the result of the fact that no community adopted it as their Gospel, or it was an accident of geography (Q was never copied in Egypt), or it was an accident of history (the Galilean and Palestinian groups died out). After exploring the idea that Q may have survived in part in Clement of Rome or the Didache, Kloppenborg devotes the rest of the chapter to the similarities of Q to the Gospel of Thomas and the canonical letter of James. A key conclusion to the chapter is that the Q Gospel "gives us a glimpse of the earliest Jesus movement in the Galilee, a different Gospel with a different view of Jesus' significance" (p. 121).

The book does not have a conclusion, unless the final words of the fourth chapter serve as his conclusion to what he wants to say: "Knowing about Q lets us think differently about the complexion of the early Jesus movement, differently about the development of the Synoptic Gospels, differently about the creation of documents such as the letter of James, differently about the death of Jesus and Jesus' vindication, and differently about the core and essence of the Jesus movement" (p. 121).

Kloppenborg has written a very interesting book about the beginnings of Christianity. No one will agree with him on all the points he makes in this book, but he will at least challenge the thinking of every reader and force them to come up with better ideas. He begins with the basic conclusion of many scholars today, such as Helmut Koester, who have been convinced by Walter Bauer that, instead of the biblical view that there was one form of Christianity that was orthodox, there were many "Christianities." What we call Christianity today was only the view of the majority contained in the canonical NT. All other forms were destroyed or suppressed by the "orthodox" group that eventually survived and became the only form of Christianity. Kloppenborg belongs to the tradition that regards those who disagree with him as motivated by theological presuppositions: "Theologians sometimes suffer from the conceit that everything connected with Christianity occurred for a theological reason" (p. 101). He never admits that he, too, may be influenced by theological or philosophical presuppositions. Yet with these reservations, I believe that Kloppenborg has done a persuasive job of defending the idea that Luke and Matthew must have used a common source known as Q.

Leslie Robert Keylock
Evangelical University and Seminary, Plant City, FL

Mark. By Robert H. Stein. BECNT. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2008, xxii + 823 pp., \$49.99.

Robert H. Stein has devoted much of his academic career to questions related to the Gospels. The first book of his that I found as a seminary student was *The Synoptic Problem* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1987), which was then issued in a second edition as *Studying the Synoptic Gospels: Origin and Interpretation* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2001). In addition to critical study of the Gospels, Stein has also investigated interpretation of this genre; the subtitle of the book mentioned above bears witness to his acumen with this topic. Interest in Gospel studies and interpretation quite naturally leads to commentaries. Stein's first commentary was on the Gospel of Luke, published in 1992 in the New American Commentary series. His second commentary is the work under present consideration.

The form and structure of this commentary presents no surprises. Stein begins with 37 pages of introduction. He discusses authorship, audience, date, the emergence of Mark in Gospel studies, and theological emphases, ending with a relatively compact outline of the Gospel. The commentary proper then begins on page 38 and continues for 701 pages. The end matter includes a helpful list of cited works and four indices (subject, author, Greek words, and Scripture and other ancient writings).

Baker, the publisher of this series, has introduced many useful refinements in the page layout that make the commentaries in this series easier to use. (These are worthwhile to note as part of the review because they add value to this work in distinction to other commentaries.) Shading is used to set apart introductory overview and concluding summary discussions, which can be easily accessed when one does not need to dive into the detailed discussion. Each section concludes with "additional notes" that cover more technical or ancillary issues that need not take up space in the commentary proper. The headers contain outline segments that allow the reader to determine at any point where the discussion is in the larger flow of the narrative.

Stein's goal in writing the commentary is stated in his preface: "The primary goal of this commentary is not to construct a life of Jesus of Nazareth but to ascertain the meaning of Mark, that is, what the second evangelist sought to teach by his Gospel" (p. xiii). This is an important distinction, as much Gospel commentary seeks to get "behind" the text to issues related to the historical Jesus, while Stein's goal is clearly to explain the text of the Gospel that we have. To that end Stein has organized his writing and discussion of the material in a way that is clear and effective, while still benefiting from his knowledge of critical issues.

The introduction to the commentary provides a useful coverage of the main topics one would expect to see at the beginning of a commentary. The sections I found most helpful were "The Emergence of Mark in Gospel Studies" and "Theological Emphases." In the former, Stein addresses the traditional, critical issues of source, form, and redaction criticism and how they relate to Mark, but he also tackles literary and narrative criticism, reader-response criticism, and the issue of genre. Here he emphasizes again his goal in writing, namely, "the primary purpose of this commentary is to explain not what happened in the life of Jesus or exactly what he said, but rather what Mark is seeking to teach by this event/saying that he shares with his readers" (p. 19). In my opinion, in this section Stein is unduly dismissive of the contributions narrative criticism can make to our understanding of the Gospel. He argues that because Mark is "historical narrative" (p. 18), many questions a narrative critic would ask (which he suggests in the form "Why did Mark do such-and-such in his story?") are invalid. "Mark did not have the freedom to construct his plot and characterizations in the same way that a writer of fiction does" (pp. 18–19). My response would be similar to the defense scholars make for redaction criticism: It is true that Mark did not create his story out of whole cloth, but his specific retelling and reshaping of the Jesus story can be examined profitably

for his unique contribution as to plot, characterization, and the like. Caution is certainly advised, but narrative criticism need not be dismissed outright. (Perhaps it is even helpful to say that in the instance of “historical narrative,” narrative criticism provides tools for the interpreter to work directly on this history. For example, many historical events can be interpreted to have a plot; narrative criticism simply provides another tool to discuss that history.) In the latter section on theology, Stein discusses in turn Christology, the Messianic secret, the disciples, discipleship, and the death of Christ. These sections are not extensive discussions but instead concise summaries of the primary theological points in Mark’s Gospel.

In the commentary proper, Stein winds his way through the text, offering consistently conservative, evangelical interpretations. This is not meant to disparage Stein’s work; indeed, one of the values of this commentary in my opinion is its summation of an entire career of consistent evangelicalism and a high regard for the text of Scripture. There is little that is novel here, but there is much that is valuable. By way of examples, Stein argues that the church’s practice toward the Sabbath more likely arose from Jesus’ Sabbath teaching and actions than the other way around (p. 143). Stein argues regarding the well-known problem of Abiathar in Mark 2:26 that “no satisfactory solution has come forward that resolves this problem” (pp. 146–47). He argues that the proper referent of 9:1 in the Markan setting is the transfiguration (p. 411). Concerning the referent of Mark 13, Stein argues for the traditional view that both the destruction of the temple in AD 70 and the parousia are in view in respective sections of the discourse (see his overview on pp. 582–85).

My critiques are few. First, the translation given in each section is the author’s: “A literal translation is given, at the expense of fluidity, in order to better assist in the discussion of words and phrases in the comment section” (p. xiii). The translation is so literal, however, that at times it becomes burdensome and ineffective. I see no value in retaining an English present tense for the Greek present tense, for example, when the latter is clearly a historical present. Because of infelicities such as this the translation occasionally obscures the meaning when it could be a great tool to advance meaning. Second, the additional notes are the place in this commentary series where technical yet ancillary information can be profitably included. These were often quite sparse and limited to text-critical problems or grammatical classifications. I would have enjoyed seeing the author use these for a broader array of information. Third, I appreciate the headers being used to remind the reader of where they are in the outline of the book, but occasionally they can be confusing. The headers on the even, left-facing pages indicate higher levels of subordination, while the headers on the odd, right-facing pages indicate lower levels of subordination. The confusion occurs because often not enough information is given on the right page to fully locate the argument of the commentary and because what is there does not match exactly the outline of the Gospel given at the end of the introduction. For example, throughout the pages discussing Mark 3:1–6, the left page in the header indicates the higher level of subordination:

II. Who is this Jesus? Part 1

D. Jesus’s Mighty Acts in Capernaum and Galilee

The right page indicates the lower level of subordination:

5. Jesus and the Sabbath, Part 2

There is no way to tell at a glance with this information how section 5 fits within section II.D. This is complicated by the fact that the outline in the introduction does

not even subdivide section II.D at all. So the reader is receiving more information here than what the general outline contains, but the reader does not have enough context to properly place each section. This is a minor point; I certainly think that the use of the headers has been maximized, small as they are! However, having verse references for every line in the header would help, as the reader could quickly see that Mark 3:1–6 is construed as the final part of section II.D. In addition, if the general outline in the introduction matched the information in the headers exactly, with much more subordination than what is presently there, the author's goal of explaining what Mark has endeavored to teach would be helped.

On the whole, though, these criticisms are minor. Stein has written a valuable commentary on the Gospel of Mark. His consistently evangelical, traditional exegesis in the current format is accessible and useful to student, pastor, and scholar alike and should be applauded as the fine fruit of many years of Gospels study.

Michael H. Burer
Dallas Theological Seminary, Dallas, TX

Perspectives on the Ending of Mark: 4 Views. Edited by David Alan Black. Nashville: Broadman and Holman, 2008, xiii + 145 pp., \$19.99 paper.

This book is the result of a conference that dealt with varying positions concerning the ending of Mark, held at Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary in Wake Forest, NC on April 13–14, 2007. The conference speakers included world-class scholars: David Alan Black, Darrell Bock, Keith Elliott, Maurice Robinson, and Daniel Wallace. Black, Professor of New Testament and Greek at Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary, collected and edited these papers as a point-counterpoint book in the Broadman and Holman *Perspectives* series. Within the preface of this work, Black makes the pertinent observation: “while the great majority of variants in the New Testament are of absolutely no account . . . [one] can hardly afford to neglect the one under discussion in this book. We must always ask ourselves the question: How can we best resolve textual difficulties, taking into account all of the evidence that is available to us today?” (p. xii).

Daniel B. Wallace is the author of the first chapter, entitled “Mark 16:8 as the Conclusion to the Second Gospel.” Wallace concedes to presuppositions that he holds concerning his position on the ending of Mark: (1) Wallace holds to Markan priority (p. 2), and he believes that if one held to Matthean priority it would be difficult to conclude that Mark ended at 16:8 (p. 3); (2) one's theory concerning the ending of Mark may dictate one's solution to this text-critical issue (p. 5); (3) one's position concerning Mark's ending affects a person's bibliography on the issue (pp. 5–10). In the remaining pages of this chapter, Wallace evaluates the internal and external evidence concerning Mark's ending. Wallace argues that Mark's purpose in ending at 16:8 is the ironic impact of the 16:8 ending.

Maurice Robinson offers the second chapter, “The Long Ending of Mark as Canonical Verity,” based on his preference for the Byzantine manuscripts, which greatly outnumber those of other text families. Robinson presents an excellent and fair listing of the various endings and the rationale for each of these positions (pp. 40–45). Robinson is well capable, as demonstrated in this chapter, of defending the long ending of Mark based on external evidence. Of course, this argument is supported by most manuscripts and most of the patristic evidence. Furthermore, the doctrine of divine preservation is a hallmark of this position, from John Burgon to Maurice Robinson. Robinson acknowledges the necessity “to go on decisions reached on the basis of external testimony” (p. 45).

After noting the patristic evidence for the long ending, Robinson evaluates the other proposed endings of Mark. He deems the 16:8 ending “a puzzling and incomplete conclusion” (p. 50), though verses 9–20 pose apparent contradictions with other canonical narratives (pp. 52–59). The question of possible contradictions is not only a matter for critical/modern scholarship, since such questions existed in the patristic era (pp. 52–55). Robinson also addresses the issue of the style and vocabulary of the long ending (pp. 59–64). He concludes that the long ending is a “short summary abridgement” and “reflects ‘Mark’s style’” (p. 64). Robinson finds further support for his position in the “promise and fulfillment” motif that exists between the OT and Mark, as it is expressed also in Mark 1 and Mark 16 (pp. 66–72). Robinson concludes his chapter by listing fifteen points that support the authenticity of verses 16:9–20 (pp. 74–79).

J. K. Elliott presents the perspective of “Radical Eclecticism” in the third chapter, “The Last Twelve Verses of Mark: Original or Not?” Elliott describes the introduction and conclusion of Matthew, Luke, and John as well-crafted; whereas, “Mark seems rather blunted at both ends” (p. 81). Elliott compares the problem concerning the ending of Mark with the problems in Revelation and Romans with their alternate readings. Elliott proposes that such problems occur because an “unbound codex was liable to be damaged at both ends, but so too was a roll—especially if its ending was occasionally exposed when it was not rewound to the beginning after each consultation” (p. 81). Like Robinson, Elliott deals with both internal and external evidence to formulate his conclusion; however, he has a different conclusion in that he holds that the original ending of Mark was lost. Elliott notes that “B, uncharacteristically, leaves a blank column following his truncated ending of Mark. Elsewhere in B the text of each successive book starts at the top of the next column” (p. 83). He further notes, “It is almost as if the scribe hesitated here. Perhaps his exemplar had the so-called longer ending of Mark, that is, vv. 9–20, and he had instructions not to include it” (p. 83). On the basis of internal evidence, Elliott makes a convincing argument that the language and style of Mark 16:9–20 are not found in 1:1–16:8.

The contents and theology of the 16:9–20 ending prove to be a problem. For example, Elliott points out, “The opening words [of the 16:9–20] ending suggest it is Jesus who is the subject of the preceding context and Mary is introduced for the first time. These verses hardly continue and explain what is written in vv. 1–8” (p. 90). In the conclusion, Elliott describes textual issues that make him reluctant to use the terms “infallible” or “inerrant” concerning Scripture. Elliott states, “The sooner that the language of inerrancy is dropped in the context of textual criticism the better it will be for scholarship” (p. 101).

The fourth chapter discusses “Mark 16:9–20 as Markan Supplement.” David Alan Black holds that “Mark originally ended his Gospel narrative (comprised of the actual words of Peter at 16:8) and then later supplied the last twelve verses himself as a suitable conclusion” (p. 104). The bulk of Black’s chapter deals with the Synoptic problem. Black, unlike Elliott, does not dismiss the concept that the original ending still exists (not 16:9–20 *per se*). Black notes three significant facts concerning the authentic ending of Mark: First “few would argue that the original reading is not to be found among the existing manuscripts. Secondly . . . the external evidence points to the originality of the last twelve verses. This reading is as ancient as the omission is. . . . Finally, the Longer Reading is more widespread than its counterpart in terms of geographical distribution of texttypes” (p. 104).

Black describes “The Four Phases in the Development of the Gospels” from his perspective of the production of the canonical books of the NT where he clearly holds to Matthean Priority (pp. 106–21). Black states, “In the Spirit-directed process of in-scripturating the fourfold Gospel there were four main phases: 1. The Jerusalem Phase (Acts 1–12) under the leadership of Peter. 2. The Gentile Mission Phase (Acts 13–28) under the leadership of Paul. 3. The Roman Phase requiring joint action by Peter and

Paul. 4. The Johannine Supplement” (p. 108; see pp. 108–21). Black also writes a pertinent “Non-Academic Postscript” in which he confirms, “The longer ending of Mark reminds us that Mark’s Gospel is highly evangelistic” (p. 122); therefore, “Our Lord Jesus is not a system. He is a person, and evangelism is simply bringing another person to face with this person” (p. 123).

Darrell L. Bock evaluates the various proposals in the final chapter, “The Ending of Mark: A Response to the Essays.” Bock identifies three points in which all of the contributing scholars of the work agree: (1) the variants we possess for the short and longer ending of Mark are both old; (2) what is taught in the longer ending for the most part is taught elsewhere in the NT; (3) everyone desires to work with hard evidence (pp. 124–25). Bock evaluates the views expressed in the previous four chapters by the following fivefold response: “(1) observations about method, (2) external evidence, (3) internal evidence, (4) other raised issues, and (5) conclusion” (pp. 125–40). Bock responds concerning the views held in this conference/book, “We have argued that given the nature of our external evidence that points to both endings (the 16:8 ending and the longer ending) as old, internal factors indicate that Mark ended at 16:8 with an open-minded attempt to say to listeners that once the message is heard, it becomes the hour of decision” (p. 140). Bock concludes with two important ideas that all students of Scripture should take into consideration. First, “whatever view one has on this issue there is no central teaching of the Christian faith at stake in which view is chosen” (p. 141). Second, “whatever choice we make, it should not significantly alter our faith” (p. 141).

I conclude with a few thoughts on each of the contributions to this conference and resulting book. A significant point that scholars might overlook is that Black reluctantly presented a paper, which he did not initially plan to do at the conference. He offered his work as an object of evaluation in both oral and written form rather than take the easy way out by placing himself as the one who would evaluate the views of others. I appreciated Elliott’s discussion on “infallibility,” though I disagree with Elliott’s conclusions. They challenge us to develop an apology on the doctrine of the infallibility of Scripture, deeper than a simple confession that “we believe that the Scriptures are infallible.” Scholars and students may read this book and realize that over a time period their position on the ending of Mark may not be where it was previously. Upon reading Daniel Wallace’s chapter, I realized that my own position had moved from where he is (a position I held when I wrote my dissertation) to the place where Black is, with the exception that I hold that someone other than Mark wrote the longer ending under Petrine authority. Yes, this position is not the definitive answer. Though I do not hold to the longer ending as the conclusion of the Second Gospel and written by Mark at the time when the Gospel as a whole was written, I do admire and respect Robinson’s unwavering position on the Byzantine text and the authenticity of the longer ending. Bock’s knowledge concerning the topic and his critique demonstrate that research on the ending of Mark has not reached a definitive conclusion. Such studies will and must continue.

Steven L. Cox
Mid-America Baptist Theological Seminary, Cordova, TN

Anatomies of Narrative Criticism: The Past, Present, and Futures of the Fourth Gospel as Literature. Edited by Tom Thatcher and Stephen D. Moore. SBLRBS 55. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2008, x + 304 pp., \$35.95 paper.

This collection of essays is both a tribute to the significance of the seminal work *Anatomy of the Fourth Gospel*, by Alan Culpepper (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983), on the

twenty-fifth anniversary of its publication and an assessment of its lasting significance on Fourth Gospel scholarship. It even attempts to envision the future course of Johannine studies. Its contributors have incorporated some aspect of literary methodology into their interpretations of the Fourth Gospel. Like many of them, I also was greatly influenced by Culpepper's work when I was introduced to it as a graduate student under D. Moody Smith, who also directed Culpepper's doctoral work. *Anatomy* was a breath of fresh air for an evangelical surrounded by historical-critical scholarship. However, there is much in this collection of essays that is disconcerting to evangelicals, and it does little to reassure those among us who are suspicious that there is anything worthy of evangelical appropriation in the use of literary methodology for biblical interpretation.

The essays are divided into two parts, preceded by Thatcher's introductory essay. The first section is characterized as "Hermeneutical Reflections" on the twenty-five years of Johannine studies since Culpepper's *Anatomy*, but many of its contributors include specific examples of their own application of his insights to the text of the Fourth Gospel. The second part, headed "Anatomical Probes," is intentionally more practical, but the contributors to this section also address the hermeneutical theory that underlies their work. These essays accomplish their purpose in providing a detailed portrait of Culpepper's ongoing influence and the current practice of literary-critical methodology in Johannine studies.

Thatcher's introductory essay traces the history of the interpretation of the Fourth Gospel from Bultmann to Culpepper and beyond. He provides a helpful analysis of Culpepper's dependency on Berkeley film and literary critic Seymour Chatman and his exploration of narrative theory in *Story and Discourse* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1978). The first essay in part one is Culpepper's own contribution in which he examines select interpretations of the beloved disciple and Jesus' mother at the cross in John 19 both before and after the publication of *Anatomy*. He concludes that, whereas in the past symbols were often interpreted in isolation, a narrative-critical reading helps to properly place them within the narrative's symbolism throughout. He notes that therein lies the meaning of the symbolism of these characters at the cross in John 19, "not in its literal or superficial sense" (p. 53).

Adele Reinhartz, who characterizes any historical reconstruction (including her own) "as the exercise of imagination" (p. 71), offers an alternative to Martyn's firmly entrenched reconstruction of the historical circumstances of the Johannine community that produced John 9. She suggests it is a warning against a return to the synagogue for those who have confessed Christ. She agrees with Martyn that "these verses do not describe events that actually took place, or could have taken place, in the life of the historical Jesus" (p. 76). Colleen Conway explores the theoretical trajectories beyond traditional literary criticism, including her own interest in postcolonial theory, linking the animosity of the chief priest and the Pharisees to their "colonial status" under Rome (p. 88). Paul Anderson revisits the Johannine *aporias*, but finds traditional explanations unsatisfying. He sees them as a reflection of an internal dialogue within the Johannine community itself. In the end, interpreters today must engage in the same dialogue, and, invoking Mikhail Bakhtin, he declares, "There is never a first meaning nor a last meaning because we all are involved in the making of the meaning" (p. 118).

Both intratextuality and intertextuality are Jean Zumstein's keys for understanding the Gospel's structure and meaning. Within the text he examines the role of prologue, conclusion, and epilogue as well as the narrative asides in shaping the reader's understanding of its meaning. Outside the text, he examines the title: *Gospel according to John*, its relationship to the Synoptics, the rest of the Johannine corpus, and the OT. Robert Kysar has himself journeyed from his roots in traditional historical-critical scholarship to postmodernism, doubtful of the possibility of any certain knowledge of the historical reality behind the Gospel of John. He decries the possibility of identifying

the Fourth Evangelist, then questions the usefulness of the “implied author” construct popularized by Culpepper. In the end he concludes that in John’s narrative what can be found is not a historically accurate “diary” of Jesus of Nazareth, but “the ponderings of the first Christians, which are really not unlike our own, about what happened and what difference it makes” (p. 146).

Mark Stibbe advocates both a diachronic and synchronic approach when interpreting this Gospel. He uses literary methodology to attempt to discover the compositional history from the narrative itself. Rather than an indication of editorial clumsiness, he posits that the *aporias* of this narrative could be “an artful literary device” both “innovative and subtle,” resulting in this narrative’s “embracing the fragmentation and disordance of life” while “longing for wholeness and integration” (p. 163).

Another postcolonial reading is offered by Tat-siong Benny Liew. He interprets the Gospel’s narration of Jesus’ death against the secondary status of Jews in the Roman empire, both “a part of but also apart from the empire,” and thereby living closer and more vulnerable to death (p. 169). Jeffrey Staley, noting Chatman’s career as a film critic, analyzes the cinematic portrayal of the uniquely Johannine narrative of the resurrection of Lazarus in nine films from the silent era through 2003. The symbolic nature of the language of John’s Gospel is the subject of Ruben Zimmerman’s essay. He relates the resurrection appearance of Jesus to Mary in John 20 to the Genesis creation echoes throughout the Gospel. He draws parallels to garden symbolism in the OT, but in the end he concludes that “no final judgment can be made as to whether the Evangelist intended for the reader of the garden scene to see an allusion to the symbolism of the garden of paradise” (p. 235).

Francis Maloney examines the unity of John 21 with the first 20 chapters. After laying out the arguments against its unity, he concludes that the final chapter subverts the previous twenty that prepare readers for life in the absence of Jesus. So at a later stage in its development when the church faced earlier unforeseen challenges, John 21 is added, which “undermines the message of the absence of Jesus by telling of the presence of Jesus to the infant church” (p. 249). Stephen Moore’s concluding essay acknowledges that literary methodologies have not replaced historical ones for NT scholars. Nor has narrative interpretation remained static. Instead it has been a springboard into feminist, postcolonial, post-structural, and other recent critical trends.

What all of these essays share in common is the denial of a fixed determinative meaning embedded within the text. Therein lies the problem for evangelicals. Non-evangelical practitioners of literary methodology in biblical studies do not hold to a fixed meaning in the text, nor any notion of a single discoverable correct interpretation. Yet the problem does not lie with the methodology but in the basic presuppositions that separate evangelicals from mainstream biblical scholarship. Our understanding of revelation and inspiration sets us apart. For us, there is a fixed meaning in the biblical text, one that is placed there by the author, an author who ultimately is God himself, working by his Spirit through chosen human agency. If an interpreter begins from this position, then positive contributions may be found in the use of narrative methodology for interpreting biblical narratives (since God himself inerrantly inspired that genre for much of his written revelation).

This collection of essays gives a good assessment of the current practice of narrative-critical and other recent methodologies by many biblical interpreters. It demonstrates the coexistence (albeit at times an uncomfortable one) of both traditional historical and post-modern methodologies within mainstream biblical scholarship. However, if one seeks to understand the practical usefulness of narrative interpretation for evangelicals committed to the Bible as God’s inerrant revelation to us, this collection is not the place to find it.

David R. Beck
Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary, Wake Forest, NC

Paul's Way of Knowing: Story, Experience, and the Spirit. By Ian W. Scott. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2009, xvii + 341 pp., \$44.99 paper.

Scott makes an excellent contribution to Pauline biblical epistemology. My minor criticisms of this fine work will be imbedded in the paragraphs that address the respective subjects. The book is a revised version of Scott's dissertation at McMaster University under the direction of Stephen Westerholm.

Scott considers Paul's background as excluded from the "social elite" and the "details of Hellenistic philosophy" (pp. 3–4). This assessment is probably true but overplayed, since Paul does not lack awareness of the Epicurean, Stoic, and populist philosophy of first-century Athens (Acts 17). Instead, Scott assumes that Paul operates from "the truth of the traditional Jewish narrative which forms his overall hermeneutical framework" (p. 10). Perhaps Scott expresses an overly simplistic pan-Judaism, since twentieth-century scholarship (in light of the work of W. D. Davies and the nuanced arguments in new perspective discussions) recognizes differences between Pharisaic, rabbinic, and sectarian traditions in first-century Judaism, each of which has been claimed as Paul's Jewish context by some interpreters.

From this framework, Scott sets out a strategy: (1) "to survey the evidence for Paul's attitude towards human rationality"; (2) to set out the "logical structure his knowledge exhibits"; and (3) to "provide a clearer picture of the narrative, hermeneutical logic . . . a reliable path to religious knowledge" (pp. 4–5). Then, Scott applies this model in Galatians (p. 10).

Scott limits the parameters for his investigation to a biblical study, excluding Greek philosophy. However, it would have been good to interact with contemporary evangelical epistemologies that justify their position by appealing to Paul (e.g. Alvin Plantinga, "Reformed epistemology," and Paul Moser), but Scott's volume is strictly a NT study. Furthermore, Scott clarifies that his study does not try to reconstruct Paul's "process of discovery" but to explore his "arguments adduced to persuade others," a theology of communication rather than Paul's own epistemology (p. 11).

Scott sees Romans 1 as exploring the descent of humanity into a moral problem of denying God, excluding Aquinas's natural theology (pp. 15–23). Scott views the moral problem of Romans 1 as universal rather than as the identification of one kind of person among several condemned options in Romans 1–3; thus Scott concludes, "ordinary human inquiry will always mistake the truth of God's action for nonsense" (p. 49). There are other ways to interpret this passage, but Scott does not show awareness of them.

1 Corinthians 1–2 explores "the effective, saving power of the (apparently foolish) Gospel forces" (pp. 24–25). The Spirit reorients the moral life for the chosen; thus the wise recognize this revelation reorientation (pp. 34–48).

Haunted by Hans Leisegang's irrational vision of Paul (*Der Apostel Paulus als Denker* [Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1923]), Scott moves to defend reason in ethical deliberation via prophetic speech over *glossolalia* (pp. 51–55). As such, Scott defends rationality in the theological speech through a survey of the Pauline corpus, concluding, "Such passages would suggest that the Spirit produces faith, not by inducing an irrational belief, but rather by allowing the believer to become truly rational" (p. 59). Scott utilizes the word "rational" in a non-technical manner, including with the concept the idea that the Spirit reveals a *coherent narrative* that is *congruent with perception and memory* and enables *coherent arguments and judgments* (pp. 68–70). This epistemology could be categorized as a Spirit-funded (2 Cor 10:3–5; pp. 61–67) common sense realism with an existential narrative emphasis provided by narrative theology (in the wake of Paul Ricoeur and Stephen Fowl). I think that Scott is making too much use of the language of narrative theology when we primarily have a different genre from Paul (i.e. epistle), and Scott

does not attempt to explain the transposition of multiple genres into testimony as Brueggemann does in his *Theology of the Old Testament* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1997). Scott instead positions this narrative terminology within the context of NT Pauline commentators: (1) Dieter Lührmann (*Das Offenbarungsverständnis bei Paulus* [Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1965]) in holding that Paul's "revelation is conveyed not in immediate communication from God, but in the human being's reflected interpretation of encounters with the divine" (p. 75); (2) Leander Keck ("Paul as Thinker" *Int* 47 [1993] 27–38) in seeing that even an event's "happenedness" requires thinking and that in Paul's thinking an event such as the resurrection is plausible as an eschatological fulfillment within the "new age" (pp. 78–79); (3) Jürgen Becker (*Paul: Apostle to the Gentiles* [Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1993]) in seeing "the gospel" forcing a radical reevaluation resulting in a "theology of experience under the influence of the gospel and of the Spirit connected with it" (p. 374; Scott pp. 80–81); and (4) John D. Moores (*Wrestling with Rationality in Paul* [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995]) in recognizing the crucifixion and Damascus experience as a sign driving Paul's thought and providing its justification (pp. 81–85).

Scott analyzes three kinds of knowledge: "mundane," "theologic" [*sic*], and "ethical." Mundane knowledge for Paul is either immediate and public or an internal state (pp. 91, 93). Theologic knowledge is a narrative of Christ causally interrelated into Paul's life (pp. 95–118). In ethical knowledge, Christians recognize their role in the story by looking (in part) at the way they behave, but they can also change that role by adopting a new course of action (p. 129). Scott positions this ethic within the post-Kantian approach of Alisdair MacIntyre's communal post-modern conventionalism and claims Judaism follows this approach (pp. 138–39; cf. MacIntyre, *After Virtue* [Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1981]). Within this communal conventionalism Scott follows Stephen Fowl as he claims, "Paul's ethics necessarily draw their force and coherence from a common narrative tradition which he shares with his audience" (Fowl, *The Story of Christ in the Ethics of Paul* [Sheffield: JSOT, 1990] 205; Scott p. 137). However, MacIntyre's communal conventionalism is anti-realist, whereas my read of Paul and Judaism places them within a *Merkabah* mystical realism as Schweitzer and followers portray. Contrary to Fowl and Scott, the issue is not communal narrative connectedness; it is instead an epistle declaration of the real change transforming the new human, mystically but actually by way of crucifixion and resurrection in Christ. Furthermore, biblical Judaism is much more *torah* based, and post-biblical Judaism is oral *torah* based, neither of which is primarily narrative in genre.

As Scott applies Paul's ethical knowledge from Galatians, he crafts a nuanced Reformation position correctly identifying "works of the Law" as obeying the Law as a whole (p. 182). Scott claims only Qumran documents are available to support this point, but are not there some documents beyond Qumran that say the same thing (e.g. *2 Bar.* 57:2)? Part of the nuance of Scott's position is that he recognizes that the Galatians context is that which the new Paul has spotlighted; "yet here the Galatians have received the eschatological Spirit *without taking on any of the observance of Torah which was usually understood to define the boundary between God's people and the rest of humanity*" (p. 196; emphasis his). Scott traces a new reading of Gal 3:6–9, in light of the work of Hans Dieter Betz (*Galatians* [Philadelphia: Fortress, 1979] 137), which reconfigures Israel's story to support the accomplishment in the messiah's death (p. 202). Scott concludes that Paul reinterprets Israel's narrative, assuming that the Gal 3:10 quote of Deut 27:26 contradicts its meaning (p. 204). Perhaps instead of contradiction, Romans 2 better provides the elements assumed by Paul but not mentioned so clearly in Galatians, that is, that Israel's normal response is disobedience to the Law. So perhaps broadening this section beyond the Galatians parameters here would have helped. A standard Reformation discussion in the terminology of "narrative strands" contrasting

faith and Law follows, showing awareness of a range and their arguments (pp. 210–16). The use of analogy in Gal 3:15–18 aids in reconfiguring Israel’s story, since there is no evidence that Pharisaic interpretation developed this analogy in Paul’s direction (pp. 217–25). Paul’s re-plotting of the story includes Gentiles as among the blessed (pp. 231–38). After exploring the Jewish allegory of Philo, Scott opts for a non-technical analogy that re-appropriates narrative events through the lens of Paul’s perspective (pp. 238–52). Scott develops the idea that the Spirit brings and motivates ethical living (pp. 252–69).

Douglas Kennard
Houston Graduate School of Theology, Houston, TX

Inhabiting the Cruciform God: Kenosis, Justification, and Theosis in Paul’s Narrative Soteriology. By Michael J. Gorman. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009, xi + 194 pp., \$24.00 paper.

This volume follows Gorman’s previous work on the cruciform character of Paul’s theology, especially his work titled *Cruciformity: Paul’s Narrative Spirituality of the Cross* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001). The present, much shorter, book is an extension and development of Gorman’s earlier work. While Gorman does not overtly set this offering in the midst of the debates related to “new,” “fresh,” and “traditional” perspectives on justification in Paul, this proposal may well end up being just what is needed: an irenic work, exegetically based and theologically rich, that shows how unnecessarily polarized the debates have become. This is especially the case in that a clear-eyed vision of justification in Paul will grasp how richly layered Paul’s development of this notion actually is.

In an introductory chapter, Gorman notes that theosis is a notion that is foundational to and much more highly developed in the Eastern church than in the West, with the result that it may be unfamiliar to many Protestants. It is not about making humans “little gods” but rather involves God drawing humanity into God’s own life. Rather, “Theosis is about divine intention and action, human transformation and the *telos* of human existence—union with God” (p. 5). Gorman gives a working definition of theosis: “Theosis is transformative participation in the kenotic, cruciform character of God through Spirit-enabled conformity to the incarnate, crucified, and resurrected/glorified Christ” (p. 7). The use of this concept from the Eastern tradition is long overdue, since Pauline scholars have noted for several generations the centrality of union with Christ for understanding Paul’s thought.

In chapter 1, Gorman develops Paul’s “master story” that demonstrates the kenotic character of Jesus Christ and reveals the very identity of God as kenotic. He focuses on Phil 2:5–11 and argues, based on a thorough exegetical treatment of the passage, that the pattern “although [x] not [y] but [z]” reveals the narrative trajectory of the kenosis of Jesus. By this, Gorman means “although [status] not [selfishness] but [selflessness]” (p. 16). Jesus Christ had status as God himself but did not exploit this, using it for his own comfort or personal gain. Rather, he pursued several “progressively degrading” positions on a movement of “downward mobility,” going eventually to the publicly shameful death on a cross (pp. 16–17). For Gorman, this passage is not properly understood to mean that Christ did this despite the fact that he was in the form of God. Rather, Christ pursued this path *because* he was in the form of God. In other words, and this is a crucial point for Gorman, Christ’s being in the form of God is most clearly seen in his self-emptying and self-expenditure (p. 25). In this sense, the very character of God is *kenotic* (self-emptying) and *cruciform* (cross-shaped).

In chapter 2, the longest chapter, which also functions as the heart of his argument, Gorman claims that setting two alternative conceptions of justification in Paul over against each other misses the mark. Rather than pitting a juridical—or forensic—notion against participationist conceptions, Gorman says that “justification is by crucifixion, specifically co-crucifixion, understood as participation in Christ’s act of covenant fulfillment” (pp. 43–44). This vision comprehends within it the two other—often (mis-) understood as competing—renderings of justification. Gorman argues mainly from Gal 2:15–21 and Rom 6:1–7:7, concluding that for Paul “justification means the establishment or restoration of right covenant relations, both ‘vertical’ or theological (toward God) and also, inseparably, ‘horizontal’ or social (toward others)—what Paul most frequently calls *‘pistis’* and *‘agape’*—with the certain hope of ultimate vindication and glory, all understood in light of, and experienced through, Christ and the Spirit” (pp. 52–53).

Gorman understands “covenant relations” as the proper human relational behavior of faithfulness toward God and others and love for God and others, both of which are lived out by the true human, Jesus Christ. To enter into justification, then, or to be incorporated into Christ is to participate in faithfulness and love toward God and toward others. This is not, however, a progressive rendering of justification, contends Gorman. Rather, justification is considered a realm into which believers are transferred by the Spirit of God, a realm in which there is the transformative power of God at work, enabling believers to be transformed in their behavior, from practices of injustice to practices of justice and Christ-shaped cruciform love (p. 99). Much more can be said about this complex and theologically loaded chapter, but it is sufficient to note here that much of what Gorman discusses is immensely helpful in settling disputes between competing visions of justification.

In chapter 3, Gorman relates this vision of justification to Paul’s discussions of holiness, which he regards as theosis, the community of God’s called out people—called into Christ (p. 108)—embodying and growing into the cruciform love of Christ on earth by the Spirit. Gorman claims that this holiness has three features. First, it is radically different from the surrounding culture, though the community of holiness must always participate in the host culture (p. 108). Second, it is Trinitarian in structure (p. 108) in that it is the work of the Father, Son, and Spirit in the community. Third, it is Christ-likeness in that it involves being “in Christ,” Christ dwelling with the community, and the community “putting on” behaviors characteristic of Christ. This intense fellowship with Christ, then, is where “inhabiting God” comes from (p. 109). Christ dwells with the people of God by the Spirit, and so God himself also dwells among God’s people. However, the very character of God is cruciform, since this is the manner in which Christ reveals God. The task of the church, then, as well as the character of its holiness, is to inhabit the cruciform God (p. 115).

This will result in a life of non-violence, as Gorman discusses in chapter 4. He notes Paul’s likely conversion from Phinehas-like violence. Paul had been passionate about the holiness of the Jewish nation before his conversion, persecuting the church in his Pharisaic zeal. It is not the case that Paul simply transferred his violent zeal to his Christian call as an apostle of Jesus. His conversion involved a radical change of the mode in which he carried out his ministry, drawing upon and releasing the resurrection power of God through a cruciform ministry of power in weakness (p. 152).

One of the strengths of Gorman’s work is the exegetical care with which he makes his case. He does not become bogged down in methodology, even in chapter 1 where he mentions but does not extensively develop the linguistic theory that undergirds his theological rendering of Phil 2:5–11. He makes his case and moves on. It does help that he has carefully developed much of this in far more detail in his previous work, so that he can point readers in that direction for further elaboration. This book also is the embodiment of what so many are calling for these days—a significant work that does

not respect the artificial lines between biblical studies and theology. Gorman unself-consciously brings the two into conversation fruitfully at a number of points.

It is nearly impossible to overstate how powerful and compelling this theme is and how helpful and transformative Gorman's work on cruciformity has been. Sadly, the debates and discussions among evangelicals over Paul's understanding of justification have become destructively polarized. The substance of Gorman's work on justification is a wonderful contribution and ought to be received with gratitude. Just as important, however, is the desperate need for participants in the various discussions to receive Gorman's work as an exhortation to practice cruciformity, to adopt cross-shaped postures toward one another, eschewing violence and learning to listen and speak in ways that reflect the self-expending character of Jesus Christ.

Timothy G. Gombis
Cedarville University, Cedarville, OH

The Spirit and Creation in Paul. By John W. Yates. WUNT 2/251. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008, xi + 218 pp., \$77.00 paper.

This monograph by John Yates is a revision of his doctoral dissertation written under the supervision of Professor Markus Bockmuehl and Dr. James Carleton Paget at Cambridge University (2007). As expected of a Cambridge dissertation, this volume is well researched and acutely argued. Yates not only engages a host of scholars in critical dialogue but wrestles with a good breadth of original Jewish sources as one who is seemingly well versed in the literature. What was most surprising, however, was the quality of writing. Many dissertations are written with a heavy pen, lacking in finesse and clarity, but Yates breaks free from the stereotype. *The Spirit and Creation in Paul* is not only well researched; it is beautifully presented.

One would think that another monograph on Paul's pneumatology is not needed, but Yates's work focuses more specifically on "Paul's description of the spirit as life-giving" (p. 7), something that has not received a book-length treatment in over 100 years (since Emil Sokolowski's *Die Begriffe Geist und Leben bei Paulus* [Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1903]). Moreover, as Yates notes, there is still no consensus on what exactly Paul means when he says that the Spirit gives life. Is this present life, a future resurrection life, or both? *How* exactly is this life given? Is the Spirit the actual agent of this life (James D. G. Dunn) or simply the guarantor of it (Gordon Fee)? These are some of the questions that Yates seeks to answer. Throughout the study, Yates suggests that "Paul's so-called 'soteriological pneumatology' is perhaps better understood within a wider framework of *creation pneumatology*." "In other words," Yates continues, "a part of Paul's fundamental thinking about the spirit takes place in terms of God's activity in creation and the longed-for new creation, a way of thinking about the spirit that was already developing in a cross-section of Jewish literature" (p. 23).

The book is divided into two parts, Part 1: The Jewish Background (pp. 19–84) and Part 2: The Pauline Letters (pp. 85–173), together with an introduction and conclusion. Yates first examines two texts from the Hebrew Bible (and LXX) to lay the foundation: the life-giving breath of Gen 2:7 (cf. Gen 6:3 where "Spirit" is used in a similar context; pp. 25–31) and the life-giving Spirit of Ezekiel 36–37 (pp. 31–35). The latter passage, in fact, has the former one in view. When Ezekiel prophesies about the Spirit who will give life (portrayed metaphorically as resurrection) to the nation of Israel, the language of the creation of Adam is evoked. Yates finds here the seedbed for the later Jewish and Pauline assumption that the soteriological function of the Spirit in the eschatological age is understood within the wider framework of creation. Or, as Yates says, "there is

a strong and growing element of the tradition [in Second Temple Judaism] that emphasizes the activity of the spirit in the creation and longed-for renewal of creation (broadly defined)" (p. 56).

The second part of the monograph looks at Paul. In particular, he analyses those passages where the Spirit is described as having a "life-giving" function: 1 Cor 15:45; 2 Cor 3:3–6; and Romans 8 (esp. vv. 1–2, 9–11). As with the Jewish literature previously examined, the so-called soteriological function of the Spirit is seen within the wider framework of creation. This is seen most clearly in 1 Cor 15:45, where Paul even alludes to the creation account (Gen 2:7) in describing the life-giving function of Jesus and the Spirit. (Yates has a clear and convincing discussion of the thorny issue regarding the identity of Jesus as "the life giving spirit" on pp. 99–104.) Yates then looks at 2 Cor 3:3–6 and Romans 8 (with an introductory section on Paul's argument in Romans 5–8) and concludes that "in 1 Corinthians 15, 2 Corinthians 3 and Romans 8 Paul describes the Spirit as life-giving using the language and imagery of Genesis 2 and Ezekiel 36–37. By doing so he locates the portrayal of the Spirit in the context of a new creative act of God, so that the Spirit is understood to be the divine agent who brings about the new creation" (p. 176). Paul therefore stands in continuity with his Jewish tradition. The Spirit is the agent of new creation. However, Yates sees two important points of discontinuity between Paul and Judaism. First, Paul emphasizes more than his Jewish contemporaries the life-giving function of the Spirit. While this function of the Spirit can be found in a few early Jewish texts (e.g. the *Hadayot* of Qumran), it was a minor theme across most of these texts where the Spirit was discussed. Yet for Paul, it is a major theme. Second, Paul locates the work of the Spirit in the renewal of creation in the *present* as well as the future. For Paul, the Spirit is the divine agent who effects resurrection life *now*. This is unparalleled in the Jewish literature.

Yates's thesis is a much-needed contribution to the discussion of Paul's soteriology and cosmology. I was surprised that this sort of work had not already been done. Scholars will no doubt welcome this fine monograph to a field that is so often flooded with works of unreflective scholarship.

Preston M. Sprinkle
Eternity Bible College, Simi Valley, CA

First Corinthians. By Joseph A. Fitzmyer. Anchor Bible. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2008, xxv + 660 pp., \$55.00.

This commentary is an update to the 1976 *I Corinthians* commentary in the Anchor Bible series by William E. Orr and James Arthur Walther. It follows Fitzmyer's earlier contributions to that series with his commentaries on Luke (1970, 1985), Romans (1993), Acts (1998) and Philemon (2000). Fitzmyer aims to write a commentary of "classic proportions" (p. xi) that distills Paul's thought in a not-too-technical form for the general reader of the twenty-first century. In short, this is a measured, erudite work with all the hallmarks of a seasoned scholar drawing upon a lifetime of research and writing. The commentary benefits from some of Fitzmyer's earlier work in Pauline chronology and theology, the Qumran sources, and topics in 1 Corinthians. Also notable is his inclusion of a wide range of foreign secondary sources, not only German and French, but also Italian, Dutch, and Spanish. Fitzmyer harnesses the fruit of foreign scholarship without presuming the reader's own familiarity with the languages. On the other hand, readers turning to this volume hoping to find the very latest in scholarly discussion may be somewhat disappointed. Of the 226 monographs and articles listed in the general bibliography, only 10 were published in 2000 or later, and only one as late as 2003.

Fitzmyer offers a full translation, a substantive introduction, and a general bibliography before proceeding to each unit of the text, where a translation of the unit is followed by a summary "Comment" and verse-by-verse "Notes." The commentary features context specific bibliographies nested according to the structure of the various textual units and distributed throughout the volume—a feature that is helpful for providing the user with an instant bibliography for a particular text unit. On the other hand, the distributed structure sometimes proves cumbersome for quickly locating details of a particular citation if it is not listed in the most immediate bibliography—a problem exacerbated by Fitzmyer's tendency to draw upon a range of less familiar sources.

While Fitzmyer offers substantive detail on the chronology of Paul's activity with the Corinthians, his reconstruction remains slightly out of step with the prevailing consensus. Fitzmyer dates Gallio's proconsular term to AD 52–53 (with Paul appearing before him in 52), a reconstruction that leaves less than two months between when Gallio took office and the production of the Delphi inscription testifying the report that Claudius had received from him as proconsul (p. 42). Hence the majority view (e.g. Murphy-O'Connor, Riesner, etc.) that Gallio served from 51–52 (with Paul appearing before him in 51) still seems more probable. Fitzmyer also delays Paul's writing of 1 Corinthians to "probably early in the year 57 (but the end of 56 is also possible)" (p. 43), placing Paul's "painful visit," the "tearful letter," 2 Corinthians, and his third visit to Corinth all in 57. The prevailing view that 1 Corinthians was written in 53–55, with a larger window for Paul's travel and the Corinthian correspondence, still remains more convincing.

Fitzmyer is guarded in how he reconstructs the situation that Paul is addressing in Corinth. Paul is not engaging in a polemic against outsiders (e.g. Judaizers or Gnostics) or addressing one group then another (e.g. ascetics and libertines), but rather he is addressing the community as a whole (p. 52). Paul confronts secular thinking among the Corinthians that is "at times akin to Epicurean teaching, Stoic tenets, and the rhetoric of the Sophists" (p. 30). Fitzmyer concurs that the root problems Paul is addressing are theological but rejects realized eschatology or pneumatic spirituality as a root cause. Fitzmyer conjectures the Corinthians as diverse, both economically (a range of social classes) and in the range of gods they venerated. I was disappointed, however, not to see inclusion of the Schowalter/Friesen volume *Urban Religion in Roman Corinth* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2005), which includes some recent scholarship on a range of archaeological, social, and religious questions and which would have sharpened Fitzmyer's presentation of these topics.

Fitzmyer concludes his introduction with a synthesis of Paul's theological teaching in the letter. Here he is traditional in regarding Christological soteriology as the key to Pauline theology and sees its formulation summed up in Paul proclaiming "Christ crucified" in 1 Cor 1:21–24, a proclamation echoed in the *euangelion* of Rom 1:16 and the "message of the cross" in 1 Cor 1:18 (pp. 69–70). He concludes his theological reflection by observing that the mix of hortatory counsel and doctrinal instruction in the letter makes the theology of the letter important for Christian life even in the twenty-first century and that even in heavily time-conditioned passages Paul "enunciates a principle of conduct or behavior that is easily applied to the Christian life today" (p. 92). It is a point good in theory but often perplexing in actual execution. For example, if Paul's advocacy of virginity in 1 Cor 7:25–35 is indeed conditioned on the eschatological conviction that "time is running out" as Fitzmyer suggests (p. 313), what then is the principle that applies to the reader two thousand years later?

Fitzmyer's analysis of chapters 1–4 largely follows Dahl in seeing these chapters as an apologetic section in which Paul seeks to justify his apostolic authority and ministry (p. 137). The rivalries among the Corinthians are fundamentally symptomatic of theological error in their failing to grasp the true nature of God's saving wisdom in the gospel of Christ revealed through the Spirit. Fitzmyer regards chapters 5 and 6 as further re-

lated to these problems but also transitional to the series of topics dealt with in chapters 7–15. Current with hermeneutical concerns of the present day, Fitzmyer gives heightened attention to Paul's reference to the *pornoi*, *malakoi*, and *arsenokoitai* who will not inherit the kingdom of God in 6:9–10, with more than half of his bibliographic references for 6:1–11 concerning interpretive issues around homosexuality. He translates the triad of terms as “fornicators,” “catamites,” and “sodomites” respectively and observes, “Paul's condemnation of such persons is forthright, and it has to be reckoned with as a norm for all Christian behavior” (p. 250).

Chapters 7 through 14 Fitzmyer broadly categorizes under the topic “Answers to Queries about Moral and Liturgical Problems.” Here Fitzmyer especially shines in untangling the exegetical difficulties in 11:2–16 on women worshipping with uncovered heads. Fitzmyer puts to use his earlier work on the meaning of *kephalē* in 11:3 and the Qumran parallels that provide some insight behind why Paul directs worshipping women to have their heads covered “because of the angels” in 11:10. Throughout the commentary, Fitzmyer draws effectively on Qumran parallels, while at the same time being repeatedly critical of interpreters who appeal too readily to comparatively late rabbinic sources. Fitzmyer concludes by treating chapters 15 and 16 each as separate sections.

Although Fitzmyer's style is measured and irenic, his Jesuit, Catholic perspective bears upon his interpretation of the text in various ways throughout the commentary. He acknowledges that, while the “fire” of 3:15 has been cited since Gregory the Great in support of the teaching on purgatory, the verse speaks not of purification but rather of a “testing of constancy and a subsequent deliverance achieved only with great difficulty” (p. 201). Since Fitzmyer understands the delivering of the man guilty of adultery with his father's wife to Satan in 5:5 as excommunication (with repercussions for salvation), he interprets the “spirit” saved in the Day of the Lord not as the man's spirit but as “God's Spirit present in the Corinthian congregation” (p. 239). Perhaps most provocative is his discussion of the “Pauline privilege” in 7:15 that a partner of a heathen marriage can contract a new marriage on becoming a Christian. Here he reiterates a challenge from one of his earlier works: “if Paul . . . under inspiration could introduce into his writing an exception on his own authority, then why can the Spirit-guided, institutional church of a later generation not make a similar exception in view of problems confronting Christians in married life . . . ?” (p. 298; cf. the response by Robert H. Stein, “Is It Lawful for a Man to Divorce His Wife?” *JETS* 22 [1979] 115–21).

Fitzmyer's commentary demonstrates depth of learning and engages a broad spectrum of foreign scholarship often overlooked by many Anglo-American evangelical scholars. For the average pastor looking for the optimal blend of superior exegesis and hermeneutic reflection I still regard Gordon Fee's (1987) commentary as unsurpassed, with David Garland's (2003) serving as a more recent second choice. For robust scholarly thoroughness Thiselton (2000) and Schrage (1991–2001) remain standouts. Yet for a blend of more concise yet solid scholarly assessment drawing from broader waters, Fitzmyer's work is a worthy contribution to the field.

Barry N. Danylak
Cambridge University, Cambridge, UK

The Sicarii in Josephus's Judean War: Rhetorical Analysis and Historical Observations.
By Mark Andrew Brighton. SBLEJL 27. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2009,
xiv + 184 pp., \$26.95 paper.

The Sicarii were a group of Jewish political assassins who figured importantly in Josephus's account of the Jewish war against the Romans. Brighton, Associate Professor

of Biblical Languages and Literature at Concordia University (Irvine, CA), produced this book as a revision of his PhD dissertation from the Classics Department at the University of California, Irvine. It was conducted under the supervision of Steve Mason of York University—the dean of Josephan studies. Indeed, since much of Brighton’s work builds on that of his *Doktorvater*, this work is Brighton’s attempt to “provide a holistic study of the Sicarii in *The Judean War*” (p. xiii), focusing on explicit and implicit mention of this ancient group.

Chapter 1 is “Scholarly Studies concerning the Sicarii in the *Judean War*” (pp. 1–22). Here Brighton begins by positing that contradictory historical assessments of Josephus by modern scholars often arise from inattentiveness to basic literary features of *War*. Brighton provides a summary of scholarship on *War* from both historical (pp. 2–11) and literary (pp. 11–17) perspectives. He dispels the misconceptions that the Sicarii are merely a fanatical offshoot of the Zealots (Schürer) or is that the term is simply a rhetorical label (Hengel). Instead, Josephus adopted the Roman label of “Sicarii” as a means of identifying the group to his Roman readers. In his treatment of *War* from a literary perspective (pp. 11–17), the author notes that few if any studies on the Sicarii have attended to the rhetorical elements of Josephus’s presentation. This is an important observation, since to evaluate Josephus on his historical merits one must simultaneously grasp his literary technique. Thus Brighton successfully promotes the need for further study of the subject attending to both the historiographic and literary nuances of Josephus (pp. 18–22).

To analyze the presentation of the Sicarii in *War*, Brighton first examines “The Contexts of *The Judean War*” (chap. 2, pp. 23–48). Here he looks at its literary background (pp. 23–28), attending to Mason’s original work on Josephus’s rhetoric of irony. Here Brighton demonstrates that in *War* Josephus counters the Roman assumption of their defeat of the Jews (and their God) by virtue of their superiority and the favor of their deities. Instead, Josephus contends that Jerusalem fell because civil war provoked divine punishment. This requires our reading of Sicarii passages to be attentive to figured speech and irony as well. Another context Brighton examines is *War*’s thematic elements (pp. 29–32). Here he dispels the “imperial propaganda” theory of *War* for more modern readings, including divine judgment, culpability of the Jewish revolutionary leaders (absolving the Judean population), even Roman power, among other important subjects. *War*’s date and unity (pp. 33–41) provide an additional context for examination. Here Brighton is establishing a date for the work in its entirety, including book 7, between AD 75 and 81. This is a helpful overview for specialist and non-specialist alike, locating Josephus in the Greco-Roman historiographic theme of *stasis* (“sedition”) not unlike that employed by the venerable Thucydides. Finally, Brighton considers the context of *War*’s audience (pp. 41–47), tracing literary features to conclude that Josephus wrote primarily for a non-Jewish and elite audience at Rome, though he is not unconcerned about Jewish readers as well.

Brighton’s third chapter covers “The Sicarii in *War* 1–6” (pp. 49–92). After some introductory comments on the direct and indirect references to Sicarii in these books, the author asks several questions of each: First, what criteria should be used for considering contexts where Sicarii are not mentioned by name? Second, what is the nature of the immediate context of any citation included? Third, how does Josephus describe them and their activity? Fourth, what terms does he use? Fifth, what is the context of the pericope in the overall structure of the book? Finally, sixth, what conclusions can be drawn from the above analyses? These questions are addressed comprehensively to a number of texts, including the activity of Judas in AD 6 (2.117–18), the Sicarii rise during the time of Felix (2.254–57), the capture of Masada (2.408), their joining the rebels (2.425), the rise and fall of Menahem (2.433–48), the joint activity with Simon ben Gioras (2.652–54; 4.503–8), and the raid of Engaddi (4.398–405). In chapter 4, the author applies the same methodology to more prominent appearances of “The Sicarii

in *War 7*" (pp. 92–140). After a brief discussion of the structure of *War 7*, Brighton asks the same six questions to texts in book 7, including Josephus's summary condemnation of Jewish rebels (7.253–62), the Masada narrative (7.275, 297, 311), the presence of the Sicarii in Egypt (7.410, 412, 415) and around Cyrene (the Catullus narrative, 7.437, 444). These chapters are rich in detail, covering their subjects in a readable yet thorough manner, all the while attending to the tension between historical viability and rhetorical features raised earlier in the volume.

This work is concluded in chapter 5 (pp. 141–50), which covers both the literary and historical assessment of the Sicarii in *War*. With respect to literary data, Brighton concludes that unlike the Zealots, Sicarii fought exclusively against their own people, which, he contends, "is how they are most clearly identified in *War*" (p. 141). Within the literary presentation of these figures, Josephus seems to be rather careful to name Sicarii explicitly only when they kill their own people or when they confess to such crimes (p. 142). So, while they serve a negative rhetorical purpose in the narrative, they also illustrate the limits of Roman power. For their ultimate demise is not due to imperial might but divine punishment under *God's* authority. In sum, Brighton concludes that on a literary level what "Josephus desires to say in connection with the Sicarii about divine authority upstages what he is obliged to say in connection with the Flavians" (p. 142). With respect to historical considerations of his data (pp. 144–50), Brighton first concludes that it cannot be maintained from *War* that the Sicarii are a branch of the Zealots. Instead they are part of a group of "bandits" in general and were a clearly identifiable historical group. He finds that the "Sicarii" in *War* is a label originally applied to a group of bandits who embarked on high-profile assassinations in the early stages of the war. Josephus adopts the label to develop and bring to a resolution several major themes in *War*.

In general, Brighton finds that the term "Sicarii" was somewhat fluid, used to describe Jews of the Judean revolt who were associated with acts of violence against their own people for religious and/or political ends. The book contains several appendices (pp. 151–62), including the author's translation of select texts in *War*: the rise and fall of Menahem, Eleazar's first and second speeches at Masada, and Josephus's speech at Jotapata. Here the author provides the Greek text and his own translation of all relevant material, incorporating his own lexical work provided earlier in the book.

This is a fine piece of work that will surely contribute to the growing field of Josephan studies already flourishing with the publication of Brill's commentary series. The volume is replete with up-to-date, even-handed scholarship. It should prove a valuable resource for those working in Josephus's *War*, not only for research on Sicarii but also for a concise, readable, and thorough treatment of scholarship on important areas of Josephan studies. The affordable price of the SBLEJL series makes it all the more accessible to readers. More important for readers of this journal unfamiliar with the use of Josephus for NT studies is S. Mason's *Josephus and the New Testament* (2d ed.; Peabody: Hendrickson, 2003), which remains *the* place to start for NT studies in all things Josephus.

Daniel M. Gurtner
Bethel Seminary, St. Paul, MN

The Truth behind the New Atheism: Responding to the Emerging Challenges to God and Christianity. By David Marshall. Eugene, OR: Harvest House, 2007, 236 pages, \$13.00 paper.

When the "New Atheist" publishing frenzy climaxed in 2006–2007 with Richard Dawkins's *The God Delusion* (Houghton Mifflin, 2006), Sam Harris's *Letter to a Christian*

Nation and Christopher Hitchens's *god is not Great* (Twelve, 2007), ripostes began appearing like David Robertson's *The Dawkins Letters* (Christian Focus, 2007) and Douglas Wilson's *Letter from a Christian Citizen* (American Vision, 2007), which sought to rebut these atheist bestsellers individually. David Marshall's *The Truth behind the New Atheism* (Harvest House, 2007) was the first book-length response to the New Atheism as a whole. It still stands among the best of several dozen (and counting) works.

The New Atheism's central thesis is that religion in general and Christianity in particular is both false and harmful. Any apparent benefit derived from belief in God (and, by obligatory extension, gods) arises in spite of rather than due to such belief. In his rejoinder, Marshall discusses multiple faiths while focusing on the principal target, Christianity. Atheist accusations are introduced, acknowledged where substantial, and parried with evidence demonstrating how Christianity is both good and true.

Part 1, "God and Science," tackles charges that Christianity is a blind faith, scientists are too "bright" to believe in God, and evolution renders God superfluous. Drawing from social historian Rodney Stark and others, Marshall documents how the Bible and the Christian tradition gave birth to science and frequently appeal to reason, empirical facts, and experiment. Early scientists were "mostly zealous Christians" (p. 37) who viewed science as a divine calling embodying faith in a rational, creative God. Francis Bacon, father of the scientific method, extolled, "A little or superficial knowledge of philosophy may incline the mind . . . to atheism, but a farther proceeding therein doth bring the mind back again to religion [Christianity]" (pp. 32, 35, 222).

Concerning evolution, Marshall engages diverse Christian opinions thoughtfully. With Human Genome director Francis Collins (*The Language of God*, 2006) and biologist Kenneth Miller (*Finding Darwin's God*, 1999), Marshall avers, "For some, evolution has shouted down the voice of God. For others, it allows them to hear that voice in a new and subtle way" (p. 59). With nods to Intelligent Design, Marshall encourages evolutionary theorists to remain receptive to criticism for the sake of science, pointing out that critical probes often lead to fresh insight.

Part 2, "Word and Flesh," tours the Bible in its most controversial elements, or at least its most controversial according to the New Atheists. Abraham's willingness to sacrifice Isaac on Mt. Moriah, ancient Hebrew treatment of non-Israelite Gentiles, women, and war are addressed. Marshall briefly sets forth principles for responsible biblical interpretation and distinguishes between what the Bible endorses (e.g. "pray for those who persecute you"; Matt 5:44), what it reports without endorsing, and what it vehemently condemns (e.g. mayhem resulting from ignoring God's laws when "everyone did what was right in his own eyes"; Judg 17:7, 21:25). Marshall then argues for the historical reliability of the Gospels in contrast with later Gnostic writings, and closes by confronting readers with Jesus' claims about himself, and why we should believe them.

Part 3, "Truth and Consequences," samples personal and social fruit budding from Jesus' legacy. Marshall reveals how Christianity helped free slaves, liberate women, care for the poor, articulate human rights, diminish tyranny, foster literacy, and conceive the university. Civil rights leaders from William Wilberforce to Martin Luther King Jr., to even Hindus like Gandhi credit Jesus as their inspiration. "When we follow the movements that have liberated humanity most profoundly, we find that the gospel played a profound role in almost all of them" (p. 153). Marshall inquires, "Shouldn't we applaud the religion whose followers invented science, the modern hospital, and the Red Cross, and helped end (or weaken) slavery, the caste-system, foot-binding, and widow burning?" (pp. 189-90).

But what about Crusades, Inquisitions, witch hunts, the Atlantic slave trade, anti-Semitism, and other sins? Marshall examines each soberly and determines that where Christians or those calling themselves Christian sinned, it was the consequence of

ignoring or repudiating Jesus' teachings rather than adhering to them. As he notes: "It's harder to find warrant in the New Testament for torturing heretics. . . . No one blames Buddha or Confucius for the Japanese Inquisition which killed as many Catholics as the Spanish killed non-Catholics. Why blame Jesus when people do the opposite of what he taught?" (pp. 158–60). Without trivializing nastiness bolstered by religious rhetoric, Marshall cites Christians and Christian institutions that appealed to Jesus and his teachings to resist or restrain such evil. For example: "Puritan pastors in New England condemned the use of 'spectral evidence' [against alleged witches]. . . . Scottish missionary Mary Schlessor . . . defied a mob commissioned by a Nigerian chief to murder . . . people he accused of using witchcraft. . . . Corrie Ten Boom . . . hid Jews [in World War II]" (pp. 162–66). Marshall calls attention to Israeli historian Pinchas Lapide, who affirmed that even much maligned Pope Pius XII was plausibly "instrumental in saving . . . as many as 860,000 Jews from certain death at Nazi hands" (pp. 167, 232). Young people too can exemplify Christian love in the midst of hate. Marshall retells an interview by Harvard psychologist Robert Coles with a six-year-old black girl who was the first to attend a formerly all-white school in New Orleans. "She looked back just before entering the school to pray for the people yelling at her. Why? Because they needed praying for . . . and because Jesus forgave his enemies from the cross" (p. 169).

In the final three chapters, Marshall investigates questions about a supposed "American Taliban" (the "Religious Right") and ponders atheism's implications for human dignity, violence, freedom, and sexuality. He shows that atheism's record and propensity for cruelty is horrifying and severe. "Stalin didn't kill alone. Lenin, Mao, Pol Pot, both Kims [Il Sung, Jong Il], Ho, Castro, Ceausecsu, and Honekcer were also atheists. In one-third of the world, Communist parties announced the death of God. . . . Millions were *Tortured for Christ*, as the title of a book by . . . Richard Wurmbrand succinctly put it. . . . Children of religious parents were kidnapped by the state and taught atheism" (pp. 197–98). According to Marshall, although numerous atheists act morally and lovingly, it is not atheism that impels them to do so. On the other hand, Christians who sin through human frailty and people of countless persuasions who invoke God to justify malevolence do not wreak havoc out of fidelity to Christian teaching, but by living contrary to what Jesus taught.

Marshall's final chapter is a winsome reflection, "Consilience," alluding to biologist Edward O. Wilson's meditation of the same title. He gives atheists their due, extends a hand of friendship, and hints at how Jesus satiates the deepest yearnings of every person, whether scientist, artist, or devotee of any religion or none. In Jesus, all that is true and beautiful finds its proper place and is fulfilled. "Distinctives are not lost," he adds, "but woven together in a pattern, like melodies in a Bach fugue" (p. 217).

Other books defending or explicating Christianity are thicker or more thorough than *The Truth behind the New Atheism*, but Marshall is hard to match for cogently replying to key issues in a short space. Marshall writes with erudition and brevity for students, pastors, scholars, and others who lack time to scrutinize the New Atheism in depth but who seek a reliable guide surveying and skewering its most serious salvos. Sources and references are listed in detail for further consideration.

Toward the end of his book, Marshall mentions a letter by Friedrich Engels, the Communist theorist and collaborator with Karl Marx. Engels was "pious when young, and lost his faith reading David Strauss's *The Life of Jesus*. 'Why does not someone write a devastating refutation?' he wrote his friend Fritz Graebar" (pp. 200, 234). For spiritual descendents of Engels, and others who find their faith wounded by the New Atheism, Marshall supplies a splendid salve.

Benjamin DeVan
Harvard University, Cambridge, MA

Body, Soul, and Human Life: The Nature of Humanity in the Bible. By Joel B. Green. Grand Rapids: Baker, 20008, xviii + 219 pp., \$19.99 paper.

What do neuroscience and biblical hermeneutics have to do with one another? As Joel Green's new book demonstrates, they both provide vital perspectives on what it means to be human. Indeed, Green argues that no adequate theological anthropology can be done without paying attention to both of these disciplines. To this end, Green focuses in this book on "neuro-hermeneutics"—that is, understanding the human person by identifying the surprising areas of agreement between neuroscience and biblical hermeneutics.

Throughout Green argues that traditional (i.e. dualist) anthropologies need substantial revision. The growing consensus that the Bible portrays the human person as a holistic, physical being and the growing scientific evidence that all aspects of human existence—including the psychological, social, and spiritual—are grounded in human physicality both require, according to Green, that we understand human persons as entirely physical beings. Rather than trying to ground human uniqueness in the possession of an immortal and immaterial soul, Green contends that human uniqueness lies exclusively in covenantal relationship with God (*imago Dei*).

Having established his basic framework for understanding humanity, Green turns his attention to three areas of convergence between neuroscience and biblical hermeneutics that support and explain his position. First, Green considers human free will. Looking to the sciences, he argues that human behavior is constrained by physical, psychological, and environmental factors, among others, making it impossible for us to have "free will" in the popular sense. He finds a similar picture in the biblical portrayal of sin as a power that traps and shapes human persons such that they are unable to act "freely." Green points to a similar convergence in how we should understand salvation. In possibly the most novel contribution of the book, Green looks at the nature of conversion, salvation, and sanctification, arguing that all three must be viewed, both scientifically and biblically, as embodied realities. Green takes us on a quick tour of the neurophysiology of change in the human brain before showing how the conversion narratives of Luke/Acts emphasize the embodied nature of Christian salvation. The third convergence addresses how we understand the resurrection. Here Green argues that neither the Old nor New Testaments should be understood as teaching that there is an intermediate, disembodied state that occurs between death and resurrection. Instead, both affirm that humans are physical beings who cease to exist at death and are raised to new life in the future with no conscious awareness of any intervening time. Continuous personal identity (i.e. what establishes that it really is *I* who will be raised in the future) is grounded in narrative and relationship, rather than the continuous existence of an immaterial soul.

Green's book is both commendable and unique for the way in which it brings together the neurosciences and biblical hermeneutics to understand the human person. This unique combination is timely and thought-provoking, and the book warrants close reading for that reason alone.

At the same time, however, Green's work is marred by three significant flaws. First, because of his focus on the neurosciences and hermeneutics, he rarely deals with the important philosophical implications of his conclusions. Admittedly, Green does not pretend to be providing a philosophical account of human nature. Nonetheless, he deals with philosophically significant issues like freedom and personal identity, and he provides answers that are hotly debated in philosophical discussion. It would seem important, then, that he provide some comment, however brief, on what these issues are and how they might be addressed.

Secondly, his understanding of the relationship between science, exegesis, and theology warrants further explanation and defense. Indeed, the very way in which he

presents several of the chapters—a survey of the science followed by a discussion of how the biblical data presents a similar perspective—raises the question of whether the biblical interpretation is being driven entirely by his understanding of the science. Whether this is actually how Green understands the relationship, the order of presentation and the failure to explain his methodology more clearly leaves room for significant ambiguity on this point.

Finally, Green occasionally fails to engage adequately some of the more important dualist arguments. For example, Green presents the growing consensus on the holistic nature of the human person in the Bible as an argument against dualism. Yet, he does little to appreciate the fact that most contemporary dualists are equally keen to emphasize the holistic nature of embodied human life. Although dualists think that there is more to the story, they are quick to affirm the biblical emphasis on the human person as an embodied, psychophysical being. Green also overemphasizes the consensus by neglecting those, like N. T. Wright, who argue that the biblical texts were written in a cultural context that was, despite Green's arguments, largely dualistic and must be read in that light. Regardless of which side is correct, Green does the reader a disservice by not adequately presenting these disparate perspectives.

Despite these weaknesses, Green's book is well worth reading. Although much of the material is very similar to other books and articles that Green has published, there are enough new ideas and arguments for this to be valuable even for those familiar with his work. Those people new to the conversation will find the book easy to engage, though they may find some of his conclusions surprising. It will be particularly helpful for anyone seeking to understand the science and exegesis that lies behind the growing support for physicalist ontologies among some evangelicals. Probably the most important aspect of Green's book, though, is the way in which he demonstrates that modern science and biblical hermeneutics can be brought together in a vital dialog as we work toward a better understanding of the human person.

Marc Cortez
Western Seminary, Portland, OR

The Narcissism Epidemic: Living in the Age of Entitlement. By Jean M. Twenge and W. Keith Campbell. New York: Free Press, 2009, x + 339 pp., \$26.

Both Twenge and Campbell are psychology Ph.D.s and academicians: Twenge teaches at San Diego State University (and is the author of *Generation Me: Why Today's Young Americans Are More Confident, Assertive, Entitled—and More Miserable Than Ever Before*; 2007); Campbell teaches at the University of Georgia. For those of us who hold to the inspiration and veracity of the Bible, the thesis of *The Narcissism Epidemic* comes as no surprise: humanity is self-centered, narcissistic by nature. Nevertheless, to see the case being made for it from the enclaves of secular academia, and presented with a wry sense of humor, is refreshing.

The book is divided into four sections, each vaulting off the medical theme of the book: diagnosis, root causes of the epidemic, symptoms, and (bravely enough) prognosis and treatment.

There has been a "relentless rise of narcissism in our culture" (p. 1). According to the authors, it all began in the 1970s with the drive to develop self-esteem, to find one's self-expression, and the movement away from community-oriented thinking. "Not only are there more narcissists than ever, but non-narcissistic people are seduced by the increasing emphasis on material wealth, physical appearance, celebrity worship, and attention seeking. Standards have shifted, sucking otherwise humble people into the

vortex of granite countertops, tricked-out MySpace pages, and plastic surgery” (p. 2). A quarter of all college students agree with items on the standardized Narcissistic Personality Inventory, and 5% of all Americans even have the extreme version of the trait—Narcissistic Personality Disorder. Because we were warned a long time ago that in the “last days” difficult times would come, with humanity being “lovers of self,” “lovers of money,” etc., I am not convinced that this is a new disease. A more virulent mutant form, perhaps, but not a new disease, with its contagion spreading rapidly in a media-saturated culture.

Twenge and Campbell assert that this epidemic of narcissism has affected every American directly or indirectly, the recent mortgage meltdown being a case in point, in part due to the “narcissistic overconfidence” of homebuyers and greedy lenders (pp. 2–3). Culture now holds court not in reality, but in grandiose fantasy: “We have phony rich people (with interest-only mortgages and piles of debt), phony beauty (with plastic surgery and cosmetic procedures), phony athletes (with performance-enhancing drugs), phony celebrities (via reality TV and YouTube), phony genius students (with grade inflation), a phony national economy (with eleven trillion dollars of government debt), phony feelings of being special among children (with parenting and education focused on self-esteem), and phony friends (with the social networking explosion). All this fantasy might feel good, but, unfortunately, reality always wins” (p. 4). Indeed!

The symptoms of the disease are easily recognizable: an inflated view of the self and an absence of deep connections to others. The authors proceed to debunk, quite mercilessly, myths regarding narcissism: Narcissism is *not* high self-esteem; narcissists lack the critical element of caring for others. Narcissists are *not* necessarily insecure deep down; in fact, the evidence shows that narcissists think they are “awesome.” Narcissism is *not* healthy; at its core, it is antisocial behavior: “[s]elfishness, for example, might allow you to get a bigger piece of dessert after dinner, but will hurt your longer-term relationships with your companions” (p. 29). Narcissism is *not* simply vanity; those afflicted are also “materialistic, entitled, aggressive when insulted, and uninterested in emotional closeness” (p. 30). Twenge and Campbell cite a study in which thirty-nine percent of American eighth-graders were confident of their math skills, compared to six percent of comparable Korean children. The latter, however, did far better than the former in math tests. “We’re not number one, but we’re number one in *thinking* we are number one” (p. 47). The apostle Paul’s sharp rebuke is apropos: “For who regards you as superior? What do you have that you did not receive? And if you did receive it, why do you boast as if you had not received it?” (1 Cor 4:7).

Why is narcissistic behavior so prevalent? The authors address the four root etiologies of the epidemic: parenting, media, Web 2.0, and easy credit.

Squarely, the authors bring the first cause to the door of the home, where “royalty” are raised: “More than at any time in history, the child’s needs come first” (p. 74). Nationwide surveys tracking parental attitudes in the last five decades show that obedience is no longer high on the list of values parents want children to learn. All of that adds to overindulgence, role reversal (parents are no longer authority figures), and overpraising.

Media transmission of narcissism, via the depiction of narcissistic celebrities and their narcissistic lifestyles, is a second major cause of the epidemic. And this kind of fame and fortune is luscious bait for the rest of us commoners. More than half of those aged eighteen through twenty-five said “becoming famous” was an important goal—five times as many as named “becoming more spiritual” as a goal (p. 93). Apparently, even being *near* fame is appealing: Forty-three percent of middle school girls would rather be a celebrity personal assistant, twice as many as those who wanted to be president of an Ivy-league school, three times as many as those who wanted to be a U.S. senator, and four times as many as those who wanted to head up a company like General Motors (p. 94).

Web 2.0—all of the user-focused internet sites, including social networking and virtual worlds—is labeled the third root cause of the epidemic. They are ideal for narcissists seeking to promote themselves. Friendships based on Web 2.0, the authors declare, “[facilitate] the kind of superficial, emotionally bankrupt relationships favored by narcissistic people” (p. 111). Even blogs turn out to be “vapid exercises in self-expression and attention-seeking” (pp. 116–117). Andy Warhol’s prediction of fame for all—for 15 minutes—finally has become reality . . . on YouTube.

Fourth, the availability of easy credit in the last decade encouraged people to live the kind of lifestyles they could not afford, spreading the epidemic of narcissism and the illusion of wealth and success. For the first time since the 1930s, in 2005, more was spent than earned by Americans; credit card debts have tripled since the 1990s. The average size of homes has increased sixty-six percent in the last three decades, according to the National Association of Home Builders. Needless to say, all of this affects everybody else, and not simply because the rest of the populace tries to keep up: When the mortgage enterprise was shipwrecked, it was the average taxpayer who was left holding the tab.

Twenge and Campbell’s diagnosis of the epidemic of narcissism is based upon numerous symptoms: vanity, materialism, relationship problems, and entitlement, among others.

That vanity is a symptom of narcissism is almost a tautology. Botox was employed more than three million times in 2006, about fifty times more often than it was a decade ago. About twelve million people in the U.S. submitted themselves to cosmetic procedures in 2007—five times as many as in 2005. As a practicing dermatologist, I can heartily attest to the fact that a veritable industry thrives on the narcissistic culture’s agonizing over the paleness of teeth, darkness of skin, shortness of eyelashes, wrinkling of brows, rippling of fat, and the urgency to wax, spray, laser, peel, lift, tuck, and color.

Narcissism is consumed with buying and using products that confer and convey status, and materialistic trends gradually raise standards for everyone else: “The rich are . . . treated with an aspirational reverence—somewhat like the gods were to the Greeks, except that many people fervently hope they can soon join their ranks” (p. 172). If square footage of retail space is any gauge of this avaricious consumerism, the numbers are striking: average retail space per person in the U.S. is 39 sq ft, compared to 20 sq ft for Australia, 14 sq ft for the U.K., and 11 sq ft for Japan. In fact, consumption even has its own holiday—ironically, it is the day after Thanksgiving (“Black Friday”).

Narcissists are prone to relationship problems; for them, relationships are all about bolstering their own egos: “In place of love for another person, put love for the self; in place of caring, put exploitation; and to commitment, add ‘as long as it benefits me’” (p. 213). Twenge and Campbell label narcissists’ relationships “fungible:” Interchangeable and disposable, relationships serve one end, that of self-exaltation (p. 214). Unfortunately, “if you love yourself too much, you won’t have enough love left for anyone else” (p. 223; italics removed). *Contra mundum*, the Scriptures teach Christians “to lay down our lives for the brethren,” modeling the paradigmatic expression of Christ’s sacrificial love (1 John 3:16).

Entitlement, the state of mind that believes one deserves special treatment, is an important symptom of narcissism and a dangerous one at that, for invariably someone else is going to be left with the cost of entitling those so afflicted. A 2008 survey of college students revealed that two-thirds believed they were entitled to special consideration by their professors simply for trying hard; one-third thought they deserved a B just for attending class. Not only are the “entitled” ones self-focused; the attitude also betokens a fundamental lack of respect for others. Well might the church play a role in keeping check on this attitude of entitlement, for Paul recommended that one be concerned about benefiting others, not oneself: “Let no one seek his own good, but that of his neighbor” (1 Cor 10:24). Has the church failed to model this kind of altruism?

No longer is religion making such expectations of its adherents, Twenge and Campbell allege; it has merely become a means to fulfill one's dreams. Such is the sad indictment upon those who ought know better.

The authors must be applauded for being plucky enough to prescribe a chapter-full of suggested treatments for narcissism, "the fast food of the soul" (p. 259). Briefly, one must avoid the epidemic, cut off the spread, and quarantine the disease. Humility, Twenge and Campbell aver, is the opposite of narcissism, and they recommend "religion," where values such as love, compassion, community, and forgiveness are espoused—elements sorely lacking in a narcissistic world. One of the refrains encountered in this book is that the home is the primary locus where the epidemic may be nipped in the bud. In addition, education itself must be reformed with the elimination of the emphasis on self-esteem, and media must change with the projection of community values, and with priority given to humility and not on self-exalting, on saving and not on consuming.

Twenge and Campbell confess, "We realize that this level of change is probably a pipe dream" (p. 292). It probably is. On the other hand, Christians, particularly those who hold to the inspiration and inerrancy of the Word of God, have a greater responsibility in this matter and stand a better chance of realizing positive change. When the secular press points an accusatory finger at self-centeredness and its threatening consequences, pastors, teachers, and laypeople of every stripe would do well to heed its warnings. Not that we, who were exhorted millennia ago not to look out for our own personal interests, but also for the interests of others (Phil 2:24), needed any goading. Resisting the progress of this epidemic is crucial, lest a greater implosion of character and culture take place. May the words of Paul ring in our ears: "For through the grace given to me I say to everyone among you not to think more highly of himself than he ought to think; but to think so as to have sound judgment. . . . Do not be haughty in mind" (Rom 12:3, 16). Wise words, indeed.

Abraham Kuruvilla
Dallas Theological Seminary, Dallas, TX

GloboChrist: The Great Commission Takes a Postmodern Turn. By Carl Raschke. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2008, 176 pp., \$22.00, paper.

Carl Raschke's latest book, part of Baker's *The Church and Postmodern Culture* series, is offered as a wake-up call for the American Evangelical church. Raschke calls on his American Evangelical readers to move beyond parochial battles and provincial visions of mission and evangelism, so as to embrace a more powerful vision of the living, growing body of Christ in our postmodern, postsecular, and globalized world. The term "GloboChrist" is Raschke's way of referencing the truly global reality of the church, both as it has always been and as it is becoming more and more visible in today's world. The book attempts to convey an accurate and attractive sense of the body of GloboChrist by mapping the rapidly changing territory of the "globopomo" world, and by describing what the church might look like as it also becomes globopomo in fulfillment of the Great Commission.

Thankfully, Raschke does not handle the postmodern turn in exclusively epistemological terms, as many popular Christian authors have been prone to do. Instead, he develops a much broader picture of the postmodern turn, following the Russian political scientist D. A. Silichev in treating it as principally an issue of the emergence of "global polycentrism" (p. 27). In other words, for Raschke, postmodern culture is not the result of some kind of trickle-down economics of ideas, from the French university system to

American politics and pop culture. Rather, for Raschke, following Silichev, postmodern culture is what one gets when patterns of globalization develop into "a world community minus a world state and world governance" (citation of Silichev; p. 27). This global reality might very well entail certain shifts in epistemological theorizing, especially for those rooted in the Western intellectual tradition. More significantly, however, global polycentrism involves reconfigurations of political, economic, technological, social, and religious patterns (to name but a few), even for those who have never even heard of epistemology. If Silichev is correct, and the postmodern condition is a function of globalized social and political conditions, and not merely a set of esoteric philosophical theories, then Raschke is correct to observe that "no one can refuse to be postmodern any more than one can resolve to live completely as people did in the seventeenth century" (p. 27). In other words, postmodern culture must be understood as the unavoidable reality within which contemporary Christians must figure out what it means to be faithful incarnations of Christ.

To do this, Raschke is convinced that we must understand and be able to navigate the emerging global plurality, and this requires that we come to grips with the ways in which religions are proliferating in our increasingly post-secular times. The mavens of enlightenment have always assumed that cultures would gradually outgrow the need for religion, finding, as they become enlightened, that needs once met by religion are better satisfied by robust participation in global free-market economies and democratic political systems. As such, the prophets of secularization have said, religion will come to play less and less of a role in both national and global politics, economics, and culture making. But, Raschke notes, while it might have been possible for some to entertain such hopes even as late as the 1990s, the first decade of the twenty-first century has decisively demonstrated that religion is not going anywhere anytime soon. Indeed, religions are proliferating, growing in not only in number, but also in numbers of converts and in influence in global affairs. Both Christianity and Islam, for example, are growing globally at a rate faster than global population growth (p. 36), and religion is now an integral part of the responses of indigenous peoples to the global spread of consumer capitalism. As people in local cultures feel threatened by the homogenizing and Westernizing forces of globalizing capitalism, many cling ever more tightly to local and traditional customs, languages, and styles of dress, art, and food. And they often return to, or entrench themselves more deeply within, indigenous or non-Western religions. Thus, it seems that as the global and the local collide, it is actually the secularist outlook that is called into question, not religion. The postmodern world is increasingly religious and post-secular.

For Raschke, this fact should cause the American evangelical church to reassess both its "fateful alliance with consumer culture" (p. 107) and its ongoing battle against secular humanism as the main enemy of the church. He thinks that the primary challenges facing today's global church will come not in the form of a battle with the forces of secularization, but in the form of a global "clash of eschatologies," between Christianity and Islam, as Islam is increasingly seen as the religion of choice for many of those who wish to resist the imperialist spread of Western consumer culture. To meet this challenge effectively, the American Evangelical church must break loose from its consumerist attitudes and values and begin to embody the fact that Christianity is more than just a cultural export of the West, like McDonalds, Coca-Cola, and Disney. The American Evangelical Christian church must become globopomo, an active participant in the global church, a part of the worldwide body of "GloboChrist."

The body of GloboChrist, a truly global postmodern Christianity is, according to Raschke, decentralized, deinstitutionalized, and indigenized. As such, it is also radical, relational, revelatory, and rhizomatic. The global postmodern church is decentralized in that it is not rooted in the West, with a centralized American/European church sending

missionaries to the global South and East. Instead, the radical church grows from a root commitment to God's revealed word, a word that is shared by all the church and is not the exclusive property of any particular culture or tradition. This means that the global postmodern church is deinstitutionalized and relational, in that it functions as a multi-directional network of relational connections, communication, and mutual benefit across national, cultural, linguistic, and denominational boundaries. This network of connections is not centrally managed or organized, but develops rhizomatically, spreading like crabgrass in a decentered, interlinked pattern of connections between multiple unique individual growths. Raschke argues that the global church will be marked by diversity, not uniformity, and will grow by way of multiple, diverse connections made possible not only by channels of global capitalism, but also, and perhaps primarily, by pathways within local, indigenous cultures. The rhizomatic church will thus be an indigenizing church in which a multiplicity of cultural differences is preserved and redeemed, not eradicated and homogenized. Indeed, says Raschke, the doctrine of incarnation "entails a constant 'translation' of who God is into seemingly disparate and incompatible cultures. Christianity has no culture itself but belongs to all cultures. Incarnation is translation . . ." (p. 66). But the church's indigenizing "translation" of the gospel into a plurality of cultures is not a relativistic "have it your way!" approach in which anything goes and everything is up for grabs (an attitude which Raschke calls "Burger King Christianity"). This is because the global postmodern church is also revelatory, which is to say that, because it is radically rooted in God's revealed word, the church constantly and boldly calls for repentance and humility, a fundamental reorientation of individuals and cultures toward the revealed reality of the Kingdom of God. And the Kingdom of God is far from relativistic, as it is grounded exclusively in the person and work of Jesus Christ.

Raschke believes that Islam is also developing globally along rhizomatic lines, albeit with a radically different eschatology than that of Christianity. It is for this reason that he sees a "clash of eschatologies" looming on the horizon as both Christianity and Islam spread rhizomatically across the globe. As such, he urges those in the American Evangelical church to throw off their passivity and privatized sentimentality in order to become active participants in the global postmodern church, suggesting that "the kind of radical, relational, and incarnational Christian witness that a postmodernized Great Commission entails would have the ferocity of the jihad and paradoxically also the love for the lost that Jesus demonstrated" (p. 131). Indeed, he suggests, nothing short of a passionate postmodern "church militant" (without a literal military) will have any hope of countering the global spread of Islam.

It is on this basis that Raschke ends his book by chastising both proponents and critics of the emerging church. He urges both parties to forsake their increasingly narrow focus on debates that have "degenerated into just one more skirmish in the ongoing culture wars" (p. 158), and he rightly points out that many of the topics which consume those involved in these debates have little relevance beyond the American and European contexts.

To those flirting with what he calls "Burger King Christianity," those who might be uncritically equating a "new kind of Christian" with a more open and inclusive, less judgmental, less doctrinally rigorous, and easier-to-get-along-with kind of Christian, Raschke points out that such an attitude is simply a capitulation to the secularizing forces of globalized consumption, "which promises anything anytime to anyone so long as it is enjoyable, satisfying, and undemanding." But, says Raschke, "to be incarnational in the most radical and eschatological sense . . . is diametrically opposed to Burger King Christianity" (p. 163). "The challenge," he says, "is to be able to frame the non-negotiable truth of the Christian witness in terms that will have a genuine, planetary impact, where Christ will become GloboChrist once and for all" (p. 148).

To those who react strongly against the emerging church, Raschke points out that the litany of charges typically leveled against postmodernism and the emerging church seems to be nothing more than a repetition of the charges brought by cultural conservatives of prior generations against secular humanism and existentialism. Raschke suspects that such charges have little to do with “postmodernism as either a philosophical or cultural development,” but instead stem from a fundamentalist outrage that “their view of religiosity is shared less and less by the public at large, that they have failed to persuade anybody except their own minions, and that non-Christians are allowed to immigrate and believe whatever they want without constraint or coercion” (pp. 155–56). In response to such fears, Raschke challenges the assumption that relativism is on the rise or is a real threat to the church. Instead, he encourages those who fear postmodernism to follow the lead of those in the early church, who, filled with the love of Christ, waded fearlessly into the relativistic pagan culture of their day and boldly confessed Jesus Christ as Lord, apparently without feeling anxiety about the influence of relativism and apparently without feeling the need to argue against relativism as a prolegomena to Christian witness (pp. 153–54).

To both sides of the current debate about the church and culture, Raschke has this to say: the church today “must no longer take its cues from the twilight broodings of the West or from American culture wars. It must become the incarnational church that knows no cultural boundaries. It must become the global body of the *GloboChrist*, the shining bride waiting on her groom and standing fast in the promise ‘until the appearing of our Lord Jesus Christ, which God will bring about in his own time’” (p. 167).

Whether or not readers agree with Raschke’s specific claims or with his overall apocalyptic vision of a “clash of eschatologies,” his book is a valuable challenge. The series of which this volume is a part is designed to answer questions such as “What does postmodern theory have to say about the shape of the church? How should concrete, in-the-pew and on-the-ground religious practices be impacted by postmodernism? What should the church look like in postmodernity? What has Paris to do with Jerusalem?” (from the Series Preface; pp. 8–9). Raschke’s book certainly does spur us to think in fresh ways about these kinds of questions, and no small part of its value is found in the fact that he treats the postmodern turn as something more than just an epistemological issue. That alone makes the book a necessary and valuable contribution to contemporary evangelical discussions of postmodernism, as Raschke issues a desperately needed call to American Evangelicals to move beyond the culture wars and to stop chasing the red herring of epistemological relativism.

But I think that the main value of *GloboChrist* is not to be found in its response to the question “What has Paris to do with Jerusalem?” because Raschke’s references to contemporary theorists such as Derrida, Deleuze, or Vattimo, or to disciplines like semiotics, are simply not developed enough to be of any real help to the reader. To be sure, the ideas of a good number of contemporary thinkers do indeed lurk behind the scenes of this text. But for readers not already familiar with these contemporary writers, the disciplines within which they work, and the jargon they employ, the traces of their writings visible in Raschke’s text are just too sketchy, and the theories themselves are too complex and nuanced, to bear much fruit in a short work like this one. Rather than looking to *GloboChrist* for this kind of benefit, I would contend that we should instead read it for the value of his answers to the question “What has Jakarta (or Seoul, or Mumbai, or São Paulo) to do with Jerusalem?” That is to say, Raschke’s book can serve as a catalyst to readers to explore further the ever-changing face of the global church, pushing us beyond ill-informed and culturally-constrained ways of thinking about the church. With passion and clarity, Raschke guides his American Evangelical readers into a bigger picture of God’s work in the world, and in doing so, he helpfully introduces his readers to important thinkers like Vinoth Ramachandra, Lamin Sanneh,

and Philip Jenkins, who have been working in recent years to help readers in the West develop a more accurate picture of the global church. If any reader of this book is inspired to pick up works by these writers, or others like them, then Raschke's purposes will have been accomplished at least in part, as his work will have helped to form new rhizomatic connections between Christians around the globe.

David M. Mills
Cedarville University, Cedarville, OH