more important than questions of human origins or the origin and transmission of sin. Drawing on Psalm 8, Paul sees the glory that God intended for humanity as already fulfilled in Jesus and shared with those that are one with the Messiah. Unfortunately, the question of cosmic and human origins has become completely muddled with the *soteriological* question as to whether an "original Adam" is necessary for the biblical doctrine of salvation. In biblical theology, the promise to Abraham in Genesis 12:1–3 is the answer to the plight of humanity depicted in Genesis 3–11. The divine answer to the problem of Adam (as explained in Rom. 1:18–3:20) is found in the fulfilment of the covenant with Abraham in the saving work of Christ. Romans 5:12–21 is a summary of how the promise to Abraham deals with the sin of Adam and its effects. Paul is focused on the glory the Creator intended to give his human creatures, their dominion over the world.

While the biblical account has similarities with others of the ancient Near East, there are also significant differences. Other accounts consider the creation of humanity to be *en masse* in order to supply the needs of the gods. The Hebrews had no such concepts of deity. Instead, Genesis emphasizes that humans have mortal bodies empowered to serve in sacred space. Humans serve in the relationship of families. It is for this fundamental reason that their bodies are created as male and female. As an archetypal account, questions of chronology or material origins are not addressed by the narrative in any sense.

Walton distinguishes between concepts conveyed by cultural analogies of language and the theology which they articulate. It is typical in the ancient world to depict the heart (*lēb*) as the center of intellect and emotion. Though biblical writers may have actually believed that to be the case, it has no theological relevance. Translators must decide whether *lēb* should be rendered as mind or emotion in modern terms, but it has no bearing on the biblical understanding of the human person. In the same way, it is not necessary to treat Adam as the sole progenitor from whom the whole human race descended (p. 204). This is no more necessary than a requirement that mental activities must be associated with the human heart. In dealing with theological questions such as that of human origins, language has a greater context than what may be perceived as immediate literary implications. To use a parallel example (pp. 96–101), Melchizedek had human progenitors, a fact certainly believed by the biblical author. But progeny was irrelevant to him serving as a priest. Such a priesthood, in complete contrast to the Levitical priesthood, serves as an analogy for the priesthood of Jesus. The theology of priesthood is critical, not a knowledge of the human ancestors of Melchizedek.

The book is divided into twenty-one propositions which address various modern questions of human origins or interpretation of ancient accounts. The last proposition asserts that humans may be a special creation of God even if there is material continuity with the rest of biological creation. But proposition 11 asserts that Adam and Eve are real people, though their names are representative, in part because Adam is listed in genealogies. This need not require that they be the first human beings (p. 103), but they are the humans that serve as the archetype of all humans.

The book is a concerted attempt to avoid any use of science as a means to interpret the Genesis account. Science is simply unreliable as a guide to absolute or inerrant truth. Science is constantly in process and there is no certainty as to where it may lead. For example, Rajat Bhaduri of McMaster University has joined a growing group of scientists challenging the general theory of relativity which requires that the universe begin with a "big bang." Their model attempts to answer the gravitational question and account for dark matter by a theory in which the universe is retained at a finite size which therefore gives it an infinite age. Biblical accounts simply do not address such questions. Biblical writers are not trying to reconstruct the world that was; they are providing a theology which explains the world that is.

The book is written in a nontechnical style, making it comprehensible to any nonprofessional reader. It does lead the reader to consider Genesis as part of a biblical theology which is surely the purpose and intent of its author. As a complement to Walton's work, I would recommend Mark S. Smith, *The Priestly Vision of Genesis 1* (Fortress, 2010). Smith develops the linguistic significance of the terminology of Genesis which shows the priestly vision of time and space, humanity and divinity.

Reviewed by August H. Konkel, Professor of Old Testament, McMaster Divinity College, Hamilton, ON L8S 4K1.

THE BOOK OF *GENESIS*: A Biography by Ronald Hendel. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2013. 287 pages. Hardcover; $29.95. ISBN: 9780691140124.

Ronald Hendel is a well-respected Jewish biblical scholar who became even more well known in 2010 for writing an essay in the *Biblical Archaeology Review* entitled "Farewell to SBL: Faith and Reason in Biblical Studies" (SBL in his title refers to the Society of Biblical Literature). In his essay, Hendel lamented that this esteemed scholarly society, numbering many thousands of members and devoted to the critical study of the Bible, was now welcoming explicitly religious/ideological points of view. As a result of this change, he withdrew his membership.

Hendel's negative appraisal of the role of faith in biblical studies should not lead us to prejudge *The Book of* Genesis*: A Biography*, since it is a delightful read that both informs and engages the reader through its fascinating retelling of selected aspects of the history of interpretation of Genesis, from the beginning up to the modern period. Indeed, I had only a vague memory of Hendel's 2010 position statement while I was reading the book; it was only after completing it that I went back and re-read his earlier statement about faith and reason. In the end, I will suggest that Hendel's overall argument in *The Book of Genesis: A Biography*, and even the structure of the book, aligns with his position in the 2010 article.

The book contains seven chapters, an introduction that surveys Hendel's approach, and a very brief (and, I judge, quite weak) afterword that reflects on living with the book of Genesis in the contemporary world. Of the seven main chapters, the first, "The Genesis of Genesis," sketches Hendel's modern, scholarly understanding of the origin and meaning of the book of Genesis, while chapters 2–4 trace the premodern history of interpretation and chapters 5–7 address Genesis in the modern period. Although it might seem that Hendel's account is evenly divided between premodern and modern eras with three chapters on each, the chapters on premodern interpretation add up to only 62 pages, in contrast to the 165 pages devoted to the modern period. If we combine this with the first chapter, which clearly draws on modern critical scholarship to understand the origin of Genesis, we find that fully 196 pages are devoted to a modern interpretation of Genesis.

The dividing point for Hendel is between a "literal" or "realist" interpretation of Genesis and a "figural" (nonliteral) interpretation. According to Hendel, the book of Genesis

> envisions a single, God-created universe in which human life is limited by the boundaries of knowledge and death. We are earth-bound, intermittently wise, often immoral, mortal creatures. There is a harsh realism in the Genesis accounts of human life. (p. 9)

This realism of Genesis, which Hendel attributes to the original meaning of the text in ancient times, and which he unpacks in often illuminating ways in chapter 1, was compromised by two nonliteral approaches to the world, both of which became lenses for interpreting Genesis. In chapter 2, "The Rise of the Figural Sense," Hendel draws on James Kugel's famous analysis of four assumptions in *The Bible as It Was* that had become standard by the first century of the Common Era, namely that the Bible was *cryptic*, *relevant*, *perfect*, and *divine*. Hendel explains how these assumptions led interpreters to go beyond the surface meaning of Genesis—in one of two directions, which he names the *apocalyptic* and the *Platonic*.

In chapter 3, "Apocalyptic Secrets," Hendel gives a selective, but nonetheless interesting, introduction to the rise of apocalyptic interpretation of the Bible in, or soon after, the Babylonian exile, beginning with Ezekiel's integration of aspects of the Eden narrative into his vision of a renovated Jerusalem. He cites speculation about the restoration of Eden and the glorious renewal of humanity at the "end of days" (a favored phrase of Hendel's) in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Targums (later Aramaic paraphrases of the Old Testament), and ultimately in Paul's writings in the New Testament.

Where the chapter falters, however, is in Hendel's reading of Paul as an "apocalyptic" theologian. He claims (against the grain of almost all NT scholars) that Paul's mysterious experience in the "third heaven" (2 Cor. 12:2–4) was formative for his theology, and then uses these few verses as the basis of reading an "esoteric" Paul. He also misunderstands completely the nature of the resurrection in 1 Corinthians 15, taking the "spiritual body" as a body composed of spirit (*pneuma*) or ethereal "stuff" so that it is fit for living in heaven. James Ware's recent article, "Paul's Understanding of the Resurrection in 1 Corinthians 15:36–54," in the *Journal of Biblical Literature* (which is sponsored by SBL), addresses Paul's argument in 1 Corinthians 15, and should permanently lay this interpretation to rest. Underlying these misreadings of Paul is Hendel's equivocation on the meaning of "apocalyptic." Whereas he initially defines the term as having to do with the revelation of mysteries and secrets, he later uses it as equivalent to eschatological; then on the basis of Paul being an "apocalyptic" (read: *eschatological*) thinker, he imports esoterism into Paul.

In chapter 4, "Platonic Worlds," Hendel traces the rise of figural (specifically, allegorical) interpretation of the Bible back to Plato's allegory of the cave, which Philo of Alexandria, the great Jewish theologian of the first century AD, used as a hermeneutical lens. Just as the Platonic philosopher must emerge from the darkened cave of physical illusion to view the spiritual/intellectual reality of the sun, so the biblical interpreter must go beyond the literal meaning of the text to its hidden, spiritual meaning. Thus the call of Abraham to leave his *land*, *kindred*, and *father's house* (Gen. 12:1) is taken by Philo to mean the purification of the soul from earthly matter, specifically, *the body*, *sense perception*, and *speech*. Then follows a fascinating sketch of the desire to ascend from Earth to heaven in Paul (a clear misreading), the Gnostic gospels, and the desert fathers. Part of the problem with this chapter is that Hendel takes the presence of Greek (the language) to imply a Platonic interpretation (p. 90), which is a non sequitur.

Chapter 5, "Between the Figure and the Real," then recounts the recovery of literal/realist interpretation of

Genesis, and the problems that came with this recovery. Hendel begins with Rashi, the twelfth-century Jewish rabbi, who often criticized previous Midrashic interpretations of the Bible and advocated a pesher approach, which corresponds in many ways with what we would call grammatical-historical interpretation. This approach was taken up by Luther, who confessed that in the past he used to allegorize "even a chamber pot," but then came to disdain anything but the plain sense of the text. Hendel quotes Luther on his perception of ludicrous or fictitious aspects of Genesis (such as Eve being created from Adam's rib) and on the genealogies of Genesis 10, as being "full of dead words." Hendel's point is that Luther began to see problems with taking the plain sense of the Bible as obvious truth, which was immediately relevant to the life of the faithful. After Luther, we find the learned Catholic Rabelais parodying the Genesis stories in the hilarious bestseller *Gargantua and Pantagruel*; then we have the Jewish Spinoza's literal/realist interpretation of the Bible that led to his questioning its divine origin and authority.

Chapter 6, "Genesis and Science: From the Beginning to Fundamentalism," traces the rise of the modern scientific picture of the cosmos, which initially seems to be congruent with the biblical "realist" picture. Indeed, a literal interpretation of Genesis contributed to the "disenchantment" of nature, which allowed it to be studied scientifically. Yet what science subsequently discovered about the cosmos, particularly the question of heliocentrism, seemed to contradict a plain-sense reading of Genesis; thus we have the famous conflict between Galileo and the church authorities. Here Hendel cites Augustine, who claimed that allegorical/figural interpretation was allowable only when a literal reading of the biblical text seemed false. The problem, as Hendel portrays it, is that in the modern era, with the decline of allegorical reading, interpreters were in a quandary when they discerned contradictions between the Bible and science. The long and short of this chapter is to suggest that there were three modern approaches to the seeming contradiction between science and scripture, particularly with respect to Genesis.

One approach was Galileo's limited acceptance of figural interpretation when the Bible seemed to contradict what he was discovering about the universe; this approach is encapsulated in the famous statement that "the intention of the Holy Spirit is to teach us how one goes to heaven and not how heaven goes." This distinction surfaces in the later position of Pope John Paul II, who reversed the Catholic Church's judgment against Galileo and affirmed that reason and revelation were two distinct, noncontradictory realms of knowledge.

But there were two other approaches to the seeming contradiction between science and scripture that arose from the decline of figural readings. One was the approach of Spinoza, who was upfront about the contradictions between science and Genesis, and who developed the rudiments of what later became higher biblical criticism, including Pentateuchal source theory (JEDP). Hendel's glee in sketching Spinoza's approach to the Bible is palpable, and one can see that he understands this approach to have led to the later formation of the SBL, and thus to his disappointment with that Society.

The only alternative to Spinoza and to biblical criticism, generally, is, according to Hendel, the doctrine of inerrancy, which became the favored approach of conservative Christians, including those who penned *The Fundamentals*. In the wake of New World exploration which led many to wonder about pre-Adamite races, the challenges of deep geological time, which did not fit the six days of creation, and the growing awareness of biological evolution which contradicted human uniqueness, more and more Christians who rejected figural readings of the Bible, and thus the separation of faith from science, attempted to harmonize a literal understanding of Genesis with a realist understanding of the world, which resulted, according to Hendel, in compromising the truth of both.

While there is much to ponder in this chapter, Hendel is confused about the meaning of inerrancy, treating it as equivalent to a focus on the "plain sense" of the text. Yet he goes on to claim that the idea of inerrant autographs means that evangelicals cannot establish any point of doctrine from the Bible unless they have access to these autographs, since the present Bible we have is "an incorrigibly corrupted text, unreliable in its details, unstable in its support of any interpretation of its meanings" (p. 191). Thus, for Hendel, inerrancy is a modern, historicized variant of the Bible's cryptic meaning (as delineated by Kugel).

Hendel's final chapter, "Modern Times," begins by tracing how Genesis was used in nineteenth-century debates about slavery and the status of women. But then the chapter shifts to an evocative portrayal of Emily Dickinson's "slant" telling of the Genesis stories and Franz Kafka's parabolic engagement with the text, concluding with Erich Auerbach's *Mimesis* and his profound analysis of the literary realism of Genesis, in contrast to Homer's epics. Not only does Hendel take Auerbach's analysis as returning us to the original meaning of Genesis, but he understands Auerbach's approach as presenting us with the choice of either submitting to this ancient text in its literal meaning or resisting its authority in the light of what we "know" as moderns. While Hendel chooses the second option, he does not intend to simply jettison Genesis (or the Bible as a whole), evident in his joyous lingering over the poetics of Dickinson and Kafka.

I have to be honest: I could not put this book down. I was hooked from the start and enthralled the whole way through, partially through Hendel's lucid writing, partially by wrestling with aspects of Hendel's portrayal that did not make sense to me. In the end, I came to realize that the primary focus of the book is on the modern recovery, not only of Genesis but also of the entire Bible, as a literal/realist text, which results in the reader necessarily discerning tensions between the text and the world. For Hendel, this leads to something like Stephen Jay Gould's "Non-Overlapping Magisteria" (NOMA), in which faith and science, including biblical studies, are viewed as entirely separate domains of knowledge, which should never interfere with each other. This, I discern, is what led him to critique, and then leave, the SBL in 2010.

Although I am sympathetic to NOMA, since it allows scientists who are Christians to get on with their scientific work without forcing the results of scientific inquiry to conform to our theological assumptions, I wonder if there is not more to be said on the intrinsic relationship of theology and scripture to science. Tom McLeish's amazing book *Faith and Wisdom in Science* (Oxford University Press, 2014) is perhaps a start at overcoming NOMA without reverting to the old program of harmonization.

All in all, however, Hendel's volume is a selective, nontechnical, thoughtful introduction to the history of interpretation of Genesis. Despite disagreements with aspects of Hendel's argument, I judge that *The Book of Genesis: A Biography* is worthwhile reading for anyone interested in this subject.

Reviewed by J. Richard Middleton, Northeastern Seminary, Rochester, NY 14624.

Technology

RECODING GENDER: Women's Changing Participation in Computing by Janet Abbate. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2012. 247 pages, notes, bibliography, index. Hardcover; $34.00. ISBN: 9780262018067.

Recoding Gender is a thoroughly researched book that uses interviews and primary documents to illustrate women's contributions to the history of computing. It is an engaging read that carefully provides context for facts and stories, without vilifying any of the players involved. Though there are certainly unfair practices, stereotypes, and biases mentioned, Abbate chooses to focus on the champions, with just enough background on the prevailing social constructs to make it clear why these were formidable successes. But this is also a weakness of the book. By choosing to only include the success stories, a rosier picture of the past is created than other sources would suggest is accurate. However, when read as an addition to existing male-dominated histories, this book provides a necessary understanding of how gender has impacted the relatively new field of computer science.

Abbate begins her book by explaining the role of women in two key computing projects of World War II: the British Colossus projects and the US ENIAC project. Though computer hardware was considered a male enterprise even during war times, programming, as a new and as yet undefined activity, was open to women. In fact, early in computing history, women were encouraged in software roles, since some saw programming as an extension of the role of women as "computers" who performed calculations by hand in clerical roles. Abbate uses interviews with women of each project to understand the appeal of the work (engaging, challenging, exciting) as well as the gender roles that were implicitly or explicitly associated with this new field. She also sheds light on the very limited understanding that society at large had of the new machines, and the skills that both men and women were able to use in programming.

Abbate moves forward from the war to consider the role of women in the developing computing industry of the early 1950s. At this time, hardware was still the primary selling point of a system, but custom software was often needed and so a programmer might be sent by the hardware company if required. Here, the opportunities for women were more varied, depending on how programming fit into the structure of the organization. In particular, in business application areas (as opposed to scientific areas), women often encountered a glass ceiling. To understand the context of these organizations, the author spends time exploring the ways in which programmers were recruited and assessed (e.g., college degrees of any kind showing an ability to learn, or specially formulated aptitude tests) and considers the implications of each from a gender perspective (e.g., far fewer women were able to pursue degrees than men at this time, but women were just as likely to do well on an aptitude test). She then looks at the various ways computing was put into context with other disciplines such as math, engineering, business, and considers the gendered implication of those associations.

As programming evolved in the 1960s, new terminology like "software engineering" and a greater understanding of the inherent complexity of programming also advanced. Abbate explores the factors that caused people to talk about the "software crisis" and the myriad approaches that were used in trying to overcome it, keeping each approach in the context of its gendered implications. For example, "automatic programming" and its related "structured programming" were highly influenced by women such as Grace Hopper who