

“political theology,” “resurrection theology,” and so on) or segregatable themes without understanding how these work, and offer entry points for complex understanding. Interestingly the book does suggest that something more is required of a cross theology than simple explication of the cross, albeit in a very poor criticism of Douglas John Hall: “the real problem is that Hall is defining the theology of the cross narrowly, in this case restricting it to the atoning work of the crucified Christ” (p. 177). Yet the study simply misses the *theologia crucis* as a theological *mood*, a conditioning of theological instinct. My suggestion would be if one is unable to work through the massive undertaking of understanding the complex traditions of a theme/term’s use, and of the philosophical (re)conditioning of theological discourse, to simply to spend more time working through a manageable section of the chosen theologian’s writing (perhaps IV.1 in Barth’s case).

Unfortunately there is a rather amateurish reference to ATLA; several typographical errors; the citations of Nicholas Cusanus, Athanasius, Thomas, and Tauler are largely from secondary and not primary sources; and the Thomas who appears is a highly contestable one. It is worth mentioning a number of other claims and assertions that require more significant testing and complicating, and I do not have time to expose their troublesome nature here: talk of “a comprehensive theological system” (p. 16); that Luther’s talk about the “knowledge of God” is epistemological (p. 160); that Schleiermacher is guilty of “founding God experientially” (p. 213). What modern philosophical (more specifically Idealist) assumptions are discernible in separating Chapter 1 on a “classical [whatever that is] epistemology of the cross” from Chapter 3 on a “classical soteriology of the cross”? Readers of the range of medieval theologies will undoubtedly howl when they hear that the *ordo salutis* is “predicated on the notion that the human will is free and unencumbered, it holds the creature capable of conditioning its justification.”

John C. McDowell  
Research Office, University of Divinity

## SEEING BLOOD AND WATER: A NARRATIVE-CRITICAL STUDY OF JOHN 19:34

Sebastian A. Carnazzo

(Eugene, OR: Pickwick, 2012). ISBN: 978-1610979412.

If, in passing, commentators merely touch upon the complexities of interpreting John 19:34, Sebastian A. Carnazzo, *Seeing Blood and Water*, devotes a monograph to the verse. This volume is a modified version of a

thesis submitted at the Catholic University of America. The introductory sections appear patchy. There is a solid section on the previous interpretations of the verse; physiological, typological, sacramental, symbolic, and a brief section on narrative-critical methodology which reveals an extensive debt to Moloney. The date of the gospel is well handled, but the identity of John is basically a rehash of Raymond Brown's thesis that John the son of Zebedee is the best candidate, and there is no engagement with ancient records (Papias) which raise issues with this. Similarly, there is no critical engagement with the now-questioned view that the community is formed in a post-Jamnia expulsion of Christians based on the *Eighteen Benedictions*. There is no attempt to specify a specific location for the community which appears connected to the production and/or reception of the gospel. In short, the introductory work seems outdated, uncritical and over-reliant on scholarship of a certain age.

The background work in Chapter 2 is also problematic. There are two sections in this which claim to set out the cultural milieus of blood and water. Yet these are both very short. The section on Blood is restricted to OT and NT texts, with no reference to even the literature of the Qumran library or rabbinic tradition, let alone the whole gamut of Graeco-Roman religious or cult practice. Interestingly, the volume, whilst noting in the Acknowledgements the use of patristic and classical sources, contains no index for the same, and the classical sources not from within the Christian tradition cited in the bibliography are limited to Euripides (whose *Bacchae* should not be used as a liturgical source for Dionysian cultic tradition, especially four to five hundred years or so later).

In the section on water, there are minimal references in the footnotes to the existence of lustral rites in Graeco-Roman tradition, but these remain peripheral. This seems to set up a very limited milieu; Martin Hengel's *Judaism and Hellenism* long pointed out the extensive interplay between Hellenism and Judaism, and more recent scholarship (my own included) has pointed out that the cultures of the first century can no longer be seen as discrete, but must rather be considered to have porous boundaries. The end result appears an impoverished understanding of the cultural plurality of ideas and traditions which might have influenced both the writing and reception of the gospel; it seems to limit the flow of ideas to purely within Judaic tradition, and even that is restricted in scope. Its paucity can further be seen in the stated acknowledgement that the section on water is essentially a summary of Boismard's 1966 article "'Eau" (fn. 17, p.17).

The next chapters examine blood and water in the gospel before 19:34. Again the section on "blood" is disappointing. Carnazzo rightly notes the

difficulties of drinking blood as literally implying cannibalism, but does not address the full spectrum of Graeco-Roman use of blood, nor of the symbolic use of the phrase particularly in relation to the Psalms, and to 2 Samuel 23:17 and 1 Chron 11:19 which suggest Davidic precedents for drinking blood. Water is less problematic, seen as life-giving, purified and associated with the spirit. The launch point reached for the interpretation of 19:34 is that these two provide a stronger combination than blood and bread. It seems to this reviewer that playing down the significance of blood combined with bread—a combination which cannot be lightly dismissed, especially of the sacrificial implications of pouring blood, which need not demand any link with water, are borne in mind—is a necessary precursor to the association of blood and wine which is being proposed, and the argument made is not persuasive, not least because of the limited texts and imagery employed in exploration of the cultural milieu.

The nub of the argument is that Zechariah provides the point of departure for the interpretation of 19:34. Carnazzo makes a valid point when he stresses that Zechariah makes as plausible point of departure for the verse as other alternatives which have often been offered. He has, not, however, managed to rule out the cases that can be made for other alternatives, such as sacramentalism, albeit in a form different from the post-Augustinian forms which are more familiar today (thus Burchard and Kilpatrick). Lastly, the qualitative difference between this work and Moloney's show how narrative criticism must be anchored within a rigorous and broad reading of context.

Fergus King  
Trinity College, University of Divinity

## TO SEE INTO THE LIFE OF THINGS: THE CONTEMPLATION OF NATURE IN MAXIMUS THE CONFESSOR AND HIS PREDECESSORS

Joshua Lollar

(Turnhout, Belgium: Brepols, 2013). ISBN: 978-2503548937

Lollar's historical investigation aims to disclose key structures within traditions of analyses (θεορία) undertaken by ancient Greeks and Christians, that aimed at the disclosure of structures which, hidden,