picture that emerges in such a storyline immediately challenges the traditional assumption and suggests a more holistic scenario for salvation.

In many ways, Middleton's study intersects with the issue of theodicy. For example, he presents a positive view of judgment and of the Second Coming, which are often negatively perceived by many Christians. Further, in affirming the reversal of evil and death, and in fleshing out a material and this-worldly redemption, the author not only emphasizes the goodness of creation, he also highlights the goodness of the Creator-Redeemer God. This feature is also noted when he contrasts the character of the biblical God with that of ANE gods (51) or when he explains that without bodily resurrection the Creator's purposes cannot be complete (154), i.e., a reversal of the present evil state of affairs is needed for the purposes of a good Creator to come true. Finally, his positive view of God seems to lead him to conclude the wicked will eventually go through annihilation instead of eternal torment (207).

Middleton articulates his arguments persuasively and presents a coherent picture of the Bible story. I would only disagree with him in issues that are too minor to mention here. However, there is one he was not able to successfully explain: Luke 23:43. In this text, the author could not harmonize the temporal marker “today” with Jesus’s resurrection on the third day and later ascension. He does make several accurate and insightful remarks in his discussion of the text, however he was not able to remain consistent to his plan there. Not finding a solution to the tension, and perhaps in exhaustion, Middleton withdraws from the discussion, saying “in the end” this point “does not matter” (236). I can understand his frustration, but hope that future scholarship might help to resolve this difficulty.

*New Heavens and a New Earth* is a pleasant read which has a healthy approach to biblical eschatology. Middleton’s concern for holistic salvation can positively impact the way people live today. His challenge to end sociological dichotomy promotes reconciliation among people and appreciation for those who are different from us. But Middleton’s most significant contribution is his broad view of the canonical story, which, applied to the issues of the bodily resurrection of humans and the restoration of the earth, led to a more convincing scenario than what previous studies had shown. Such an approach will help readers from all traditions to gain fresh perspectives on the biblical text. The book will be valuable to biblical scholars, theologians, pastors, and educated lay members who are interested in the biblical metanarrative, eschatology, and holistic living. I hope it enjoys a wide readership.

Berrien Springs, Michigan

Flavio Prestes III


Accordance Bible software was first released in 1994, marking 22 years of serving biblical scholars, pastors, and laypersons. Its history actually goes back to 1988 with the release of The PerfectWord, bought by Zondervan and renamed MacBible in 1989. Despite the major developments that have taken
place within computer technology during these last decades, Accordance is still thriving. At present it is definitely among the leading Bible software options. The nine major updates, not to speak of minor updates, tell a story of unceasing work and painstaking effort.

A major drawback, however, has been that it could run natively only on Mac. The last ten years it has been possible to use the Basilisk II emulator to run it on Windows, but it could not run on Windows as a native program. In September 2013, the Windows version was launched. According to OakTree it is now the “only cross-platform Bible program which utilizes a single codebase and runs natively on both Mac and Windows.”

It has been a goal for Oaktree that Accordance should be a stable and fast software. The initial version I got had some issues with the installer program freezing during the installation process. The helpful support team solved this issue for me effectively and quickly. On a regular basis I have received new updates fixing bugs that I or other users have experienced. It seems that now most of the these problems have been fixed.

So far, it has satisfied my expectations in regard to speed. Searching for a lemma or phrase is done very efficiently, and if you do not know the correct codes for the specific search you want to do, right-clicking in the “Argument Entry” box (the search window) will give you a menu for the various search commands. The possibility of simply typing in the word or string of words that you are searching for in the Argument Entry box is another feature that greatly enhances efficient searches in a given text. By writing a semicolon between biblical references in the search field (e.g. “Exod 20:24; Deut 12:13–14”) you get the given passages in order, something that facilitates easy comparison. I also enjoyed the possibility of being able to open multiple workspaces, so it is possible to quickly switch between workspaces set up for different studies in the HB and the NT, for example.

I find Accordance’s syntax search to be more intuitive than syntax searches I have used in other programs. Ctrl+1 opens the “Simple Construct” for the source in the active tab. Ctrl+2 opens “Greek Construct” (for Greek/Latin), and Ctrl+3 opens the “Hebrew Construct” (for any Semitic language). It is also possible to search in multiple sources simultaneously.

Copying a lemma or the form of the word or phrase you prefer is also done with just a few clicks. As the copied text of the original languages is formatted in Unicode, this also avoids problems of word order and right-to-left issues in the Hebrew text. This can save you a lot of frustration when copying Hebrew text into a Word document. The only formatting issue I experienced when I pasted a Hebrew text into a Word document was when the copied Hebrew text had a text-critical reference. This creates a right-left distortion, which can be solved by copying with “No Superscript.” Under “Preferences” you can also choose whether you want to strip the characters of cantillation only, vowels and cantillation, or all marks. The appearance of the text-critical apparatus in the “Instant Details” field worked nicely, as there is no need of other information in this field when checking the critical apparatus.
I find the most interesting features of the Accordance program are the “INFER,” “SEARCH BACK,” and “FUZZY SEARCH.” This allows you to do searches on parallels between passages, often called intertextuality. The INFER function (Ctrl+Shift+I and then link to another source) allows you to do searches between two sources in the same language. In the source ("secondary text") where you want to find possible parallels, make sure that the bar beside the Argument Entry box says 'verses' and that you have open only the text you want to search in (e.g. "Deut 24:1–22" or "Exod–Deut"). In the tab with the primary text you limit the range of the amount of text you want to compare with (e.g. under "range" limit it to for example “Jer” or “Jer 3”). Given the choices you have made in the INFER tab, a set of highlighted verses will appear. In the above example, יֶתֻתיִרְּכ רֶפֵס is highlighted in Jer 3:8.

By using the SEARCH BACK function the program will give you the context of the parallels in the source in the linked pane. This function can be accessed by right-clicking on the highlighted phrase and choosing 'Search Back Linked Text' in the pane that opens. For יֶתֻתיִרְּכ רֶפֵס in Jer 3:8, the above mentioned search will give you יֶתֻתיִרְּכ רֶפֵס in Deut 24:1, 3 (since Isa 50:1 was not included in the search range). Ignoring word order is also an option. A more flexible search than SEARCH BACK is possible with the FUZZY SEARCH option (Shift+right-click). Similar searches can be done in translations as well.

Of course, the program does not do all the work for you. Some parallels might be significant and others insignificant, depending for example on whether the phrases are unique or distinct in the two parallel passages. However, to my knowledge, Accordance is the only Bible software to date offering this search function.

There is one option I missed and wish Accordance would include in future versions of the INFER search to enhance the tool even more. The program now automatically ignores phrases with 50% or more common words, which is convenient. But it would have been preferable if the user could define the upper limit of occurrences of words in the searched texts, for example, to limit the search such that that words appearing more than 5 times in the HB would not be included. This would have enabled a quick search for words or phrases that are unique, significant for determining cases of reuse.

One final point that is helpful to be aware of: if you want to, for example, search for parallels between Isa 58 and the rest of the HB in BHS, you open two sources with BHS. If you simply search for parallels between Isa 58 and the rest of the HB, the entire text will be highlighted as Isa 58 apparently belongs to the range of the HB. Therefore, you would need to limit the range. The easiest way to do this is to define your range with the command, [RANGE *] <NOT> [RANGE Isa 58]. In an INFER search, you can simply add the INFER command to that string (e.g. [INFER 6 BHS] <AND> [RANGE *] <NOT> [Range Isa 58]).

Another convenient tool for cross referencing is to hover the cursor over a given text reference and click “Amplify,” “Parallels,” and then “OT in NT.” This is a simple way of finding possible cases of reuses in the NT of a given...
OT passage. A similar but more advanced tool is the module “Comprehensive Bible Cross References.” However, these two options are based on compilations somebody has made of possible references, while the INFER search is a tool that enables you to do the primary research yourself, independently.

One area where I see potential for improvement is in aesthetics. It might be an issue of personal taste, but in my opinion, the interface for the Windows version is a little too technical and crowded in its appearance. The Mac version here seems somewhat more tidy and aesthetically pleasing. I would also have liked the possibility of removing some functions in the workspace that I do not use on a regular basis. For example, it’s possible to remove the toolbar with Ctrl+Alt+0, but are a number of other buttons I would have preferred to remove if I could. Further, OakTree has designed its own fonts. Even though I have used the interface on a daily basis for the last several months, I still find myself enlarging the font more than I would normally need to when using other Bible software, especially for the Hebrew characters. To be comfortable reading it, I’m up to size 27 font! In my opinion, the Hebrew font in Accordance simply does not look nice in smaller sizes.

Overall, Accordance® 10 for Windows provides superior speed in searches; has an intuitive syntax search; offers unique tools, like INFER and SEARCH BACK; and offers add-on modules that provide sources for one’s specific area of interest. Though there are the few aforementioned, minor issues, Accordance can be used by the specialist, pastor, and layperson to greatly enhance the study of the Bible.

Berrien Springs, Michigan

Kenneth Bergland


Ronald Osborn’s recent book, *Death Before the Fall*, consists of a larger part 1, “On Literalism,” and a shorter part 2, “On Animal Suffering.” This book has been described as “intelligently argued yet pastorally sensitive” (Celia Deane-Drummond), and “sophisticated” (John F. Haught) (1). The book is also recommended by John Walton in a brief foreword (7–8). Osborn aims to make the problem of animal suffering less troublesome by arguing against “biblical literalism” in order to allow for animal suffering and death before the fall of humanity into sin. In other words, his book is an articulation of his proposal that death before the fall is a partial solution for two real problems—animal suffering and biblical literalism.

Part 1 includes nine chapters that contrast what Osborn regards as a legitimate literal interpretation of the Bible (ch. 1) against an illegitimate wooden literalism in the interpretation of the Bible (ch. 2). He also critiques the illegitimate literalism that is sometimes present in the interpretation of the results of the scientific study of nature (ch. 3). For him, a legitimate literal interpretation can support the views of “theistic evolution” or “process creation” (37). In contrast, an illegitimate literalism is present in biblicism,