parallels from the Greco-Roman world that will benefit students by pointing them to primary sources that will shed light on the world of Paul and his hearers. Perkins rejects the arguments of rhetorical approaches that 1 Corinthians is a speech framed as a letter. Nevertheless, she incorporates questions raised by rhetorical analyses into her epistolary approach. She also recognizes that Paul commonly employed rhetorical devices as part of his persuasive strategy (e.g. prosopopeia, diatribe). Reflection on theological themes at the end of each section of commentary will make this volume especially useful as a text for seminary students and ministers. The commentary does not significantly advance scholarly discussion of 1 Corinthians, but it will serve as an excellent introduction to major issues in reading and interpreting the letter.

Matthew P. O’Reilly
University of Gloucestershire


According to Míguez, Paul was the intellectual organizer of innovative social practices that brought about a new conceptual reality for believers. 1 Thessalonians is the earliest extent document reflecting Paul’s “Christian strategy” to expand into the Gentile world by creating a Christian counterculture. It is a “revolution of resistance and anticipation”—resistance to Roman hegemony and anticipation of a new political reality inaugurated through the resurrected Christ in the parousia. Míguez uses both sociocultural exegesis and philosophical theology to support his reading of the text of 1 Thessalonians. Unfortunately, he relies on a limited and dated bibliography that ignores much that has been published since the mid-1990s on the sociocultural context of Thessalonike that would have greatly enhanced and strengthened his core arguments. Yet a historical explication is of less concern to Míguez than a political-theological reading of 1 Thessalonians for evidence of the confrontation of Pauline Christ groups with the Roman Empire. Although written as an academic work, with its genesis in a dissertation completed twenty years ago, the intended readers are decidedly Christian, with Míguez aiming to recover the “counterhegemonic value of Pauline symbolism” for new sociopolitical realities of modern churches.

Richard S. Ascough
School of Religion, Queen’s University


Roitto’s revised doctoral dissertation aims at using areas of cognitive psychology to assess how the author of Ephe-

sians worked toward the formation of identity and ethical behavior in the letter. After providing thorough clarification of his methodology (roughly half of the book), he analyzes Ephesians in light of it. He outlines the entire letter with this approach in mind, supplying a helpful analysis of the relationship between the “two halves” of Ephesians (Chapters 1–3; Chapters 4–6), the question of the relationship between the ekklesia and Israel, and by focusing largely on the author’s strategy for identity formation in Eph 4–6. Roitto provides an astute assessment of the household code (Eph 5:21–6.9), and the characterization of “Gentile living” (Eph 4:17–24), as well as key in-group attributes promoted by the author (e.g., knowledge, faith, love, righteousness, unity, speech). He concludes that the author’s rhetorical strategy was, by providing narrative rationale, to move the recipients closer toward becoming “prototypical” Christ-believers. Readers with little familiarity of cognitive psychology may find his methodological chapters a bit abstruse, but his thesis provides a much-welcomed assessment of how the human mind works, and what that contributes toward understanding Ephesians’ vision of identity in Christ for early Christ-followers.

Justin G. Winzenburg
London School of Theology


In this self-described theologically oriented study, Williams provides a detailed exegesis of select passages in the First Letter of Peter that concern the nature of salvation articulated in the epistle. Key to what Williams describes as his “theological-critical” methodology is the confessional claim that postulates God as the ultimate author of Scripture. Guided by this contention, Williams proposes to uncover the meaning placed in the text of 1 Peter by the divine and human author. Williams does an admirable job of emphasizing in this study the pervasive theme of election that one encounters in 1 Peter, a theme that he also persuasively connects to the community’s experience of enduring societal scorn. At the same time, there are problematic features in his analysis. As perhaps to be expected given William’s clear confessional claims, he rejects other hermeneutical approaches that seek to locate the meaning of a text either in the reader or the interpretive community. While Williams is, of course, forced to admit that there can be nothing like a presupposition-less exegesis, his claim to give a “literal” reading of 1 Peter is frequently compromised by the very confessional claims that consistently guide his reading of the text, especially his claim that a key component of 1 Peter’s concept of salvation relates to a doctrine of Christ’s death as a substitutionary atonement.

Kevin B. McCruden
Gonzaga University