Chris Green’s *Sanctifying Interpretation* is an important contribution to Charismatic and Pentecostal theology. It is particularly significant because it is the first monograph within the ongoing Spirit/Pentecostal/Pneumatic hermeneutics conversations to seriously identify and tackle the role of sanctification within interpretation. Green's aim is “to make a case for thinking differently about how and why we read Scripture, focusing on the ways the Holy Spirit uses our readings to work sanctification in and through us” (161). He believes that traditional Evangelical methods of approaching Scripture, which Pentecostals have tended to hold to, have resulted in an over-emphasis on epistemology (how we know) when “the real work of interpretation” lies within the soteriological dimension, particularly “the way in which God works in and through our readings of Scripture to form us into Christlikeness” (113). He argues for an interpretive reframing in the way Scripture is approached, which places sanctification centrally. Sanctification, he stresses, correcting what he believes is the most basic failure of the holiness movement, should be thought of “in terms of *being conformed to Christ*” and not “in terms of overcoming sin” (64, italics original).

There are three parts to the book: vocation, holiness, and scripture. The central premise of the book—conformation to Christ by the Spirit's sanctifying work upon the individual—is considered in respect of vocation, and holiness, building to the heart of Green's argument, with the implications of this on the interpretation of Scripture.

In Part One, Green argues that “we are called to share in Christ's vocation, joining him in bringing to bear God's holiness for the good of all creation” (109). He explains that to share in Christ's vocation is also to share in his identity (15) and therefore, aspects of Christ's life such as learning obedience through suffering (15) and priestly mediation (“connecting God to the people and God's people to one another” (30)) are parts of our vocation and identity.

Part Two continues, asking, “what is the character of the holiness that we are called to bear? How does the Trinity sanctify us and what does this sanctification require of us? What does it mean for us to co-operate with the Spirit’s work?” (63). I welcome Green's emphasis on conformation to Christ by the Spirit's intercession but I wonder if the emphasis is at the expense of highlighting the personal requirement and responsibility to engage with the Spirit's work or sanctification? Perhaps I am doing him a disservice here though, for this
is not his focus, and for well-argued reasons of redressing the holiness movement’s emphasis on sanctification as overcoming sin.

In Part Three, Green brings vocation and holiness into conversation with the interpretation of Scripture, exploring how reading Scripture draws us into holiness and (trans)forms us “for our vocation as Christ’s co-sanctified co-sanctifiers” (109). In keeping with his belief in the need to shift from epistemological to soteriological methods of interpretation, Green shifts the emphasis from how our (pneumatic) interpretation of Scripture is altered as we are sanctified and conformed, to how this sanctification and conformation affects the ability to pneumatically interpret. He writes that whilst wholeheartedly believing in divine revelation, he also holds that “Scripture has the deeper purpose of making us wise ... Scripture, read with and in the Spirit, actually works to conform us to Christ, materializing his character in us, incorporating us into his identity.” (110, italics original). His point then, is that the Spirit, through Scripture, transforms us in the depths of our being, sanctifying us, and conforming us to Christ. It is in this process that we discover who we are (our vocation) and this renews our vision (111). Therefore, it is our conformation and sanctification that is the most important factor, not what we can or cannot “see.”

Green’s strength lies in his incorporation of thought from across church history and outside of his own Pentecostal denomination. Historical scholars such as Augustine of Hippo, John Wesley, Dietrich Bonhoeffer and Thomas Torrance are all incorporated, and Rowan Williams and John Webster are contemporary favourites. This inclusion alongside Pentecostal scholars such as James K.A. Smith or Cheryl Bridges Johns deeply enriches his offering (see, for example, his reflections on liturgy (50–54)). I was confused therefore, regarding Green’s advocacy of shifting from Evangelical frameworks of interpretation to early Pentecostal hermeneutics as a basis for an interpretive framework (chapter 6) because, for me, this does not align with the rest of his approach. Green highlights hidden treasures within early Pentecostal hermeneutics, but I would argue that there are pearls of great price within historical-grammatical principles of interpretation that should not be discarded. The desire amongst Pentecostal scholarship to correct what some see as the dominance of Evangelical frameworks is understandable, but surely the richer (and more ecumenically-inclusive) ground will be found by seeking and applying the riches across both fields of interpretation?

Contained within the pages of Sanctified Interpretation are an abundance of (related) themes that weave throughout the book. Many I found to be deeply thought provoking, some even finding their way into my personal prayer journal. Space permits that I highlight only one and the theme I choose is Green’s emphasis on the importance of recognising the limitations of interpretation.