encing biblical texts, touching on theological history, relevant to contemporary faith-science conversations about human origins and destiny, and passionately attuned to the importance of its subject matter for the oppressed and the vulnerable, it deserves a wide readership.

Reviewed by Patrick S. Franklin, Associate Professor of Theology and Ethics, Providence Seminary, Otterburne, MB R0A 1G0.

BEING HUMAN, BEING CHURCH: The Significance of Theological Anthropology for Ecclesiology by Patrick S. Franklin. Carlisle, UK: Paternoster, 2016. 325 pages. Paperback; $49.99. ISBN: 9781842278420.

The theme of this book is that a theologically adequate doctrine of the church presupposes an equally adequate doctrine of the human person. The meaning of being human has a decisive bearing on the meaning of being church. This insight alone makes an important contribution to the contemporary discussion about the nature and mission of the church, no matter which part of the ecumenical mansion happens to be one's home. Patrick Franklin's aim is to develop a holistic view of the human person that is theologically more satisfying than all the competing models he describes.

To develop an adequate theological anthropology the author draws heavily from the works of contemporary theologians who have contributed to a renewal of the doctrine of the Trinity, most notably Wolfhart Pannenberg, Jürgen Moltmann, John D. Zizioulas, Colin Gunton, Miroslav Volf, and Catherine LaCugna. Surprisingly absent from this list is the name of Robert W. Jenson, American Lutheran theologian, who has written more extensively and creatively on the Trinity than most of the others.

Franklin writes from the perspective of an evangelical theologian, affiliated with the Baptist tradition. He agrees with the charge that historically Evangelicalism has lacked a coherent ecclesiology; in this book, Franklin rises to the challenge to demonstrate that Evangelicalism has the resources within its tradition to compensate for this deficit. In doing so, he cites a number of his fellow evangelical theologians who have written books on ecclesiology from a Trinitarian perspective, in particular Stanley Grenz and Miroslav Volf. Both of these have reached considerably beyond Evangelicalism to enrich their thinking about the church. As for the author himself, he cites the works of Dietrich Bonhoeffer more often than any others. Bonhoeffer's dissertation on the church, *Sanctorum Communio*, which Karl Barth called a "theological miracle," is accorded a place of preeminent significance.

Franklin writes that evangelical ecclesiological imagination must expand and deepen. That is true not only for evangelical theologians but for all of us in different regions of the worldwide church. Our thinking about the church has been too small. What is the best strategy to expand and deepen our ecclesial imagination? Franklin gives it an injection of Bonhoeffer and others. Is that sufficient? I do not think so. What is missing is a broader ecumenical perspective that takes seriously more of the Eastern Orthodox, Roman Catholic, and Anglican theological traditions whose strong suit is and has always been ecclesiology. Granted, Pannenberg and Moltmann are both ecumenical theologians who have invested a lot of thought in doing just that. Pannenberg especially has been at the forefront of ecumenical dialogue, a leader in Faith and Order and a member of the Catholic-Lutheran Dialogue, both of which rank ecclesiology as a topic of highest importance.

Franklin's book on the nature of being human and its relation to the nature and mission of the church is a worthy gift to the ecumenical quest for a deeper and broader ecclesiology whose goal is to restore unity to a badly divided Christian world. To give one example, Franklin strongly emphasizes that the worldwide apostolic mission of the gospel of Jesus Christ is part of the essence of the church, a theme not always front and center in the majority of books on ecclesiology that are preoccupied with institutional questions of order. Readers would do well to receive with gratitude the insights Franklin's book offers their own search for a richer understanding of the church.

Reviewed by Carl E. Braaten, Professor Emeritus of Systematic Theology of the Lutheran School of Theology at Chicago and Founder of the Center for Catholic and Evangelical Theology.

Science & Biblical Studies

SCRIPTURE AND COSMOLOGY: Reading the Bible between the Ancient World and Modern Science by Kyle Greenwood. Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2015. 251 pages. Paperback; $24.00. ISBN: 9780830840786.

Kyle Greenwood's *Scripture and Cosmology* helpfully introduces nonspecialists to biblical cosmology in the context of the ancient world and shows how Christians in the medieval and early modern periods who were committed to biblical authority had to adapt their interpretation of scripture in the light of what they were learning from science. Following a brief introduction (chap. 1, "Scripture in Context"), *Scripture and Cosmology* is organized into three main parts.

In Part 1, "Scripture and Cosmos in Cultural Context," Greenwood takes the reader on a tour of "Ancient Near Eastern Cosmologies" (chap. 2), exhibiting how Israel's neighbors thought of the structure and nature of the cosmos. Drawing on a variety of ancient writings, carvings, and drawings to illustrate his analysis, Greenwood shows that the cosmos was consistently pictured on the model of a building. In particular, he sketches the common idea of the cosmos as tripartite, consisting of the heavens (above), the earth (as a flat land mass), and the sea (beneath and around the earth, usually thought of as a single cosmic ocean or deep).

In "Cosmology in Scripture" (chap. 3), Greenwood goes on to demonstrate how the same basic ideas show up in the Old Testament. Using a variety of biblical texts, Greenwood shows that the writers of scripture thought of the heavens as either a solid, dome-shaped structure overhead (the "firmament") or a taut tent that God stretched out (tents were more stable structures in the ancient world than we usually imagine). In either case, the heavens functioned as the roof of the world, serving to hold back the upper cosmic waters. The heavenly bodies—sun, moon, and stars—were fixed in the firmament and below it were birds and clouds, while God's throne was typically located above or upon the firmament. Greenwood thus distinguishes the "upper heavens," the realm of God and angels, from the "lower heavens," which included ordinary celestial phenomena, with the firmament in between. The heavens were supported by the distant mountains at the extremities of the earth, the roots of which went down into the subterranean waters; thus, the mountains also functioned as the foundations or pillars of the earth, which explained why it did not sink into the waters.

In chapter 4, "Cosmology and Cosmogony in Scripture," Greenwood endeavors to illustrate the pervasiveness of this understanding of the cosmos by drawing together a variety of creation texts from the Old Testament. His lucid analysis of the different creation accounts in Genesis 1 and 2 is especially helpful for anyone new to biblical studies, but his choice of other texts did not always seem intuitive (I could think of better ones), and the extreme brevity of his comments in some cases made me doubt the value of parts of this chapter. Yet Greenwood makes the important point that Genesis 1 is the only Old Testament creation account in which the idea of creation over six days is mentioned. And he wryly notes that while the Genesis flood is, indeed, worldwide (covering the known world), it is not technically "global," since the earth was not considered a globe.

While there is little new in Part 1 for biblical scholars (this is all widely agreed on), Greenwood goes on in Part 2, "Cosmology and Scripture in Historical Context," to narrate post-biblical changes in the accepted cosmology of Western culture, beginning with the shift from the ancient Near Eastern conception of a flat earth to the spherical earth introduced by the Greeks. In chapter 5, "Scripture and Aristotelian Cosmology," we find a helpful sketch of the contributions of Aristotle and Ptolemy to the development of the idea of a spherical earth at the center of the cosmos, around which revolved seven concentric spheres (seven heavens), in which the sun, moon, and five planets were embedded, with God's throne/dwelling beyond that. This new cosmology, which greatly expanded the imagined size of the cosmos, also included the Platonic idea of a corruptible sublunar realm, with everything beyond the moon being incorruptible (the circular motion of the sun, moon, and planets was thought to embody perfection).

Once this new cosmology became dominant in the church, it required some reinterpretation to harmonize it with the biblical world picture. In a fascinating account of how Augustine, Aquinas, Calvin, and Luther among others struggled to adapt the biblical picture to the new cosmology, Greenwood discusses the reinterpretation necessary for the "firmament," the waters above the firmament, the ends or corners of the earth, the "foundations" of the earth, and the nature of the underworld (Sheol/Hades)—to name just some of the ideas found in the Bible. Two examples of reinterpretation will suffice. Since the firmament could no longer be the dome in which the sun, moon, planets, and stars were embedded (they were not equidistant from the earth according to the new cosmology), it was now interpreted as the boundary of the seventh heaven, beyond which was the realm of God. The idea of a spherical earth resting on "foundations" was transformed into a metaphor for affirming that God kept the earth stable, without imagining literal pillars going down into the deep.

In chapter 6, "Scripture and Copernican Cosmology," Greenwood discusses the contributions of Copernicus, Galileo, and Kepler, whose work led to the heliocentric conception of the cosmos. In the remainder of the chapter, Greenwood focuses on the reception of Copernican cosmology by the Roman Catholic church, which was wedded to the Aristotelian view of the cosmos, and on ways in which Galileo, then later Luther and Calvin, tried to address the discrepancies between the Bible and the new cosmology. While the opposition of the Catholic church and Galileo's trial (then later inquisition)

are well known, it was instructive to read about the responses of the Protestant reformers, who had already worked at reconciling biblical cosmology with the Aristotelian view. Living so close to the rise of heliocentrism, they struggled to affirm the truth of the new cosmology and the teachings of the Bible, for example, how to affirm the nature of the sun and moon as "lights," given that the moon was not technically its own light source.

In Part 3, "Scripture and Science," Greenwood first (chap. 7, "Cosmology and the Authority of Scripture") develops Calvin's doctrine of divine accommodation to account for the disjunction between biblical cosmology, which utilizes ancient Near Eastern ideas as a vehicle for revealed truth, and our changing scientific understanding of the cosmos. Then, in chapter 8, "The Authority of Scripture and the Issue of Science," he uses the example of medicine to show the value of going beyond the "scientific" ideas assumed in the Bible, and then returns to how various Christian and Jewish theologians throughout history related the science of their day to biblical truth. He concludes with famous words from Charles Hodge and Augustine about respecting what experts in science tell us about the world instead of trying to make scripture speak authoritatively on that subject.

Since Greenwood's book is so helpful in what it accomplishes, I hesitate to raise criticisms or caveats. But a few are in order. First, Greenwood uses the term "worldview" as equivalent to cosmology, which is confusing and bypasses the immense literature on worldviews that has developed in the past half century. It would have been helpful if he had distinguished the *world picture* (German: *Weltbild*) or cosmology that the Bible assumes from its normative *worldview* (German: *Weltanschauung*), the distinctive and abiding theological vision that God was revealing precisely through this ancient world picture. The biblical writers were using an ancient cosmology to communicate a normative worldview meant to orient us to the ultimate meaning of this world.

One caveat that should be noted is that the ancient Israelites did not distinguish the upper heavens, the realm of God and the angels (pp. 85–89), from the lower heavens, the realm of birds, clouds, and celestial bodies (pp. 89–94), quite so clearly as Greenwood does (the terminology of "upper" and "lower" heavens is not actually biblical). True, Job 22:14 says that God walks on "the dome of the heavens" and God's throne is sometimes pictured as resting upon the firmament, which is sapphire/blue in color (Exod. 24:10; Ezek. 1:26). Yet Psalm 104:2–4 envisions God dwelling in the heavenly tent he has spread out, and he is portrayed as clothed in the light of the sun, with the winds and lightning as his servants—thus mixing phenomena from the so-called upper and lower heavens. This mixing is further evident in various biblical texts that identify stars with angels (Job 38:7; Judg. 5:20) and by the use of "the host of heaven" to refer variously to angels (1 Kings 22:19; Ps. 103:20–21), stars (Ps. 33:6; Isa. 40:26), or false gods (2 Kings 17:16; Isa. 24:21). In general, God is simply said to dwell "in" the heavens, which is a symbol for God's transcendence, since the sky above is generally inaccessible to us; but it is also a symbol of God's immanence, since God has chosen to dwell within the cosmos he created.

A second caveat would be that while the tripartite cosmos—heaven, earth, sea or underworld—is often in evidence in the Old Testament as Greenwood notes, Jonathan Pennington's *Heaven and Earth in the Gospel of Matthew* (Baker Academic, 2009) has decisively shown that this three-fold division is typically a function of a more fundamental bipartite conception of "heaven and earth" with the sea or the underworld as a subcategory of the earth. This is evident in the merism "heaven and earth" (Gen. 1:1 and 2:1), which signifies the entire cosmos. Thus, while Greenwood cites some New Testament texts that assume a tripartite cosmos (Phil. 2:10), others portray the cosmos as clearly bipartite (Matt. 6:10; Col. 1:16, 20; Eph. 1:10).

But perhaps my major substantial criticism would be that Part 2, "Cosmology and Scripture in Historical Context," ends too early, with the Copernican revolution. Even the chapter on modern cosmology feels unfinished; Greenwood just begins to discuss how Christians at the start of the modern period tried to relate biblical cosmology to the new scientific world picture. Minimally, this chapter needs some analysis of how "heaven" came to be understood as God's immaterial dimension (the way most Christians think of it today). This modern conception of heaven seems to have been motivated by the new ability to look at the night sky through telescopes; if God was not literally located somewhere "out there" in the cosmos (which made no literal sense), then "where" was he? To solve this conundrum, theologians were able to draw on the classical metaphysical notion of immaterial reality inherited from Neoplatonism, which was applied not just to God, but also to God's realm ("heaven"), thus generating the quite unbiblical idea that heaven is uncreated.

Also, it would have been extremely helpful if Part 2, "Cosmology and Scripture in Historical Context," had included a chapter on more-recent scientific

changes to our world picture, such as the Big Bang and a universe of billions of galaxies expanding and accelerating away from each other. Some reflection on how Christians have tried to connect this new cosmology to the Bible would be fascinating.

Finally, there were a number of proofreading or copy editing issues with the book. Thus "more temporary structure" on page 82 should actually be "more permanent structure"; here Greenwood is describing two metaphors that biblical writers used to describe the ceiling of the world: "One appealed to their nomadic past using tent imagery. The other employs the imagery of a more temporary structure." Then, at the bottom of page 163, "sun" and "earth" are reversed: Copernicus did not shift "the center of movement from the sun to the earth," but vice versa.

More confusing is that the term "hendiadys," used twice on page 86. It should be "merism," although technically a merism is a contrasting pair meant to include everything in between. Here "hendiadys" is used as a comprehensive list of items—five in one case (Ezek. 38:20) and three in the other (Zeph. 1:3).

But these are small details and do not really detract from a most helpful volume.

Reviewed by J. Richard Middleton, Northeastern Seminary at Roberts Wesleyan College, Rochester, NY 14617.

Science and Religion

FAITH AND WISDOM IN SCIENCE by Tom McLeish. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 2014. 304 pages. Hardcover; $32.95. ISBN: 9780198702610.

This is the best book I have read all year, and the best I would expect to read for a long time to come. It is a superbly crafted exploration of the relationship between science and faith (yes, another one of those, but stay with me a bit!) by an author deeply conversant with both topics. He is wise enough to discern the foundations on which both enterprises rest, humble enough to offer his observations without offense, and literate enough to do so in a marvelously well-written text. The book flows smoothly from one difficult topic to another, erudite but not showy, scholarly but not dense, bold but not brash.

Tom McLeish is Professor of Physics and, until recently, Pro-Vice-Chancellor for Research at Durham University in the United Kingdom. His specialty is the molecular theory of complex fluid flow, and stories from his own collaborative research find their way into the text. He is a public intellectual, drawing on his academic reputation to influence policy decisions regarding science. He is a Fellow of esteemed professional organizations, including the Royal Society. And he is also a Christian. He does not explicitly state that in this book, but his ruminations on scripture are not merely theoretical; they are also devotional. He writes of both faith and science as an insider, as one with investment and commitment to the enterprises they represent and the assumptions on which they are founded.

McLeish would have us do away with any notion that theology and science are distinct entities; he wishes to delete the "and" between those two words and substitute "of." He illustrates and initiates this agenda by proposing his own rudimentary theology of science, rooted in love.

McLeish is a story teller. He arrives eventually, in his penultimate chapter, at this theology of science by way of a series of small narratives, beginning with stories of natural philosophy, the love of wisdom in nature, which was what science was called before that word was invented in the early nineteenth century. The love of wisdom is a trait that both people of faith and people of science share, for example, Robert Brown (for whom Brownian motion is named), the thirteenth-century Bishop of Lincoln, the seventh-century Venerable Bede, and Macrina, the theologian sister of the fourth-century Cappadocian Fathers. These are fascinating and penetrating vignettes surveyed in chapter 2.

In chapter 3 he explores natural wisdom in the Old Testament, particularly in its multiple creation narratives in the Proverbs, Psalms, prophets, and, of course, Genesis. (A reader might be surprised to discover that the Jewish scriptures contain more than one, or even two, treatments of the origins of the natural world.) This culminates with a marvelous exegesis of the oldest and murkiest wisdom literature of the Jewish/Christian scriptures: the Book of Job. McLeish explores the story of Job through the lens of order and chaos in the natural world—how this is interpreted by his friends, by Job himself, and finally by the Lord speaking from a whirlwind. He then moves to the New Testament explorations of the meaning of the natural world, particularly as found in the themes of creation and reconciliation (to which he later returns).

His purpose in this highly informed biblical survey is to illustrate that the enduring questions of natural philosophy are rooted deeply in the pain and passion of human experience, and therefore they do not belong solely to the rationality of modern science. And science itself is not as rational, orderly, or methodical as its champions sometimes insist: