

Several enhancements of the book would be useful in a future edition. Charts 3, 9, 11, 14, 18, and 20 are all missing some of the European Hebrews scholars such as Franz Delitzsch, Erich Grässer, Ernst Käsemann, Otto Michel, Hans-Friedrich Weiss, et al. To the chart (#24; p. 58) concerning the text-linguistic structure of Hebrews, Cynthia Westfall, *A Discourse Analysis of the Letter to the Hebrews*, would add insights which Guthrie did not point out. On the chart (#23) regarding the chiasmic arrangement of Hebrews Vanhoye's structure is accidentally duplicated (pp. 56, 57). On the charts (#83-84; pp. 143-145) about the words of exhortation and the danger of apostasy in Hebrews the exhortation and warning of Heb 4:11 is missing. On p. 180 in chart #97, under significance and explanation to Heb 9:14, a long space has mistakenly been inserted right after the variant a. On p. 205 in chart #103, under unique words in Hebrews, the verb δέκατόω has been mistakenly duplicated instead of the following adjective δέκατο, η, ου. On p. 151, under the explanations for charts 83-87, chart #85 is mentioned twice instead of chart #84. By the way, the explanations for each chart at the end of the book rather than at the beginning of every chart are user-unfriendly. I understand the rationale for not having them at the beginning of each chart since it takes up space and the charts are intended to be used in teaching. Lastly a scripture index would be accommodating.

Overall, the book deserves a place in the library of students, teachers, and scholars who are interested in the book of Hebrews. Bateman is to be commended for the compilation of such a vast amount of information. I will use this book as a reference book in my teaching of Hebrews.

Andrews University

ERHARD GALLOS

Bod, Rens. *A New History of the Humanities: The Search for Principles and Patterns from Antiquity to the Present*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014. 400 pp. Hardcover, £45.00.

This book review on Bod's *History of the Humanities* deserves to be of a more elaborate nature than what is common. Bod's work did create a big sensation not only in the academic scene but also in the public and major newspapers in the Netherlands, England, and more generally Western Europe. Not only did he accomplish something that has not been done before, namely, a written history of the humanities, but he also takes a perspective to this enterprise that redefines the role of the humanities especially in relation to the natural sciences. His work will prove to be a milestone for the further development of both the sciences and the humanities.

Today's humanities are in a phase where methodological reorientation has to take place. After classicism, positivism, structuralism, and post-structuralism the question has to be answered how the humanities have to approach and analyze human works in the twenty-first century. This question becomes an increasingly important issue in a world of digitization where most important works of literature, art, and music are available in their original and digitized

form. How should the humanities relate to algorithms and digitization after they have been influenced so strongly by Dilthey's, Windelband's, and Rickert's distinction between the natural sciences as explaining sciences ("erklärenden Wissenschaften") and the humanities as understanding science ("verstehende Wissenschaften")?

Any attempt to answer this question should be informed by Bod's exceptional work. As professor of computational and digital humanities and as director of the Center of Digital Humanities at the University of Amsterdam, Bod does something that no one has done before. He has presented to the scholarly community the first history of the humanities. While there are many histories of sub-disciplines of the humanities (history of art, history of linguistics, history of musicology, etc.), no effort has yet been seen that tries to trace what the Western world has called disciplines of the humanities. Bod's broad perspective allows him to detect relations between the different disciplines that had not yet been uncovered in modern description. Further the broad perspective allows him to redefine the humanities and critique the distinction between humanities and the natural sciences, bringing them closer to each other. His historical investigation will show convincingly that the most fruitful periods of the humanities have been those where the search for patterns, laws and norms dominated the study of human activities (speaking, writing, painting, building, playing, acting). As qualifier for the attribute "fruitful," Bod takes the problem-solving approach (243) that the humanities brought to the real world (e.g., language acquisition, literary source reconstruction, testing of arguments, creating realistic drawing, etc.).

Bod's history of the humanities discusses four different eras of the humanities and watches the development and interrelatedness of what we nowadays handle as eight different disciplines: linguistics, historiography, philology, musicology, art theory, logic, rhetoric, and poetics. The second chapter deals with Antiquity, the third with the Middle Ages, the fourth with the Early Modern Era (Renaissance and Enlightenment), until the Modern Era is finally addressed in the fifth chapter. The fact that Bod treats the time of the Renaissance and the time of the Enlightenment as one unit is remarkable but convincing. At the moment where one decides not to be restricted by the findings and impacts of single disciplines of the humanities, one is free to focus on the analysis (disregarding which discipline is carrying out the analyzing act) of patterns to be found in the expressions of the human mind. It is Bod's comparative analysis of the formulation of laws, norms, and regularities, based upon found patterns, that allows for new insights. On the basis of these insights Bod suggests a reorganization of the different historical phases of the humanities and states that "the modern compartmentalization of the humanities should not stand in the way of its history" (358).

When one expects that Bod's history is dictated by a Western, postmodernistic, digital agenda, one errs substantially. Testifying to his sensitivity for culturalism, anachronism, and other forms of colonialization, Bod studies in a labor-intensive manner the history of the sciences in China, India, Arabia, and Africa. Wherever possible, he bases his description on

available primary sources (Latin, Germanic, Semitic, African, or Asian languages). Each of the treated historical epochs covers the development of the humanities in different regions and cultures of the world. Primarily due to the lack of accessible primary data, his research did not include Japan, pre-Columbian America, and some Asian cultures such as the Khmer.

Due to the broad approach of historical analysis, it becomes clear that from the very beginning of the humanities, there was no separation from what we call today the natural sciences. Musicology and mathematics, art theory and architecture, historiography and physics were exercising the same mental discipline: searching for patterns in order to detect rules, norms, or laws, by which solutions for the mastering of life can be found.

The global perspective of Bod's work makes one realize some strikingly similar developments that appear to us as a lockstep movement between the different continents and cultures. These observations cannot easily be explained. However, they invite us to revisit our own understanding of Western history. As an example, the perception that the historical-critical method was based primarily on a Cartesian rationalistic agenda and was mainly utilized for deconstructing the biblical sources of Christianity is too simplistic after all. Similar methods have been developed in China without religious motivations and without the support of revolutionary philosophical worldviews. The first formulation of a text critical methodology was established by Gu Yanwu in the early modern times (158). The Chinese used this method for the reconstruction of hypothetically original texts. Likewise, Islamic scholarship had produced with its *isnad* method ways of analysis that are strikingly similar to modern historic-critical methods. The *isnad* method, however, was religiously motivated, serving to protect the legacy of the prophet Mohammed. A historical survey shows that during the Christian Middle Ages techniques "for unmasking forgeries or tracking down corruptions were virtually lost" (246). Modern textual criticism should therefore be taken as a "resurgence" of a lost philological skill.

While Bod moves into details of musicology (Pythagoras, Liu An, Hucbald, Galileo, von Helmholtz, et al.), logic (Zeno, Aksapada Gautama, Abelard, Ibn Sina, Leibniz, Frege, et al.) or art theory (Pliny, Xie He, Procopius, Abu'l Qasim, Alberti, Burckhardt, Panofsky, et al.), he always strives to conceptualize his descriptions. A number of the generated insights are not only new for many scholars, they are also refreshing in such a way as to offer new ways of thinking about the identity and focus of one's own discipline.

The historical description presented in chapters 2-5 generates the data and insights by which the questions that are asked in the Introduction (chap. 1) can be answered. Among others the most central questions presented to the reader are the following:

Where and how do the research methods of the humanities and the natural sciences differ? (1)

When and why did the humanities and science develop in different directions? (1)

What does a comparison of the western history of the humanities with other regions of the world bring to the fore? (5)

In the sixth and last chapter, Bod concludes by dedicating his attention mostly to the relation of the humanities and the natural sciences. Different topics come to the fore when a historical assessment of this relation is studied. I would summarize the most important findings of Bod's work in the following eight points.

First, from its very beginning, the methodology of the humanities has often been similar to the ones of the natural sciences. As an example, linguists such as the Indian Panini (sixth century B.C.E.) have been very similar to mathematicians such as Euclid with regard to their analytic procedures. This can be observed while no mutual influence can be tracked. In both, the case of the mathematician and the case of the linguist, a finite number of rules is abstracted to form patterns by which an infinite number of expressions is possible (be that language, discourse, or mathematic calculations).

Second, due to their similar approaches to patterns found, cross-fertilization between the humanities and the natural sciences was possible. The stemmatology of philology that was developed in order to reconstruct authentic original sources has been applied to genetics and the reading of DNAs in modern times (276). Likewise, the formal analysis of human language exercised throughout history enabled the development of artificial languages (Leibniz) being virtually identical with Boolean logic (195). Consequently, linguistics made possible the development of computer science.

Third, Bod concludes that "Nowhere in our history of the humanities did we come across an acute divide between the humanities and sciences" (355). What both have in common and what constitutes both sciences is their search for underlying patterns. When those patterns are found, every science, whether natural or human, expresses these regularities either in logical, procedural or mathematical terms.

This does not mean that patterns are to be understood as universally valid laws, by which the expressions of the human mind are determined. Rather, the historical survey shows that the conceptualization of found patterns ranges between "inexact regularities and exact laws" (9). Bod's history remarkably shows that the general assumption that the one side of the spectrum deals with the humanities ("inexact regularities") while the other side of the spectrum characterizes the natural sciences ("exact laws") is incorrect and ahistorical. While such a distinction was stimulated and remains cultivated in our modern times, it is a distinction that was only theoretically and programmatically made by the German neokantian school of Dilthey, Windelband, and Rickert (late nineteenth, early twentieth century). This distinction could not be found in antiquity, the Middle Ages, Renaissance, or the Enlightenment period. Humanities and natural science were not studied as separate disciplines. The same can be observed in the history of the humanities in China, India, and Arabia. Not only is this distinction historically mistaken, it also does not describe the present state of pattern reception in the natural sciences, be that biology, chemistry, or even physics. A biological

“law” is today understood foremost as “a pattern that is usually local and not universally valid and is moreover often statistical” (355). Even for physics the reference to “exact laws” is only utilized in theoretical physics (356). In applied physics, constant corrections or “provisos” are exercised, relativizing the “exactness” of a law that is drawn from pattern detection.

Fourth, from early on but especially in the Middle Ages a general relativizing of formal logic within historiography, musicology, philology, rhetoric, and art theory can be observed. Valla (fifteenth century) and others argued that not everything that is formally correct is convincing to the mind. Similar findings have been made in art theory, where the revolutionary introduction of the vanishing point was first established with the help of mathematical laws (215). However, the calculation of the vanishing point had to be “corrected” by empirics after realizing the dependence of the true point of focus on light, color, and shade if one desires to produce more realistic pictures. This correction to the mathematical foundation yielded much more realistic art, as demonstrated especially by the Dutch artists (220-222). Likewise, musicology first based its work on pure Pythagorean ratios. However, the definition of consonants had to be adapted by empirical data where musical perception was not exactly in “tune” with Pythagorean mathematical harmonies. Generally speaking, the early modern period moved from a theory-dominated approach to empiricism, allowing for nuance in music theory, art theory, and other disciplines.

Fifth, the most insightful patterns have been found when the different disciplines did not operate in reductionist ways. The analyses of human expression are most insightful when they are studied for what they are and not as reduced products of neuropsychological events. Bod then suggests—not for ideological reasons but for pragmatic ones—that the different disciplines should remain autonomous in such a sense that they are allowed to come to their objects of research with their own specific tools of analysis.

Sixth, the detection of patterns can be dangerous as well. The sophistication of grammar did not only lay the basis for computer science; it also stimulated imperialistic thoughts and nationalism at the moment where comparative linguistics discovered the Indo-European language family. The historical survey shows that the humanities have not always served the “humanistic” dream of freedom, equality, democracy, love, and peace. Rather, the finding of patterns has stimulated the developments of ideas such as Aristotelian classicism (through logic and rhetoric) or racism (through comparative linguistics and philology). The scholarly treatment of detected patterns therefore has to be accompanied by ethical cautiousness.

Seventh, while pattern detection in musicology, logic, linguistics, philology, art theory, rhetoric, and poetics has brought very successful concepts to the fore, this cannot be said about historiography. After discussing idealist, romanticist, Marxist, historicist, positivist, narrativist, and postmodernist historiography, Bod summarizes in a convincing and refreshingly sober way that the “most extreme form of history that rejected patterns produced little historiography, as did the most extreme form of pattern-seeking history”

(265). Further he argues that history is the object of study in which the findings of patterns is possible, but it is impossible to orchestrate them into a theory of history due to the fact that “history gives no boundaries to its subject” (271).

Finally, Bod’s history presents a more nuanced understanding of western history and the development of modernity. It was not primarily the “new scientists” such as Kepler, Galileo, or Bacon that torpedoed the Christian-Aristotelian worldview. It rather was the sum of all early modern scholarship, with philology as the most influential element. With the humanists and their manuscript hunting (144), the need for the analysis of the reliability of the sources became important, especially since many forgeries were produced. With Valla’s employment of his principles of consistency (chronological consistency, logical consistency, and linguistic consistency) the foundation for modern source criticism has been laid. The fruitfulness of this approach has led to the well-known denial of the genuineness of the *Donatio Constantini*. The use of textual criticism furthermore was utilized as a weapon against the Roman Catholic Church during the reformation time (148). Further development of the text-critical method (especially under Lachmann)—resembling to a great extent the Islamic *isnad* method (150) and earlier Chinese textual criticism—led to the rejection of Erasmus’ “textus receptus,” the reconstruction of Lucretius’ works, and the *Nibelungenlied*. Finally, philology undermined what has been accepted as biblical authority. The consequences of the philological work stimulated the development of the modern worldview even more than the new sciences. National governments until this very day use source criticism and philology in order to establish the reliability of documents.

Clearly, Bod’s *New History of the Humanities* should be read by every scholar whether he comes from or comes to the field of natural science or the humanities. I would not be surprised if this work becomes one of the epochal works of the early twenty-first century.

Andrews University

OLIVER GLANZ

Brown, Warren S., and Brad D. Strawn. *The Physical Nature of Christian Life: Neuroscience, Psychology, and the Church*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2012. xii + 178 pp. Paper, \$28.99.

What are the ecclesiological implications of a wholistic anthropology? Profound, according to Warren Brown, professor of psychology at Fuller Theological Seminary, and his former student Brad Strawn, now of Southern Nazarene University. Their well-researched, succinct, and readable book offers a new perspective on Christian community. If human beings are both embodied in physical forms and embedded in the world around us, they argue—not only physically, but socially, culturally, and especially psychologically—then interpersonal connections are constitutive of our identity. When it comes to the Christian life, therefore, the church is not