is a topic of immense debate within the field of biblical studies, and anybody wishing to research the topic seriously should have no difficulty at all in finding ample resources written by researchers with specific training and expertise in modern linguistics and ancient Semitic languages (e.g., Cook, *Time and the Biblical Hebrew Verb*; Niccacci, *The Syntax of the Verb*; Buth, "The Hebrew Verb"; Buth, "Functional Grammar, Hebrew, and Aramaic"; Endo, T*he Verbal System of Classical Hebrew*; Arnold and Choi, *A Guide to Biblical Hebrew Syntax*; Joosten, "Do the Finite Verbal Forms …?"—and this is to say nothing of the many beginner and technical grammars available). The fact that Ross in no way engages any of this literature while depending heavily on the conclusions of an untrained, amateur Hebraist regarding verbal syntax and semantics simply beggars belief.

In fact, apart from his use of *TWOT* and passing references to a few scholars, Ross seldom engages biblical scholarship of any kind. He does not engage current thinking about the structure, theology, and message of Genesis 1–2, or of the primeval history (chaps. 1–11) as a whole, to say nothing of the overall literary structure of the book of Genesis. Walton and van Wolde each receive the briefest of mention and are brushed aside without meaningful engagement, and well-known evangelical scholars working actively in the book of Genesis, such as John Sailhamer, receive no mention at all. This absence is felt most keenly in chapter 20, in which Ross purportedly engages "Higher Criticism." Ross's engagement with what he calls "higher criticism" (a term that belongs more to the nineteenth century than the twenty-first) is badly out of date, and is only accurate in the broadest sense of the word. Here we find statements such as the following:

> Astruc, Eichhorn, and the emerging "higher critics" presumed that the order in which various creation events appear on the page represents the intended chronology in the text. For the most part, they ignored verb choice, verb forms, contextual cues, indicators of parenthetical comment, and virtually all other syntactic features. (p. 198)

No citations are provided to support this claim. First, most biblical scholars (and not merely the terrible "higher critics") do indeed read the Genesis 1 and 2 accounts as though they are presented in chronological order. For chapter 1 at least, the creation account is presented as an event proceeding in six successive days, each culminating in evening and morning. The suggestion that this somehow ignores the structure and context of the text is peculiar. Second, the suggestion that biblical scholars (whether in the seventeenth/eighteenth century such as Astruc, the eighteenth/nineteenth century such as Eichhorn, or the nineteenth/twentieth century such as most of those who called themselves "higher critics") ignore issues such as verb choice, syntax, and context is simply false. The briefest perusal of books, commentaries, and articles on the book of Genesis disproves this absurd claim immediately. No honest engagement with critical biblical scholarship is even attempted in this chapter. What we find here is little more than a dismissive parade of straw men.

Suffice to say that I find Ross's foray into biblical scholarship in *Navigating Genesis* wanting. Ross is dismissive toward the long history of scholarship on this ancient text, constantly submits the text to his modernist eisegetical presuppositions, and does not deal honestly and openly with those with whom he disagrees. The frank truth is that I cannot recommend this book to anybody, except as a case study in concordist hermeneutics.

Reviewed by Colin M. Toffelmire, Ambrose University, Calgary, AB T3H 0L5.

Technology

INFORMATION DOESN'T WANT TO BE FREE: Laws for the Internet Age by Cory Doctorow. San Francisco, CA: McSweeney's, 2014. 192 pages. Hardcover; $22.00. ISBN: 9781940450285.

"Information doesn't want to be free, people do," says Internet expert and prolific author Cory Doctorow in this provocative and timely book. If this phrase leaves you still a little murky as to what his thesis is, the subtitle says it better. In short, the Internet changes everything, so let's start changing copyright laws so that they work better for people in creative fields (and use existing laws to serve creators rather than their distributors).

Doctorow proposes three main "laws" for the information revolution when it comes to creative content (writing, music, visual art, etc.). By "law," he means a universally true observation; in particular, these are his observations about the current copyright situation whose implications he believes most Americans do not fully grasp.

First, locked formats such as DVDs that you cannot play on Linux, or Kindle books that you cannot read somewhere else, are not there for the benefit of consumers or artists. Second, having fewer distribution channels and more copyright liability for intermediaries such as YouTube or Internet providers is bad for artists and consumers. Third, and most critically, a copyright system that encourages providers to have

full access to our computers and other devices at all times (to catch any possible copyright violation) is worse than Orwellian because it is no longer just the government that is spying on you.

His "laws" are stated more pithily; the last "law" is quoted using his words at the beginning of this review. Some of the examples of this that he cites are quite disturbing. For example, in 2009, Amazon used a secret hook to delete legitimately obtained copies of *1984* from customers' hard drives; aside from this irony (which CEO Jeff Bezos apologized for), there is no reason that a malicious actor could not use the same facility to do far worse.

Now, I am not a lawyer, economist, Internet expert, or copyright aficionado so I cannot speak directly about the impact of most of these issues. However, I find much of it compelling. For instance, perhaps a mathematician and writer is a bit of a creative artist—and sure enough, while discussing the relative utility of fame, he describes my situation: "You can't pay for a copy of this book with fame. (Unless you're famous as a reviewer, in which case you can.)" So I will focus instead on the highlights most relevant to readers of *PSCF* with a technical bent.

First, anyone who knows anything about computers should be alarmed by software used for digital rights management, software that is legalized in the United States by the Digital Millennium Copyright Act. For many such "digital locks," it is illegal even to try to figure out how they work, though they often restrict legal activity on a customer-owned device. As an excellent example of how this plays out, one Sony product immediately cloaked any files beginning with "sys." Naturally, virus writers immediately started writing their "rootkits" to begin with this same string; one amusing result (among other things) was that World of Warcraft cheaters could elude detection.

Second, there is a *lot* of creativity out there in terms of how to make money from the vast array of small markets now available online. The book is full of examples, while making it clear that most artists will not be financially successful (this is nothing new). For open-source advocates like myself, it is encouraging to think of how such projects could make enough money to be sustainable without corporate sponsorship; however, I think that this is true for anyone engaged in creative ventures, from coding to writing praise songs.

Unfortunately, the author provides anecdotal evidence only. Persuasive as this may be, this is by no means a scholarly text, and it is very frustrating that one cannot actually quantify things such as a "chilling effect" of spurious cease-and-desist-type orders. Although I agree with Doctorow that finding hard data on this might be difficult, an example where it might be possible is quantifying how many free uploading sites are taken down due to such orders, or exactly how they have changed policies. (A similar annoyance is the essential lack of footnotes or any bibliographic references.)

Hearteningly, he also says that disagreeing with some rules does not mean disagreeing with rules altogether. So even if we might disagree on whether Napster was a good thing, there seems to be room for a common ground that respects humans as moral actors capable of making their own determinations of good and ill while also acknowledging that people are lazy and sinful and will often take shortcuts.

Finally, as one might expect of a successful sci-fi author, he is entertaining. I imagine Doctorow channeling the snarky Eloise (of the Plaza Hotel) when he says

> "Here are some other things that do not make money:
> - Complaining about piracy.
> - Calling your customers thieves.
> - Treating your customers like thieves."

Doctorow is *really* passionate and knowledgeable, and practices what he preaches. For instance, the book is published by McSweeney's, which is an indie press having (at this writing) a Kickstarter campaign to turn nonprofit. I do think that he is missing a key component to the argument—that all this is only possible in artistic domains which require relatively small infrastructure; I would have liked this to be addressed more concretely. I find it hard to imagine that a full staging of Wagner's *Ring Cycle* could rely solely on selling swag to pay the bills. Then again, I know that I would end up spending *more* money on organ music if I could do more via pay-what-you-want.

In summary, even if you are not completely convinced that the "copyfight" is a titanic battle to save us from a surveillance state (and after all, we have already given Facebook and Google all our information, why not the movie studios?), and even if you find that it is a bit of a stretch to compare this fight to the one over access for common folk to the text of the Bible (which he does more than once), this book is a worthwhile read, especially if you care about copyright and creativity for the future.

Reviewed by Karl-Dieter Crisman, Associate Professor of Mathematics, Gordon College, Wenham, MA 01984.