more scandalous to prohibit women from speaking with men than it is to allow men and women to speak freely as long as our own sense of propriety is not offended" (p. 730). On the Lord’s Supper, they observe that the phrase “on the night he was betrayed” “reminds us that from its very institution the meal has always been in danger of being eaten by those who fail to live out its meaning” (p. 549). They warn that in an “evangelical culture” the Christian God has become “a tame God” (in contrast to Aslan in C. S. Lewis’s The Chronicles of Narnia), “into whose presence people feel free to enter in a trifling or frivolous manner” (p. 557).

The authors find the Corinthians to be divided by social stratification and succumbing to “a personality-focused approach to leadership, with its emphasis on the high rank of the leader and the status conferred on the follower” (p. 77). They take the puzzling directions in 7:36-38 to mean that Paul prefers betrothed people to stay betrothed and not to marry unless they feel they must. The statement that “Do not muzzle an ox” (Deut 25:4) is written “for us” applies to missionaries who “fall under the category of field laborers” (p. 406). The directions in 11:2-16 affirm gender distinctions and respect “culturally specific approaches to guarding moral and sexual purity” (p. 503) while fully integrating women into worship. The authors translate ἄρτος πνευματικόν (12:1) as “spiritual things” because they deem it less restrictive than “spiritual gifts.”

This meticulous, evenhanded commentary will richly repay multiple readings. It should well serve pastors and interpreters of Paul for many years.

David E. Garland, George W. Truett Theological Seminary, Baylor University, Waco, TX 76798


All those who know Collins’s work can celebrate her achievement in this Olympian commentary. The 100-plus-page introduction on the Gospel’s authorship, provenance, date, genre, christology, structure, audience, reception history, and text is itself a major contribution. Excursuses cover principal topics: John’s baptism, messianic secret, Son of Man tradition, the historicity of Judas, the Secret Gospel of Mark, Galilee and Jerusalem in Mark, scholarship on the passion narrative, resurrection in ancient cultural contexts. C. translates comparative material so that readers get a welcome flavor of those texts as larger wholes.

Collins combines other scholars’ views with clear statements of her own: evidence for Mark’s composition in Rome is weak; the Gospel is best seen not as biography or history but as an eschatological historical monograph; Mark wrote the story of the empty tomb. C. assesses the evidence for Jesus as a prophet, messiah, and teacher; she discusses his death at length both in the introduction and in the commentary.

Given the work’s obvious achievement, I step back to raise tentative questions both about the character of such a commentary and about the character it may impose on Mark’s Gospel. Mark’s story has odd moments. Jesus is apparently (never explicitly) the Son of Man who belongs in heavenly visions. He prevents many from understanding him (4:10-12). An angelus interpres appearing “seated on the right” (16:5-7) is inexplicably linked to the
naked young man (14:51-2) and to the Son of Man “seated on the right” of the power (14:62). The story ends enigmatically at 16:8. In a commentary’s scene-by-scene divisions, these quirks can be discussed individually and effectively defused; therefore we can forget how odd they seem.

Collins writes with unsurpassed authority about apocalypticism. But was the Gospel designed as an apocalypse, to disclose heavenly secrets—in particular the revelation of a heavenly figure? Those cryptic passages would then not be oddities to be quarantined but moments where the veil between earthly and heavenly is nearly torn apart. Was the audience to be systematically baffled, riddled, and awed into recognition of the Jesus unveiled? Study of a Gospel’s genre is a study of its function: what was it designed to effect?

So great is the volume of classical literature that scholars must choose either breadth or depth in adducing it. Correctly choosing breadth, C. marshals a dazzling repertoire of both ancient texts and modern scholars. This does come, however, at a cost. C. adduces Lucian’s *Demonax*, a *bios* of fifty-two witty remarks of the genial, undogmatic philosopher, with framing material. Lucian says that he writes so that the noblest in mind among those inclined to philosophy should have a modern exemplar, but the claim is interesting only if we ask how Lucian expected the text to achieve this success and how the achievement would be recognized.

Among the commentary’s richest pages are those that survey beliefs about the life that (immediately or eventually) follows death. Yet even C. cannot do justice to the inflections of consolation, encouragement, and warning that reveal a living and adaptable tradition. In *2 Enoch*, Adam lives in a paradise of perpetual light with an open heaven so that he might see the angels above. This paradise is prepared for the righteous. Like the Holy of Holies, the Garden was and will be a point of convergence between the earthly and heavenly. Similar connections appear in the Greek *Apocalypse of Moses* (compare the Latin *Life of Adam and Eve*), where paradise is the place or places at which earthly and heavenly—creatively and parenetically imagined—converge. The same image appears in Plutarch’s *Aemilius* 1.1-4 and *Perikles* 1–2 as well as in Philostratus’s *Life of Apollonius* 2.22; 4.7; 6.19. What matters is the function of the text.

Back to Mark. How were its listeners really to learn what needed to be learned, really to see what needed to be seen? Plutarch and Philostratus called for nothing more than careful, sophisticated reception. Mark makes a stranger claim: he needs his audience to recognize in Jesus the heavenly Son of Man. At issue are the conditions necessary for understanding. Mark’s audience, no less than Jesus’ contemporaries, might need their sight and hearing to be miraculously healed.

What, then, is Mark’s Gospel? If *bios* or historical monograph whose parenetic agenda is obvious, then we can simply adduce comparable texts with their comparable agenda, which C. so skillfully invokes. But both the Gospel and that comparative material are subtler and more opaque than such first-order comparisons allow. If the Gospel is an apocalypse, historical critics have a more delicate task: to study its strange function in communities far stranger to us than we usually recognize. Readers encounter in Jesus’ apparent defeat the victory of the Son of Man and so, in Daniel’s terms, the victory of the saints of the Most High. The earthly battle portended in Daniel’s dream had been fought and (implausible though it seems, in a world as fearful as it had ever been) won. Distinctions in the cosmic order and hierarchy dissolve. How suggestive those ancient paradises now become. Mark’s
Gospel is a parable. Those who take it as straightforward history are on the outside. Otherwise put, the Gospels are not simply texts about a revelation that was in the past; the Gospels are themselves, by design, revelatory.

We have multiple reasons to be grateful to C. for the map, immensely rich in detail and insight, that she gives of Mark's Gospel. She provides the deeper probe of the imaginative and intellectual engagement for which the Gospel calls. She helps us to ask the unsettling question: Are those who today read Mark's upside-down apocalypse as a straightforward narrative among those who in Mark's own terms are those who will not turn or be forgiven?

Robin Griffith-Jones, King's College London, London WC2R 2LS, United Kingdom


Farely's monograph is a revision of his doctoral thesis directed by Andrew T. Lincoln and Angus Paddison (University of Gloucestershire, 2009). His starting point is the conventional view that the Johannine disciples came to full faith in Jesus only after the resurrection when the Paraclete led them to greater understanding. F. challenges the position that misunderstanding implies lack of faith. Using narrative criticism primarily, he examines first the discipleship group, then offers a brief but insightful analysis of five key disciples: Peter, Judas, Thomas, the Beloved Disciple, and Mary Magdalene. This analysis leads to an evaluation of the disciples' faith and their understanding. In his final chapter, F.'s main dialogue partner is Rudolf Bultmann, selected because of his particular understanding of faith that requires knowledge: "Bultmann's existential understanding of faith leads him to present misunderstandings as occurring in the context of unbelief in the Fourth Gospel" (p. 223).

Farely positively evaluates the disciples' first encounter with Jesus (1:19-51), while recognizing that they lack full understanding of his mission and identity. He notes in this pericope the titles that the disciples use and the motif of witnessing. The following scene in the temple is particularly important, as it highlights the element of remembering and the retrospective understanding of the Scriptures (2:17, 22; cf. 12:16). These two scenes lead F. to conclude that faith "does not presuppose understanding" and that, after the resurrection, the disciples' faith continues, now aided by the proper interpretation of Scripture leading to a deeper understanding (p. 37). Another important scene for F. is the Bread of Life discourse, where some disciples remain with Jesus while others abandon him. Remaining with Jesus is a hallmark of the disciples' faith across John 5-10, despite their not understanding. F. also points to a pattern that emerges whereby in response to the disciples' lack of understanding, Jesus offers further teaching in preparation for a time when he is no longer present. His teaching continues through the Book of Glory, although the disciples continue to misunderstand and are apparently absent at his burial.

In his study, F. reveals that, although there are many ambiguities in the portrayal of the disciples, their presence throughout the narrative and beyond the cross presupposes a level of faith even without full knowledge. F.'s fine treatment of Judas shows the complexity