

## Book Reviews

Mark S. Gignilliat. *Reading Scripture Canonically*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2019. xvi + 125 pp. Paperback. ISBN 978-1540962065. \$21.99.

*Reading Scripture Canonically* is a brief and thought-provoking discussion of how to read and interpret the Old Testament as Christian Scripture. Mark Gignilliat's goal is to shape his readers' interpretive instincts by discussing the material form of the OT and by examining its main subject—the Trinity (p. xiii). The book is written for students with a background in biblical studies (p. xii) and emerges from the author's personal struggle to move beyond merely describing the Bible, to preaching it (pp. xi–xii). Overall, the book is a helpful introduction to the canonical approach, but students should be aware of at least one issue, discussed below.

Gignilliat begins with a short introduction (pp. ix–xiv). Here, he states that he aims to “equip readers with a theological grammar and a set of interpretive instincts to aid in their reading of Scripture as an enduring canonical witness” (p. xiii). The book is divided into two parts. In the first, the author discusses the material character of the Old Testament. The subject matter of the OT, the Trinity, is relayed in the second (p. xiii).

The author begins by discussing the topic of canon. This includes chapter 1's important discussion of terminology. Chapter 2 treats Scripture's final form. Here, we learn that the canonical approach prioritizes the final form of Scripture since the final form is the witness to divine revelation, not the sources used to compose it (p. 33). The relationship between canon and intentionality is discussed next (chapter 3). To end the first part of the book, chapter 4 investigates the discipline of textual criticism (p. 59).

After discussing the Old Testament's material form, Gignilliat explores the Old Testament's subject material, the Trinity (chapters 5 and 6). In these chapters, he relays in some detail the implications that derive from God being Scripture's author (p. 84).

The book has several strengths. First, Gignilliat is concise. In only 117 pages, he captures key issues of the OT canon and the implications of the Trinity being the OT's author. For example, he surveys the two main theories about the state of the OT text in the Second Temple period in five pages (pp. 59–64). Anyone familiar with this field understands the breadth

of literature on this topic. Gignilliat is to be applauded for his concision.

Second, the book offers helpful insight into the role of God as the author of Scripture. Gignilliat's main idea here is that interpretation of the OT canon should expand beyond the human author's historical and literary context. This does not mean that Trinitarian authorship contradicts the meaning of the original human author. Rather, he argues that the “*literal sense* or given verbal form is not left behind for greener New Testament pastures” (p. 98, emphasis original). Instead, the enriching character of the OT, coupled with the fact that the Trinity is its author, allows “for a fuller appreciation of the Old Testament's range of signification” (p. 98). Understanding the harmonious relationship between the OT's human and divine authors helps the reader understand how the trajectory of the OT is indeed Christ. His discussion here is helpful.

Despite these strengths, there is at least one important area of concern. Gignilliat does not provide sufficient justification for prioritizing one form of the OT over another. His method prioritizes the final form of Scripture, but he does not identify this final form. In his discussion of the canon and textual criticism, he asks the question, “[S]hould we prioritize the Hebrew text, or should the Septuagint have pride of place canonically?” (p. 66). Unfortunately, he then states that this book has no final word on the matter (p. 66). This presents a problem for the canonical approach. If we cannot determine which form of the Scripture is the final form, then how can we utilize a method that depends on analyzing the text's final form? Moreover, if we are unable to determine which form has priority, we are left either with a no “final form” situation or one where there are several “final forms.” Gignilliat should have provided more discussion on this topic since it is foundational to his method.

Overall though, Gignilliat's work is helpful. He concisely surveys important concepts and emphasizes that our method of studying Scripture must be shaped by the text's supreme subject—the Trinity. Despite these strengths, the book's biggest drawback is its lack of justification for which form is indeed the “canonical form.” I will recommend this book to seminary students who want an introduction to the canonical approach but will also give them my reservations.

Anthony Ferguson  
Beaumont, California

Matthew H. Patton and Frederic Clarke Putnam, Miles V. van Pelt, eds. *Basics of Hebrew Discourse: A Guide to Working with Hebrew Prose and Poetry*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2019. 288 pp. Paperback. ISBN 978-0310535768. \$29.99.

The editor of this volume, Miles van Pelt, is well known as the author, with Gary Pratico, of a Hebrew grammar published by Zondervan that is now in its third edition. *Basics of Hebrew Discourse* is a valuable addition to Zondervan's family of Hebrew language resources that includes the grammar by Pratico and Van Pelt, vocabulary cards and guides, a *Graded Reader*, plus other learning helps. Matthew Patton is a pastor and scholar who has also published in the area of Old Testament studies, producing a more technical work published by Eisenbrauns (*Hope for a Tender Sprig: Jehoiachin in Biblical Theology*), a Bible study guide on Deuteronomy (Crossway, 2017), and a forthcoming commentary on Jeremiah. Frederic Putnam is a veteran professor who has published several books, including a Hebrew grammar (*A New Grammar of Biblical Hebrew*, Sheffield, 2010).

The basic task of all preachers and teachers of the Old Testament is to determine and communicate the meaning of Hebrew texts. In performing that task, one mistake that results in interpretational errors is focusing on morphological or even syntactical issues without attending to discourse issues related to the larger structures of a text. In other words, we should interpret the parts in light of the whole. Discourse analysis aims at helping students of the Hebrew Bible look at the larger structures of texts.

The study of Hebrew typically progresses from small to large. In the beginning, Hebrew students learn the forms and sounds of letters, then syllables, words, phrases, clauses, and sentences, in that order. *Basics of Hebrew Discourse* helps readers take the next step in understanding Hebrew texts. For example, interpreters should be able to parse Hebrew verbs, but they also should know the nature and meaning of verbal aspect in Hebrew, and how Imperfect and Perfect verbs function in various contexts. As Patton writes, "In-depth knowledge of individual words, phrases, and clauses is of little value if we cannot relate each of these parts together in the text," and "We have identified the flow of a text when we can describe how each part relates to the other parts in the text, and this description of a text's flow of thought is the goal of discourse analysis" (p. 29).

The approach to discourse analysis in this book is text oriented. The authors define terms related to the subject, and they interact with more philosophical discussions in the footnotes. Primarily, however, this book is devoted to helping readers understand and use discourse analysis in the interpretation of texts in the Hebrew Bible. The authors provide a guide,

a handbook, that students can use to grow in their understanding of the way Hebrew texts convey meaning.

*Basics of Hebrew Discourse* is divided into two parts. Patton writes Part 1, "Working with Biblical Hebrew Prose." Putnam writes Part 2, "Working with Biblical Hebrew Poetry." In Patton's presentation of the discourse structures of Hebrew prose, he shows the various ways Hebrew clauses relate to one another, and he discusses the terms that indicate such relationships. For example, what are the Hebrew words that introduce conditional clauses or comparison clauses? What verbs communicate verbal sequences in narrative, and how do they do so? A strength of this discourse grammar is the regular use of examples to illustrate each concept the authors introduce. They describe discourse relationships, and then they demonstrate such relationships with sentences and paragraphs from the Hebrew Bible. Patton also provides a three-step process for discourse analysis with Hebrew prose, plus four extended examples.

Putnam's section on biblical Hebrew poetry differs from the first part of the book just as Hebrew poetry differs from Hebrew prose. The mere existence of the second part of the book is a strength, since poetry is ubiquitous in the Hebrew Bible and poetic discourse "works" so much differently than prose. Putnam's descriptions will help readers become more competent interpreters of Hebrew poetry. His goal is to help readers "understand the text as it was meant to be read and not to impose our own logic or structure on it" (p. 155). Hence, Putnam asks questions like "How is this poem organized?" And since poetry does not have structural devices like the *wayyiqtol* verb in narrative, Putnam explores the factors that create cohesion in poetry, like semantic relationships or participant reference. Like Patton, Putnam illustrates discourse concepts with numerous passages from the Hebrew Bible, thereby showing readers how to use discourse analysis in exegesis.

*Basics of Hebrew Discourse* will surely be used broadly. It deserves such use since it meets a need and provides practical help in the task of the exposition of the Old Testament.

Allan Moseley  
Wake Forest, North Carolina

Jacqueline Vayntrub. *Beyond Orality: Biblical Poetry on Its Own Terms*. New York: Routledge, 2019. v + 252 pp. Hardback. ISBN 978-1138235625. \$155.00.

In *Beyond Orality*, Jacqueline Vayntrub demonstrates that the scholarly pursuit of original ideas is not an effort in futility. Vayntrub walks a well-trodden path and invites her readers to see the path in a new light. Her

work is prodigious because she seeks to rethink the essence of biblical poetry, reframe the meaning of *mashal*, critique the standard approach to the development of biblical literature, and contribute to the debate about the “oral” and the “written” in biblical literature.

Vayntrub argues that biblical scholars have adopted an evolutionary model of the development of biblical literature in chapter 1 (oral proverbs → oral poetry → written prose). Vayntrub suggests that this model derives from the presentation of the biblical text in which poetry in a narrative frame is presented as spoken words in the distant past and poetry in a non-narrative frame is attached to legendary heroes. Without accepting this evolutionary model, Vayntrub invites scholars to pay more careful attention to the literary shape of biblical poetry.

In chapter 2, Vayntrub surveys the interpretive history of the essence of biblical poetry which is intimately tied to perceptions of the meaning of the Hebrew word *mashal*. The medieval Jewish poets described biblical poetry/*mashal* in terms of *mimesis* (i.e., representation or imitation of the real world). Robert Lowth (1710–1787) defined biblical poetry/*mashal* as sententious, figurative, and sublime (the defining element for Lowth). Johann Gottfried Herder (1744–1803), against Lowth, suggested that biblical poetry/*mashal* should not be privileged above the poetry of other cultures based on its sublimity. Twentieth-century structuralists suggested that the parallelistic structure of biblical poetry/*mashal* is its essence. In response to these ideas, Vayntrub contends that biblical poetry and *mashal* should not be equated. Instead, *mashal* should be defined based on its presentation in the biblical text.

Vayntrub begins chapter 3 by contending that the “wisdom literature” category is circular since many scholars assume a priori that Proverbs is “wisdom literature” and then determine the other “wisdom” books based on their relationship to Proverbs. Moreover, she contends that *mashal* is not the basic literary form of “wisdom literature” because it has numerous alternative uses outside of traditional “wisdom literature.” Instead, Vayntrub outlines the primary characteristics of *mashal* as follows,

1. in narratives the *mashal* is framed as speech performance,
2. those who speak in *mashal* are not necessarily its authors, and it is sometimes described as speech that has been transmitted across generations,
3. the *mashal* asserts claims as conventional, widely held views, and expresses these claims in parallelistic verse (p. 80).

Vayntrub concludes the chapter by inviting scholars to refocus their attention on the literary depiction of *mashal* rather than on its original *Sitz*

*im Leben*.

Vayntrub puts her theory to the test in chapters 4, 5, and 6. Vayntrub argues that the frame of Balaam’s *mashal* speeches is a key to the meaning of the speeches in chapter 4. She writes, “One considers the frame of a poem because this frame further contextualizes the composition and provides a represented social context that shapes the meaning of the text” (p. 130). The frame of Balaam’s *mashal* speeches portrays them as prophetic utterances. However, stripped of their frame, his speeches fall into the category of instruction. Balaam’s speeches serve as instruction to King Balak about Israel’s uniqueness among the nations and their immunity to curse.

In chapter 5, Vayntrub analyzes the *mashal* in Isa 14:4b–21 and in 1 Sam 24. She argues that the frame of the *mashal* for Isa 14:4b–21 (i.e., 14:4a) shapes the text into an anticipated performance (i.e., a taunt of Babylon’s king) for the time after Israel’s release from captivity. Vayntrub claims the following for the *mashal* in 1 Sam 24:14:

I argue that the *mashal* itself functions to establish the category of evil and its associated behavior. In its performed context, David uses the general claim of the quip to advance a particular claim: that he does not belong to the category of “evildoers.” (p. 167)

Vayntrub applies her research on *mashal* to the book of Proverbs in chapter 6. She demonstrates that Proverbs is unique among ancient Near East “wisdom literature” for presenting wisdom sayings apart from speech performance. She contends that the lack of a performance context draws attention to the written form of the sayings. She argues, “The work uses its frames to shift authority from a fictional moment of speech performance, in the voice of a named-and-famed individual to the enduring presence of the text itself” (p. 205).

*Beyond Orality* deserves approbation because it advances the study of Hebrew poetry by critically engaging with the history of research and by carefully analyzing the biblical *meshalim*. Vayntrub convinced the present reviewer of her central claims (listed in the first paragraph of this review). Moreover, *Beyond Orality* deserves commendation for reminding the scholarly community that, despite its many benefits, historical criticism often distracts scholars from attending to the literary conventions of the biblical text in its final form. Finally, *Beyond Orality* deserves praise for offering fecund readings of and reading strategies for approaching the biblical *meshalim*.

Despite large-scale agreement with her argument, I question Vayntrub’s analysis in two places. First, she invites her readers to read Balaam’s speeches apart from the *mashal* frame as instruction rather than prophecy (p. 134). However, I think it might be more advantageous to

draw on her insight that Balaam's speeches are instruction and view them as instruction-through-prophecy because of their frame. Second, Vayntrub demonstrates that the absence of an explicit speaker in Proverbs leaves the text itself to be the speaking medium. I agree with her analysis here. However, I think it might be worth reading sections of Proverbs (e.g., 16:1–15, a royal section of Proverbs) in light of the book's frame and imagine Solomon as the speaker of these words.

*Beyond Orality* is groundbreaking research in the field of biblical poetry and, hopefully, the work will exert influence in the field.

Robb Coleman  
Wake Forest, North Carolina

Michael Rydelnik and Edwin Blum, eds. *The Moody Handbook of Messianic Prophecy: Studies and Exposition of the Messiah in the Old Testament*. Chicago: Moody, 2019. 1,434 pp. Hardback. ISBN 978-0802409638. \$39.99.

*The Moody Handbook of Messianic Prophecy*, dedicated to the late John H. Sailhamer, is a compendium of articles that address the Messianic nature of the Hebrew Bible. Despite critical scholarship's denouncement of the use of "Messiah" in the Old Testament or the perceived late concept of a messianic deliverer, this book affirms that "there was indeed a clearly intended messianic message in the Hebrew Bible" (p. 29).

The work begins by defining the term "Messiah" as the "eschatological, royal, Servant of the Lord, springing from the Davidic dynasty, who is consecrated by God to provide redemption from sin, bring deliverance for Israel, rule the world, and establish a kingdom of peace, justice, and righteousness" (pp. 32–33). This definition sets the stage for understanding multiple texts' foreshadowing of the messianic king, using prophetic prediction and patterns. Building upon John Sailhamer's scholarship, the authors of this publication take the messianic intent that Sailhamer outlined in the narratives and poetry of the Pentateuch and extend it to the Prophets and Writings as well.

The first half of the book addresses issues such as textual criticism and messianic prophecy, the Messiah in Intertestamental Literature (i.e., Talmud, Mishnah, and Targums), the biblical theology of the Messiah, and the Messiah in Medieval Jewish Literature. However, the most significant contribution of this work is the second half, which aims to reclaim the Messianic elements of particular texts whose nature was lost to unsound exegesis. Extended expositions of classic messianic passages appear here,

as well as other texts not commonly interpreted as messianic. In this review, for the sake of space, I briefly summarize three selected passages, one from each section of the *Tanakh*.

From the Torah, Seth D. Postell discusses Num 24:5–9 and 15–19. Reading one of the strangest stories of the Hebrew Bible, Balaam and his talking donkey, one might question the messianic nature of such a tale. Long interpreted in a non-messianic fashion, Postell notes that Balaam's oracles allude to "the last days," a common reference in the Torah to the reign after David. Israel's messianic future here in Num 24 is viewed in terms of her glorious past, the exodus (Num 23). As the Pentateuch links the exodus with the messianic figure (p. 53), Balaam's prophetic discourses provide intertextual links not only between the two speech acts contained within the passage, but to Jacob's prophecy of the Messianic King in Gen 49:1 and 8–12.

From the Prophets, Abner Chou tackles what is "considered one of the greatest interpretive challenges of the Hebrew Bible" for OT scholars, Zech 11:4–14. Chou argues that the rejected shepherd is the Messiah, since this reading justifies how the NT Gospels apply it to Jesus. Some of his examples include inner biblical allusions and shepherd motifs (Isa 53, Dan 9, Ezek 37), which ultimately result in his conclusion that "this text is not merely about the fact of the Messiah's betrayal, but also its importance in redemptive history" (p. 1,282).

From the Writings, implicit messianic references can be seen throughout oft-debated books such as the Psalter. Robert Cole shows that Ps 1–2 thrust the reader into an eschatological rendering that serves to establish the principal topics for the rest of the book. Of the many messianic portrayals, he outlines implicit references to the deity of the "blessed man." These include phonological parallels between YHWH and the verb "meditate" (*vehegel*), resonance with Josh 1:7–9 on the meditation of the Torah, and Ps 1:2–3 where "king in Zion" parallels Ps 2:6 "established on Zion." Cole points out multiple other parallels, since they "exist on practically every conceivable level, whether semantic, lexical, morphological, or phonological" (p. 480).

Many more texts, less commonly viewed as messianic, have been fleshed out in this work, and it should be commended for multiple reasons. While evangelicals often adopt a hermeneutic that explains away a significant number of such prophecies, this book stands as a testament, and scholarly defense, of the Messianic character of the entire Hebrew Bible. Sailhamer's thoughts that the Hebrew Bible was not written as the national literature of Israel, but as an expression of the "deep-seated messianic hope of a small group of faithful prophets & their followers," is the

driving force behind the compendium (p. 59). Whether or not one is convinced of the cogency of the argument for the Messianic nature of the Hebrew Bible, I encourage all serious students and scholars to consider the arguments for the perspectives in this work.

Ashley E. Lyon  
Cleveland, Georgia

Grant R. Osborne. *Acts: Verse by Verse*. Osborne New Testament Commentaries. Bellingham, WA: Lexham Press, 2019. xi + 543 pp. Paperback. ISBN 978-1683592747. \$15.99.

The Osborne New Testament Commentaries series is the culmination of a lifetime of practice of biblical scholarship by one of the most respected evangelical New Testament scholars, the late Grant R. Osborne, longtime faculty member at Trinity Evangelical Divinity School. Its stated goal is “to remove the complexity of most modern commentaries and provide an easy-to-read explanation of the text” (p. x). A threefold use envisioned by Osborne is to serve as a devotional, to guide Bible study groups, and to aid sermon preparation. He is well qualified to accomplish this task through his academic scholarship, pastoral experience, and international pastor training ministry.

Osborne notes that the genre of “Acts” in ancient literature was reserved for the doings of a famous personage, but this Acts is the record of a movement rather than a person—and of the Holy Spirit of God. He thinks a composition date during Paul’s imprisonment (circa AD 62) is most likely. Interestingly he postulates that the apostles were probably “note-takers” and Luke, as a careful researcher and historian, would have availed himself of those notes (p. 5).

Osborne’s analysis of the text includes necessary background information, careful exposition of the meaning of each passage, and some attention to contemporary application. An example of the kind of background information he provides is the note on the shipwreck on Malta: When the ship runs aground (Acts 27:41), he explains that the seabed in that region is very hard clay and would be prone to holding fast a ship which had run into it (p. 469). Another example precedes his discussion of the Jerusalem council in Acts 15: Osborne briefly notes the difficult question of its relationship to Paul’s account of deliberations on the same issue of Gentile inclusion in the church in Galatians 2. He then states his opinion that the two accounts refer to separate events, with the writing of Galatians preceding the Acts 15 council (p. 270). Unfortunately, though, he does not provide the evidence that persuades him to hold this position.

Sensitivity to the canonical context of the text is also evident in Osborne’s exposition. In his analysis of the church’s prayer for boldness in response to persecution in Acts 4, he notes that the shaking of the place where they were assembled is reminiscent of the trembling when God met Moses on Mt. Sinai (Exod 19:18), of Isaiah’s experience of God (Isa 6:4), and of the Jerusalem earthquake upon Jesus’s death which coincided with the veil of the temple torn in two and the graves being opened (Matt 27:51).

The evenness of Osborne’s interpretation is evidenced throughout this commentary. He does not avoid the issue of the legitimacy of *glossolalia* as an experience for contemporary believers. He rightly notes that nowhere in the biblical text is it mandated, nor is there biblical support for its prohibition, so he adopts a “seek not, forbid not” position (p. 43). On the question of New Testament leadership structure, he notes that at the Jerusalem council three groups are mentioned and all are involved in the decision-making process—the church, the apostles, and the elders.

Other examples of Osborne’s interpretive acumen and faithfulness to the text occur in his analysis of two narrative events after the Jerusalem council that are often interpreted with assertions beyond textual warrant. On the dispute between Paul and Barnabas over the inclusion of John Mark, he does not speculate on why Mark left them in Pamphylia, nor why Paul is not willing for him to rejoin them now. He notes that we cannot know if the use of the term *paroxysmos* in 15:39 indicates anger between them, nor does the text assign blame to either party (p. 291). He also rightly concludes that the disciples of John which Paul encounters in Acts 19 cannot be used as evidence for the reception of the Holy Spirit as an event distinct and separate from salvation. Their unawareness of repentance and faith in Jesus clearly indicates they were not yet believers (p. 342).

It is commendable that this kind of non-academic expositional commentary is produced from the context of Osborne’s lifetime of biblical scholarship to serve lay people and to enhance sermon preparation. It should help those preachers serving faithfully without benefit of formal academic training. Nevertheless, this commentary and its companions in the series are not a replacement for more thoroughly researched and documented academic commentaries, including Osborne’s own offerings such as *Matthew* in the Zondervan Exegetical Commentary on the NT and *Revelation* in the Baker Exegetical Commentary on the NT series. For the academically trained preacher and teacher, this volume should not be used as a shortcut to avoid deeper exegetical research. However, after that pro-

cess is completed, it could serve as a valuable model for a faithful exposition of the text.

David R. Beck  
Wake Forest, North Carolina

James D. Dvorak and Zachary K. Dawson, eds. *The Epistle of James: Linguistic Analysis of an Early Christian Letter*. Linguistic Exegesis of the New Testament 1. Eugene, OR: Pickwick, 2019. 348 pp. Paperback. ISBN 978-1498224581. \$40.00.

This recent volume, edited by James D. Dvorak and Zachary K. Dawson, is the first in a projected series of volumes analyzing various corpora of NT books from a linguistic perspective. Based on the series preface, the goal of these volumes is to provide “a collection of linguistically informed exegetical analyses of a sub-corpus of the New Testament” with a “consistent and unified linguistic perspective across each volume” (p. vii). This inaugural volume offers a group of essays on the book of James from the perspective of Systemic-Functional Linguistics (SFL). The essays are predominantly by either faculty or students (current or former) at McMaster Divinity College.

The introduction, authored by the editors, provides a brief defense of SFL as the unified approach adopted by the contributors, as well as an overview of the contents of the book. The first essay, by Cynthia Long Westfall, presents a discourse analysis of Jas 1:2–27, culminating in a structural outline of the chapter. The second essay, by Stanley E. Porter, is a response to the claim by Martin Dibelius that the book of James is incoherent. Porter argues that the real issue is whether James has cohesion, and he demonstrates the cohesion of the book by examining the interactions between cohesive chains. These first two essays both focus on higher-level textual concerns in the book of James.

The third essay, by Christopher D. Land, is a rebuttal to the assertion in Dale Allison’s ICC volume on James that Jas 2:18 (on faith and works) is unintelligible. He proposes a new interpretation of this verse based on the situational and literary contexts. The fourth and fifth essays share a common focus on intertextuality in James. The fourth essay, by Ji Hoe Kim, attempts to link the neologism *δίψυχος* (Jas 1:8; 4:8) to the call to whole-heartedness in the *Shema* (Deut 6:4–5) via the language of “divided hearts” found in Hos 10:2. The fifth essay, by Xi Xia E. Xue, attempts to explain the significance of James’s link between Rahab the prostitute and the patriarch Abraham by looking at the use of Abraham and Rahab elsewhere in contemporary Jewish and Christian literature.

The last four essays each address the “interpersonal” dimension of the book of James. The sixth essay, by Zachary K. Dawson, analyzes the function of diatribe in Jas 2:14–26 in terms of James’s ideological goals and the relations that he seeks to establish with his readers. The seventh essay, by James D. Dvorak, examines James’s use of questions to “reposition” the readers to accept the group values and ideology that James seeks to promote. The eighth essay, by Benjamin B. Hunt, is a study of James’s use of various forms of address to affect his relationship with the readers. The ninth essay, by Jonathan M. Watt, examines whether James uses what M. A. K. Halliday called “anti-language.” The conclusion supplied by the editors evaluates the linguistic competence of Dale Allison’s ICC commentary on James and demonstrates the superiority of linguistic approaches.

One benefit of this book is that it demonstrates the value of linguistics for exegesis. One noteworthy contribution in this regard is the essay by Westfall, which shows how the use of discourse analysis clarifies the structure and message of Jas 1:2–27. Her essay is also exemplary in its accessibility. Another contribution exemplary in both clarity and exegetical value, is the essay by Kim. The linguistic analysis of the use of *δίψυχος* in Jas 1:8 and 4:8 and its relationship to Hosea and Deuteronomy provides significant insight into James’ influences and thought.

In addition to the exegetical value of these contributions, this collection of essays demonstrates the main strength of SFL, namely the focus on language with reference to its social functions. Exemplary in this regard is the chapter by Dvorak on the use of questions, which features a rigorous grammatical study to analyze the letter’s social function.

One noteworthy limitation on the accessibility of this volume is the level of linguistic knowledge assumed. Because the contributors all work from within SFL, concepts derived from this framework are often left unexplained. Furthermore, while linguists and specialists will no doubt derive much benefit from the essays, non-specialists may find themselves asking whether the effort of sloughing through pages of technical linguistic terminology is worth the narrow, specific results yielded. However, advanced students and specialists will find this volume a noteworthy contribution to the study of the book of James.

Noah Warren Kelley  
Wake Forest, North Carolina

Elijah Hixson and Peter J. Gurry, eds. *Myths and Mistakes in New Testament Textual Criticism*. Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2019. xxviii + 372 pp. Paperback. ISBN 978-0830852574. \$40.00.

Elijah Hixson is junior research associate in New Testament Text and Language at Tyndale House, Cambridge, and author of *Scribal Habits in Sixth-Century Greek Purple Codices*. Peter Gurry is assistant professor of New Testament and codirector of the Text and Canon Institute at Phoenix Seminary. He is author of *A Critical Examination of the Coherence-Based Genealogical Method in New Testament Textual Criticism* and coauthor (with Tommy Wasserman) of *A New Approach to Textual Criticism*. In addition, Hixson and Gurry have made important contributions to text-critical scholarship through their essays, presentations at academic conferences, and frequent posts on the Evangelical Textual Criticism blog.

Hixson and Gurry planned the volume under review out of love for the Bible because they observed that “statistics, facts, and arguments meant to bolster confidence in the Bible” were actually undermining trust in the Scriptures “because they were misinformed, misapplied, or misstated.” This concern prompted them to gather a cadre of Christian scholars working in the field of New Testament textual criticism to set the record straight on several false claims regarding the text of the Greek New Testament. Such claims are made by some Christian apologists and even occasionally by respected textual critics and New Testament scholars.

The book addresses errors in several different categories, such as those based on outdated information, others based on unverified information, errors based on abused statistics, and some caused by selective use of the evidence. Space will allow a discussion of only a few of these errors. Scholars often compare the number and antiquity of New Testament manuscripts to that of the manuscripts of important classical texts. They rightly argue that skeptics operate with a double standard when they claim that the New Testament text cannot be reliably restored but classical texts can be, since the Greek manuscripts of the New Testament are more numerous and date closer to the time of composition than the manuscripts of classical texts. Unfortunately, those making this argument have often depended on old sources for the data on classical texts, thus overlooking the manuscript finds of the last few decades. They have also unintentionally exaggerated the number and age of New Testament manuscripts at times. Readers who discover the flaws may get the impression that Christian scholars are skewing the evidence to support their faith claims.

An important example of an error based on unverified information is the oft-repeated claim that one can reconstruct the entire New Testament (minus 11 or so verses) exclusively from second- to fourth-century church

fathers’ NT quotations, even if no manuscripts of the NT had survived. However, this myth is based on second-hand information regarding an informal breakfast conversation about amateur biblical research. The claim “appears to be a conflation of two unsubstantiated, unpublished nineteenth-century studies” that were never subjected to scholarly review.

Abused statistics come into play when some Christian apologists seek to minimize the amount of variation in manuscripts of the Greek New Testament. Scholarly estimates based on solid data suggest our surviving manuscripts of the Greek New Testament have about 500,000 differences among them, not counting spelling differences. Almost half of these differences are meaningless mistakes, but some are theologically significant. Although it is true that no essential Christian doctrine depends solely on a variant worthy of serious consideration as the original text, to imply that variants have no significance for Christian theology or practice is misleading.

Unlike many collections of essays in which some chapters are excellent and others are of considerably less quality, every essay in *Myths and Mistakes* is packed with valuable information. The book will be helpful not only for Christian apologists (the primary audience) but also for New Testament students, New Testament scholars, and textual critics. Scholars familiar with recent monographs and journal literature in the field will already be aware of some of the content of the book. Even so, it assembles in one place discussions scattered across several different sources in a convenient and accessible manner. The essays also break new ground in some important ways. These features make *Myths and Mistakes* essential reading for anyone interested in New Testament textual criticism.

The book is an important reminder that authors, including even highly respected New Testament scholars and textual critics, sometimes make mistakes and unwittingly propagate myths. Although every scholar must depend on the work of his predecessors to a certain degree, *Myths and Mistakes* highlights the need to read all works with a critical eye. The many examples of false and unintentionally misleading statements in trusted sources make a strong cumulative case for the claim that scholars must exercise greater care and caution in their research and writing. And writers’ admissions of the great amount of work still to be done in the field should serve as a powerful incentive to students to focus their research on this important area of scholarship.

Charles L. Quarles  
Wake Forest, North Carolina

Shawn J. Wilhite. *The Didache: A Commentary*. Apostolic Fathers Commentary Series 1. Eugene, OR: Cascade, 2019. 326 pp. Paperback. ISBN 978-1498205108. \$38.00.

Shawn J. Wilhite, author of this recent commentary on the Didache, is Assistant Professor of Christian Studies at California Baptist University and serves as director and research fellow for the Center for Ancient Christian Studies. He holds a ThM in Patristics and a PhD in New Testament from The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary and is a PhD Candidate in Patristics at Durham University. He has published several works on the Didache, including *“One of Life and One of Death”: Apocalypticism and the Didache’s Two Ways* (Gorgias, 2019). This commentary is the first installment in the Apostolic Fathers Commentary Series. According to the series preface, it “offers a literary and theological reading of the final form text in an intelligible fashion for a broad audience” (p. xiv).

The commentary begins with an original translation of the Didache. Part 1 then contains introductory essays on the Didache. In chapter 1, the author discusses the manuscript witnesses to the text of the Didache, its role in the ancient church, its date and place of origin, and the structure of the document. Wilhite acknowledges the difficulty of attaining certainty regarding the origins of the Didache and opts for a “window” of time between 80–110 CE in which the composite text may have “become” the Didache (p. 21). He believes the Didache emerged “concurrently with or after the composition of Matthew” (p. 21).

Chapter 2 considers the use of Scripture in the Didache. It focuses on four explicit biblical traditions (Matt 6:9–13; 7:6; Mal 1:11; Zech 14:5), although the commentary proper addresses many more parallels. Chapter 3 addresses the theology of the Didache, including its doctrine of God (incipient Trinitarian ideas alongside binitarian theology), liturgical teaching, doctrine of salvation (not explicit but present via “salvation metaphors”), ethics, ecclesiology, and eschatology. This chapter is a helpful contribution since scholars have frequently denied the theological nature of the Didache.

Part 2 consists of the commentary proper and is divided into five chapters based on the proposed outline of the text (title[s], 1.1–6.2; 6.3–10.7; 11.1–15.4; 16.1–8). Within each chapter the commentary proceeds unit-by-unit, based on the outline proposed in the introduction.

A few helpful features set this commentary apart. First, there is detailed interaction with the secondary sources in the footnotes. This allows readers to follow up on discussions raised in the commentary with the relevant literature. However, while the commentary is firmly rooted in the secondary literature, it never loses its focus on the Didache itself. Second,

there are numerous discussions regarding the relationship between the Didache and other primary sources, both biblical and extra-biblical. Wilhite cites the Didache’s numerous parallels with the OT, the NT, and early Jewish and Christian documents but also illustrates these by means of tables, with primary sources in the original languages.

Third, the commentary fulfills its aim to be both literary and theological. Wilhite introduces units with comments about their structure and makes appeals to the discourse features of the document. Syntactical features receive significantly less attention, though they are not completely neglected. Significant word usage is also explored, such as the use of *κύριος* for God/Jesus (pp. 97, 184, etc.). Wilhite also weaves theological commentary throughout as he explores language and concepts with reference to contemporary literature.

One minor critique of this commentary is that its treatment of text-critical issues leaves something to be desired. Knowledge of the text of the Didache is highly dependent upon one late Greek manuscript (H54), dating about 900 years after the document’s composition. This manuscript seems to be the basis for the commentary, but according to Wilhite, the “final form” remains “hypothetical” (p. 192). While this conclusion is to some degree unavoidable, establishing the text appears to receive less attention than it deserves, given the other witnesses to it (cf. pp. 6–9).

To conclude, Wilhite’s commentary represents an invaluable contribution to the study of the Didache. Its up-to-date engagement with the primary and secondary sources and its attention to literary and theological details provide an excellent resource for those who are interested in understanding this ancient document. The commentary is accessible to students and specialists alike (though it assumes the knowledge of Greek). In sum, Wilhite provides faithful guidance through the maze of issues that pertain to the Didache. Hopefully, future contributions to the Apostolic Fathers Commentary Series will be as useful as this volume.

Noah Warren Kelley  
Wake Forest, North Carolina

Matthew R. Crawford. *The Eusebian Canon Tables: Ordering Textual Knowledge in Late Antiquity*. Oxford Early Christian Studies. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019. xxvii + 372 pp. Hardback. ISBN 978-0198802600. \$105.00

Matthew R. Crawford is Associate Professor and Director of the Program in Biblical and Early Christian Studies in the Institute for Religion and Critical Inquiry at Australian Catholic University. He is the author of *Cyril of Alexandria’s Trinitarian Theology of Scripture* as well as co-editor of *The*



*Gospel of Tatian: Exploring the Nature and Text of the Diatessaron.*

Part 1 of his latest work, *The Eusebian Canon Tables*, focuses on the origins of biblical canon tables. Crawford demonstrates that the use of tables was surprisingly rare in the ancient world. Although tabular presentation was used in cuneiform tablets, primarily in astronomical works, as few as four tables appear in Latin works prior to the fourth century. Unfortunately, no comprehensive investigation of tables in Greek sources yet exists. Nevertheless, enough evidence is available to claim confidently that Eusebius's work was strikingly innovative. Eusebius was probably introduced to the helpfulness of tables in his reading of the treatise on the date of Easter by the Laodicean bishop Anatolius, whose work was modeled on Ptolemy's astronomical tables.

The purpose of Eusebius's tables was twofold: to divide the four long Gospel narratives into smaller sections and to show the relationships that exist between those four separate narratives. Ammonius of Alexandria had placed parallels from other Gospels alongside the Gospel of Matthew in a format later called a synopsis. Ammonius's synopsis probably lacked section numbers and may not have included portions of the three other Gospels that had no parallel in Matthew. Eusebius contributed the section and canon numbers and composed the canon tables necessary to identify and locate parallel material. Eusebius's work was a huge advancement over Ammonius's contribution since it permitted readers to identify parallel passages in the Gospels without disrupting the original order of pericopes in the individual Gospels. This advancement made Eusebius "a true founder of Christian biblical scholarship."

However, the arrangement of Eusebius's system into ten canons is artificial. Since the tenth canon actually contains four canons (material unique to each of the four Gospels), a system of thirteen canons might have been more consistent. Crawford suggests that the ten-canon table was ordered based on Eusebius's view (expressed in his *Oration in Praise of Constantine*) that the number 10 (1+2+3+4) was important in the divine ordering of the universe. Perhaps Eusebius believed that the canon tables portrayed the sacred text as a divinely ordered microcosm. Later users of the Eusebian tables including Victor of Capua, Sedulius Scottus, Dionysius bar Salibi, and Nerses Snorhali certainly believed that the ten tables displayed the similarity between the harmony in the Scriptures and the harmony in the cosmos.

The Eusebian canon tables influenced the reading of the four Gospels in three major ways. They served to bind the four Gospels into a single corpus, thereby excluding other gospels and intensifying the canonizing effect of the codex. They encouraged reading one Gospel passage in light

of its parallels. They introduced readers to both the similarities and tensions between parallel accounts and permitted the reader to draw his own conclusions about how to explain these features.

Part 2 of the book focuses on the reception of the canon tables. Three chapters examine the usage of the canon tables by Augustine, the Peshitta, and the Hiberno-Latin tradition. A final chapter treats the artistic adornment of the canon tables in Armenian commentaries. The book includes four helpful appendices, the first of which is Crawford's own translation of Eusebius's letter to Carpianus, in which he explains the origin, purpose, and use of the canon tables.

Crawford's work is a product of careful and thorough research. The book is also visually impressive. The 52 high-resolution photographs of ancient texts and images result in a book so beautiful that readers will be hesitant to highlight the text or add notes in the margin. It breaks new ground in several areas that will be helpful even to scholars who have done extensive work with the canon tables. For example, the book contains what is likely the most extensive analysis thus far of the Peshitta revision and its relationship to Eusebius's original work. Consequently, it is an indispensable guide to any scholarly study of the Eusebian canon tables.

Charles L. Quarles  
Wake Forest, North Carolina

Cyril of Alexandria. *Glaphyra on the Pentateuch*, intr. Gregory K. Hillis, trans. Nicholas P. Lunn. Fathers of the Church, vol. 137. Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 2018. 354 pp. Hardback. ISBN 978-0813231310. \$45.00

Cyril of Alexandria. *Glaphyra on the Pentateuch*, trans. Nicholas P. Lunn. Fathers of the Church, vol. 138. Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 2019. 264 pp. Hardback. ISBN 978-0813231617. \$45.00

Cyril of Alexandria is well known for the fifth-century Christological controversy with Nestorius of Constantinople. His writings comprise ten volumes in the *Patrologia Graeca-Latina (PG)*. Despite the volume of his literary output, translators only recently turned their attention to his commentaries on the Bible and other works concerning Scripture. His dogmatic works, particularly those from the Nestorian Controversy, found their way into English more than his commentaries. However, more recent translations make Cyril's biblical exegesis available for a wider audience. The current volumes join this growing list of English translations,

remedying the neglect of Cyril's Scriptural exegesis.

The current two-volume translation is accompanied by an introduction from Gregory Hillis, which itself is worth the price of admission. Hillis, Associate Professor of Theology at Bellarmine University in Louisville, Kentucky, summarizes Cyril's life and ministry, locating him within the greater Alexandrian tradition. Hillis explains the purpose and structure of the commentary as a theological exegesis of the text, in which Cyril begins with the literal reading and moves to the higher, Christological reading from which the Christian may learn Christ and his way of life. The *Glaphyra* is a theological reading of the Pentateuch.

In the section, *The Bishop as Exegete and Enlightener*, Hillis explains Cyril's contention that the interpretation of the Pentateuch requires the Spirit's guidance to the proper Christological meaning of the text. Exegesis is a spiritual exercise that allows the bishop to fulfill his highest calling: the teaching of Scripture to his congregation. Cyril was a pastor whose spiritual care for his congregation came through instruction in Scripture.

Regarding the anti-Jewish flavor of the commentary, Hillis helps readers understand that because the Christian and Jewish communities were at odds in Alexandria at the time, those political disagreements surely influenced Cyril's language. Hillis also points out that Cyril's main purpose is theological: "That the Jews fail to see Christ in their very own scripture is an endless source of bafflement and frustration for Cyril" (p. 22).

At the core of Cyril's explication of the Pentateuch are the two themes of Jesus Christ as the Second Adam, and the work of the Holy Spirit. After surveying recent scholarship on Cyril's Old Testament exegesis, Hillis shows how that exegesis results in Cyril's understanding of the text. The introduction is an entry-point into Cyril as an exegete of Scripture and not merely a dogmatic theologian in conflict with Nestorius.

Nicholas Lunn, for his part, offers a readable and reliable translation of one of Cyril's most important exegetical writings. He serves as a Translation Consultant with Wycliffe Bible Translators and Associate Tutor in Old Testament at Spurgeon's College, London. Translating the *Glaphyra* into English is long overdue. Because of the importance of the Pentateuch in Scripture itself, and in the church's understanding of the gospel, an exegesis of the text is of inestimable importance. Fortunately, Lunn has given the church a highly accessible translation that is close enough to the original Greek to enable those consulting the PG to follow the English, while also making Cyril's often challenging Greek construction readable for those not familiar with Greek. This is no easy task, but Lunn has far exceeded expectations in his translation. Certainly, his work as a consultant with Wycliffe Bible Translators has shaped his sensitivity to English readers.

Cyril's Greek is difficult enough, but there are terms that are vital to his exegesis that challenge any reader or interpreter. Thankfully, in his preface, Lunn not only alerts the reader to the underlying Greek vocabulary but also gives his reasons for choosing one possible translation over another. Scholars familiar with Cyril will be aware of different readings of Cyril's exegesis, based on particular understandings of what he means when he uses technical terms. Competing interpretations of Cyril rest on (and often determine) how these terms are understood and, therefore, translated. Lunn bases his choice of English vocabulary on both lexical evidence and recent scholarship. Providing this information upfront affords the English-only reader with additional resources regarding Cyril's exegesis. Lunn's awareness of the theological issues at stake and the varied uses of technical terms in the commentary give the reader confidence.

To conclude, the translation is most helpful as it gives English readers the first opportunity to delve into Cyril's exegesis of the Pentateuch. Cyril is a representative biblical interpreter from the ancient church. He is an example of how Christians in the Alexandrian tradition read and understood the Pentateuch. He is also a pastor whose primary responsibility was interpreting the Bible for the church, not for scholarship. Readers discover both Cyril's methodology and the conclusions he garnered from reading the Law of Moses. These conclusions were, in his estimation, beneficial to the Christian congregation. Lunn's translation and Hillis's interpretation are rich contributions both to patristics scholarship and to the church. Pastors can discover the rich tradition of early Christian Christological interpretation of the Old Testament and perhaps understand more fully Jesus's statement, "Moses wrote of me."

Steven A. McKinion  
Wake Forest, North Carolina

Darren Sarisky. *Reading the Bible Theologically*. Current Issues in Theology. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2019. xix + 407 pp. Hardback. ISBN 978-1108497480. \$120.00.

Drawing on the late John Webster's question posed to theological studies, one might interrogate recent approaches to Scripture and theology as follows: What makes theological exegesis "theological"? and What makes the theological interpretation of Scripture "theological"? *Reading the Bible Theologically* is Darren Sarisky's attempt to answer. Like Webster's own response, Sarisky believes that "theological reading" of Scripture, at its most basic level, must understand both the biblical text and the reader in relation to God (p. xi). Sarisky serves as Associate Fellow and Departmental Lecturer in Theology and Religion at the University of Oxford,

and he comes to this task well familiar with the field as a prominent contributor, represented principally by his *Scriptural Interpretation: A Theological Exploration* (Wiley-Blackwell, 2013).

With *Reading the Bible Theologically*, Sarisky purposes “to ascertain what the text signifies about divine reality and how this reality enfolds readers themselves” (p. 2). To accomplish his goal, Sarisky divides the monograph into two parts: “The Model of Augustine” (Part 1) and “A Constructive Proposal” (Part 2). In chapter 1, “The Reader, Redemption, and Signs,” Sarisky gleans from Augustine the idea that biblical words are a “species of signs” that “allow something to be known” (pp. 96–97). In addition, Scripture envisions an “implied reader” who possesses a set of predispositions (e.g., faith) and human capacities (i.e., embodied-souls), which are uniquely designed for divine grace to work its proper ends in the reader, through the mediate access the Bible supplies (pp. 80–81). Chapter 2, “Between *Scientia* and the Trinity,” then draws upon Augustine’s case for the incarnation to serve as the transition from the *scientia* (sensory knowledge) of the biblical text that gives way to the *sapientia* (the direct contemplation of the eternal God and his truth), a movement Augustine identifies as the *telos* of humanity.

The transition to Part 2 flows from Augustine’s theological ontology of the text and the reader and his “substantive” account of the practice of Bible reading. This sets the parameters within which interpretive questions, answers, and strategies should be posed (p. 142). To demonstrate that method, Sarisky examines Spinoza’s impact upon contemporary biblical interpretation in chapter 3, “In Contradistinction to Naturalism.” Here he shows how Spinoza’s “procedural,” “naturalist” method relegates theology to what is *explained*, instead of that which *explains* (p. 157), whereby the Bible reader becomes simply “a self-determining, textual analyst” (p. 165). In contrast, Sarisky responds with chapter 4, “Faith and the Ecclesial Community,” to argue that faith renders the reader “receptive to the text’s claims because a theological reader has the capacity to exercise faith in the God who discloses himself through the text” (p. 189). Moreover, the practice of faith-filled reading should conduct itself in its God-given social location of ecclesial life (pp. 211–13).

In chapter 5, “The Bible and Theological Semiotics,” Sarisky carefully considers how to relate the text (“what is written”) and its subject matter (“what is written about,” p. 242). Then the final chapter, “Exegetical Ends and Means,” puts forward three stages of theological reading (*explicatio, meditatio, applicatio*) to serve Sarisky’s stated goal of interpretation, which is “the movement of attending to God via the text” (pp. 287, 294). Sarisky closes the monograph with an extended response to the charge of eisegesis, something he identifies as probably the strongest objection to his

proposal (p. 332). He addresses this issue in familiar ways already on display in the prior chapters, and then ends the book in a modest tone, hopeful that his work can carve out a healthier path for the ongoing discussions and practice of “reading the Bible theologically.”

Sarisky has made a valued contribution to the “Current Issues in Theology” series. His case is well-made, from his exhaustive engagement with the diverse abundance of secondary literature to his careful, methodical working through several of the central points of discussion. Perhaps the most compelling aspect of Sarisky’s proposal emerges in his relentless devotion to his overarching claim: Theology does, indeed, make a difference to reading the Bible when the text and the reader are theologically understood. In this respect, the reward of Sarisky’s monograph is the clear, rigorous articulation and defense of the necessity of a “theological ontology” for the biblical text and the reader, due to Scripture’s own claims.

Anyone who embarks upon the challenge of *tolle, lege* will find this volume a deeply thought-out and instructive read that unashamedly desires to confess and advance the peculiar endeavor of Christian, theological reading of the Bible. This text would yield rich conversation for students and teachers in graduate and doctoral level settings, ranging from courses/seminars concerned with hermeneutics to bibliology to theological method. It is highly recommended for those with an interest in relating Scripture and theology and will likely become a new standard contribution to the field.

William M. Marsh  
Cedarville, Ohio

Han-Luen Kantzer Komline. *Augustine on the Will: A Theological Account*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2020. xv + 469 pp. Hardback. ISBN: 978-0190948801. \$125.00

Han-Luen Kantzer Komline’s *Augustine on the Will* is a valuable contribution to the broader discussion of the nature and freedom of the will. It highlights the fact that multiple major views of the will in the history of Western thought draw on significant ideas in Augustine. Kantzer Komline approaches Augustine’s thought chronologically and developmentally and analyzes the progression of his conception of the will. Though she recognizes that a *strict* chronology would excise too many significant works, she adopts a generally chronological approach that allows for a debatable dating of some primary texts (pp. 7–8).

Kantzer Komline’s work divides neatly into two sections. The first three chapters provide an extensive survey of the development of Augustine’s thought on the will from *Soliloquia* (386/87) and *De Libero Arbitrio*

(388–95) to *Contra Iulianum opus imperfectum* (429–30), touching on most of the works written in between. Her mastery of the Augustinian corpus is on impressive display through these chapters, and she highlights Augustine’s movement from taking a generally autonomous view of the will in *Soliliquia* and the first two books of *De Libero Arbitrio*, through the famous turn in *Ad Simplicianum*, to a much more complex view that arose out of the Pelagian controversy. In this section, she highlights the human powers of the will as *created* (*posse non peccare*) and the will as *fallen* (*non posse non peccare*).

Chapters 4 through 6 focus on the development of Augustine’s view of the will during the Pelagian controversy. Here the author emphasizes the Trinitarian element of Augustine’s view of the will, his formulation of the *redeemed* will (*posse non peccare*) in regards to the work of God the Father, Christ, and the Holy Spirit, and concludes with a discussion of the *eschatological* will (*non posse peccare*) that believers will attain in the heavenly city.

Kantzer Komline has three central points to make in her work, and she makes them all convincingly. First, she shows that Augustine does not provide one account of the will, but instead develops a concept of the will that is contextualized by theological periods of creation, fall, redemption, and eschaton. Second, she demonstrates that Augustine’s approach to the will was neither completely innovative nor derivative on early accounts—such as the Stoic *Horme* (419–20). Instead, Augustine draws on sources that already put biblical, theological, and philosophical discussions into dialogue (e.g., Cicero, Origen, Gregory of Nyssa, Cyprian, and Ambrose), and that he adapts and innovates from this basis. Third, Augustine’s view of the will does not move from being philosophical to theological but is instead simultaneously philosophical, theological, and biblical throughout his career. She stresses that even in *Soliliquia*, *De Libero Arbitrio*, and other early works, Augustine is at pains to ground his ideas in Scripture (pp. 52–56).

Nevertheless, a question to raise from Kantzer Komline’s treatment of Augustine’s work is whether he understands the will as a faculty or an action. Her own answer is that Augustine understands the will as a dynamic action *rather* than a faculty (pp. 266–69). She claims that this is an unchanging feature of his view (p. 418). However, while Augustine does refer to the will as “a movement of the mind” throughout his corpus, his early conception of the will as a *cardo*, or hinge, that turns the person towards good or towards ill reads much more like a faculty than a dynamic act. While she competently defends Augustine’s understanding of will as action in his later works, the question seems open in his earlier works.

A second question concerns the relation of the will to the passions. Kantzer Komline effectively defends the contention that Augustine

comes to equate “will” with “love”—specifically *caritas* and *cupiditas* as two distinct wills (pp. 246–49). However, she indicates that even from the beginning of his career, Augustine understood the will to be *prior* to the passions: In some sense, for early Augustine, we *love* that which we *will* rather than the other way around (p. 108). Nevertheless, she also suggests that the will is, for Augustine, conditioned by circumstances both social and theological (pp. 150, 258–65, 280). These seem to be contradictory ideas, though perhaps this is due to a misreading by the reviewer. In any event, more explanation would be helpful.

Overall, as John C. Cavadini says (back cover), Kantzer Komline’s treatment of Augustine’s view(s) of the will is destined to become a “standard resource.” She shows a deep mastery of the Augustinian corpus and a broad familiarity with the secondary literature in English, French, and German. Her arguments, even where she highlights apparent and unresolved conflicts, are bolstered by her emphasis on Augustine’s reliance on narrative and metaphor (p. 225), and on the development of his thought over time.

K. Lauriston Smith  
Youngsville, North Carolina

Petrus van Mastricht. *Theoretical-Practical Theology: Faith in the Triune God*, vol. 2, ed. Joel Beeke, trans. Todd M. Rester. Grand Rapids: Reformation Heritage Books, 2019. xxxviii + 660. Hardback. ISBN 978-1601785596. \$50.00.

Petrus van Mastricht (1630–1706) ministered as a pastor and professor during the Dutch Further Reformation (*Nadere Reformatie*) of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Paralleling Puritan efforts in England, the Netherlands’s *Nadere Reformatie* emphasized practical piety along with Reformed doctrine. One sees a chief example of this experiential approach to theology in Petrus van Mastricht’s seven-volume work, *Theoretical-Practical Theology*. Although the Anglophone world has lacked access to Van Mastricht’s Dutch magnum opus, the Dutch Reformed Translation Society is working to publish these volumes into English for the first time. In 2019, the Society, led by editor Joel Beeke and translator Todd Rester, published Van Mastricht’s second volume of these works. This second volume presents Van Mastricht’s doctrine of God, entitled *Faith in the Triune God*.

Many consider Van Mastricht’s magnum opus as the premier work of theology for pastors and preachers. Van Mastricht combines piercing exegesis with clear doctrinal presentations, insightful polemics, and pastoral applications. However, lovers of the lofty truths of Reformed theology

often disconnect the theologians concerned from their original contexts. Van Mastricht ministered and taught theology when the Netherlands faced political crises from the Roman Catholic armies and philosophical threats from Cartesian metaphysics.

Van Mastricht speaks with prophetic conviction against the inevitable outcomes of rationalizing faith in God. Modern Christians see the results of these ideas in the havoc wreaked within contemporary ethics and theology by post-modernism. Van Mastricht's theology is essentially pastoral in nature. He believes that these high truths would comfort souls and ward off wolves. Van Mastricht's theological method remains relevant today for pastors and theologians who seek to recover preaching, teaching, and counseling that informs the mind and engages the heart with God's Word.

Reflecting his commitment to present both a theoretical and practical system, Van Mastricht foregoes traditional organizations of theology proper and introduces the doctrine of God with an explication of saving faith. The editors comment that Van Mastricht aims to instruct his readers and students in the necessary disposition of faith if they desire to study God. One must engage the study of God from saving faith. The editors state that Van Mastricht aims for readers to "believe with true faith for the salvation of their souls, and bear faith's good fruit in a life of humble obedience to God" (p. xxxi). In the first chapter, Van Mastricht distinguishes saving faith from counterfeit faith by exploring the pathologies of various forms of faith and its activities and responses to God within the world. Van Mastricht calls for academics to reform Christian education by returning theological pedagogy to the context of the local church, where pastors and members evaluate prospective students for saving faith and its fruit.

Van Mastricht uses traditional theological categories to explain the attributes of God. He organizes God's attributes under three statements according to their functions: (1) what God is, (2) how great God is, and (3) what qualities God has (p. 121). With reference to himself—what God is—God is simplicity and spirituality (pp. 129ff.). These attributes require omnimodal immutability, "for he who is . . . does not admit someone prior who would change him, and he who is most simple does not have anything that would, through change, be taken away or remain" (p. 153). After these first-class attributes proceed characteristics that describe the *quantity* of God—how great God is—in his unity, infinity, and eternity. One derives from God's infinity his omnipresence with reference to space, his eternity with reference to time, and his immortality with reference to life and being. As the living Spirit par excellence, God demon-

strates rational, emotional, and volitional faculties and their perfect attributes—what qualities God has. From these faculties stem the typical communicable attributes assigned to God such as truthfulness, goodness, grace, love, mercy, righteousness, and holiness. These primitive attributes insinuate three final summary attributes: perfection, glory, and blessedness.

Van Mastricht's unique contribution to theology consists in this clear presentation of the logical connections between the divine attributes. Many Christians take an inductive approach to theology proper where one gathers the various attributes assigned to God throughout Scripture and taxonomizes each characteristic or trait. Van Mastricht deduces the nature of God starting from God's ectypal revelation as Spirit and each logical subsequent attribute. This methodology provides balance between the divine attributes and prevents the privileging of one characteristic over another. For example, as an omnimodal, immutable, omnipotent, and eternal Spirit, God's love and mercy cannot override his sovereign rule over creation since his moral attributes derive from his essence and perfections.

Van Mastricht concludes with a helpful summary of the doctrine of the Trinity. He establishes the relationship between the attributes of God and each divine personality, which he defines as "a rational, incommunicable substance" (p. 503). He also explores the individual operations of each member of the Trinity in relation to one another and humanity. Since many heresies arise from misunderstanding or distorting the doctrine of the Trinity, Van Mastricht's clear presentation and pastoral application of the work of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit will benefit many contemporary theological discussions.

This volume will contribute to the growing library of translated works from the *Nadere Reformatie* and the study of practical piety. Van Mastricht is a friend of counselors and pastors who desire to connect theological truths to the lives of counselees and congregants. Van Mastricht challenges all students and leaders in theology and ministry to recover theology's great goal of "living for God through Christ" (p. xxxv).

Jared S. Poulton  
Seneca, South Carolina

F. Albert Tizon. *Whole and Reconciled: Gospel, Church, and Mission in a Fractured World*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2018. xxi + 230 pp. Paperback. ISBN 978-0801095627. \$22.99.

Al Tizon, executive minister of Serve Globally, presents a thought-provoking argument for reconciliation as an integral part of mission in a

fractured and broken world. Speaking directly into the context of the holistic mission debate among evangelicals, he wholeheartedly calls for both evangelism and social justice, but argues that “holistic mission also needs to be about joining God in *putting the world back together again*” (p. xvii). Tizon is unapologetically evangelical as he prioritizes the gospel and humanity’s need for reconciliation to God. Without this vertical (God-people) reconciliation, the horizontal (people-people) and circular (God-people-creation) reconciliations cannot come to fruition (p. 87).

Tizon defines reconciliation as “God’s initiative to restore wholeness to a shattered creation” (p. xviii). He argues it is part of mission through a series of four sections. He describes the context (one world), defines the message (one gospel), introduces the key players (one church), and states the task (one mission). In doing so, he approaches reconciliation in mission from sociological, theological, ecclesiological, and practical angles (p. xxi).

In the first section, he describes globalization, post-Christendom, and postcolonialism and wrestles with their implications for mission in the twenty-first century. His description of each trend is comprehensive, yet concise, and he offers readers a solid introduction to the discussions, as well as major issues each trend presents in mission. This section demonstrates that reconciliation uniquely contributes to mission today due to the wounds and brokenness of the current global context.

Next, Tizon argues for the whole gospel, which he contrasts with the false gospels of hate, prosperity, comfort, and empire, as well as the half gospels of personal salvation (that only focuses on the spiritual aspect) and social liberation. This section forms a crucial part of his argument in which he calls for an expanded understanding of the gospel to include kingdom shalom. He includes thoughtful narratives, well-argued critiques of other false or half gospels, and a biblically anchored picture of a whole gospel that includes both personal and social aspects (p. 62).

In the next section, Tizon describes a whole church as a group of whole people who are broken, yet bold. Drawing from the Trinity’s plurality, distinctiveness, and love, he calls for the church to “practice the Trinity” through community, diversity, and love (pp. 112–13). While few people would argue with his major points, some evangelicals might contest their explicit connection to the Trinity.

Finally, Tizon highlights the whole mission. His section on the Great Commission and its relationship to other “Greats” in the Bible is beautiful and winsome. He proposes that instead of replacing the Great Commission, passages such as Luke 4:18–19, Matt 5–7, the texts describing Jesus’s death and resurrection, and Rev 7:9 “fill in, deepen, beautify, and complete it” (p. 167). These other passages in Scripture show believers what

it means to “[teach] them to obey all that I have commanded you” (Matt 28:18–20). Tizon concludes with a call for peace-making, or reconciliation, in mission. Unfortunately, his sudden shift from reconciliation, which he uses in previous chapters, to peace-making is confusing and disjointed, and this section, which should have been an important part of the book, feels rushed.

As another point of critique, while he is often fair and balanced, Tizon occasionally veers towards examples from one side of the spectrum without acknowledging the existence of other views. This weakness is most felt in some of his discussions about American Christians. Though this fault does not detract from the overall usefulness of the book, Tizon could have made an even stronger argument by giving a fuller picture of the diversity in American evangelical Christianity.

In any event, this book stands apart from others in this genre because Tizon attempts to use different definitions to paint a fuller picture instead of pitting them against each other. For example, Tizon presents four aspects of discipleship—evangelism, justice, compassion, and reconciliation—as perspectives of the whole. Instead of emphasizing one perspective at the expense of the others, Tizon uses them all together to deepen Christian understanding.

In sum, Tizon attempts to navigate the sometimes-treacherous waters of the holistic mission debate while also adding reconciliation to the conversation. Anyone thinking critically about mission in the twenty-first century should interact with Tizon’s work. Even if one does not agree with his overall thesis, his presentation of current topics in this field is invaluable to those who are new to it and to those who have worked for decades but recognize the cultural shift around them. He presents a fair critique of the major camps represented in the current argument and searches for a way forward that is faithful to God’s word in the twenty-first-century global context.

Anna Daub  
Wake Forest, North Carolina

John C. Lennox. *Can Science Explain Everything?* Epsom, UK: The Good Book Company, 2019. 128 pp. Paperback. ISBN 978-1784984113. \$9.83

Many believe that relating science to faith is antagonistic to humanity’s move towards greater truth, happiness, and progress. Historically, naturalism has prevailed as the dominant worldview in academia and Western culture, particularly in medicine and the sciences. Dating back to the an-

cient Greeks, naturalism proposes that the motions, properties, and interactions of atoms are sufficient to explain every aspect of the world and human life. In fact, the success of science has led many to assume that science, faith, and God do not mix well in our twenty-first-century culture. To tackle this subject, John C. Lennox writes *Can Science Explain Everything?* He aims to address specific questions he has encountered through his long career of teaching, dialoguing, and witnessing to those who reject the Christian faith. Topics he addresses range from the relationship of science and religion, to miracles and the historicity of Christ's death and resurrection.

In chapter 1, the author asks whether a scientist can believe in God. As a scientist and academic himself, Lennox answers with a resounding affirmation, citing the many scientists and Nobel Prize winners who have declared a belief in God. However, there have also been many scientists denying God's existence. Therefore, the conflict is not whether a scientist can believe in God but whether science fits better within a naturalistic or theistic worldview. Then, in chapter 2, Lennox considers the historical developments leading to the antagonism between science and religion in Western culture. He argues that a major factor behind this phenomenon is the confusion surrounding both the nature of scientific explanation and how one interprets the nature of God. Specifically, many scientists overlook the different realms of explanation in science and religion. Lennox summarizes,

Suppose you ask: Why is the water boiling? I may say that heat energy from the gas flame is being conducted through the copper base of the kettle and is agitating the molecules of the water to such an extent that the water is boiling. Or, I may say that the water is boiling because I want a cup of tea. We see at once that both of these explanations are equally rational—they each make perfect sense—but they are very different. The first is scientific and the second is personal, involving my intentions, will and desire. What is also obvious is that the two explanations do not conflict or even compete. They complement each other. (p. 36)

Following this observation, Lennox addresses two central myths of the science-faith relationship in chapters 3 and 4. The first is that religion depends on faith, but science does not. The second is that science depends on reason, but Christianity does not. On the first, he argues that faith is a necessary component of all knowledge in both science and religion, given the vast complexity and mysteries of the universe. On the second, he observes that Jesus Christ himself had a high view of reason as he argued extensively with the leading intellectual and religious scholars of his day

(e.g., John 8:39–40).

In chapter 5, Lennox addresses biblical interpretation in the light of scientific advancements. He argues that a literal interpretation of scripture should consider metaphorical and literary motifs to avoid confusion and contradictions with scientific discoveries, such as the evidence for the Big Bang. In chapter 6, he discusses the possibility of miracles by arguing against David Hume's primary objections against them, namely that miracles were part of pre-scientific cultures, ignorant of our modern scientific understanding, and that they violate the laws of nature. Then, in chapters 7 and 8, Lennox establishes the reliability of Scripture and the reality of the death, burial, and resurrection of Jesus Christ. Specifically, he argues that Christianity is falsifiable if anyone can provide a reasonable argument against Christ's resurrection.

Overall, this book is a good introduction, presenting major objections to naturalism and scientism, and towards religious belief and faith. The book condenses many of the arguments Lennox has made in public forums and debates in a format accessible to the layperson. For well-read Christians, it is a good refresher on the topic and a great resource for church discussions and Bible studies. However, the book's brevity prevents a deep exploration of the history and arguments surrounding science and faith. This is particularly evident in the short sections on hermeneutics, the reliability of the New Testament, and the resurrection of Christ. Other scholars, such as Gary Habermas or Alister McGrath, would be more appropriate resources for those wanting to explore these areas in greater depth. Nevertheless, Lennox's book serves as a succinct argument for the harmony between science and faith in the modern scientific age.

Jonathan Kopel  
Lubbock, Texas