

## RECENSIONES

Daniel MOULINET. *Guide bibliographique des sciences religieuses*. Paris, Éditions Salvator, 2000. (14×21), 487 p. ISBN 2-7067-0259-1. € 30,18.

Ce *Guide bibliographique des sciences religieuses* s'est élaboré en collaboration avec Philippe Mercier, professeur d'exégèse de l'Ancien Testament, dans le cadre du cours d'initiation bibliographique donné à la Faculté de théologie de l'Université de Lyon. L'ouvrage comporte trois parties.

Dans la première partie (1-23), D.M. donne sous le titre «Quelques principes de base» les indications d'utilisation de l'ouvrage, la présentation des références bibliographiques, une bibliographie des guides utiles à la préparation d'un mémoire ou d'une thèse, et la bibliographie de son propre ouvrage. La seconde partie (25-408) comporte le «Guide bibliographique» à proprement parler. Après un aperçu des instruments de travail généraux (encyclopédies religieuses et bibliographies générales en sciences religieuses), suivent 21 sections couvrant les diverses matières. Elles sont présentées dans l'ordre alphabétique: Catéchèse (41-43), Congrégations religieuses (45-72), Droit canonique (73-89), Exégèse et sciences bibliques (91-130), Hagiographie (131-135), Histoire de l'art religieux (137-151), Histoire et théologie des religions (153-162), Histoire religieuse (163-193), Islam (195-204), Judaïsme (205-217), Liturgie (219-230), Magistère (231-243), Missiologie (245-257), Morale (259-274), Œcuménisme et dialogue interreligieux (275-291), Patristique (293-315), Philosophie (317-328), Religions orientales (329-337), Sociologie religieuse (339-344), Spiritualité (345-351), Théologie (351-409). Dans chacune de ces sections, les références bibliographiques sont données dans le même ordre: manuels et instruments de travail, dictionnaires, bibliographies, collections et revues. La troisième partie (409-487) contient les «Annexes» avec les adresses des bibliothèques spécialisées (411-431), l'index des noms d'auteurs (433-452), l'index des revues (453-469), un très utile index des matières contenues dans les revues à l'orientation bibliographique (471-473), et enfin les abréviations (475-479).

Dans l'«Introduction», l'auteur indique qu'il ne signale que les revues qui sont disponibles dans les bibliothèques françaises. Pour les collections, il a opéré une sélection. La revue *ETL* se trouve mentionnée dans la section «Théologie» (voir p. 367-369, 394) avec un compte-rendu détaillé de la structure le *Elenchus bibliographicus* annuel, mais la collection *Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium* n'est pas reprise. Cependant, bien des ouvrages de la *Bibliotheca* sont signalés (voir par ex. p. 112) avec le sigle *BETL*, mais cette abréviation n'apparaît nulle part dans la liste des abréviations.

Bien qu'il ne soit pas toujours précis, ce guide mérite d'être conseillé non seulement aux étudiants qui commencent une dissertation doctorale, mais aussi aux professeurs et aux chercheurs travaillant dans un des domaines des sciences religieuses.

G. VAN BELLE

J.-M. AUWERS – A. WÉNIN (eds.), *Lectures et relectures de la Bible. Festschrift P.-M. Bogaert*. (BETL, 144.) Leuven, University Press – Peeters, 1999. (16x24), XLII-482 p. ISBN 90-429-0745-2 (Peeters), 90-6186-957-9 (University Press). FB 3000.

Twenty-one friends and colleagues of Pierre-Maurice Bogaert have contributed an essay to the Festschrift that was published on the occasion of his sixty-fifth birthday under the redaction of J.-M. Auwers and A. Wénin, his colleagues at the Université catholique of Louvain-la-Neuve. Bogaert's scholarly work covers a wide range as can be seen in his Bibliography (XIII-XXX; some 150 titles for the years 1956-1998). As an exegete of the Old Testament, Bogaert has published studies on the Masoretic text as well as on the Septuagint and on the Old Latin and Vulgate versions. Through the work on the latter he became also very much interested in the reception of the Bible text. Moreover, ever since the publication of his translation and commentary of 2 Baruch and Ps-Philo's Biblical Antiquities in the series of the "Sources Chrétiennes" (nos. 144-145, 1969, and 229-230, 1976), he has always kept a keen interest in the intertestamental literature. Finally, one should not be surprised also to find in the list of his publications an occasional contribution in the field of New Testament studies.

All these disciplines are represented in the four parts that constitute this volume. Part I, on the Masoretic text, contains essays by M. Vervenne (textual criticism of Ex 14,20), F. Gonçalves (the relationship between 2 Ki 18-19 and Isa 36-39), J. Vermeulen (literary criticism of Jer 31,31-34), B. Renaud (the differences between the Hebrew and Greek version of the same passage from Jer), and J. Lust (diaspora and dispersion in Ez). Part II, on the Greek and Latin versions of the OT, is the longest with seven essays: A. Schenker (the translation of בְּרִית), J.W. Wevers (the Balaam narrative in the LXX), R. Hanhart (Greek and Old Latin version of 1-2 Ezra), J.-C. Haelewyck (the Latin version of Esther in the first edition of the Alcala Bible), M. Gilbert (additions to Sir 24), M. Harl (Soph 3,7-13 in the LXX and early Christian tradition), and A. Wénin (a discussion of A. Kabasele Mukenge's monograph on Baruch). The intertestamental literature and the New Testament are dealt with in Part III in the essays by E. Tov (papyrus fragments in Qumran), J.-M. van Cangh (Mk 14,22-26 par.), C. Focant (Ps 22 in Mk), and J.-M. Sevrin (1 Cor 2,9 and its parallel in the Gospel of Thomas as a Jesus saying). Five other essays are collected in Part IV under the title "Reception of the biblical text": S. Brock (Gen 1,2 in the Syriac tradition), G. Dorival (Origen on the OT), F. Dolbeau (a medieval Latin poem on the OT), J.-P. Delville (OT quotations in the Vita of Julienne of Cornillon), and A. Kabasele Mukenge (Gen 4,1-16 in an African context).

Bogaert's three NT colleagues in the Faculty have contributed an article. Van Cangh takes up S. Dockx's "interesting hypothesis" (*Chronologies néotestamentaires*, 1976) that Mk 14,24b is a later insertion in a more original version of the Supper tradition. The covenant saying of v. 24 stems from a relatively ancient Palestinian tradition (older than the Pauline version in 1 Cor 11,25 and the Lukan version of 22,20), but would have been inserted here only in the hellenistic communities, because the identification of wine with blood that results from it would have been offensive to a Jewish mind. The saying otherwise also better fits a Jewish-Christian milieu (esp. the allusion to the Servant poem in Isa 53).

Focant discusses the function of the allusions to (vv. 24 and 29-32) and citation (v. 34) from Ps 22 in Mk 15. He is critical of attempts to soften or to do away with the embarrassing words of Jesus in v. 34. If Mark's use of Ps 22 can be regarded as a "reverse reading of Ps 22" (so V.K. Robbins), the complaints of the Psalmist that were alluded to in vv. 24 (Ps 22,19) and 29-32 (22,7-9) culminate in the cry of v. 34 (22,2). "Le sentiment d'abandon est abyssal, la déréliction est à son comble et débouche sur une terrible question à Dieu, le pourquoi de son abandon" (302).

Sevrin's main interest is in the parallel to 1 Cor 2,9 in the Gospel of Thomas (GT 17), but he also discusses some other attestations of the saying in the Manichaean fragments found at Turfan, the Acta Petri, Ps-Titus, the Apostolic Constitutions, and Clement of Alexandria. The question whether we should accept Origen's suggestion that Paul is citing from an "Apocalypse of Elijah" (307: "Faut-il, avec Origène, l'attribuer à une Apocalypse d'Élie? Nous en savons trop peu ...") was addressed extensively, and answered negatively, in my essay *Origen on the Origin of 1 Cor 2,9* (R. Bieringer, *The Corinthian Correspondence*, 1996). Sevrin examines three differences between GT 17 and the saying in 1 Cor. GT adds "I will give you" at the beginning and "what the hand has not touched" after the doublet "eye-ear", and leaves out the final reference to "God and those who love him". All three modifications can be regarded as redactional changes that fit in with the overall perspective of GT: "celui-ci transforme en parole de Jésus la phrase traditionnelle citée par 1 Co 2,9" (324). Direct dependence on the letter is thought to be "improbable" because GT gives a much more eschatological interpretation of the saying.

In a fine contribution on the academic and scientific career of the honoree, his former colleague J. Ponthot describes Bogaert as "un collègue apprécié certes pour sa haute compétence et un renom justifié, mais aussi pour son aménité, son sens du devoir d'état et une disponibilité désintéressée ... Sensible à l'humour, il sait aussi considérer les personnes et les événements avec une lucidité amusée mais aimable" (xxxiv-xxxv). I cannot imagine that one would not agree with these lines.

J. VERHEYDEN

Klaus KOENEN – Roman KÜHSCHMELM. *Zeitenwende*. (Die Neue Echter Bibel. Themen, 2.) Würzburg, Echter Verlag, 1999. (15,5×23,5), 129 p. ISBN 3-429-02146-4.

"Zeitenwende", which means the "turning of an era", is used here as the title of a book on messianic and/or eschatological expectation in the Old and the New Testament. It is the second in a new series of studies ("Themen") that will contain thirteen volumes dedicated to topics of biblical theology. Other volumes will deal with the one God, the neighbour, the Kingdom, the Messiah, evil, reconciliation, creation, Jewish and Christian festivals and liturgical feasts, poverty and wealth, anthropology, the Spirit, and death and resurrection. The series is edited by C. Dohmen and T. Söding and reflects a view on studying biblical theology as being the result of a dialogue between an OT and a NT scholar, such as they have propagated this in some of their writings. Consequently, each volume is written by two authors and consists of two parts.

Klaus Koenen surveys the most important passages in the Prophets that refer to the coming of a new age, of future salvation and of judgment. He lists the main

motifs that are used to express these ideas (the new Exodus, the restoration of Israel, the new Jerusalem or the new Temple, the Messiah, a reign of peace, a new people, resurrection). Roman Kühschelm follows a different outline. He discusses the announcement of judgment in the preaching of the Baptist and in the Kingdom message of Jesus, the significance of Easter and the gift of the Spirit, the futuristic-apocalyptic eschatology of the early church, as this is expressed in various ways in the synoptic gospels (Mk 13,24-27 par., Mt 25,31-46, and the apocalyptic discourse of Lk 17,22-37) and some of the letters of Paul (esp. Rom 8 and 1 Cor 15), and the experience of presentic eschatology that is witnessed in Col and Eph, the Johannine writings, 1 Peter, and Hebrews. The volume concludes with a “dialogue” between the two authors (111-117), which is not really a dialogue but rather an attempt by both authors to look from the OT into the NT and vice versa. Kühschelm illustrates how some of the OT motifs (new Jerusalem, etc.) have been taken up by the early Christians, while Koenen points out how the New Testament has transformed some of these motifs (e.g., “the day of Jahweh”, which has become “the day of the Lord”, i.e., Christ returning from heaven). Both authors duly emphasise the major shift that has taken place in the NT from a theocentric towards a christocentric-soteriological orientation.

J. VERHEYDEN

Michel HERMANS – Pierre SAUVAGE (eds.). *Bible et histoire. Écriture, interprétation et action dans le temps*. (Le livre et le rouleau, 10.) Bruxelles, Éditions Lessius; (Connaître et croire, 6.) Namur, Presses universitaires, 2000. (14,5×20,5), 162 p. ISBN 2-87037-316-3.

On trouvera dans ce volume intitulé *Bible et histoire* les cinq conférences bibliques qui ont été données aux Facultés Notre-Dame de la Paix à Namur durant l'année académique 1999-2000. Ces conférences s'insèrent dans un projet plus large qui a pour but d'étudier les relations existant entre la Bible et «les différentes disciplines qui ordonnent le savoir, l'expression et l'action: littérature, histoire, droit, science, économie, philosophie». Les Actes de la première série de conférences ont déjà été publiés en 1999: F. MIES (ed.), *Bible et littérature: L'homme et Dieu mis en intrigue* (Le livre et le rouleau, 6), Bruxelles, Éditions Lessius; (Connaître et croire, 5), Namur, Presses universitaires, 1999.

Le nouveau recueil envisage la relation entre *Bible et histoire* sous quatre aspects. (1) Dans le premier article, qui est consacré à «l'histoire de la Bible», Pierre Gilbert examine la façon dont la Bible a été écrite et en retrace l'histoire jusqu'à la fixation du canon. (2) Deux articles traitent de «l'histoire dans la Bible»: André Wénin (31-56) analyse la relation entre histoire et mythe en Gn 1-2 et Maurice Gilbert (57-82) la signification de l'histoire dans le Livre de la Sagesse. (3) Sous le titre «Vérité historique et vérité narrative», Camille Focant (103-104) étudie le thème de «la Bible comme histoire» à partir du récit de la Passion dans l'Évangile de Marc. (4) Enfin, «la Bible dans l'histoire des hommes d'aujourd'hui» est abordé dans l'article de Pierre Sauvage (105-154). L'auteur montre, à l'aide d'une analyse de la théologie de la libération de Gustavo Gutiérrez, comment les chrétiens interprètent la Bible de nos jours.

Ce projet universitaire sur les relations entre la Bible et les autres disciplines est, comme le soulignent les éditeurs dans l'*Avant-Propos*, fondé «sur la conviction que la Bible, loin d'être réservée aux croyants, aux exégètes et aux

théologiens, constitue l'un des fondements majeurs de notre civilisation occidentale et, par conséquent, l'une des références à interroger pour penser et agir». Nous recommandons donc ce recueil, écrit pour un large public, aussi et avant tout à toute personne qui s'intéresse au projet de ces conférences.

G. VAN BELLE

Joachim KÜGLER (ed.). *Die Macht der Nase: Zur religiösen Bedeutung des Duftes. Religionsgeschichte – Bibel – Liturgie.* (Stuttgarter Bibelstudien, 187.) Stuttgart, Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk, 2000. (13,5×20,5), 191 p. ISBN 3-460-04871-9. DM 47,80.

Ce volume dédié à la mémoire d'Helmut Merklein (°17 septembre 1940 – †30 septembre 1999) offre sept études sur un sujet peu étudié: la signification religieuse de l'odeur suave dans l'histoire des religions, la Bible et la liturgie. De nombreuses cultures et religions appréhendent les odeurs non seulement comme une perception agréable dans la vie de tous les jours, mais aussi comme médium de l'expérience de Dieu. Le divin se révélerait d'une façon immédiate dans les parfums agréables. Les articles sont rédigés par trois auteurs. Cinq sont de la plume de Joachim Kügler (Bayreuth). Après avoir esquissé dans l'introduction générale (11-23) l'arrière-plan anthropologique de l'odeur suave, Kügler traite de la signification de celle-ci dans l'Égypte ancienne (25-47), dans le monde gréco-romain (99-110), dans le Judaïsme (111-122) et dans le Nouveau Testament (123-171). Ulrike Bechmann (Bayreuth) a réalisé le même exercice pour l'Ancien Testament (49-98) et Peter Wünsche (Bamberg) clôt l'ouvrage avec un article sur la signification des odeurs dans la liturgie chrétienne (173-191).

Dans l'article «Duftmetaphorik im Neuen Testament», Kügler analyse sept textes qu'il classe en deux ensembles: quatre d'entre eux évoquent les parfums agréables du sacrifice (Phm 4,18; Ep 5,2; Ap 5,8 et 8,3-4) et les trois autres l'odeur divine du Christ (2 Co 2,14-16; Mt 2,11; Jn 12,3). En ce qui concerne Jn 12,3 («et la maison s'emplit de la senteur du parfum») cet auteur montre que l'onction du Christ, qui préfigure celle de la mise au tombeau, mérite d'être comprise en fonction de l'arrière-plan culturel de telles onctions: Jésus est la résurrection et la vie en personne, et par son exaltation (c'est-à-dire sa crucifixion et sa résurrection comme unité paradoxale) il donne vie à celui qui croit. En outre, Kügler montre que Jn 12,3 contraste de façon aiguë avec l'odeur du cadavre en 11,39: «In Opposition zum Todesgeruch in Joh 11 verweist der sich ausbreitende Duft des Salböls auf die universale Heilsbedeutung der Erhöhung Jesu. Indem Maria Jesu Füße salbt und die Salbe von seinen Füßen mit ihren Haaren abwischt, geht sie eine Duftgemeinschaft ein, die auf ihre Glaubensbeziehung zu Jesus hinweist. In diesem liebenden Glauben hat sie Gemeinschaft mit Jesus, und zwar als Anteil an der Leben spendenden Kraft seines Todes» (170). Quoi qu'il en soit, Kügler conclut qu'en ce qui concerne les textes du Nouveau Testament, il n'existe pas *un* symbolisme ou *une* théologie néotestamentaire de l'odeur suave. Les textes néotestamentaires sont plutôt discrets sur un tel symbolisme ou une telle théologie, à l'exception toutefois de quelques-uns: «Trotz des überwiegenden Desinteresses am Geruchsinn wird in den wenigen Texten, in denen er als theologisches Symbol aufgegriffen wird, ein vielfältiger und kreativer Umgang mit diesem Bereich menschlicher Erfahrung greifbar. Hier liegen Schätze christlicher Tradition, die in ihrer furchtlosen Rezeptionshaltung vorbildlich sein und

mit ihren Inhalten frische und unverbrauchte Impulse für einen zeitgenössischen christlichen Umgang mit dem Duft und seinem Symbolpotential geben können» (171).

G. VAN BELLE

*The Rediscovery of the Hebrew Bible.* (Amsterdamse Cahiers voor Exegese van de Bijbel en zijn Tradities: Supplement Series, 1.) Maastricht, Shaker Publishing, 1999. xvii-158 p. ISBN 90-423-0104-X.

The *Amsterdamse Cahiers*, published annually by the *Societas Hebraica Amstelodamensis* produces contributions devoted to the exegesis of the Bible, focussing on a Dutch readership. Its new *Supplement Series* addresses a more international readership. The authors of the first volume of the new series present their quest for methods allowing the audience at large to read the Bible as something unfamiliar, to let it speak anew, calling for a response. This is fully in line with the goals of the *Societas Hebraica Amstelodamensis*. Inspired by Buber and Rosenzweig this society seeks to let the Hebrew Biblical text speak for itself. In the first paper of the present collected essays, K.A. Deurloo and G.J. Venema introduce the reader into the exegetical methods of the Amsterdam tradition. In the second contribution, Deurloo presents some Hebrew keywords of the Bible, and their (concordant) modern translations. A. Blokker then applies the Amsterdam method to Gen 22, guided by an earlier article on the subject written by K.A. Deurloo. Next, G.J. Venema proposes four readings of Deut 9,21 and Ex 32,20. P.J. van Midden deals with the story of Gideon in Jgs 6-8. After a vigorous plea in favour of the Amsterdam approach, J. Dubbink invites the reader to listen to Jeremiah. In a refreshing contribution, J.C. Siebert-Hommes focusses on the dinners in the book of Esther, and on their links with love and erotics, as well as with power and control. Taking Deut 29 as a starting point, E. Talstra reads the biblical text in the context of theology, which implies that, after the questions of composition and production have been answered, exegesis has to turn to the question of reader participation. Turning to a different set of problems, K.A.D. Smelik studies the use and abuse of the Hebrew bible as a historical source. Finally R. Zuurmond presents a lecture on the structure of the Canon in the Hebrew Bible and in its Greek translations. Most of the papers defend the so-called "Amsterdam method" and try to promote it as an export product. The English language in which several of these essays are couched is, however, hardly adapted to their export purposes.

J. LUST

Rajia SOLLAMO – Seppo SIPILÄ (eds.), *Helsinki Perspectives on the Translation Technique of the Septuagint: Proceedings of the IOSCS Congress in Helsinki 1999.* (Publications of the Finnish Exegetical Society, 82.) Helsinki, The Finnish Exegetical Society; Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2001. 307 p. ISBN 951-9217-37-1/3-525-53620-8.

In 1999 R. Sollamo organised and chaired the symposium of the International Organisation for Septuagint and Cognate Studies (IOSCS) in a section of the SBL meeting held in Helsinki. The present volume publishes the papers of that



symposium, roughly grouping them as follows. It opens with general methodological articles, continues with treatises on a single biblical book, and concludes with studies of special lexemes or individual verses. In her programmatic contribution, R. Sollamo outlines the perspectives of further Septuaginta studies in Helsinki. After having investigated translation technique for several decades, the new objective is to compile a syntax of Septuagint Greek. A major methodological question complicates the project: Is this syntax to be a contrastive study, based on comparison between the syntax of the Hebrew original and that of its Greek translation, or should it be conceived like a syntax of other Greek documents using the grammatical categories and framework of Greek grammars? Sollamo rightly emphasizes that it is not the syntax of a language that is at issue, but the syntax of a translation. The main emphasis is to be on translation-technical research, not on inner-Greek comparison. The following paper, by B. Lemmelijn, offers a survey and analysis of recent studies on translation technique. C. den Hertog then turns to a study of the verbal and nominal relative clauses in Greek Leviticus. Drawing on his doctoral dissertation, F. Austermann presents a case study of the theological notion ἀνομίᾱ in the Septuagint Psalter, demonstrating that it is difficult to grasp the theology of a translator without an analysis of his translation technique. S. Olofsson seeks to interpret Ps 49,15 focussing on the Greek interpretation of צַרַּר as a metaphorical epithet of a foreign god. A. Pietersma outlines the IOSCS project concerning a commentary series on the Septuagint, connected with the IOSCS NETS (New English Translation of the Septuagint) project. He also gives a sample on the basis of the first psalm. J. de Waard presents some reflections on some unusual translation techniques in Septuagint Proverbs. Building on his earlier work on this topic, J. Cook argues that the background of the ideology of the translator(s) of Proverbs is not to be sought in Hellenism but rather in Jewish conservative circles. Despite the general thesis developed in his recent monograph that in as far as verbal syntax is concerned Hebrew interference is fairly slight, T.V. Evans defends here the view that the principal cause of low imperfect frequencies in the Greek Pentateuch relative to aorist indicatives is the translator's largely literal method of translation. P. Danove describes the syntax and semantics of the verb ἀκούω in comparison with its classical use. E.G. Dafni studies the theological implications of the phrase ἄνθρωπος ὁ πνευματοφόρος in Hos 9,7. K. De Troyer draws attention to the translator's unexpected interpretation of תהרה דמי ("blood purity"?) in Lev 12,4-6. Finally P.D.M. Turner returns to her 1970 PhD thesis and studies some idiosyncratic renderings in Septuagint Ezekiel as a clue to the inner history of the translation. The present volume gives some fine samples of a wide variety of Septuagint studies providing the reader with a good survey of today's trends in the field.

J. LUST

*Unless Some One Guide Me... Festschrift for Karel A. Deurloo.* (Amsterdamse Cahiers voor Exegese van de Bijbel en zijn Tradities: Supplement Series, 2.) Maastricht, Shaker Publishing, 2000. (17×24), xv-422 p. ISBN 90-423-0140-6.

K.A. Deurloo is a prominent representative of the "Amsterdamse school" and the founder of the periodical *Amsterdamse Cahiers*. At the occasion of his

retirement (January 2001) the board of the periodical deemed it fitting to honour him with a *Festschrift*. The volume opens with a *laudatio* by R. Zuurmond describing K.A. Deurloo as a theologian and a man of letters, and ends with his extensive bibliography. The volume further comprises 42 contributions in English, German, and French, mostly on biblical exegesis and theology. Generally speaking, the essays are grouped according to the order of the biblical books. In a short note K. Smelik interprets Gen 1,1–2,3 as a story about the creation of the Sabbath. J.W. Dyk analyses the use and the translation of the verb פָּרַד in the story of the separation of Abram and Lot in Gen 13 (correct ויפָּרַד into ויפָּרְדוּ p. 14, al. 3 line 9). A.M. Spijkerboer deals with Rembrandt's representation of Hagar in Gen 21,41. C. den Hertog re-examines the meaning of the "sign" given to Moses in Ex 3,12 in light of other prophetic and call signs. H. Jagersma studies the structure and function of Ex 19,3b-6. D. Boer reads Num 16,1-35. C. Houtman turns to Deut 1,9-18, and E. Talstra to Deut 6,7 and 11,19. P. van Midden reads the Book of Judges as a foreword to the Books of Samuel and Kings. Three more contributors deal with Judges: K. Spronk (Jgs 2,1-5), W. van Wieringen (about the woman in Jgs 13), U. Bauer (the metaphoric aetiology in Jgs 18,12). L. van Daalen searches the meaning of the word play with שָׂאֵל in 1 Sam 1. E. van den Berg tries to distinguish between fact and imagination in 1 Kgs 18-20. Five papers focus on the prophetic books. M. Prudky studies Is 44,1-5 as a liturgical pericope used on the Sunday of Pentecost. K. van Duin presents some remarks on the interpretation of the root גָּאָה. J. Dubbink reads the messianic prophecy of Jer 23,5-6 within its context. J. Siebert-Hommes interprets Hos 11 as a recapitulation of the basic themes in Hosea, and R. Abma tries to explain the function of the references to Jacob within Hos 11. Six papers are devoted to the Psalms: Ps 23 (N. Schuman), Ps 44 (M. Kessler), Ps 91 (T. Witvliet), Pss 96,98 (H. Leene), Ps 111 (H. van Grol), Ps 130,3-4 (Th. Booij). The following contributions are more oriented towards methodology. J.W. Wesselius seeks to demonstrate that the discontinuities in biblical texts, which are often explained as resulting from the history of the text, can better be explained as literary devices. A. Verheij offers a comprehensive quantitative examination of the biblical texts. Two authors deal with the apocryphal or deuterocanonical books: B. Dicou introduces Judith to a liberal protestant congregation, and P. Beentjes draws attention to the portrayal of the scribe in 38,24–39,11. The next series of essays are concerned with topics taken from the New Testament. D. Monschouwer discusses biblical Christology focussing on the title "son of God" in Mark 1,1. R.R. Brouwer studies the classical conflicting passages Luke 1,33 and 1 Cor 15,28. R. Venema describes the way in which the motif of 'reading scripture' is used in Luke 4,14-21. Y. Bekker tries to explain the meaning of the expression 'the disciple whom Jesus loved' within the context of the Fourth Gospel. J. Mazurel analyses the use of the verb ὀδηγεῖν in the Bible and more particularly in Acts 8,13. B.J. Diebner seeks to understand why it is said that Joseph of Arimathea gave his tomb as a burial place for Jesus. J. Helder interprets the name Armagedon in Ap 16,16 as a programme. A. Brenner and J.W. van Henten entertain the reader about food and drink in the Bible. N.A. van Uchelen gives an example of the rabbinic approach to the Scriptures (Is 49,14. 15 in *Bavli Berkhot* 32b). I.E. Zwiép offers some thoughts on the largely forgotten 13th century philosophical treatise *Ruach Chen*. J. Boendermaker shows how



Luther saw and described the figure of Abraham. H. Blok surveys recent Dutch Bible translation projects and advertises the Amsterdam project: *Een vertaling om voor te lezen*: a translation to be read aloud. Finally, D. Blokker lets the readers share in his experience gained while teaching Old Testament exegesis in West Africa. Most of the contributions are very short and do not intend to give a full survey of the available literature on the topics dealt with. They rather seek to give refreshing insights.

J. LUST

*Hosea*. (Amsterdamse Cahiers voor Exegese van de Bijbel en zijn Tradities, 17.) Maastricht, Shaker Publishing, 1999. (17×24), viii-130 p. ISBN 90-423-0077-9.

*Psalmen*. (Amsterdamse Cahiers voor Exegese van de Bijbel en zijn Tradities, 18.) Maastricht, Shaker Publishing, 2000. (17×24), xv-168 p. ISBN 90-423-0110-4.

*Richteren*. (Amsterdamse Cahiers voor Exegese van de Bijbel en zijn Tradities, 19.) Maastricht, Shaker Publishing, 2001. (17×24), viii-191 p. ISBN 90-423-0177-5.

Beginning with its seventeenth issue, the periodical series *Amsterdamse Cahiers voor Exegese van de Bijbel en zijn Tradities (ACEBT)* received a new coating. The annual volumes are now dedicated to a specific Bible book or to a particular biblical theme. The approach of the biblical text remains the same. The inspiration of the “Amsterdam school” is omnipresent. The volume on Hosea sets the tone. In an introductory article, a survey is given of the recent past and ongoing research on the topic (E. Bons and E. Eynikel). K. Spronk discusses the position of Hosea within the Twelve Prophets. R. Abma explores some theological themes of the book. K. Deurloo focuses on the themes of “solidarity” (סדק) and “pity”. J.W. Dyk analyses Hos 1,6 and proposes an interesting interpretation of the final sentence of that verse, and C. den Hartog analyses the relation between Hos 1,9 and Ex 3,14. J. Siebert-Hommes studies the marriage metaphor, and draws attention to the shocking character of the phrase “lest I strip her naked” in 2,5. D. Monshouwer concludes the series with a survey of the liturgical use of Hosea. Summaries in English and a register of biblical texts enhance the usefulness of the volume.

J. LUST

Zipora TALSHIR. *I Esdras: A Text Critical Commentary: The Story of the Three Youths (I Esdras 3-4)*. In collaboration with David Talshir. (SBL Septuagint and Cognate Studies, 50.) Atlanta, GA, Society of Biblical Literature, 2001. (15,5×23,5), xiv-556 p. ISBN 1-58983-023-7. \$ 67.95.

Zipora Talshir is not a newcomer in the field of I Ezra studies. Already in 1984 she published her dissertation entitled *First Esdras-Origin and Translation* (Hebrew). Several other contributions followed, in periodicals and collected essays. In 1999 she presented her *Introduction* to the book of First Esdras in volume 47 of the *Septuagint and Cognate Series*. There she defended her thesis that the book was created in order to incorporate the story of the Three

Youths. The present volume is essentially a text critical commentary that aims to establish the Hebrew/Aramaic text of I Esdras as reflected in its Greek version and to discern its relationship with MT. Each major section is prefaced with an introduction describing its contents and indicating its major problems. Special attention is given to the story of the Three Youths. According to Talshir, the story which is entirely lacking in the canonical books of Kings and Chronicles was designed to introduce Zerubbabel on the stage of history. In order to interpolate it in the historical account, the author of I Esdras had to introduce major changes in the course of the events as outlined in the canonical books. He had to postpone all the episodes related to Zerubbabel until after the story of the Three Youths. Despite all his efforts, he did not succeed in creating a fully coherent course of events. A more detailed presentation of the Talshir's views on the topic is given in her *Introduction*. In the present volume the attention goes to the reconstruction of the Aramaic original underlying the Greek. This endeavour is rather risky because of the total lack of an existing model. As a whole, Talshir's reconstructions are carefully made and well argued. Nuances and variants are provided in the notes. The book as a whole, used in combination with the *Introduction* provided in SCS, 47, is a most valuable tool for the study of I Esdras

J. LUST

James W. WATTS (ed.). *Persia and Torah: The Theory of Imperial Authorization of the Pentateuch*. (SBL Symposium Series, 17.) Atlanta, GA, Society of Biblical Literature, 2001. (15×23), xi-228 p. ISBN 1-58983-015-6. \$ 39.95.

In 1984 P. Frei revived the theory of Persian imperial authorization of the Pentateuch. In order to stimulate the evaluation of this theory in the English speaking world the present volume collects the papers of a panel discussion on the subject. A translation of Frei's German paper *Die persische Reichsautorisation: Ein Überblick*, originally published in *ZABR* 1 (1995) 47-61 introduces the collection. J. Blenkinsopp surveys the evidence concerning Persian and Biblical law, and concludes that "imperial authorization of the laws in the Pentateuch remains a *possible* hypothesis, but for the moment no more than that" (p. 62). L. Fried accepts the authenticity of the decree in Ezra 7,21-26, and argues that Ezra's commission from the Persian king was limited to appointing Persian judges in the province of Jehud. L. Grabbe assumes that the Pentateuch was put into shape in the Persian period. He questions the historicity of the Ezra traditions and therefore of any imperial authorization of Ezra's law. G. Knoppers suggests that local leaders under the Persians enjoyed more autonomy than Frei's theory allows. D. Redford attacks the commonly accepted thesis that Darius the Great was the first to codify Egyptian law. In his view the writing-up of Egyptian law at Darius request was no "authorization" or "codification" of Egyptian legislation, but rather a translation into Aramaic serving to inform the Persians of existing traditions. Finally, J.L. Ska argues that there is no need to invoke Persian intervention to explain the emergence of the Pentateuch. Taken together the collected articles strongly suggest that the available evidence does not support Frei's theory.

J. LUST

Albert-Marie DENIS et collaborateurs, avec le concours de Jean-Claude HAELEWYCK. *Introduction à la littérature religieuse judéo-hellénistique*. Tomes I-II (*Pseudépigraphes de l'Ancien Testament*). Turnhout, Brepols, 2000. (16×25), XXI-886, 887-1420 p. ISBN 2-503-50981-9.

In 1970 Albert-Marie Denis published his *Introduction aux pseudépigraphes grecs d'Ancien Testament*. It was the first volume of the series "Studia in Veteris Testamenti" (Leiden, Brill). Immediately after, he started his research in view of an "Introduction" that would cover the whole corpus of OT Pseudepigrapha (OTP) in all of the ancient versions. This proved to be a gigantic task for one person. Denis passed away in November 1999, working assiduously till the last days to prepare for publication a manuscript that by then had reached almost 950 pages. The manuscript was seen through the press by his colleague J.-C. Haelewyck.

In his "Avant-propos", Denis calls his Introduction "un ouvrage de collaboration". The names of eleven collaborators are mentioned. But let there be no misunderstanding! This Introduction is above all the work of one author who collected the material and composed the whole text. The contribution of the collaborators was limited to some occasional support in revising and updating particular sections. In the years after 1970 Denis also published several other tools for the study of OTP, in particular his *Concordances of the Greek* (1987) and the *Latin texts* (1993); see the reviews in *ETL* 65 (1989) 124-130 and 71 (1995) 383-420.

A remarkable difference between the two Introductions has to do with the title. In 1970 Denis still spoke of OT Pseudepigrapha. He now uses the (more neutral) term of "Jewish-hellenistic religious literature" (with "OT Pseudepigrapha" in the subtitle). As he explains in the Preface, "le terme ... est chronologique, non littéraire" (xi), and is to be preferred over "Pseudepigrapha" because many of the canonical writings are pseudepigrapha too. Denis is aware of the fact that on such a basis he could also have included the writings of the Dead Sea Scrolls, but these are mentioned only in so far as they concern "OT pseudepigrapha".

The Introduction of 1970 (*Int I*) contained information on 34 writings, which were divided into three parts: I. "Les pseudépigraphes complets, ou conservés en grande partie" (ch. 1-14); II. "Les fragments de pseudépigraphes perdus" (15-29); III. "Historiens et auteurs littéraires" (30-33); and, as a supplement, a chapter on the *Apocalypses of Daniel* (34). The new Introduction (*Int II*) contains 38 chapters and is also divided into three parts, but in an arrangement that is modeled after the tripartite structure of the Jewish Bible. The different Parts now bear the following titles: I. "Écrits judéo-hellénistiques parallèles aux Livres historiques de la Bible" (ch. 1-16); II. "Écrits judéo-hellénistiques parallèles aux prophètes bibliques" (ch. 17-29). III. "Écrits judéo-hellénistiques parallèles aux Écrits bibliques" (ch. 30-38). Six works are mentioned for the first time: 2 *Henoch* (no. 3), *Apocalypse of Abraham* (5), Ps-Philo's *Biblical Antiquities* (10), 3-4 *Maccabees* (15-16), and 3 *Ezra* (26). Of the first three nothing of the Greek version has been preserved. The three others are part of the LXX. Nos. 28-29 (*Ps-Phocylides* and the so-called *Letters of Heraclit*) and nos. 33-34 (*Anonymous fragments* and *Apocalypses of Daniel*) of *Int I* are now taken together in nos. 34 and 38. There is no reference any longer to the old catalogues of apocryphal literature that were discussed in the Preface of *Int I*.

Overall, Denis has followed more or less the same presentation as in 1970. For each of the OTP the *Introduction* offers a summary of its content and doctrines, and information about the manuscript tradition, the original language, the authorship, provenance, date, and audience, and the various versions. The many notes contain such a wealth of references to primary and secondary literature that one might have wished the Author had retained the short lists of bibliographical references to editions and translations (and to other OTP collections) at the beginning of each chapter as in *Int I*. It would also have been helpful if there would have been added some subtitles between the different sections.

The text has been thoroughly rewritten, but of course on more than one occasion the attentive reader will discover some remnants of the *Int I* version. Compare, e.g., in the very first chapter (*Life of Adam and Eve*), “le midrash haggadique de *Gen.*, 1-4, relate la vie d’Adam et d’Ève, ...” (*Int I*, 3), with, “Ce midrash hagiographique de *Gen.*, 3-4, ajoutant, à une exégèse traditionnelle, des éléments anciens, relate la vie d’Adam et Ève après la chute, ...” (*Int II*, 3). At times, esp. in the descriptions of the content of a writing, the style is rather overloaded. Thus, in the same chapter, one reads, “Poussé par l’envie et déguisé, comme il sait le faire, un ange de lumière (*Ad. Ev. Lat.*, 5-11), Satan (?), Satan (?), qui parle à la manière des prophètes, explique lui-même sa faute d’orgueil, lorsqu’il a refusé d’honorer Adam, image de Dieu, et sa propre chute (*Ad. Ev.*, lat., 12-17, et voir infra note 57), thème apparenté à celui de la chute des anges en général (cf. *Hen.*, 6-16; voir 2 *Hen.*, p. 67 et note 30) et repris entre autres par le Coran (voir infra note 131)” (4). In such passages one feels that the work was redacted over a long period and was continually revised and updated with new information in the notes and in other sections of the book.

Another trace of *Int I* can be found in the sections on the manuscript tradition. *Int I* provided (in smaller print) the list of 22 Greek MSS that contain the text of the *Apocalypse of Moses* (3-4). This list is taken up again, in a different order, updated on the basis of the work of M. Nagel (1972), and expanded with comments on the content and the importance of the MSS for a critical edition (9-13). Moreover, Denis gives similar lists for the Latin and for all the other versions including the Roumanian (14-25). This kind of information is quite burdening in an Introduction.

The sections about the ancient versions is of course the major innovation in *Int II*. One gets a fairly good idea of the amount of work that has been done by Denis in this respect by comparing the two Introductions. Thus, in *Int I* he wrote about the *Life of Adam and Eve*, “La version latine est assez différente du grec et retravaillée par abréviations ou insertions; elle a parfois conservé des passages omis par le grec” (5). One now gets not only a survey of the Latin MS tradition, but also a detailed comparison of the Greek and Latin version (3-7 and 14-16). The results are even more impressive if one also compares the section on parallel (secondary and later) apocryphal writings. In *Int I* the chapter on *ApocMosis* was followed by what seemed to be a quite detailed presentation of other writings dealing with the life of Adam (7-14: “Le cycle d’Adam”). This section has now “exploded” into a triple Appendix of thirty pages (28-58):

“Le cycle d’Adam”, “Ouvrages aux titres analogues”, and “Ouvrages dénommés par les premiers descendants”.

Some might say that in a time in which our knowledge of this literature has increased to such a degree that one scholar can no longer dream of covering the whole discipline, projects such as this Introduction simply have become impossible. We possess some very good collective works on OTP (with translations and comments of

the various writings). However, the reader of Denis' *Introduction* will experience and certainly be sensitive for the benefits of looking into a discipline through the eyes of one expert. And he or she will also often be reminded of the great names of the past who have preceded Denis in the field of OTP research. No other of the older or the current collections of OTP contains so much information on so many different writings as Denis' *Introduction à la littérature religieuse judéo-hellénistique*. J.-C. Haelewyck is to be thanked for providing the exhaustive and most useful Indexes (1305-1420) and for taking upon him the editorial responsibility for the volume. His *Clavis Apocryphorum Veteris Testamenti* of 1998 is no longer an orphan anymore. In addition to these two excellent tools, there are now also available two recent Bibliographies of OTP: A LEHNARDT, *Jüdische Schriften aus hellenistisch-römischer Zeit* (JSRZ, 6/2), Gütersloh, 1999, 502 p., and L. DI TOMMASO, *A Bibliography of Pseudepigrapha Research 1850-1999* (JSP SS, 39), Sheffield, 2001, 1067 p.

J. VERHEYDEN

Gabriele BOCCACCINI, *Roots of Rabbinic Judaism: An Intellectual History from Ezekiel to Daniel*. Grand Rapids, MI – Cambridge, Eerdmans, 2002. (15×23), xvii-230 p. ISBN 0-8028-4361-1. \$ 24.00; £ 16.99.

In the final chapter of his book the Author gives an excellent summary of his views and intentions: "The search for the roots of Rabbinic Judaism in pre-Maccabean times is not a search for Rabbis, rabbi-like leaders, pseudo-rabbis, or elusive and disembodied oral traditions". In this monograph, the reader will not find any information about entities such as the "Men of the Great Synagogue". According to Boccaccini there were no rabbinic traditions or institutions in the early Second Temple period. His own reconstruction of the origins of Rabbinic Judaism is based on the available contemporary sources, not on later rabbinic literature. These sources are dealt with according to their presumed date of composition. The main ones are Ezekiel, Ezra, Nehemiah, Enoch, Qohelet, Tobit, Ben Sira, Josephus, 2 Maccabees and Daniel. Until the Maccabean revolt, the Zadokite priests dominated the scene. They were the first editors and interpreters of the Torah. Their early opponents were the Samaritan Sanballats, the Tobiads, and Noadiah and the rest of the prophets (Neh 6,14). Later on in the Persian period they had to confront the opposition of Enochic and Sapiential Judaism. The first step towards Rabbinic Judaism preceded the Maccabean revolt and had its roots in the tax policy of the Ptolemaic system which broke the balance between the religious and the secular powers. The most important step was set by the book of Daniel. The modifications introduced by this book into the Zadokite system, prepared the ground for the birth of the Rabbinic movement. Concluding we may say that the book offers a challenging view of the origins of Rabbinism.

J. LUST

Joseph A. FITZMYER, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and Christian Origins*. (Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature.) Grand Rapids, MI, Eerdmans, 2000. (16×24), xvii-290 p. ISBN 0-8028-4650-5. \$ 25.00; £ 16.99.

In 1997 and 1998 the three volumes of collected essays of Joseph Fitzmyer, *Essays on the Semitic Background of the New Testament* (1971), *A Wandering*

*Aramean* (1979), and *To Advance the Gospel* (1981), were reprinted in *The Biblical Resource Series* published by Eerdmans (see *ETL* 73, 1997, 446-447 and 75, 1999, 470-472). As the first volume of a new series by the same publisher has now appeared a fourth volume of essays, this one collecting Fitzmyer's studies on Qumran, with special emphasis on matters involving the significance of the DSS for the study of early Christianity. All but one (ch. 5, "Qumran Messianism") were published before between 1987 and 2000. Among them are Fitzmyer's contribution to the FS for E.E. Ellis (1987), F. Neiryneck (1992), and L. Hartman (1995), and the important opening study on "The Dead Sea Scrolls and Christian Origins: General Methodological Considerations" that appeared in the 1998 volume on *The Dead Sea Scrolls and Christian Faith* edited by J.H. Charlesworth and W.P. Weaver, celebrating the fiftieth anniversary of the discovery of the Scrolls. Also included are the two articles on the "Son of God" text of 4Q246 which are here combined into one article (ch. 3). A similar combination is found in ch. 8 which brings together the study on the Qumran Tobit texts from *CBQ* (1995) and another one on the same topic that figures in another celebration volume (L.H. Schiffmann, *The Dead Sea Scrolls After Fifty Years*). Ch. 9, by far the longest chapter in the volume (pp. 159-235), reproduces Fitzmyer's critical edition and commentary of the Tobit fragments in *DJD* 19 (1995).

The newly published article on "Qumran Messianism" (pp. 73-110) offers a survey of 23 texts from the Scrolls (and some more problematic ones) that contain the word "Messiah" and draws conclusions from it for understanding the NT usage of the word or for the interpretation of Q 7,22. The article is a warning against an indiscriminate use of the term "Messiah" and against conflating messianic and other forms of eschatological expectation in Judaism. That is the real importance, in Fitzmyer's opinion, of the Qumran passages witnessing the use of the title "Messiah". They illustrate that there already existed a clear concept of a "coming Messiah". And the same is true for the expression "Son of God" in 4Q246. It is proof that its Christian use was not (only or primarily) inspired by the fact that it was known also as a title for certain "divine men" in the Hellenistic world (see pp. 64-65 and 32-33), even though, as Fitzmyer duly recognizes, such non-Jewish influence may be apparent in Paul or John (p. 65). In this respect, the fact that Luke uses the title for the first time in a Palestinian Jewish context (1,32-35) may be of significance (cf. p. 33).

J. VERHEYDEN

Fredrick C. HOLMGREN. *The Old Testament and the Significance of Jesus: Embracing Change – Maintaining Christian Identity: The Emerging Center of Biblical Scholarship*. Grand Rapids, MI – Cambridge, Eerdmans, 1999. (15,5×23), xviii-204 p. ISBN 0-8028-4453-7.

The theme of this book is one that Fredrick Holmgren has dealt with in several of his earlier publications (see esp. *The God Who Cares. A Christian Looks at Judaism*). It is the question of how the early Christians have found ways to connect the "newness" of the Christian teaching with the promises that are found in Jewish scripture, and what it means for a Christian also to regard the Old Testament as "scripture".

The major point Holmgren wants to make is that Jews and early Christians alike have read Jewish scriptures from their own experience. Both have applied



all kinds of “creative” or “in depth” exegesis, as Holmgren prefers to call it. They both practised “believers exegesis” (37). The decisive issue that caused them to regard the same texts in different if not opposite ways was the meeting with Jesus. Holmgren illustrates this with a great number of examples from the gospels and from Paul. Their faith in Jesus made that the Christians began to read the Torah, the Books of the Prophets and the Psalms in light of what had happened to Jesus. They were no longer interested in the whole of the Jewish writings, but only in those parts and passages that would corroborate their faith. Likewise, they would prefer the Septuagint to the Hebrew text, if that proved more convenient for their purpose. However, as important as the Jewish scriptures may have been for the Christians looking for confirmation about the identity of Jesus, Holmgren is not blind either for the fact that Christians also moved away from their Jewish background, and as a matter of fact had to do so, when it dawned upon them that in Jesus the messianic expectations of old had taken on “a new dress”. To express the belief in Jesus’ unique relation with God, the concept of the Messiah could no longer do. Jesus was proclaimed the son of God by God himself. And he was the personification of the Wisdom of God. Holmgren rightly sees in it a major cause for the break with Judaism. It is more debatable whether this new development only “resulted from a loss of contact with the Jewish context” (143), or was not also the result of a deliberate choice on the part of some Christian communities.

J. VERHEYDEN

*Society of Biblical Literature: 2000 Seminar Papers.* (SBL Seminar Papers Series, 39.) Atlanta, GA, Society of Biblical Literature, 2000. (15×23), 823 p. ISBN 0-88414-030-X. \$ 35.00.

As usual, the Society of Biblical Literature has published a selection from the papers that were read at the 136th Annual Meeting of the Society on November 17-20, 2000, at Nashville, TN. The thirty-one essays that are assembled here (full references in the *Elenchus* of *ETL* 2001) were taken from fifteen different sessions or seminars and reflect the wide range of topics and of approaches that characterise the SBL meetings.

The volume includes five essays on the synoptic gospels. The two contributions from the Matthew seminar by W. Carter and R.H. Gundry deal with salvation in the gospel of Matthew. They could not have been more different in form and content. While Carter’s is a well-documented article, Gundry warns the reader that he had only accepted to write a contribution for the seminar on condition that he could “deal with the biblical text alone” (402). For Carter, salvation is “deliverance from sins” (Mt 1,21) in a “very material and political” way (400), i.e., “the defeat of Rome” and its replacing as a world power with the reign of God, which he considers somewhat superficially as a quite ironic way of presenting it, since the alternative “imitates the world-view that it resists”. Gundry does not deny that Mt speaks of a deliverance “from the physical effects of sin” (402), but in his view this does not seem to include so much of a political dimension, and in any case it is not limited to a material understanding only (cf. Mt 3,10-12).

The volume further contains no less than three of the papers that were read in the “Synoptic Gospels Section” (M. Goodacre, M.A. Matson, and J. Peterson).

All three can be subsumed under the heading “Austin Farrer Revisited”. Goodacre discusses five “fallacies” that are often found in descriptions of the hypothesis of Markan priority. The first of these is that the priority of Mark is usually seen within the perspective of the Two-Source hypothesis, i.e., Mt and Lk used Mk as their primary source independently of one another. The second “fallacy” has to do with a “misunderstanding” on the part of defenders of the Two-Source hypothesis of why Lk shows no traces of Mt’s additions to Mk. Goodacre gives a double answer. He points out that in a number of cases Luke willingly left out these additions because he was not interested in them. But Goodacre also challenges the conclusion that Luke would have omitted all of these additions. Such passages (e.g., the parallels to Mk 1,7-8.12-13; 3,20-27; and 4,30-32) are usually regarded by Two-Source theorists as “Mark-Q overlaps”, but according to Goodacre that is precisely the fallacy, for in such an hypothesis, when Lk omits Mt material it is held as proof that he did not know Mt, and when he agrees with Mt it is “automatically” assigned to Q. Yet even Goodacre has to admit that “this argument for Q [Mk-Q overlap] is one that sounds persuasive” (599). The three remaining “fallacies” have to do with the double tradition material and with the minor agreements. With regard to the latter, Goodacre criticises the usual solution of distinguishing between three separate categories (MAs in the triple tradition, of which only a limited number really carry weight; cases of Mk-Q overlaps; and “pure” double tradition material that actually consists of “major agreements” between Mt and Lk with no par. in Mk at all). The model he proposes on the basis of the Farrer hypothesis is that of “a continuum, from pure triple tradition to pure double tradition, with varying degrees of agreement along the way, from relatively minor to quite major agreement between Matthew and Luke against Mark” (611). In this model, Mk is very much the dominating factor in Luke’s composition, and Mt is dealt with by Luke in a most strange way. Wherever there is a parallel in Mk, the influence of Mt is restricted to the bare minimum. Once Luke is “freed” from the Markan hegemony (i.e., for material that has no parallel in Mk), Mt can become his guide in a way he never is in triple tradition material. How does one have to explain this dichotomous use of Mt and Luke’s very different handling of his two leading sources?

J. VERHEYDEN

Paul J. ACHTEMEIER – Joel B. GREEN – Marianne Meye THOMPSON. *Introducing the New Testament: Its Literature and Theology*. Grand Rapids, MI – Cambridge, U.K., Eerdmans, 2001. (18×23,5), XII-624 p. ISBN 0-8028-3717-4.

The text on the dust jacket offers the following description of the purpose and method of this new *Introduction*: “Unlike other New Testament introductions that are primarily concerned with historical-critical issues or with what scholars have said, this book gets directly to the business of explaining the New Testament’s background, content, and theology”. The book itself contains 25 chapters. After an Introductory part consisting of two chapters and explaining the nature of the New Testament and its world, the remainder of the book contains an initiation into each of the twenty-seven books of the New Testament. Separate chapters provide further information on the nature of the Gospels, the life and teaching of Jesus, letters in the New Testament, Paul and his world. The final chapter deals

with the formation of the New Testament Canon. The book ends with an "Index of Names and Subjects".

The content and essential message of each book of the New Testament "are described in a simple but dynamic language that reveals why they continue to inspire and challenge readers today". Numerous sidebars offer further information concerning the background of each topic. One can find also 11 maps and about 50 black and white photographs. Each chapter ends with a short list of suggestions for further reading (about ten references to English language literature).

This carefully edited and well-written book may indeed be an "outstanding guide to the writings of the New Testament for readers ranging from Bible students to those approaching the Christian Scriptures for the first time". The present reviewer, however, is inclined to prefer Introductions that are also concerned with historical-critical issues and provide information on contemporary scholarly debates for his students.

G. VAN BELLE

Daniel MARGUERAT (ed.). *Introduction au Nouveau Testament. Son histoire, son écriture, sa théologie*. (Le monde de la Bible, 41.) Genève, Labor et Fides, 2000. (14,5×22,5), 489 p.

Cette introduction est conçue comme un manuel. D. Marguerat l'explique clairement dans la Préface: «il ne dit pas tout, mais sélectionne et hiérarchise l'information utile; il défend une compréhension cohérente du champ de la littérature néotestamentaire; il explore les questions en débat et inventorie les principales hypothèses formulées pour y apporter réponse; il s'oblige à la synthèse. L'idée est d'offrir au lecteur débutant une vision globale des problèmes historiques et littéraires posés par la rédaction de chaque livre du Nouveau Testament, mais sans l'égarer dans un grouillement de références; seules les thèses significatives sont retenues, et attribuées à leur auteur d'origine» (5). Les articles sont écrits par les auteurs suivants: Corina Combet-Galland, Paris (Marc); Élian Cuvillier, Montpellier (Matthieu, Apocalypse); Andreas Dettwiler, Neuchâtel (épîtres deutéro-pauliniennes); Jean-Daniel Kaestli, Lausanne (Histoire du canon du Nouveau Testament); Daniel Marguerat, Lausanne (problème synoptique, Luc, Actes); Yann Redalié, Rome (épîtres pastorales); Jacques Schlosser, Strasbourg (1 et 2 Pierre, Jude); François Vouga, Bethel-Bielefeld (épîtres pauliniennes, Hébreux, Jacques); Jean Zumstein, Zurich (Jean, épîtres johanniques).

Pour la présentation des livres du Nouveau Testament, c'est le même schéma qui est presque toujours retenu: une présentation littéraire (structure et contenu); le milieu historique de production (auteur, datation, milieu d'origine, identité de ses destinataires); la composition littéraire (sources littéraires, traditions religieuses); programme théologique de l'auteur; perspectives nouvelles (outre les données exposées jusque-là, les nouvelles avancées des chercheurs); bibliographie sélective. L'ouvrage s'achève par un «Glossaire» (475-481), avec une brève explication des termes techniques qui sont utilisés dans le livre, et un très pratique «Index des noms et des thèmes».

Cette Introduction est à conseiller en premier lieu à tous les biblistes, aux étudiants et étudiantes des facultés et écoles de théologie, enfin à toute personne désirant mieux connaître les écrits du Nouveau Testament.

G. VAN BELLE

David G. HORRELL (ed.). *Social-Scientific Approaches to New Testament Interpretation*. Edinburgh, T&T Clark, 1999. (14×21,5), vi-426 p. ISBN 0-567-08658-5. £ 14.95.

David Horrell, who is the author of a monograph on the social background of the Corinthian community through the first century (*The Social Ethos of the Corinthian Correspondence. Interests and Ideology from 1 Corinthians to 1 Clement*, 1996), has selected thirteen studies from various authors applying different sorts of social-scientific readings to the writings of the New Testament.

The volume is introduced by the editor with a "retrospect and prospect" on social-scientific methodology (3-27). The book includes some of the pioneering studies of the 70s (cf. R. Scroggs, on early Christianity as a sectarian movement, 1975; G. Theissen, on "wandering radicals", 1973; or J. Gager, on Christian mission and theory of cognitive dissonance, 1975). Among the more recent ones are a study by J. Barclay on deviance and apostasy (1995) and one by the Editor on leadership patterns (1997). Particular texts are discussed in the essays by B.J. Malina and J.H. Neyrey, on witchcraft accusations and Mt 12 (1988); Neyrey again, on the re-interpretation given to the concepts of honour and shame in John's passion narrative (1994); Theissen, on social integration in 1 Cor 11,17-34 (1974); L. Schottroff, on 1 Cor 1,26-31 (1985); and J.H. Elliott, on 1 Peter (1993). Also included are the opening chapter from P. Esler's *Community and Gospel in Luke-Acts* (1987), as well as chapters from W.A. Meeks' prosopographical study of Paul's letters (*The First Urban Christians*, 1983) and Margaret McDonald's analysis of ritual in the Pauline communities (*The Pauline Churches*, 1988).

A difficulty with this genre of books is of course to determine which criteria to use for selecting the essays. The Editor is well aware of this, as can be seen from the Preface. He formulates three criteria: the collection should include a representative range of authors, of NT texts, and of methodologies (1). This does certainly apply to the present volume, which, moreover, contains a most useful Bibliography (361-402) that is not limited to "typically" social-scientific studies by NT scholars, but also includes a wide array of studies from the social sciences and a good number of studies on the social history of ancient Rome. Equally important are the Editor's introductions to each of the essays which at times are quite critical. Thus, in the introduction to the essay by Malina and Neyrey on Mt 12, one can find the following reflection: "Does Mary Douglas' model provide an adequate scheme for categorising types of community and culture and for theorising change? Do the New Testament texts provide enough of the kind of information that can be used to classify reliably the group culture which they reflect? Are the negative labels exchanged between hostile parties recorded in Matthew's gospel rightly seen as 'witchcraft accusations' arising within a 'witchcraft society'?" (31). To me, these are not "just some of the questions which readers may consider as they study this essay". They rather question the very heart and soul of the method that is followed by both authors in this essay.

As is well known, questions of methodology and terminology play an important role in approaches borrowing from models that were developed in other disciplines. By selecting only one chapter from a monograph there is a risk that the reader might not notice that one or another term is used in a particular way. Horrell proves to be sensitive to this problem and adds the necessary comment in his

introduction. Thus, he points out that McDonald uses "ritual" in a general way, "as an overall label for the whole range of activities which take place in the worship of the Pauline communities" (234). "Ritual" then is identical with what Malina and Neyrey call "rite", while in their view "ritual" is a type of rite.

J. VERHEYDEN

D.G.K. TAYLOR (ed.). *Studies in the Early Text of the Gospels and Acts: The Papers of the First Birmingham Colloquium on the Textual Criticism of the New Testament*. (SBL Text-Critical Studies, 1.) Atlanta, GA, Society of Biblical Literature, 1999. (15,5×23,5), xvi-283 p. ISBN 0-88414-007-5.

As David Parker notes in his Foreword, "this volume represents a double inauguration" (vii). First, it contains the papers of the colloquium on textual criticism of the New Testament that was held 14-17 April, 1997, at the University of Birmingham. The Birmingham meeting is planned to be a recurrent event. Second, the volume is the first in the new series of *Text-Critical Studies* that is launched under the auspices of the SBL and is intended as the "Third Series" of the reputed *Texts and Studies* in which were published several standard works on textual criticism at the end of the nineteenth and the first decades of the twentieth century.

The volume contains eleven essays that are divided in two parts: a more theoretical one, and one that deals with particular passages (full references are to be found in the forthcoming issue of the *Elenchus* of *ETL*). J.L. North (1-25) recalls the famous Oxford Debate of 6 May, 1897, on the *Textus Receptus* between, on the one hand, Edward Miller, assisted by G.H. Gwilliam and Albert Bonus, defending the traditional text, and on the other, W. Sanday, who was joined by A.C. Headlam, in defense of the Westcott-Hort edition of the NT. (W.C. Allen had to cancel his participation at the last minute, but his paper was read by Sanday.) As North points out, the debate proved to be the beginning of the end for the traditionalists.

In a long survey (26-48), L.W. Hurtado reviews the recent revival of interest in textual criticism and points at five important issues or developments in current research: a more systematic and thorough study of individual witnesses, esp. also the Patristic tradition; investigations in the rules and practices of scribes; awareness of the crucial place that is given by many to the second-century evidence in retracing the earliest transmission of the text; the inclusion of other aspects of historical inquiry and its implications for textual criticism; and prospects of a further appropriation and mastery of the data by computer technology.

J.W. Childers assesses the significance of versional evidence on the basis of a critical study of M.-É. Boismard's use of the Syriac translations in his reconstruction of a pre-Johannine gospel (*Un évangile pré-Johannique*, 1993-94). K.D. Clarke and K. Bales offer a critical evaluation of the rating system of UBS<sup>4</sup>, while G.P. Farthing contributes a highly technical paper on using probability theory in recovering the textual history of a passage.

In the second part, S.R. Pickering examines the problems with using a specific type of papyri, those that contain "non-continuous", i.e., miscellaneous, verses from various books of the Bible. As an example, he presents P. Vindob. G 2312, of which the eight lines give, in this order, the text of Ps 90,12, Rom 12,1-2, and

Jn 2,1-2. E. Güting deals with the relevance of literary criticism for textual criticism as exemplified from the discussion on the text of Mk 1,2-3 and 9,12b, which he regards as glosses. He tentatively suggests that the former of these could have been taken directly from Q (163).

The Diatessaron is the topic of T. Baarda's well-documented article on Mt 5,4 par. Lk 6,21b. Baarda comes to the conclusion that the harmonist must have regarded these verses as two separate sayings, as can still be seen in the Eastern tradition of the Diatessaron, an arrangement that was lost in the Western tradition. D.C. Parker, D.G.K. Taylor, and M.S. Goodacre have re-examined the Dura Europos fragment (0212) and compared it with the evidence in the Diatessaron tradition. They reach the negative conclusion that this late second-century harmony was not a part of Tatian's Diatessaron (228). The two remaining essays, by J. Read-Heimerdinger and J. Rius-Camps, deal with the codex Bezae (on the Emmaus pericope in D and the Joel citation in Acts 2,14-21 resp.).

When reading these contributions one cannot but conclude that the auguries for future meetings of the Birmingham colloquium look most promising.

J. VERHEYDEN

Wilhelm THÜSING. *Die neutestamentlichen Theologien und Jesus Christus. Grundlegung einer Theologie des Neuen Testaments. III. Einzigkeit Gottes und Jesus-Christus-Ereignis (mit Studien zum Verhältnis von Juden und Christen)*, herausgegeben von Thomas SÖDING. Münster, Aschendorff, 1999. (14×22), xvi-444 p. ISBN 3-402-03410-7. DM 78.

The third volume of Wilhelm Thüsing's (†1998) soundings for the foundations of a New Testament theology was published posthumously by his student Thomas Söding one year after volume II (see *ETL* 75, 1999, 472-474; the first volume appeared in 1981, <sup>2</sup>1996). Its topic is the unicity of God and of Jesus Christ. The book is divided into three parts and ten chapters. In an often highly abstract theological language centering around the concepts of "die Basileia-Dynamik Gottes" and "die Basileia-Existenz Jesu" (7), Thüsing examines in the first part how the New Testament and early Christian conviction of the unicity of Christ Jesus is grounded in the central message of the Old Testament that there is but one God, the God of Israel, and that the history of Israel is the manifestation of this.

In the second part Thüsing deals with the reception of, and the opposition to, Jesus' message of the Kingdom. He not only discusses some of the NT evidence of the controversies with Pharisees and Sadducees, but he also inquires into the roots of developing anti-Judaism in the early church. This part ends with a reflection on the tension that has been created by Israel's rejection of the message. This tension is considered from a theological (the one God speaking to Israel and to the Church in different ways?), christological (the Jew Jesus transmitting Israel's conviction about the one God to the nations), and ecclesiological perspective (the Church as the – sole? – "people of God").

In the third part, Thüsing ponders on the consequences of a Christology that has led to a divinisation of Jesus ("Vergottung Jesu"). Here one finds not only a discussion of the impact of the Johannine concept of the preexistence of Christ, but also of the later developments in the councils of Nicea and Chalcedon. In the last chapter Thüsing argues that the unity of Jesus' gospel of the Kingdom and the church's



gospel of Jesus, for which he had argued in chapter nine, ultimately is grounded in the recognition and confession of the unicity of God and of Jesus Christ, as this is expressed in 1 Cor 8,6 and in other passages of the NT (e.g., Eph 4,4).

In the preface the Editor announces the publication of a fourth and last volume that was planned by Thüsing as a comparative analysis of Paul's and John's theology, of which only large parts of the section on Paul were more or less finished at the time of Thüsing's death. The volume will also contain a comment on Thüsing's contribution to NT and biblical theology by the Editor.

J. VERHEYDEN

John Dominic CROSSAN. *The Birth of Christianity: Discovering What Happened in the Years Immediately after the Execution of Jesus*. New York, HarperCollins, 1998; Edinburgh, T&T Clark, 1999. (15,5×23,5), XXXIV-653 p. ISBN 0-567-08668-2. £ 19.95.

"This book is about the lost years of Earliest Christianity, about the 30s and 40s of the first century, about those dark decades immediately after the execution of Jesus" (ix). Thus begins Crossan's investigation of the first years of Christianity. After finishing the 600 pages that make up this book, the reader will find out that not everything is lost. Crossan has searched the writings of the New Testament and second-century literature (above all, Q, the Didache and other writings of the so-called Apostolic Fathers, and the oldest apocryphal gospels) and he has provided a wealth of information on the "dark decades". The reader will also note that a lot of this information has to do with the years before this period. The earthly ministry of Jesus himself remains indeed a major focus of this book, as it was in previous publications by the same author.

This book is written for a broad public. It contains no notes, but it includes many long citations from a wide array of scholarly studies, both exegetical and other, of novels, and of poetry. In 26 chapters and an epilogue, which are divided over ten "Parts", Crossan deals with such problems as "Gospels and Sources" (Part III), "History and Archeology" (V), or "Healers and Itinerants" (VII). Throughout, the book is a most impressive illustration of its author's incredibly wide reading. In dealing with the question of the formation, development, and preservation of tradition, Crossan discusses in detail several examples from studies in Serbo-Croatian epic (69-78). But in another chapter one is also introduced in the subtleties of ceramic theories and the significance of pottery for archaeology (223-230), or one may come up a comparison of Crossan's and J.P. Meier's views on healing and miracles (302-304). Often, too, the reader gets echos from the author's personal life and experiences, be it on his travels to Christian and pagan healing shrines (297), or on monastic life (421).

A crucial section in the book, to my view, is Part III (95-135: "Gospels and Sources"), in which Crossan clarifies, in an at times rather trenchant critique of N.T. Wright's negation of most of the scholarly exegetical work of the last century and a half, the presuppositions on which he is basing his investigation of the sources that inform us on Jesus and the earliest communities. These presuppositions are known already from many of Crossan's earlier publications. The crucible here is not so much his acceptance of John's dependence on the Synoptics (at least for the passion and resurrection narrative), though not a few Johannine scholars will probably be troubled by it, but above all his views on the independence of

some of the extracanonical from the canonical gospels (the *Gospel of Thomas*, *PEgerton*, the *Secret Gospel of Mark*, and part of the *Gospel of Peter*, which he labels the *Cross Gospel*). Crossan does not argue his case again but rather lays out the principles that led him to accept a particular position in each case. As he puts it, "My own principles for judging *direct literary dependence* are these: *genetic relationship* is established by the presence of individually specific order or content from independent into dependent text, and *redactional confirmation* is established by showing where, how, and why the dependent text changed the independent one" (118-119). The problem is of course how to define the amount of "individually specific order or content" and the quality of "redactional confirmation" that must be available before one can conclude for dependence. Clearly, this differs for each individual writing. And as Crossan's own hypothesis on the source criticism of the *Gospel of Peter* shows, it is even thinkable that one and the same document combines dependence upon the canonical gospels with dependence upon non-canonical sources or traditions.

In a sense, such a solution is the answer Crossan may expect to receive from those scholars who "have declared *every* extracanonical gospel as far discovered to be canonically dependent", when asking them "on what principles might any future discovery be assessed differently" (118). Should the leading principle not be that wherever there are elements in extracanonical writings that have some sort of parallel to material from canonical writings, these sections must at least also be assessed on this hypothesis, whatever one has to make of the remaining sections in which these documents manifest a proud independence? One may be surprised that someone who can accept such a position of combined dependence and independence for (parts of) the Fourth Gospel or the *Gospel of Peter*, remains absolutely unconvinced of such a solution in the case of other writings.

In chapter 21 ("Interpreting the Commands"), Crossan adds yet another presupposition, this with regard to the *Didache*. This document ("a community rule"), he considers to be "completely independent" from the synoptic gospels and even from synoptic tradition (383-385). This is a major change from his earlier position in which Crossan followed H. Koester's and B. Layton's conclusions and regarded *Did* 1,3b-2,1 as an interpolation based on an harmonisation of the respective sections in Mt and Lk into a document that had been circulating for more than half a century. The change was not so much the result of Crossan having problems with such a position, as of his appreciation of a certain reading of the *Didache* as a document of its own right, with "its own agenda, its own logic, its own passionate concerns" (A. Milavec; a similar position is taken by I. Henderson). I can understand Henderson's preference for composition-critical questions over source-critical ones and it may be that *Did* shows "a relatively simple redactional history, despite the text's diversity" (so Henderson, cited by Crossan, 386), but I do not see why "total independence" from the synoptic gospels should be the only possible outcome. And I do not see why the alternative in assessing the importance of 1,3-2,1 should only be between "a much later insertion" of almost no interest, or an original part of the *Did* in complete independence of the canonical gospels (so Crossan, 387). Hence, Crossan's comparison between *Did* 1,3-2,1 and Q 6,27-36 does not have to lead to the discovery of "a radical mini-catechism".

Besides the investigation of the "synoptic" section at the beginning of the *Didache*, Crossan also takes a keen interest in the sayings material that is shared

by the *Gospel of Thomas* (GT) and Q (or the “Q Gospel” as he calls it), and in a number of instances also by other writings. Building on S. Patterson’s work on this material, Crossan argues for the existence of a “Common Sayings Tradition” (CST) of 37 sayings behind GT and Q (see pp. 253-256). The complete list can be found in the set of Inventories at the end of the book. These Appendixes add to similar lists that were mentioned in Crossan’s 1991 *The Historical Jesus* (see the discussion by F. Neiryneck, in *ETL* 70, 1994, 221-234). This time Crossan has focused above all on the sayings material from GT and Q. It is listed according to the following categories: Sayings common to GT and Q (Appendix 1A-B), in GT but not in Q (2A), in Q but not in GT (2B), in GT, Q, and Mk (3A), in GT and Mk, but not in Q (3B), in Q and Mk, but not in GT (3C), in GT and MtSg (4A), in GT and LkSg (4B), in GT and Jn (4C), and Multiple versions of GT sayings (5).

The 37 GT/Q parallels are listed, in the order of GT, in Appendix 1A (586-589). In 16 out of 37 units the saying is attested only in GT and in Q (\* in the lists below). In Appendix 1B (589-591), the list of 37 is subdivided into four types: sayings redacted, (1) in GT but not in Q (9 cases: Q 9,57-58\*; 10,2.23-24; 11,9-10; 12,2.22-31\*.51-53\*; 14,15-24\*.25-26\*), (2) in Q but not in GT (3: Q 11,33.39-40\*; 19,26), (3) in both (7: Q 6,22-23; 7,24-27.28\*; 10,22; 12,39-40; 17,23.34-35\*), and (4) in neither of the two (18: Q 6,20.21a\*; 6,30.34.35b (taken as one unit); 6,31.39\*.41-42\*.43-45; 10,(1).4-11; 11,21-22.52\*; 12,3\*.10.33\*; 13,18-19.20-21\*; 14,27; 15,3-7\*; 16,13). In Crossan’s opinion, the tradition has clearly been reworked more systematically in GT (16 out of 37) than in Q (10). J.M. Robinson’s *Critical Edition* of Q (CrEd) does not mention the parallel at Q 10,23-24, but has also GT/Q parallels at Q 11,?27-28? (GT 79.1-2, though no reconstruction of Q is offered), 11,34 (24.3), 12,[[49]] (10), 12,[[56]] (91.2), 13,[[30]] (4.2), 17,6 (48), and 17,[[20-21]] (113). CrEd’s parallel at Q 10,3 (39.3) has to do with Mt 10,16b that is not part of Q. This brings me to Crossan’s “inventory” of Q passages, which is found by combining the references in Appendix 1A with those in 2B.

In a Preliminary Note to Appendix 1A, Crossan says that three changes have been made in the references to the “Q Gospel” (two omissions and one addition), which brings the total number of Q passages down from 102 to 101 units. This is a bit confusing. The inventory of 1991 contained 110 units, but one should exclude from it the five units that are attested in either Mt or Lk alone. “I did not count such units in my original inventory” (587). These are 1Q? 11,27-28 (no. 24 in the counting of the 1991 inventory which is always given also in *Birth*), 12,49 (no. 72), 12,16-21 (no. 94), 12,13-15 (no. 97), 9,61-62 (no. 146). This makes then a total of 105 units (in no. 8 he had previously also listed 1Q? 17,20-21 as a separate attestation along with Q 17,23, but this is now regarded as Lk 17,20-21). One must probably reckon as one unit nos. 27 (Q 11,4a) and 120 (11,2-4), nos. 125 (Q 13,28a) and 166 (13,28-29), and nos. 116 (Q 4,1-2a) and 139 (4,2b-13). Each of these “doublets” is regarded as one unit in App. 2B (595-596). But does this not also apply to nos. 137 (Q 3,7-9a) and 138 (3,9b)? App. 2B retains the former of the two and now gives the latter as “115 [& 138]. John’s Message: (1a) Q<sup>2</sup>: Luke 3:15-18 = Matt. 3:11-12 = Matt. 7:19” (a mistake for “137 [& 138] that is mentioned just before in the list?). The two omissions mentioned in the Note are Q 13,30 (no. 31) and 12,54-56 (no. 53). The former is now referred to as two separate attestations by Mt (20,16) and Lk (13,30), in addition to the parallel in GT and Mk. The latter is omitted because it is said to be “textually uncertain” (587). The

added text is Q 11,21-22 (no. 81; formerly listed as par. Mk 3,27, but now both as Q and as par. Mk). Crossan refers for these three changes to IQP (in *JBL* 1993 and 1995). All three passages are now included in CrEd within double brackets (Q 11,21-22 without an attempt at reconstruction). Of the five units that were listed 1Q? in 1991, two occur in CrEd (12,[49] and 11,?27-28?, without reconstruction). There is, however, one more addition that is not mentioned in the Note, but that figures in App. 2B: “Q<sup>1</sup>: Luke 14:11 = 18:14 = Matt. 23:12” (no. 379).

One should further note the following smaller differences in the list of Q passages in App. 1A and 2B from the one of 1991: no. 1, Q<sup>1</sup>: Luke 10:4-11, for 10:(1), 4-11 (perhaps a mistake; see p. 590); no. 40, Q<sup>2</sup>: Luke 19:26, for 19:(25-) 26; no. 10, Q<sup>1</sup>: Luke 10:16 = Matt. 10:32, for 32a; no. 101, Q<sup>1</sup>: Luke 9:57-58, for 58; no. 102, Q<sup>2</sup>: Luke 11:39-40, for 11:39-41; no. 59, Q<sup>1</sup>: Luke 6:21, for 21b; no. 170, Q<sup>2</sup>: Luke 17:1-2 = Matt. 18:6-7, for 17:1 = 18:7; no. 178, Q<sup>2</sup>: Luke 19:(11)12-24, 27 = Matt. 25:14-28, 30, for 15:14-28 in 1991. Note also the change from “1or2?Q” into Q<sup>2</sup> for Q 16,16.17.18 (nos. 168-169, 15) and Q 17,1-2.3.4.5-6 (nos. 170-173), and into Q<sup>1</sup> for Q 13,18-19 (no. 35), 16,13 (no. 86), 13,30-21 (no. 104), and 15,3-7 (no. 107). Q 9,59-60; 10,21; 12,11-12 (nos. 145, 66, 62) are changed from Q<sup>1</sup> into Q<sup>2</sup>. No. 48, Q 6,22-23 (“1or2?Q”), is now specified as “Q<sup>1</sup>: Luke 6:22-23 = Matt. 5:11-12 [except for Q<sup>2</sup>: 6:22b = 5:11b & 6:23c = 5:12c]” (589).

Appendix 3 deals with the parallels between GT, Q, and Mk. Crossan lists 23 Mk-Q overlaps (11 with a parallel in GT). His list does not include Q 17,1b-2 par. Mk 9,42 and also par. 14,21; 13,30 par. 10,31 (see above); 17,6 par. 11,22-23; 12,51-53 par. 13,12; 16,17 par. 13,31; and 12,40 par. 13,35 (all seven in H.T. Fleddermann’s *Mark and Q*; all, except par. Mk 14,21, also in CrEd).

When speaking in App. 3B of the redaction of the CST, Crossan means that GT and Q have adapted the original apocalyptic eschatology of that Tradition towards either a more ascetic form of eschatology, with a stronger emphasis on esoteric knowledge of the Kingdom (in GT), or towards confirming and strengthening the initial perspective (in Q). This was done in various ways in various passages. In Q 7,24-27 par. GT 78.1-3, GT would have left out the final reference to the Baptist in CST to concentrate on the tension between “desert” (meaning poverty) and “palace” (wealth). Q, on the other hand, retained the elegy of John (“more than a prophet”), but by adding the citation in v. 27, it contrasts John and Jesus, turning the former into a “preparer for Jesus” only (307). In Q 7,28 par. GT 46.1-2, GT has retained the mention of the Baptist but has shifted the focus towards knowledge of the kingdom, while Q is struggling to “mute” (Crossan’s expression) the strong negation of John’s place in the Kingdom by integrating the verse into the larger context of Q 7,24-26.27.28; (16,16?); 7,31-35. This is definitely a very different form of confirmation of the eschatological perspective of CST than the one in Q 7,24-26.27. Yet another kind of redactional adaptation of the major tendency of CST is found in Q 17,23-24, if one can agree with Crossan’s conclusion that the original form of the saying, which is assumed to be (close to) the “common matrix” found in Lk 17,20-21 and GT 113.1-4, has been changed by explicitly describing the coming of the Son of Man (not the Kingdom) as a sudden and unexpected event, “too sudden even for anticipating signs” (316).

Crossan has written a most readable book that is appealing both by the way he presents rather difficult matters to a wider audience and by its form and its stylistic qualities. Through Crossan’s pen, identifying traces of Mark’s redaction in

Mt and Lk becomes, “What we are seeking, as it were, are Markan fingerprints or Markan theological DNS present within the gospels of Matthew and Luke” (105). When dealing with the Q hypothesis, he points to the, in his opinion, paradoxical situation that “Q was quite acceptable as long as it was nothing more than a source to be found within the safe intracanonial confines of Matthew and Luke. But now the Q Gospel is starting to look a little like a Trojan horse, an extracanonial gospel hidden within two intracanonial gospels” (111). And when Crossan is trying to make his case, he argues that it is not enough to write an article on it: “When I need to establish a position, I write a book, not a footnote” (116)!

J. VERHEYDEN

Daniel MARGUERAT – Enrico NORELLI – Jean-Michel POFFET (eds.). *Jésus de Nazareth. Nouvelles approches d'une énigme*. (Le Monde de la Bible, 38.) Genève, Labor et Fides, 1998. (15×22,5), 612 p. ISBN 2-8309-0857-0.

“Jesus of Nazareth. New Approaches to an Enigma” is the title of a collection of twenty-three essays that has resulted from a series of lectures that were organised in 1996, through the combined efforts of the Theological Faculties of the Universities of Lausanne, Genève, Neuchâtel, and Fribourg, as a “third cycle” (doctoral) programme. The editors had three purposes in mind: 1. a critical assessment of current Jesus research; 2. a discussion of recent proposals with regard to three particularly “hot items”: the Jewishness of Jesus, the content of his teaching, and the contribution that the apocryphal gospels can make to the reconstruction of this message; and 3. an interdisciplinary approach that brings together exegetes and systematic theologians on the question of the relevance of the search for the historical Jesus for contemporary theology. The large majority of the contributors came from Switzerland and France, but the volume also contains articles (in French translation) by V. Fusco, G. Theissen, E.P. Sanders, and J.S. Kloppenborg.

Fusco’s essay that opens the series (25-57) offers a fine survey of the development of the research from the early 19th century up to the current “Third Quest”. An important place is given to the discussion on the criteria for identifying authentic Jesus tradition (49-56). Fusco points out, against J.D. Crossan c.s., that the criterion of “multiple attestation” cannot readily be regarded as the primary criterion for reaching back to Jesus. For many others it is at best a criterion that may attest to the relative antiquity of a certain tradition or saying (50). Fusco therefore prefers to stick with a perhaps rather more fluid criterion, which is to reconstruct the message of Jesus in such a way that it can explain the various interpretations that have been given to it in later tradition (this criterion is also known as the “criterion of adequacy”). “Le critère n’est plus ici celui de la double attestation, mais celui d’explication suffisante” (53).

Kloppenborg’s “The ‘Q’ Gospel and the Historical Jesus” (225-268) not only contains a good survey of the development of Q research, but it is also a warning against jumping to conclusions about the historical Jesus on the basis of literary-critical conclusions about Q: “les efforts pour comprendre la dynamique théologique et l’histoire de la composition de Q ne peuvent pas être naïvement traduits en affirmations sur le Jésus historique” (245).

J. Schlosser has studied how the theme of “God the Creator” dominates a great number of Q passages, above all Q 12,22-31 (319-348). In his interpretation, this and other passages in Q dealing with the same topic should be understood against the background of Jesus’ message about the Kingdom, and this in such a way that the latter gives credibility to the image of a caring God (347). Q is also very much present in the essay by Marguerat (293-317) who examines how to combine the two pictures of Jesus the Sage and Jesus the Prophet. The potentials for both trajectories were originally present in Jesus’ teaching. He situated himself “au croisement d’une théologie sapientiale et d’une théologie apocalyptique” (317). This singular position would reflect Jesus’ self-consciousness (cf. H. Schürmann).

The section on “Extra-canonical literature and the historical Jesus” contains contributions by J.-D. Kaestli on the Gospel of Thomas (373-395) and E. Norelli on PEgerton 2 (397-435). Kaestli compares the positions of J.P. Meier and J.D. Crossan on the dependence of GT on the canonical (synoptic) gospels and offers a number of “rules” for a correct use (“Du bon usage”) of GT as a source for recovering authentic Jesus sayings. He warns against making general judgments pro or contra this hypothesis and pleads for a case-by-case assessment, and he also points out that gnosticism is perhaps not the only key for reading GT, that GT is the result of a complex composition history, and that one should duly consider how larger unities of logia came about. A very restricted number of sayings (GT 82 and the parables in 97-98, and maybe also GT 8) could count as authentic sayings of Jesus.

Norelli concludes from a well-documented analysis that Eg knew and depends on the gospel of Jn, but on none of the synoptic gospels. In reworking Jn, the author of Eg has condensed his source, but he nevertheless had the intention to write a gospel and not just a sort of commentary. Norelli also discusses the positions of J.L. Daniels and K. Erlemann who would situate Eg in a milieu of strong anti-Jewish controversy. He does not deny that such is the case but he sees no reason to situate Eg in a mainly Jewish milieu. With regard to the general topic of the volume, Norelli reaches a negative conclusion only: “l’écrit *Egerton* ne nous offre sans doute rien qui remonte à Jésus lui-même” (434).

These are only a few examples of the essays one finds here. Since they have not been listed as separate items in the *Elenchus* of *ETL*, I give here the titles in the order of the book: V. Fusco, “La quête du Jésus historique. Bilan et perspectives” (25-57); E. Cuvillier, “La question du Jésus historique dans l’exégèse francophone. Aperçu historique et évaluation critique” (59-88); B. Neipp, “Images du Christ dans le bouillonnement du 19<sup>e</sup> siècle: un renouveau de l’art religieux?” (89-106); J.-P. Jossua, “Visages de Jésus dans la littérature française au 19<sup>e</sup> siècle” (107-121); G. Theissen, “Jésus et la crise sociale de son temps. Aspects socio-historiques de la recherche du Jésus historique” (125-155); C. Perrot, “La pluralité théologique du judaïsme au 1<sup>er</sup> siècle de notre ère” (157-176); G. Rochais, “L’influence de quelques idées-forces de l’apocalyptique sur certains mouvements messianiques et prophétiques populaires juifs du 1<sup>er</sup> siècle” (177-208); E.P. Sanders, “La rupture de Jésus avec le judaïsme” (209-222); J.S. Kloppenborg, “L’Évangile ‘Q’ et le Jésus historique” (225-268); C. Grappe, “Jésus: messie prétendu ou messie prétendant?” (269-291); D. Marguerat, “Jésus le sage et Jésus le prophète” (293-317); J. Schlosser, “La création dans la tradition des logia” (319-348); J.-P. Lémonon, “Les causes de la mort de Jésus” (349-369); J.-D. Kaestli, “L’utilisation



de *l'Évangile de Thomas* dans la recherche actuelle sur les paroles de Jésus" (373-395); E. Norelli, "Le papyrus *Egerton 2* et sa localisation dans la tradition sur Jésus. Nouvel examen du fragment 1" (397-435); F. Siegert, "Jésus et Paul: une relation contestée" (439-457); J. Zumstein, "La référence au Jésus terrestre dans l'évangile selon Jean" (459-474); C. Thoma, "Jésus dans la polémique juive de l'Antiquité tardive et du Moyen-Âge" (477-487); M. Graetz, "Les lectures juives de Jésus au 19<sup>e</sup> siècle" (489-499); B. Sesboüé, "La question du Jésus historique au regard de la foi" (503-513); P. Bühler, "Jésus, la résurrection et la théologie. La pertinence théologique de la question du Jésus historique" (515-528); M. Bouttier, "Composantes d'une quête insoluble" (529-539); C. Clivaz, "La troisième quête du Jésus historique et le canon: le défi de la réception communautaire. Un essai de relecture historique" (541-558); D. Marguerat, "Les révisions qui nous attendent" (561-565); E. Norelli, "La question des sources" (567-572); J.-M. Poffet, "Une stratégie de l'indirect" (573-576).

J. VERHEYDEN

Hans-Josef KLAUCK. *The Religious Context of Early Christianity: A Guide to Graeco-Roman Religions*. Translated by Brian McNEIL. (Studies of the New Testament and Its World.) Edinburgh, T&T Clark, 2000. (14×22), xxvii-516 p. ISBN 0 567 08693 3.

Hans-Josef KLAUCK. *Magic and Paganism in Early Christianity: The World of the Acts of the Apostles*. Translated by Brian McNEIL. Edinburgh, T&T Clark, 2000. (14×22), xii-132 p. ISBN 0 567 08749 2. £ 18.95.

The volumes are translations of two of H.-J. Klauck's studies on the "Umwelt" of the New Testament. *Religious Context* was published in 1995-96 (in two volumes) as *Die religiöse Umwelt des Christentums*, in the series of Kohlhammer's "Studienbücher Theologie" (see my review in *ETL* 73, 1997, 192-194). The English version has retained the lay-out of the original. There is a General Bibliography at the beginning of the book (xxi-xxvii) and there are 160 specific lists at the beginning of individual sections. An important new element in this translation are the updates of the Bibliography with literature from the years 1995-98 (and an occasional title of 1999). Thus, in the section on Epicurus (p. 386), I noted a reference to another handbook by the same Author: *Die antike Briefliteratur und das Neue Testament* (1998). References to literature in German have wisely been retained, but, if available, the title of the English translation has been added to it (p. 380: Theissen's *Studien zur Soziologie = Social Reality and the Early Christians*, 1992). Even the 1998 reprint of the important collection of Asclepius texts by E.J. and L. Edelstein (Baltimore, 1945, repr. New York, 1975) is duly mentioned, along with newer publications on the topic (cf. p. 155, L. Wells, *The Greek Language of Healing*, 1998).

The same translator, B. McNeil, is also responsible for the English version of *Magie und Heidentum in der Apostelgeschichte des Lukas* (SBS, Stuttgart, 1997), edited by the same publisher, but not as a volume of the series of "Studies of the New Testament and Its World". The monograph had its origin in a lecture trip of the Author in South Africa in 1994 (cf. *Neotestamentica* 28, 1994, 93-108). Somewhat remarkably, both books are introduced with the same famous citation from F. Cumont's classic work on *Les religions orientales dans le paganisme*

*romain* (Paris, 1906, German transl. 1975) about the multicultural aspects of society in imperial Rome.

The book offers a reading of those sections in Acts (ch. 1–2, 8, 10–12, 13–14, 16–18, 19, 27–28) that are concerned with the contacts of the early church with the Gentile world, esp. in so far as it involved questions of miraculous healing practices and other utterances of supernatural power (though there is also a lengthy discussion of Paul's speech on the Areopagus). Klauck discusses such aspects as the historical accuracy of Acts (p. 46: Barnabas as the original hero of Acts 13,6-12), or the literary genre of the same pericope (47: "elements of a punitive miracle" are combined with elements from stories about competing magicians), but perhaps most important are the many references to parallels in Graeco-Roman literature. Thus, for the figure of the Jewish magician Bar-Jesus the reader is referred to what Juvenalis tells us about an old Jewish woman practising magic, or to Apuleius's reply, in defending himself in court against the charge of sorcery, that this would mean that he would have wanted to be the like of such people as "Moses or Jannes" (*Apol.* 90,5).

The often violent confrontations, ending with the triumph of the Christian missionaries, are not only meant to "entertain" or to impress upon the reader the supremacy of his or her faith, but also to ward off the dangers that newly converted members of the church could pose to the community if "remnants of popular religiosity" (120) continued to survive.

In the Preface to *Religious Context* Klauck refers to the favourable reception of the German version of this work and quotes from H.-D. Betz' *JBL* review: "Translated, revised and adapted for the English-speaking readership, this work would make an enormously valuable tool" (xiv). The intended readership not only got a version of this one book, but also of another one dealing with a related topic. And after Klauck's recent move to Chicago, it now even got the Author in person.

J. VERHEYDEN

Jean MILER. *Les citations d'accomplissement dans l'évangile de Matthieu. Quand Dieu se rend présent en toute humanité.* (Analecta Biblica, 140.) Roma, Ed. Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1999. (16,5×24), 420 p. ISBN 88-7653-140-8. \$ 33.00.

The present volume is the revised version of the Author's doctoral dissertation that was accepted by the Biblical Institute in 1997 (dir. J.-N. Aletti). Jean Miler, who currently teaches NT exegesis at the Centre Sèvres in Paris, has tackled an important and much debated topic in the Gospel of Matthew. In eight chapters he discusses all of the so-called fulfilment quotations in the First Gospel (1,22-23; 2,15.18.23; 4,15-16; 8,17; 12,18-21; 13,35; 21,4-5; 27,9-10). In a final chapter he situates the quotations within the whole of Matthew's gospel, and deals with their function, which is to render intelligible the plan of God as it is realized through Jesus and to point from Israel to the Gentiles. In three Appendices, Miler gives a list of 172 citations and allusions from the OT in the gospel (the list could easily be expanded), the text of the introductory formulas, and a synopsis of the OT parallels (Hebrew and Greek) of the citations he discusses in his book.

For each of the quotations Miler offers a careful study of the text and of the narrative context, a synchronic and if needed a diachronic analysis, and an interpretation of their analeptic and proleptic function. In so far as this latter

aspect is concerned, the fulfilment quotations do not just look back at the past to show how the prophecies of old have come true in Jesus, but they also point to the future that is announced in Jesus and that surpasses the boundaries of the Jewish tradition and the Jewish people. The Author indicates at the conclusion of his Introduction that he thinks of Matthew as writing for a community of Jewish Christians who have lived through the drama of the rejection of Jesus' message by his own people and who have turned away from their origin towards the Gentile world to begin a completely new missionary project.

That the citations also point forward to the future is already clear from Miler's analysis of the very first one in 1,22-23. Even though it is possible to read these verses as words of the angel to Joseph, in Miler's view there can be no discussion about it that they should be regarded as a comment by the evangelist, because angels do not elsewhere in Mt argue from Scripture and it would be out of character to have loyal Joseph (1,19; 2,14-15.21) first be "convinced" of God's plan before consenting to it. The exceptional place of this citation (interrupting the narrative rather than being added after it) is not a problem either for Miler. In the present arrangement vv. 24-25 do not merely express the idea that Joseph is loyal to the command of the angel of vv. 20-21, but that in complying to it by accepting the newborn and calling him by his name, he already accomplishes the word of God that was cited in vv. 22-23. "Il reconnaît le salut que Jésus vient réaliser et entre activement dans son accomplissement. De manière implicite, il est le premier à l'appeler *Dieu avec nous*" (31).

The meaning and implications of what is said in vv. 22-23 by calling Jesus Emmanuel will become clear in the gospel. While most of the citations (the exceptions are 2,17-18 and above all 27,9-10) illustrate aspects of Jesus' personality, identifying him as son of God (2,15), miracle worker (8,17), and messianic king (21,4-5), they also announce the future refusal of Israel (2,17-18) as well as the justification of the Gentiles (12,18-21), and which is more, they contribute to the realisation of what is announced. As such, they offer the reader a kind of information that the characters of the story do not yet possess. This interpretation gives full weight to the citations, both on the level of the story, by revealing the way it will take (even though they are not a part of the story itself), and on the level of the communication of the author with his readers. However, Miler probably pushes too far when he argues (esp. in the final pages of his book and in a rather sketchy way) that Mt did not conceive the expansion of the message of salvation to include the Gentiles as the result of the failure of the Jewish mission, but as the expression of the "abundance" of God's salvation (see p. 360: "L'ouverture aux nations n'est donc en aucune manière une conséquence du refus d'Israël; elle est l'effet de la surabondance du don de Dieu").

J. VERHEYDEN

John Chijioke IWE. *Jesus in the Synagogue of Capernaum: The Pericope and Its Programmatic Character for the Gospel of Mark: An Exegetico-Theological Study of Mk 1:21-28*. (Tesi Gregoriana. Serie Teologia, 57.) Roma, Ed. Pont. Univ. Gregoriana, 1999. (17x24), 360 p. ISBN 88-7652-846-6. \$ 21.00.

The purpose of this doctoral dissertation (dir. K. Stock) is to show in what sense the story of Jesus healing a man with an unclean spirit while preaching at

the synagogue of Capernaum in Mk 1,21-28 has a programmatic meaning within Mark's understanding of Jesus' ministry. In Part I the Author examines the pericope from a linguistic-syntactic, a semantic, a narrative-critical, and a pragmatic approach. In Part II he widens his investigation to cover the whole of Mark's gospel to inquire how the person of Jesus (his identity and authority), his deeds (teaching and performing exorcisms), the reception or rejection of Jesus by the disciples and the crowds on the one hand, and the scribes on the other, are developed throughout the gospel. This second part is not without interest, but it may be clear that the analysis of the first healing pericope in the gospel retains the Author's primary attention.

As the result of his linguistic and syntactic study the Author points out that the passage contains a number of key words that will show up again later on in the gospel, as will the two motifs of teaching and exorcism. This conclusion is confirmed by the semantic analysis. From the narrative-critical analysis results that Jesus is the central character of the story, as he will be for most of the following, and this is again confirmed also in the reader-response analysis. Unfortunately, the presentation of the data is not always as accurate as one would have liked. Thus it is said on pp. 86-87 that in describing Jesus' activity as an exorcist, Mark as a rule uses ἐκβάλλω with δαιμόνιον (7x: 1,34.39; 3,15.22; 6,3; 7,26; 9,38; against ἐξέρχομαι 2x: 7,29.30) and ἐξέρχομαι with πνεῦμα ἀκάθαρτον (4x: 1,26; 5,8.13; 9,25). But 6,13 is about the disciples, not about Jesus, and 9,38 about an unnamed exorcist. The exceptional case of 7,29.30 may be due to Mark presenting Jesus as taking up the vocabulary of the Syrophoenician who in v. 26 had referred to the unclean spirit of v. 25 as "a demon". In the story of the boy with the unclean spirit in Mk 9,14-29, ἐκβάλλω is used to describe the unsuccessful exorcism of the disciples (vv. 18 and 28) and ἐξέρχομαι for Jesus (vv. 25 and 26, and also in Jesus' reply in v. 29).

This first exorcism following upon Jesus' preaching in the synagogue before an amazed crowd and the irritated scribes introduces the reader to two major activities of Jesus. Exorcisms are a powerful challenge to the reign of Satan; and his teaching reveals Jesus as one with authority but it also provokes divided reactions because it was unheard of before. Together these two activities will profoundly characterise Jesus' mission, and there lies the programmatic function of the pericope.

J. VERHEYDEN

Geert VAN OYEN. *The Interpretation of the Feeding Miracles in the Gospel of Mark*. (Collectanea Biblica et Religiosa Antiqua, 4.) Brus-sel, KVABWK, 1999. (18x26), xi-252 p. ISBN 90-6569-681-4.

The present volume is the English translation of the second part of the Author's doctoral dissertation on the history of the exegesis of the Gospel of Mark in the twentieth century (K.U. Leuven 1993, dir. F. Neiryneck). The first part was published (in Dutch) in 1993 (see *ETL* 1994, 466-467).

The book is divided into four chapters. As the former volume, this one too contains a solid survey of the history of research, now on the double miracle cycle in Mk 6-8. The reader will especially appreciate the many accurate quotations from the literature (in the original languages). Due attention is given to E. Wendling's *Ur-Marcus* theory which in fact focused above all on the redactional

qualities of the final redactor, the “Evangelist”. Chapter Three draws the history of investigation of the Feeding Stories in Mk 6,34-44 and 8,1-9 in redaction- and literary-critical studies from J. Schmid (1950) to R.H. Gundry’s 1993 commentary. The final chapter (174-218) offers a redaction-critical study of the Feeding Miracles, with an occasional outlook on a synchronic reading (187-190). As a result, the Author proposes, as “an alternative solution” to theories of pre-Markan miracle cycles, to regard both narratives as the work of the evangelist highlighting the motif of the incomprehension of the disciples. In Van Oyen’s opinion, the impasse that is reached by a certain form of redaction criticism trying to remove redaction from tradition to get back to a pre-Markan level can be overwon by a consistent attention for the evangelist’s redactional skills.

Previous to the publication, Van Oyen had dealt with the problem of narrative and sayings doublets in Mt and Mk in an article that appeared in *ETL* 73 (1997) 277-306. Last year he was appointed professor of NT exegesis at the University of Utrecht. See his inaugural lecture on “The Readers of the Gospel of Mark” (*De lezers van het Marcusevangelie*, in Utrechtse theologische Reeks, 43) that deals with methodological questions concerning the real versus the implied reader of the gospel.

J. VERHEYDEN

Marianne Meye THOMPSON. *The God of the Gospel of John*. Grand Rapids, MI – Cambridge, UK, Eerdmans, 2001. (15×22,5), x-269 p. ISBN 0-8028-4734-X. \$ 22.00; £ 14.99.

After the publication of her monograph on *The Humanity of Jesus in the Fourth Gospel* (Philadelphia, PA, Fortress, 1988), M.M. Thompson, Professor of New Testament Interpretation at Fuller Theological Seminary, Pasadena, CA, has pursued her theological approach to the Gospel of John with a comprehensive study of the concept of God. The *Introduction* (1-15) offers an historical survey of research on God in the NT, entitled “The Neglected Factor in New Testament Theology” (see N.A. Dahl, in *Reflections* 75, 1975, 5-8; see also *Jesus the Christ: The Historical Origins of Christological Doctrine*, ed. D.H. JUEL, Minneapolis, Fortress, 1991, 153-163). She maintains “that the Gospel of John is theocentric, that it directs our attention to God, and that this is a better characterization than the more typical ‘Christocentric’” (ix). In the space of five chapters she treats issues and subjects that are essential for our understanding of theme of God in the Gospel of John: (1) The Meaning of “God” (17-55); (2) The Living Father (57-100); (3) Knowledge of God (101-143); (4) The Spirit of God (145-188); (5) The Worship of God (189-226). The book ends with “Concluding Reflections” (227-240), a Bibliography (241-252) and two Indexes (253-255: Modern Authors; 256-269: Ancient Sources).

Portions of chapter 2 have appeared in *Semeia* 85 (1999) 19-31 and in her book *The Promise of the Father: Jesus and God in the New Testament*, Louisville, Westminster/John Knox, 2000. An earlier draft of chapter 5 was published in *The Princeton Seminary Bulletin* 19 (1998) 259-278. Note also three other contributions by M.M.T. on the theme of God in John: *Thinking about God: Wisdom and Theology in John 6*, in R.A. CULPEPPER (ed.), *Critical Readings of John 6* (Biblical Interpretation Series, 22), Leiden, Brill, 1997, 221-246; “*God’s Voice You Have Never Heard, God’s Form You Have Never Seen*”: *The*

*Characterization of God in the Gospel of John*, in *Semeia* 63 (1993) 177-204; *Jesus and his God*, in M. BOCKMUEHL (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Jesus* (Cambridge Companions to Religion), Cambridge, University Press, 2001, 41-55.

According to M.M.T. the God of the Fourth Evangelist is the God of Israel, characterised by Jesus himself as “my Father”. She stresses that the Father-Son relationship underscores the fundamental portrayal of God as the living God and creator of all life (e.g., 1,1-3; 6,57; 5,25-26) and that this portrayal influences the description of the Spirit, who can be virtually defined as the “life-giving force of power of God” (e.g., 1,12-13; 3,3-5; 4,14.23-24; 6,63; 7,37; 17,3). This means (1) that God gives life through the Son and the Spirit and (2) that He is made known through the life and work of the Son and the Spirit. We will endeavour to make these general observations a little more precise and concrete by summarising the “Concluding Reflections”.

Firstly, Jesus exercises a number of divine prerogatives through his signs and words. These divine prerogatives include the power to give life (5,25-26; 19,28-29), the authority to work on the Sabbath (5,16-18), sovereignty over or knowledge of all things (3,35; 4,25; 13,3; 16,30), the power and authority of judgement and salvation (5,27.30; 8,16), and the capacity to bestow the divine spirit of creation and salvation (6,63; 20,22). In exercising these divine prerogatives, however, “Jesus is not presented as a second divine being, not a god alongside the one true God, but as the Son who is authorized and even commanded to speak God’s words and to do God’s work” (231). M.M.T. can thus argue that John’s Christology is both functional and relational: it lays the emphasis on Jesus’ exercise of divine prerogatives and it seeks to delineate the dependence of Jesus on God.

Secondly, Jesus’ dependence on God constitutes an argument for their unity. The unity of God is stressed throughout the Gospel: “Father and Son are not two independent deities and not ‘two powers in heaven’. Rather there is – to quote the Gospel itself – one ‘true God’, the living Father, whose life is given to and whose divine power is exercised in and through Jesus, the Son, and through the agency of the life-giving Spirit” (232). The unity of Jesus with God also forms the basis of our knowledge of God: “Because the Father is present in and through the Son, knowledge of God is not knowledge that is separate from the person of Jesus, ... Rather, knowledge of God is mediated through the work and person of Jesus” (233). With regard to the very limited attribution of “God” for Jesus, i.e., for the Word (1,1) and for the risen Jesus (20,28), M.M.T. rightly remarks that “properly speaking, the term is not used of Jesus of Nazareth during his life and ministry in first-century Judea, Galilee, and Samaria” (233). Further, she notes that Jesus does not flatly deny the charge against him that “he makes himself equal to God” (5,18 and 10,33), but rather interprets in two ways. In the first instance, the charge is countered by showing that the Son does all that he does through his dependence on the Father (5,19). In the second instance, he refutes the charge through an appeal to Ps 82. Thus, “like Philo, John uses ‘god’ to refer both to the ‘only true God’ – for Philo, the ‘one who is’ – and to the manifestation of that God as the Logos” (234). M.M.T. carefully notes the difference between Philo and John, however: “While John understands the Logos somewhat differently and posits an incarnation in human flesh that Philo does not, nevertheless, that Logos is both identified with and differentiated from God in ways that allow a dual usage of the term ‘God’. Ultimately, the Logos may be called ‘God’ because



the Logos derives from God and is an expression of God. John's problem may, if anything, be deemed more acute than Philo's since John must account not only for the unity of God and the Logos but also for the identity of Jesus, a human being of flesh and blood, with the God who is Spirit" (234-235).

Thirdly, referring to her article *The Historical Jesus and the Johannine Christ*, in R.A. CULPEPPER & C.C. BLACK (eds.), *Exploring the Gospel of John*. FS D.M. Smith, Louisville, Westminster/John Knox, 1996, 21-42, M.M.T. remarks with regard to the genre of John that "While John's Gospel is often labeled the most theological or the most interpretative – characterizations often understood as equivalent – of the four Gospels, John's creativity operates within definite limits, and his theological reflections remain tethered to historical realities" (236). According to her, "John thus provides the starkest instance of what a Gospel is: a Gospel is the narrative account of God's encounter with humankind through the life, death, and resurrection of Jesus of Nazareth... The narrative presents Jesus' work as firmly anchored in the historical circumstances of the first-century world and as leading ultimately to reflections on and about the character of God's work" (238). This definition of the genre of John confirms that "the Christology of John focuses on the agency of Jesus as mediating the presence or carrying out the will of God". In this respect, she is able to argue that various Christological titles, such as prophet, king, Son of Man, Messiah, and Word all fall within the broad category of "agent of God".

Fourthly, M.M.T. maintains that "because the Gospel of John is an articulation of the significance of Jesus' ministry as the embodiment of the glory, Wisdom, and Word of God, it is also, finally, theocentric in focus and content" (238) and as such she follows Barrett's interpretation: "There could hardly be a more Christocentric writer than John, yet his very Christocentricity is theocentric" (*Essays on John*, Philadelphia, PA, Westminster, 1982, 246). According to M.M.T., "It is not as though we are to imagine an ellipse with two foci; or as though we had two 'centers' in John that simply exist side by side. Rather, the image is that of concentric circles, in which the Christological circle lies within and shares its center with the larger theological circle. Though focusing attention on the figure of Jesus as the Revealer and Son of God, the one who brings life from God, the Gospel always directs its reader's attention to God" (239).

I fully agree with M.M.T.'s interpretation of Thomas's confession in Jn 20,28 ("My Lord and my God") and note here some elements of her interpretation. *First*, this climatic confession of the Gospel forms an inclusio with the designation of "God" for the Word in Jn 1,1 (223). *Second*, Thomas does not confess that "the risen Jesus is the only God", but "he acknowledges the exclusive and comprehensive revelation of God through the person of Jesus, and the identity of Jesus with God" (235). *Third*, the formulation of his confession "stands as the summary and elaboration of the work and person of Jesus through the Gospel. The direct confession of the risen Lord as God stands alongside and interprets, but does not eclipse, the narrative that points to his dependence upon and authorization by the Father. Like the prologue, then, the entire Gospel points both to the one who is 'with God' and who 'is God'. The narrative of the Gospel demonstrates how the Father who seeks true worshippers finds them in the people who join in Thomas's confession of Jesus as 'My Lord and my God'" (55). *Fourth*, the personal pronouns in Thomas's confession "indicate that this is a confession addressed to Jesus and, hence, properly judged an acclamation not only of his

identity but an act of worship” (223). *Fifth*, after the resurrection “in hailing Jesus as ‘my God’ Thomas confesses him to be, like God the living Father, eternally alive.... Life belongs to God, and because Jesus has life as God does, and so has it eternally, the disciples are led to the confession, ‘My Lord and my God!’” (225-226). *Sixth*, with regard to the statement of the Gospel’s purpose in 20,(30-)31 (“that you may come to believe that Jesus is the Messiah, the Son of God, and that through believing you may have life in his name”), M.M.T. rightly remarks: “That the evangelist sees no contradiction between confession of Jesus as ‘my God’ and as ‘Son of God’ reveals the basic contours of his Christology and sheds some light on the question of what it might mean to worship the risen Jesus. Specifically, it cannot mean to worship a figure alongside of God, or in addition to God, but to acknowledge the propriety of speaking of the one who is the Son of God, the incarnation of the Word of God, as ‘my God.’ For John, the incarnation is nothing other than God’s self-manifestation. The incarnate Son is neither an exalted agent figure nor a second deity but the very embodiment of the Word of God, and, therefore, merits address as ‘my God’” (223-224). *Seventh*, with regard to the parallel to Thomas’s confession in Suetonius, *Dom. 13 (dominus et deus noster)*, M.M.T. only notes: “It is possible that Thomas’s language reflects the imperial title, but one of the most common adjectives or descriptive phrases attached to ‘God’ in the OT and Jewish sources is the personal possessive pronoun, either in the singular, ‘my God’, or the plural, ‘our God’”. The present reviewer expected a discussion at this juncture of the hypothesis proposed in B.A. MASTIN’s article *The imperial Cult and the Ascription of the Title Θεός to Jesus (John XX.28)*, in *Studia Evangelica*, vol. VI (TU, 112), Berlin, 1973, 352-365; compare Id., *A Neglected Feature of the Christology of the Fourth Gospel*, in *NTS* 22 (1975-76) 32-51, esp. 43-48. Mastin argues that John 20,28 “was composed at the time of Domitian’s reign, and that it was a considered rebuttal of the claims made on behalf of the Emperor by the Imperial Cult” (1973, 364). Mastin has been followed recently by, among others, S. VAN TILBORG, *Reading John in Ephesus* (SupplNT, 83), Leiden, Brill, 1996 (see, e.g., pp. 56, 218) and B. WITHERINGTON, III, *John’s Wisdom: A Commentary on the Fourth Gospel*, Cambridge, The Lutherworth Press, 1995, 349; see now also his *New Testament History: A Narrative Account*, Grand Rapids, MI, Baker Book House – Carlisle, Paternoster Press, 2001 (see pp. 390-409, esp. 394).

This monograph is an incisive, well-written, mature and valuable study of God in the Fourth Gospel. It should be on the desk of every Johannine scholar and on the shelves of any serious theological library.

G. VAN BELLE

Door BROUNS-WEWERINKE. *In verhalen krijgt geschiedenis betekenis. Verbeelding van Jezus’ lijden en dood in het Johannesevangelie.* Zoetermeer, Boekencentrum, 2002. (16×24), 287 p. ISBN 90-239-0974-7.

In this dissertation entitled *Stories Lend Significance to History: The Depiction of the Passion and Death of Jesus in the Gospel According to John*, defended at the Theological Faculty Tilburg (the Netherlands: promoter: W. Weren), D. Brouns-Wewerinke (= B.-W.) investigates the relationship between “story” (i.e., the text and its narrative world in John) and “history” (i.e., the historical facts

and the reality beyond the story of the text of the Gospel) with reference to Jesus' passion narrative in the Fourth Gospel. After the Introduction (9-17) in which the Author formulates the problem, a description of the methods used in the dissertation and a rather limited "status quaestionis", the book is divided into three parts.

The *First Part*, containing four chapters, investigates the *Story* of the Fourth Gospel from a synchronic perspective and offers narrative and semantic analyses of the text as a whole. In the first chapter (18-26) B.-W. studies the macrostructure of the Gospel on the basis of chronological and topographical indications in the texts. With respect to the latter she proposes the following structure of the Gospel:

<i>Prologue</i>	1,1-18	
I	<i>First Journey</i>	1,19-3,36
	A	1,19-51 Bethany beyond the Jordan
	B	2,1-12 Galilee
	C	2,13-3,36 Jerusalem (2,13-3,21) – Judaea (3,22-36)
II	<i>Second Journey</i>	4,1-5,47
	A	4,1-42 From Judaea to Galilee
	B	4,43-54 Galilee
	C	5,1-47 Jerusalem
III	<i>Third Journey</i>	6,1-10,39
	A	6,1-21 The other side of / on the Sea of Galilee
	C	6,22-7,9 Galilee
	B	7,10-10,39 Jerusalem
IV	<i>Fourth Journey</i>	10,40-21,23
	A	10,40-11,16 Beyond the Jordan
	C	11,17-20,29 Judaea (11,17-12,11) – Jerusalem (12,12-20,29)
	B	21,1-23 Galilee
<i>Epilogue</i>	21,24-25	

With respect to the indications of time she proposes that we read the gospel as follows:

1,1-18	Prologue
1,19-2,12	
2,13-3,21	Immediately before and during the first Passover
3,22-4,54	
5,1-47	During "a festival"
6,1-71	Immediately before the second Passover
7,1-10,21	Immediately before and during the Festival of Booths, in autumn
10,22-39	During the Festival of the Dedication, in winter
10,40-11,54	
11,55-20,29	Immediately before the third Passover
21,1-23	
21,24-25	Epilogue

After discussing these two structures, B.-W. offers three conclusions. First, Passover and Jerusalem are emphasised: Passover is mentioned three times and Jesus travels four times to Jerusalem (two times on the occasion of the Passover). Second, the first and third Passover are closely connected with Jerusalem as a place. Moreover, the cleansing of the temple during the first Passover is closely connected with Jesus' death and resurrection during the third

Passover in Jn 2,21-22. Third, this connection implies that the story of Jesus' passion and death does not begin with 18,1, because earlier passages in the gospel allude to and foreshadow these events. This means, according to B.-W., that from the narratological point of view the division of the gospel into two parts (chapters 1-12 and 13-21) is inadequate. I cannot agree with this statement. The geographical and temporal marks may indeed be important indications for the structure of the work, but other indications are also significant. I think especially of the theological themes and reflections of the evangelist. I prefer, therefore, the more "traditional division" of the Gospel into the *Book of Signs* (1,19-12,50) and the *Book of Glory* (13,1-20,29), with a Prologue (1,1-18) and a Conclusion (20,30-31) followed by an Epilogue (in addition to R. Bultmann, C.H. Dodd and R. Bultmann, for example, see also F.J. Moloney, U. Wilckens, and others). After the long theological reflections of the evangelist concerning the "The Revelation of the δόξα to the World" in John 12,37-43,44-50, the evangelist starts with a solemn phrase in 13,1 the second part of his Gospel, i.e. "The Revelation of the δόξα before the Community". And of course, because the Gospel proclaims Jesus as the Christ and Son of God, he is for the omniscient narrator from the beginning in the Gospel the exalted Christ who suffered. In both divisions B.-W. does not mention the so-called first conclusion of the Gospel (see my article *ETL* 74, 1998, 326-343).

The second chapter provides us with an insight into the temporal organisation of the Fourth Gospel, i.e. the manner in which "time" is structured. On the basis of the works of, among others, P. Ricœur, P. Genette and M. Ball, B.-W. studies the following aspects of the temporal organisation of the narrative: order (or sequence), duration and frequency. Under the aspect "order", she stresses especially the prolepses and analepses, which can also be classified as "asides"; see my *Les parenthèses dans l'évangile de Jean de Jean* (SNTA, 11), Leuven, 1985, pp. 119-111, no. 11: "Référence à un passage qui précède ou qui suit". With regard to "duration", i.e. "the relationship of the length of the narrative to the length of the story" (R.A. Culpepper), she emphasises that the greatest length of the narrative is devoted to the three Passovers, and especially to the third Passover (2,13-3,21; 6,1-71; 11,55-20,29).

The third Chapter turns to a semantic analysis of the indications of place and time. B.-W. argues that the references to Judaea, Galilee, Jerusalem and the temple not only have a geographical meaning but also convey an extra meaning that is connected with time. Thus, Judaea and the temple (in contrast to Galilee) are the places of Jesus' hour, his death, and reveal the significance of his death. In a similar way, she studies the verbs of motion (e.g., καταβαίνω – ἀναβαίνω, ἔρχομαι – ἐξέρχομαι – ἀπέρχομαι, ἄγω – ὑπάγω, πορεύομαι compared with ἐγείρω, ὑψώω, and αἴρω) and references to time (festivals and Sabbath; night, evening and morning; day and hour). She concludes: "The verbs of motion also indicate similar layers of meaning. Jesus travels throughout the land and at the same time he also undertakes a journey from heaven to earth and from earth to heaven. The confusion which this dual meaning causes for the characters in the story is part of the narrative style typical of John. Similarly, references to time in the story often contain a double meaning, which is clear enough to the reader, but not always to the characters themselves" (286). With regard to 4,44, she agrees with W. Davies that ἐν τῇ ἰδίᾳ πατριδί refers to "the world" (see 59 n. 42), but overlooks, I think, the narrative structure in 4,43-54: "Both the immediate and the broader context of the

saying in 4,44 point to an identification of Jesus' πατρίς with Galilee. With this saying, introduced by an anticipatory γάρ, the evangelist offers the key for interpreting the episode about the faith of the Galileans in 4,43-54. Jn 4,46-54 is an illustration of the saying that Jesus is not honoured in his homeland. Initially Jesus is met with only an imperfect faith, a faith based on signs, one that must grow into a faith in His word" (see my article in *ETL* 74, 1998, 27-44, esp. 44).

The fourth chapter deals with the semantic analysis of John 18–19. First, B.-W. provides a Dutch translation with philological and grammatical notes to the Greek text. Asides or comments by the evangelist are printed in italics. She considers 18,9.14.32.40d; 19,13d.17b.24def.28b.35.36-37, but not, without any apparent reason, 18,2.5e.10e.13b.16c.18c.26b.28bcde; 19,14ab.20c.23de.23gh.27c.29a.31b.31d.38c.39b.40c (see my *Les parenthèses* and my article in *BETL* 100C, 1992, 1901-1933). In a note to 19,35, she accepts H. Thyen's explanation but is apparently not aware of M. Sabbe's proposal in *ETL* 70 (1994) 34-64. Second, she discusses the inclusions (κῆπος in 18,1 and 19,41; ἔκεῖ in 18,2,3 and 19,42; Ἰησοῦς in 18,1 and 19,42; εἰδῶς in 18,4 and τετέλεσται in 19,28), the plot, the characters (see also *infra*), the key-words (παραδίδωμι, βασιλεύς, βασιλεία, σταυρός, σταυρώω, ἐξέρχομαι, εἰσερχομαι, ἔξω, ὁ ἀρχιερέυς, οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς). Third, she defends the unity of these chapters, and follows, together with R.E. Brown, a division in three sections: 18,1-27; 18,28–19,16a; 19,16b-42. Fourth, she deals with the characters (the disciples as group, Peter, Judas, the Jews, Pilate, and Jesus), and stresses that "the word 'kingship' denotes the various points of view of the characters. The kingship of Jesus represents an entirely different kind of kingship than Pilate envisages and which the Jews gradually come to share in the course of the story. On the basis of this theme the various layers of meaning in John's gospel become apparent" (287, see 133-140). Fifth, with regard to the "Scripture", she discusses the Old Testament background of κῆπος, the fulfilment of Jesus words in 18,9; 18,32 (compare my article in *BETL* 131, 1997, 515-521 on 18,9), the explicit quotations of Scripture in 19,24.36.37, and the theme of Jesus as paschal lamb. With regard to the "garden" B.-W. stresses in dialogue with F. Manns that John combines themes of the creation story with elements of the Canticle of Canticles, but she does not discuss T.F. GLASSON's hypothesis on *Davidic Links with the Betrayal of Jesus*, in *ExpT* 85 (1973-74) 118-119; see also more recently M. DALY-DENTON, *David in the Fourth Gospel: The Johannine Reception of the Psalms* (AGAJU, 47), Leiden, 1999.

In chapters five and six, B.-W. turns to "History". At this juncture she limits her investigation to the account of the trial before Pilate in Jn 18,28–19,16a. Chapter five contains and analysis of the tradition and redaction of the account, the author defending the point of view of the "Louvain School": "The analysis offers sufficient evidence to assume that John was both familiar with and made use of the final versions of the synoptic accounts. Elements differing from the synoptic versions (construction, order and vocabulary) can be attributed to the redaction of John himself. It is safe to assume, therefore, that John did not use any other written sources than the Synoptics in writing his version of the trial before Pilate" (287).

In chapter six, B.-W. studies the historical background of John 18,28–19,16a. She confronts the results of redaction criticism with historical facts about the socio-political situation in Palestine prior to 70 A.D. She thus compares extra-biblical texts (Flavius Josephus, *Bellum Judaicum*, II,169-174, 175-177; *Antiquitates*

*Judaicae*, xviii,55-59, 60-62, 85-89, 63-64; Philo, *Legatio ad Gaium*, 299-305; Tacitus, *Annales*, xv,44) with the Johannine text regarding Pilate as a person, the date of the death of Jesus and juridical competence. She definitely thinks that this research “reveals that it is in the redaction of John that facts can be found corresponding with historical data from non-biblical sources” and concludes: “This means that John retained more historical elements in his description of the trial before Pilate than the Synoptics and that he employed these elements to elaborate meaning, or in other words for his theology”. Two remarks need to be made with regard to this part of the work under review. First, B.-W. has not investigated the distinction between tradition and redaction thoroughly enough. The description of the Johannine redaction is rather disappointing. She has not used the lists of style characteristics of M.-É. Boismard and A. Lamouille (1977), E. Ruckstuhl and P. Dschulnigg (1991) et W. Schenk (1993); see also the lists in F. Neiryneck, in BETL 49, 1979, 45-66 (= *ETL* 53, 1977, 363-478, 404-425); G. Van Belle, *Les parenthèses*, p. 105-155; Id., in BETL, 116, 1994, p. 405-420. I mention only some Johannine style characteristics from the list of E. Ruckstuhl and P. Dschulnigg, not mentioned in the present study (the number of the characteristics refers to BETL, 116, 1994, p. 405-420): 52 ἡμελλεν/ἔμελλεν ἀποθνήσκειν (18,32); 53 ἀπεκρίθη (asyndetic/οὐν) (αὐτῶ/αὐτοῖς) ([ὁ] Ἰησοῦς / other name/noun or pronoun) as introduction of direct discourse (18,34.35.36.37; 19,7.11.15); 72 (108) εἶμι ἐκ (in metaphorical sense) / γεννάομαι ἐκ (18,37); 100 Ἐβραϊστί (19,13.17.20); 104-105 ἐγώ, ὑμεῖς (19,6); 116 ἦν δέ (καί) / ἦσαν δέ immediately followed by the subject (18,40; 19,14.23); 118 ἦν/ἦσαν δέ + temporal note (18,28; 19,14); 133 ἐντεῦθεν (18,36); 172 Proper name οὐν + participle + finite verb (19,13); 174 expegetic ἵνα/ὅτι (18,39); 175 ἔρχομαι ἵνα (final) (18,37); 211 λέγει/λέγουσιν (asyndetic/οὐν) + dative + someone (as introduction to the direct discourse) (18,38; 19,6.10.15); 222 ὁ λόγος (...) ὃν εἶπεν (18,32); 223-225 τοῦτο/ταῦτα + verb of saying (18,34.38); 265 νόμος + with a term indicating the appartenance (18,31); 269 εἰ ... νῦν δέ (18,36); 289a οὐκ ... οὐδεῖς (or inflexions) (18,31; 19,11); 295 οὐν ... καί + finite verb... καί + finite verb (same subject) (18,33); 339 ἵνα ὁ λόγος (...) πληρωθῆ (18,32); 343 ποιέω ἐμαυτόν + attribute (19,7); 368a σύ after the verb (18,37; 19,9); 408 ὥρα ἦν ὡς + number (19,14); 412 Adjective possessive, placed after the substantive, with duplication of the article (in 18,36 four times); 412a *Asyndeton epicum* (18,30.34.35.36.37; 19,7.11.15); 416a *Wiederaufnahme* (18,36). Second, one also has to ask to what extent can one find “historical data” in, for example, Flavius Josephus, given that these texts also contain a significant amount of interpretation of history, thus making “historical data” all the more difficult to ascertain.

The Third Part deals with the relation between story (Part I) and history (Part II) and covers Chapter 7. Following Paul Ricoeur, B.-W. contends that “History and story are not separate entities, but are closely connected by the imagination of the author or narrator. Without the story, history fades from memory, whereas history comes to life in the story. Using the imagination as a vehicle we can take a fresh look at reality and lend significance to it” (287). She illustrates the link between story and history with the following examples: 2,13-22; 11,47-53, and the theme “Jesus as Pascal Lamb” in 18,28–19,16. The book ends with Bibliography and a Summary in English.

I have read this book with sympathy and I look forward to further publications of B.-W. The problem with this dissertation, however, is that the project was too large



and that the Author has apparently not used a lot of pertinent literature. I already noted some absent works above and have to say that a Johannine scholar has to use more commentaries than one can find in the list of the present dissertation (she only mentions R.E. Brown, R. Bultmann, D.A. Carson, E. Hoskyns, P. van Houwelingen, R.H. Lightfoot and R. Schnackenburg). With regard to the literature related to the passion narrative, for example, she has not used the very useful works of J.P. HEIL, *Blood and Water* (CBQ MS, 27), Washington DC, Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1995; T. KNÖPPLER, *Die theologia crucis des Johannesevangeliums* (WMANT, 69), Neukirchener, 1994; M. LANG, *Johannes und die Synoptiker* (FRLANT, 182), Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1999; S. LÉGASSE, *Le procès de Jésus* (LD Commentaires, 3), Paris, Cerf, 1995.

G. VAN BELLE

Philippe BOSSUYT. *L'Esprit en Actes. Lire les Actes des Apôtres*. (Le livre et le rouleau, 3.) Bruxelles, Éditions Lessius, 1998. (14,5×21), 174 p. ISBN 2-87299-072-0.

Contrary to what one might expect, this book is not a systematic study of the role and function of the Holy Spirit in the Acts of the Apostles. It is rather the subtitle of the book that matters. Philippe Bossuyt offers a reading of the Book of Acts in the form of a short commentary in which special attention is given to the presence of the Spirit in the works of the apostles. A clear advantage of such an approach is that one avoids the danger of writing a kind of treatise "De Spiritu Sancto" that risks to become some kind of systematic presentation of a "doctrine" on the Spirit that Luke never intended it to be. On the other hand, the problem with the "commentary" genre is that one lacks even an attempt at systematization and that it is not always clear how what can be said about this or that section is related to the role of the Spirit. There is also a certain danger to such an approach that one "discovers" the Spirit at work in passages where Luke does not even hint at it. Thus in commenting upon Paul's defense speech in Ephesus, Bossuyt gives the following rather psychological exegesis of Paul raising his hand to calm the crowd (21,40): "S'imaginer-t-il pour autant qu'il va d'un seul coup retourner tous les cœurs et transformer cette meute hurlante en disciples du Nazaréen? Un prophète est un serviteur envoyé pour dire la parole. La conversion des cœurs est l'œuvre de l'Esprit Saint" (p. 127). But then there are of course also those passages in which the Spirit is explicitly mentioned, such as Acts 1,5, that is related not only to John's preaching in Lk 3,16, but also to Stephen's "rapture" by the Spirit in Acts 7,55 (p. 10). In so far, Bossuyt's little book can probably best be regarded as an invitation to read through Acts again "à la lumière de l'Esprit Saint qui y est déjà présent, et encore à raconter" (p. 165).

J. VERHEYDEN

Daniel MARGUERAT. *La première histoire du christianisme. Les Actes des Apôtres*. (Lectio Divina, 180.) Paris, Cerf; Genève, Labor et Fides, 1999. (13×21), 454 p. ISBN 2-204-06293-6 (Cerf), 2-204-8309-0956-9 (Labor et Fides). 196 FF.

In the past decade Daniel Marguerat, who is currently preparing a commentary on the Acts of the Apostles, has published a number of studies on various aspects

of the Book of Acts, including its status as primary source of inspiration for similar writings in later generations (see ch. 13 on the Acts of Paul). In the present volume he has collected a selection of studies, all of which but two have been published before. However, this is not merely a reprint. Some of the articles have been adapted (“retouchés”), others have been revised and developed. Two chapters consist of a combination of two originally separate articles.

The first chapter, “Comment Luc écrit l’histoire”, is presented as a new study (“inédit”). It is inspired by the Author’s *Le premier historien du christianisme* (Cahiers bibliques, 36) of 1997. The second chapter (“Un récit de commencement”) is here published for the first time. Marguerat deals in it with the genre of Acts, with the point of view of its author presenting himself as a historian, and with the author’s decision to give a continuation to the Gospel. Acts is regarded as a work of historiography with an apologetic purpose, “permettant à la chrétienté de se comprendre et de se dire” (53). But as a historian, Luke is not a chronicler but one who is interested in the philosophy of history, or rather, in the theology of history, in the way divine providence has furthered the work of its heralds through hardships and resistance. The unity of Luke and Acts is a topic that is dealt with also in the third chapter (a reprint of the Author’s contribution to the CBL of 1998 on Luke-Acts). Marguerat here offers a narrative-critical reading of “the Lukan diptych”, pointing out both some of the tensions between the two books and three strategies for reading Luke-Acts from a perspective of unification.

Beside a narrative- and rhetorical-critical reading Marguerat is also much interested in the way Luke has integrated into his work certain aspects of the ancient world in which he lived, be it with regard to the disputes about miracles and the charge of performing magic (ch. 7), or the perils of traveling the world (ch. 12). Important themes in Acts, such as the role of God or of the Spirit (ch. 5 and 6) and the emancipation of the early community from its Jewish background (ch. 4 and 8), are dealt with in separate studies. Three contributions focus on particular passages: Acts 5,1-11 (ch. 9), the stories of Paul’s conversion (ch. 10), and the conclusion of the book (ch. 11). This volume makes one look forward to the commentary.

J. VERHEYDEN

Klaus SCHOLTISSEK (ed.). *Christologie in der Paulus-Schule. Zur Rezeptionsgeschichte des paulinischen Evangeliums*. (Stuttgarter Bibelstudien, 181.) Stuttgart, Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1999. (13,5×20,5), 192 p. ISBN 3-460-04811-5. € 23,42.

The present volume is the result of a colloquium that was organised by students of K. Kertelge on April 24-25, 1998. It is the second such volume to appear in the SBS series (the first one dealt with the Gospel of Mark and was published as no. 163 in 1995). In this second meeting of former members of Kertelge’s “Oberseminar”, the group decided to take as its topic the reception and further development of Paul’s Christology as it is reflected in the pseudepigraphical writings in the Pauline corpus. In the first three of the seven contributions, K. Scholtissek (*Paulus als Lehrer. Eine Skizze zu den Anfängen der Paulus-Schule*), K. Backhaus (“*Mitteilhaber des Evangeliums*”. *Zur christologischen Grundlegung einer “Paulus-Schule” bei Paulus*), and Kertelge himself (*Christologie bei*

*Paulus*), discuss Paul's Christology as the normative referential framework of the later letters, and address the question of Paul's status as a teacher and the evidence in his letters of how Paul saw his task as an apostle and as the founder of a community of faithful. The remaining four contributions deal with the Christology of the letters to the Colossians (A. de Oliveira) and to the Ephesians (R. Kampling), the second letter to the Thessalonians (G. Hotze), and the Pastoral letters (T. Söding).

From comparing the various ways in which a later generation has struggled to preserve the essence of Paul's Christology, while at the same time showing an openness for more recent developments and even for other traditions (so Söding, with regard to Past), there results that it is probably impossible to give a clear description of this "Paulus-Schule", but also that these successors were able to interpret Paul's thought in a personal and independent way, something that has too often been ignored in the past. It is especially in the Pastoral letters that one can discover how at a certain point is taken up material of non-Pauline origin to be presented as, and combined with, material of genuine Pauline tradition, as Söding (pp. 177-180) illustrates from 1 Tim 1,15 (cf. Lk 19,10), 2,6 (Mk 10,45), 6,13 (Mk 15,2 par.), and 2 Tim 2,11-14 (Mt 10,33 par.).

J. VERHEYDEN

John D. HARVEY. *Listening to the Text: Oral Patterning in Paul's Letters*. (ETS Studies, 1.) Grand Rapids, MI, Baker Books; Leicester, Apollos, 1998. (15x23), xviii-357 p. ISBN 0-8010-2200-2 (Baker), 0-8511-464-4 (Apollos).

The topic of this monograph, the first to appear in the new series of the "Evangelical Theological Society Studies", are the so-called oral compositional devices that characterise and structure not only many ancient stories but that can also be detected in written culture and even in the specific genre of the letter.

John D. Harvey has divided his work into three parts. In the first one (ch. 1-2) he sketches the history of research on orality from Milman Parry's work on the Homeric epithets and the "oral-formulaic theory" Parry developed in the early fifties in collaboration with Albert Lord, to the work that has been done in this field in Biblical studies by Charles Lohr, Birger Gerhardsson, and Werner Kelber. Harvey also gives a survey of studies on the epistolary genre, from Paul Wendland's *Die urchristlichen Briefformen* (1912), over Heikki Koskeniemi's investigations in hellenistic epistolography (1956), to the more recent interest in the rhetorical aspects of Paul's letter writing (esp. W. Wuellner and H.D. Betz' commentary on Gal). In ch. 2 Harvey broadens the perspective again and deals with orality and literacy in the first century, comparing the works and views of Eric Havelock, Walter Ong, and Thomas Boomershine, as well as drawing attention to the combination of oral, scribal, and rhetoric environment that characterised hellenistic society.

In Part II (ch. 3-5), Harvey discusses some examples of the use of oral devices in the writings of Homer ("the last things first"), Herodotus (ring-composition), Plato ("transposition and contrast"), Isocrates and Demosthenes, Aristoteles' *Arts rhetorica*, the Roman rhetoricians Cicero and Quintilian, Dio Chrysostom, and the Septuagint (esp. Gen, Dt, Isa), and concludes with a survey of some of the most important of these devices (chiasm, inversion of order, alternation, inclusion, ring-composition, word-chain, refrain, and concentric symmetry) that is

illustrated again with passages from Homer, Herodotus, and Gen 6–9 and Isa 5,1-17.

Part III (ch. 6-13) is the most elaborate one. It is an inquiry of the presence and role of such devices in the authentic letters of Paul. For each letter Harvey begins with a short presentation of the epistolary structure, and then continues with an analysis of what he calls the “readily apparent oral pattern” and “other suggested structures” (by other scholars). In the final chapter (283-300), he gives an overview of the frequency of the above mentioned devices in the letters, a more systematic analysis of the occurrence of each device throughout the letters, and some reflections on their significance for exegesis. This is of course the more interpretative part of the book. Thus, Harvey points out that the word-chains that occur in Rom 5 are indicative of the transitional function this chapter has in the whole of the letter (with 5,1-11 and 5,12-21 both looking forward and backward). One cannot therefore argue that there is “a sharp break” at the beginning or ending of this chapter. The combined presence of word-groups with *δικαι-* and *πιστ-* in Rom 3,21–4,25 is found again in 9,30–10,21, and links chapters 9–11 closely to the very first chapters of the letter.

Overall, one should note that Harvey is primarily interested in the larger compositional devices (word-chains, etc.), though his book also contains some observations on devices that usually have a more limited radius, such as chiasms. With regard to the latter, the fact that, as a rule, Paul reproduces the chiasms from the Old Testament in his quotations (Harvey refers to Rom 10,19; 14,11; 15,9; 1 Cor 1,19), shows above all that he cites the text accurately, but not necessarily that “Paul’s use of chiasms is probably to be attributed principally to his familiarity with the OT rather than to his knowledge of Greco-Roman rhetoric or literature” (287). In Rom 14,11 Paul may have inverted the order of the second part of Isa 45,23 to create a more “perfect” chiasm (Rahlfs *ἐξομολογήσεται πάντα γλώσσα*).

J. VERHEYDEN

Sven HILLERT. *Limited and Universal Salvation: A Text-Oriented and Hermeneutical Study of Two Perspectives in Paul*. (Coniectanea Biblica. New Testament Series, 31.) Uppsala, Almqvist & Wiksell International, 1999. (15,5×22), 270 p. ISBN 91-22-01858-1. SK 206.

This volume is the result of a doctoral dissertation presented at Uppsala University (dir. R. Kieffert). Sven Hillert examines four core issues in Paul’s theology: justification by faith (in Gal and Rom 1-5), election (Rom 8 and 9-11), unity and dissension within the community (1-2 Cor), and the unity of humankind (Rom and 1 Cor 15). He thus wants to prove that Paul at times has combined a perspective of universal and of limited salvation

In a rather long Introduction (13-52), the Author presents his strategy and his method. He distinguishes three levels of investigation. The first one is that of the textual analysis which takes up most of the five chapters that follow. The second offers some conclusions for the construction of Paul’s theology. This is done mainly in the final sections of each chapter and in the sixth and final chapter itself (238-247). There one also finds a section on “Consequences for modern theology” (247-252) which constitutes the third level of Hillert’s study.

An element of central importance in Hillert’s approach is the view that the various eschatological perspectives that can be found in Paul’s letters are linked to

the various functions of the eschatological statements he makes in his argumentation. Thus, “it should be remembered that statements within a *uniting* perspective can never indicate limited salvation”. Likewise, “statements within a *dividing* perspective should never be taken as indications of universal salvation” (44). As for method, Hillert uses a “text-oriented” approach which combines aspects from ancient rhetoric with insights from modern linguistics and semantics.

The rather theoretical reflections of the introduction become somewhat more concrete when applied to the letters of Paul. Thus in analysing the letter to the Galatians, Hillert argues that the arguments about justification by faith function exclusively within a uniting perspective. “They are never used in order to warn about exclusion or to state limitation. Instead, they are all used to state equality and to motivate inclusion” (78). Whatsoever of a dividing perspective that can be found in the letter (as in 1,8-9 and in 5,13-6,10) is not expressed in terms of justification, but rather points to the deeds and “good works” of individuals.

The situation is said to be more complex with regard to the theme of election in Rom 8 and 9-11. While the uniting perspective dominates in ch. 8 and 10-11, Rom 9 clearly is written from a dividing perspective (see esp. 9,27), but this perspective is overwon, in Hillert’s view, by what follows in ch. 10-11 (with the assertion in 11,26 that the division will be temporary only). The strong statements of 1-2 Cor about dissensions and strive in the community are obviously written from a dividing perspective (the good and the bad ones, those who obey and those who do not, those who side with Paul and the others, etc.), but Hillert points out that this perspective is not described as a final situation, but is used more pragmatically to defend Paul’s authority and to convince the Corinthians to support each other and to gain a new form of unity. Finally, a strong perspective of definitive unity is expressed in such passages as Rom 5,12-21, Phil 2,6-11, and above all, in 1 Cor 15.

The obvious conclusion from Hillert’s analysis is that one does not have to choose between a Paul full of contradictions and somewhat forced attempts to turn Paul into an exemplary systematic theologian. “A Pauline theology should instead be open for tensions and *multidimensionality*” (240). It is this second term that becomes the keyword for Hillert in assessing Paul’s theology. Consequently, Hillert emphasises “the dynamic qualities of a Pauline theology, as well as its ability to take different shapes in different situations” (247). He points out that “one aspect of a Pauline theology could emphasise justice and difference between right and wrong behaviour. ... People are responsible for their actions”, and that “another aspect of the same Pauline theology would emphasise the victory of God and equality among humans. God is the one who saves the world through Christ” (246). But those who can agree with such a description of Paul’s theology will inevitably be confronted with the question of how these “dimensions” are linked to each other. Of course, Hillert is also aware of the problem that one should carefully examine in such a case, “how much (and what sort) of coherence is needed in order to talk about *theology*” (246). But with regard to the perspective of limited and universal salvation, the theme of the book, Hillert seems to argue that they should not be thought through within a more or less strictly hierarchical composition (242-245). I wonder, however, whether this can and even should be avoided. After all, “multidimensionality” does not necessarily have to be mutually exclusive with some sort of hierarchical framing.

J. VERHEYDEN

Sven K. SODERLUND – N.T. WRIGHT (eds.). *Romans and the People of God: Essays in Honor of Gordon D. Fee on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday*. Grand Rapids, MI, Eerdmans, 1999. (16x24), 321 p. ISBN 0-8028-3861-8. \$ 35.00.

Besides the text of the New Testament, the apostle Paul and his letters have since long been a major field of interest of Gordon Fee. He has published two commentaries on the Pastoral Letters and he is the author of the commentary on Romans (1987) and of the one on Philippians (1995) in the series of *The New International Commentary on the New Testament*, of which he is also the general editor. It is no wonder then that one of Paul's letters is the topic of the Festschrift in honour of Fee's 65th birthday. That it turned out to be Romans may be called a sign of hope and good faith in the working capacity of the honoree on the part of the editors, for "while this is an area in which Gordon himself has not published extensively hitherto, it is nonetheless a subject in which he is keenly interested and teaches regularly. One day he plans to publish his own conclusions on the meaning of the text" (ix). Apparently the volume is also intended as a help in achieving this goal ("we hope that this collection of essays will help him"). And a help it certainly will be when looking at the list of the contributors and the quality of the articles. Nineteen friends and colleagues have written a contribution (full references in the *Elenchus* of ETL 2000). Among them are not only the author of a first-rank commentary on Romans (J.D.G. Dunn), but also three colleagues working in the field of textual criticism (B. Aland, on John Chrysostom's interpretation of Rom 8; L.W. Hurtado, on divine sonship in Rom; and M.W. Holmes, with a study on reasoned eclecticism and the text of Rom, the only contribution dealing exclusively with textual criticism). The volume is divided into three parts: I. Exegetical essays, with contributions on Rom 1,16-17 and the OT (R.E. Watts), the narrative structure of Rom 3-8 (N.T. Wright), reconciliation and Rom 5,1-11 (R.P. Martin), the role of Rom 5-8 in the argument of the letter (R.N. Longenecker), Rom 7,14-25 (J. Packer), Rom 8,12-27 (Dunn), redemption in 8,19-22 (J.R. Michaels), prophetic criticism in Rom 9-11 (C.A. Evans), rhetoric in Rom 9,30-10,21 (E.M. Humphrey), Rom 13,1-7 and the missionary perspective (P.H. Townes), and the conclusion of the letter (I.H. Marshall). II. Thematic essays, with contributions on God as Father in Rom (M.M. Thompson), biblical principles and cultural change (R.T. France), the rhetoric of surprise (R.H. Gundry), and the articles by Aland, Holmes, and Hurtado. Part III, Pastoral essays, consists of a contribution on Paul as a pastor (E.H. Peterson) and a sermon on Rom 15,29 (R. Stevens).

The contributions by Thompson and Hurtado are complementary (God as Father and Jesus as son) and in part they discuss the same texts (Rom 1,1-17 and ch. 8), but their treatment of the topic and its results are rather different. In dialogue with J. Jeremias's classic work on God's fatherhood, Thompson understands the expression as a confession of trust in God's faithfulness and mercy, in the future as it used to be in the past. For Hurtado, the concept of divine sonship is Paul's way of arguing how his mission to the Gentiles conforms to God's plan of adopting all those who express their faith in Christ into the same kind of sonship.

Holmes discusses a number of instances in Rom for which he proposes a different reading from NA<sup>27</sup> on the principles of reasoned eclecticism. He suggests to drop the bracketed words at 4,19; 12,14 (interpolation from Mt 5,44 par.); and 14,12 (οὐδ' an assimilation to the more current ἄρα οὐδ' elsewhere in Rom; τῶ



θεῶ explicitation of the context). He further argues for three more changes at 8,11 (ἐκ νεκρῶν Χριστῶν Ἰησοῦν, “the one reading that explains how the others emerged”), at 13,12 (ἀποβαλώμεθα, on the authority of P46), and at 14,21 (favouring the longer reading with ἡ σκανδαλίζεται ἢ ἀσθενεῖ as the one that readily explains the various shorter readings).

J. VERHEYDEN

Michael BACHMANN. *Antijudaismus im Galaterbrief? Exegetische Studien zu einem polemischen Schreiben und zur Theologie des Apostels Paulus*. (Novum Testamentum et Orbis Antiquus, 40.) Freiburg, Universitätsverlag; Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1999. (16×23), ix-220 p. ISBN 3-7278-1256-7 (Universitätsverlag), 3-525-53940-1 (Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht).

This collection of studies on the letter to the Galatians contains six contributions by Michael Bachmann, five of which had been published before in the years 1993-1998. All of them deal with aspects of Paul’s understanding of the Law and its implications for the attitude of Christianity towards Judaism: 1. “Rechtfertigung und Gesetzwerke bei Paulus” (*TZ*, 1993); 2. “4QMMT und Galaterbrief. מעשי התורה und עֲרָא νόμου” (*ZNW*, 1998); 3. “Jüdischer Bundesnomismus und paulinisches Gesetzesverständnis, das Fussbodenmosaik von Bet Alfa und das Textsegment Gal 3,15-29” (*Kirche und Israel*, 1994); 4. “Ermittlungen zum Mittler. Gal 3,20 und der Charakter des mosaischen Gesetzes” (*Amt und Gemeinde*, 1997), 5. “Die andere Frau. Synchrone und diachrone Beobachtungen zu Gal 4.21-5.1” (*Judaica*, 1998).

The last contribution (“Kirche und Israel Gottes. Zur Bedeutung und ekklesiologischen Relevanz des Segenwortes am Schluss des Galaterbriefes”) is here published for the first time. It is basically a study of the expression ὁ Ἰσραὴλ τοῦ θεοῦ in 6,16, which for Bachmann does not refer to the Church but would reflect Paul’s conviction that he does not want to exclude the Jews from God’s blessings. Bachmann argues for this understanding on the basis of a detailed analysis of the context, Paul’s use of the word Israel, the way he elsewhere reckons the Gentiles among the people of God, and parallels in Jewish (pseudepigraphical) literature. With regard to the latter, it should be noted that Bachmann places great emphasis on the parallel in 1 Enoch 1,8 (containing the words peace and mercy): καὶ μετὰ τῶν δικαίων τὴν εἰρήνην ποιήσει, καὶ ἐπὶ τοὺς ἐκλεκτοὺς ἔσται συντήρησις καὶ εἰρήνη, καὶ ἐπ’ αὐτοὺς γενήσεται ἔλεος, καὶ ἔσονται πάντες τοῦ θεοῦ ... καὶ φανήσεται αὐτοῖς φῶς καὶ ποιήσει ἐπ’ αὐτοὺς εἰρήνην. However, he tends to ignore the important difference there remains (both in wording and meaning) between 1 Enoch’s πάντες (!) τοῦ θεοῦ and Paul’s “Israel of God”.

J. VERHEYDEN

Kari KUULA. *The Law, the Covenant and God’s Plan*. Volume 1: *Paul’s Polemical Treatment of the Law in Galatians*. (Publications of the Finnish Exegetical Society, 72.) Helsinki, FES; Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1999. (15×21), vi-231 p. ISBN 951-9217-27-4 (Helsinki), 3-525-53650-X (Göttingen).

This is the first part of a two-volume project examining Paul’s view of the Law in the letter to the Galatians and the one to the Romans. The work was

accepted as the Author's doctoral dissertation at the University of Helsinki (dir. H. Räisänen). Kuula offers a critical reading of the classic Lutheran position and a sustained attempt at reflecting upon the views formulated by Räisänen, and also by E.P. Sanders, that it is impossible to get a coherent picture of Paul's understanding of the role and significance of the Law because his statements on the topic simply cannot be harmonised.

Kuula's treatment includes a short history of research, a more detailed analysis of the meaning of the term "law", and a study of the "deficiencies" as well as of the positive role that is assigned to the Law (esp. Gal 3,21-24). In the Conclusion, Kuula not only reviews some of the inconsistencies and tensions in Paul's arguments in Gal, but he also proposes an explanation. They can only partially be explained as the result of Paul's rhetorical and argumentative strategy. More fundamentally, however, these tensions are inherent to Paul's thought because of (a) his starting point, which is focused on Christ, (b) the dualistic nature of his eschatology ("the present evil age of sin and corruption has been invaded by the power of Christ and the Spirit"), and (c) his struggle to situate his "christocentric Christology" within the Jewish tradition of God's promises to his people.

J. VERHEYDEN

Marie-Émile BOISMARD. *L'énigme de la lettre aux Éphésiens*. (Études bibliques, NS, 39.) Paris, Gabalda, 1999. (16×24), 189 p. ISBN 2-85021-116-8. FF 160.

Immediately after he had finished his monograph on Paul's letter to the Colossians, in which he argued that it has integrated (parts of) an otherwise lost letter to the Laodiceans, M.-É. Boismard now tackles the letter to the Ephesians in search for another authentic but lost letter of the Apostle. In a double reading and more or less systematic comment, Boismard guides the reader first through the letter to the Ephesians as it exists in its current form (17-77), and then reads through it again to unearth Paul's original letter and separate from it the additions that were made by a redactor (79-146). The authentic document would have been written sometime between 58 and 60 during Paul's captivity at Caesarea (against Justin Taylor's proposal to limit this period to a few months only). The pseudopigraphon was composed some twenty years after Paul's death. Boismard emphasises that the primitive letter forms the basis for the later insertions by the "Redactor", that it was well-composed, and that it fully reflects the style and interests of Paul.

The insertions can relatively easily be identified because they have a parallel in Col (or in the letter to the Laodiceans). In interpolating these sections the Redactor made use above all of the technique of repetition ("Wiederaufnahme"), as can be seen in, a.o., Eph 1,5.9b (κατὰ τὴν εὐδοκίαν αὐτοῦ), 3,1.14 (τοῦτο χάριτι), or 4,1.4b (τῆς κλήσεως ἧς ἐκλήθητε). The problem is of course not that Eph would contain material that is borrowed from Col, but that the remainder can be considered as a composition of its own.

Boismard then takes his hypothesis one step further still when arguing, with reference to the parallels between Eph and Acts that were assembled by C.L. Mitton (Eph, 1951), that the Redactor of Eph was no other than the person who was responsible for the composition of Luke's gospel in its final stage (169: "l'ultime Rédacteur des écrits lucaniens"). In both cases he would have used the

same literary procedure of inserting material from one source into another one (parts of Mk inserted in proto-Lk; parts of Col-Laod inserted in the original version of Eph). Boismard discusses a number of instances in which Eph contains words and expressions that occur also (or only) in Lk-Acts. As he himself indicates, the most convincing passage (174: “l'exemple le plus significatif”) is the parallel he draws between Eph 5,12-18 and Lk 8,16-18. However, one should note that in this instance Boismard's interest is not so much in how the Redactor has integrated a second source (Mk or Col) into a more primitive text, but in how he has modified that second source. In 8,16b Luke has added ἵνα οἱ εἰσπορευόμενοι βλέπωσιν τὸ φῶς to his parallel of Mk 4,21b, by which he assimilates this version of the saying to the one that he quotes in 11,33 (from Q), and to which he adds the same element. In Eph 5,12-18, on the other hand, only vv. 15-16 show “un certain parallélisme avec Col 4,5, mais assez large” (170). Boismard points out that both in Eph 5,13 and in Lk 8,16 it is said that things will be revealed “by the light”: “on comprend alors que c'est grâce à la lumière que ce qui est caché devient manifeste. On rejoint alors sans difficulté l'idée exprimée en Ep 5,12-14” (171). But in Lk this same idea is already expressed in v. 16a (ἐπὶ λυχνίας τίθησιν par. Mk). In v. 16b follows an additional element emphasising that those present (Mt) or entering (Lk) will certainly see this light. The real parallel to Eph 5,12-13 is not so much 8,16b but rather v. 16a. Boismard further notes that the parallel is strengthened because Lk and Eph use an almost identical expression in the following verse (5,15 βλέπετε οὖν ἀκριβῶς πῶς περιπατεῖτε and 8,18 βλέπετε οὖν πῶς ἀκούετε). But this expression is as untypical for Lk as it is for the author of Eph (only once in Lk-Acts and Eph). In Lk it is inspired by Mark's βλέπετε τί. The πῶς of Eph 5,15 may stem from Col 4,6 (εἰδέναι πῶς δεῖ ὑμᾶς ... ἀποκρίνεσθαι). The sequence makes sense in Lk, but is less apparent in Eph (171). V. 15 would make better sense after v. 8 and even be “a natural word to use after describing the danger of false teaching”, as one recent commentator of Eph has observed (J. Muddimann, 2001, 245). As to ἀκριβῶς, Boismard quotes the text as it is printed in NA<sup>27</sup>, with the adverb defining the imperative. There is no parallel in the NT for this “virtual tautology” (Muddimann, 245).

J. VERHEYDEN

Markus BARTH – Helmut BLANKE. *The Letter of Philemon: A New Translation with Notes and Commentary*. (Eerdmans Critical Commentary.) Grand Rapids, MI, Eerdmans, 2000. (16×24), xviii-561 p. ISBN 0-8028-3829-4. \$ 40.00.

Joseph A. FITZMYER. *The Letter to Philemon: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. (The Anchor Bible, 34C.) New York, Doubleday, 2000. (16×24), xvi-138 p. ISBN 0-385-49629-X. \$ 21.95.

Paul's letter to Philemon has been the subject of two recent commentaries. Fitzmyer's was written for the “Anchor Bible” (his fourth in that series after the commentaries on Luke, Acts and Romans) and counts some 130 pages. That is about half of Barth's Introduction (pp. 1-240)! Barth (1915-1994), the author of the volume on Ephesians and, with Blanke, of the one on Colossians for the “Anchor Bible” (and initially also scheduled for the one on Phlm), did not live to see his work on Phlm published. The volume now appears as the second in the

new series of commentaries that is being published by Eerdmans (Note that both series are being managed by the same General Editor.) In a sense, the work combines a commentary with a kind of monograph on "Slavery in the Ancient World" (the first one hundred pages of the Introduction; cf. Fitzmyer, pp. 25-33). But the difference is not only in the Introduction. Fitzmyer's commentary of the text covers some 45 pages, Barth's some 260 (pp. 243-498), including 21 Excursus on such widely diverging topics as "Coercion in Greek philosophy and in the Pauline letters" (384-387, at v. 14) and more generally theological ones (317-319: "Ethics based on the Gospel", at vv. 8-9).

For Fitzmyer, Phlm was written to the Christian Philemon (and not to Archippus as some have proposed), a convert of Paul and the master of the slave Onesimus, as a petitionary letter "motivated by love for a fellow Christian" (24), asking Philemon to forget about the past and to settle things with his slave, and maybe also suggesting that Philemon release Onesimus, which he may well have done if one accepts the evidence from Col. Contrary to his former position (see his commentary on Phlm in NJBC), Fitzmyer now argues that Onesimus was not so much a runaway slave, but one who had come to find Paul asking him as a friend of Philemon to plead with his master that "he might be restored peacefully to his former status in the master's household" (38).

Two questions that have troubled many interpreters are the reason why this letter ended up in the Pauline corpus and whether the letter is in any way theologically significant. As to the first, Fitzmyer thinks that one reason may have been that Onesimus later on was involved in putting together a collection of Paul's letters. But perhaps the more important reason is that the letter manifests a pastoral concern when describing how one should behave towards fellow Christians. Commentators remain divided about whether Paul is arguing for an "interiorisation" of slavery (35, "i.e., give it a Christian meaning"), or whether he is "mildly criticising" slavery as an institution. In any case, the letter is not an outright critique of ancient slavery, even if it shows a greater flexibility and discusses the matter on a more personal level than is the case in 1 Cor 7,20-24; Eph 6,5-9; or Col 3,22-4,1. As for theology, the letter is about faith and brotherly love as the expression of Christian faith. In so far, it touches upon core aspects of the Christian message, even if it does not deal with any other of the topics of "Pauline theology" that are found in other letters (37-40).

Barth and Blanke see things differently on a number of aspects, but certainly not for all. Thus, they regard Phlm not as a private letter, for the whole community is addressed through one of its members (115). A major difference exists in the way Barth and Blanke discuss the "dramatis personae" and the purpose and occasion of the letter. While Fitzmyer lists four reasons of why the letter was written (a. a fugitive slave seeking asylum and help from Paul; b. a messenger from Colossae; c. a slave or d. a brother of Philemon pleading for Paul's intercession) and finally opts for the third possibility, Barth and Blanke offer a lengthy, at times almost novelistic, description of the "known" and "unknown" elements about the characters and the situation to settle in the end for a "docta ignorantia" (149) which is perhaps too sceptic a position. After all, Paul seems "confident that Philemon will fulfill voluntarily whatever is expected of him" (133).

On the other hand, Barth and Blanke reject, as does Fitzmyer, the suggestion (most vigorously defended by J. Knox) that Archippus was the owner of Onesimus and the real addressee of the letter, which was sent to him from Laodicea,

Philemon's hometown (Col 4,16-17). From the long comparison with the *Haustafeln* in Paul's letters (151-170), it appears that Paul is not arguing against the institution of slavery as such. Fitzmyer sees "no development of christological teaching in the letter" (38), but he does point out that ἐν κυρίῳ in v. 16 "denotes the dynamic influence that the risen Lord has on the practical and ethical areas of Christian conduct" (40). The latter aspect is still more (too?) strongly expressed by Barth and Blanke when Paul's plea is likened to "Christ's high-priestly intercession" (167). However, such a description is in danger of importing into Phlm too much of the theology that can be found in other (non-Pauline) letters (i.e., Heb).

There are of course many aspects for which Barth and Blanke offer far more information than Fitzmyer. To give just one example, those who want to know more about the textual tradition should look to the ECC commentary. But on the other hand, when browsing through the many pages of this volume, one will sometimes also wonder whether this or that section really contributes to the exegetical understanding of the letter (see, e.g., the section on "Precursors of the theology of liberation" on pp. 238-240, tracing a very sketchy history of protests against all forms of oppression, from the Old Testament prophets to Marxism).

J. VERHEYDEN

Barth L. CAMPBELL. *Honor, Shame, and the Rhetoric of 1 Peter*. (SBL DS, 160.) Atlanta, GA, Scholars Press, 1998. (14×22), x-266 p. ISBN 0-7885-0510-6.

Steven Richard BECHTLER. *Following in His Steps: Suffering, Community, and Christology in 1 Peter*. (SBL DS, 162.) Atlanta, GA, Scholars Press, 1998. (14×22), xiv-239 p. ISBN 0-7885-0485-1.

Campbell's book is the revised version of his doctoral dissertation which he presented at Fuller Theological Seminary in 1995 (dir. D.A. Hagner). Bechtler's dissertation was accepted by Princeton Theological Seminary in 1996 (dir. B.R. Gaventa). Both authors follow in part the same approach (social scientific) but their work shows some important differences in the way they interpret some of the fundamental motifs in the letter. Campbell, moreover, has combined a social-scientific with a rhetorical approach that is only secondarily present in Bechtler's work.

Campbell wants to illustrate how the author of the letter, while following the literary canons of his time, uses his rhetorical skills to defend the "honour" of his audience and the Christian communities in general against such people who have caused the suffering of the faithful and have treated them unjustly. In doing this, Peter consciously takes up a pattern of perceiving social relations that dominated the whole of ancient society. Campbell briefly discusses the results of earlier research in rhetorical criticism of the NT and of 1 Peter, and then basically follows the structure of the letter in his analysis: the "exordium" (1,3-12); three "argumentations" (1,13-2,10; 2,11-3,12; 3,13-4,11) that each consist of five parts (propositio, ratio, confirmatio, exoneratio, and complexio), as prescribed in the *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, a Latin handbook of rhetoric by an unknown author of the first century BC; and the "peroratio" (4,12-5,14), with an "expolitio" on suffering in ch. 4, a farewell speech in 5,1-11, and the usual greetings in vv. 12-14.

As one can expect, Campbell's analysis owes a lot to the works of T.W. Martin and L. Thuren for the rhetorical, and of J.H. Elliott for the social-scientific aspect. In the latter he particularly appreciates the "realistic" understanding of the *παρουσία* motif. The "diaspora" situation was a reality for the Christians and a cause of suffering for many. Yet, as Peter emphasises, it should not be a cause of resignation or revolt. How this is argued in the letter is best shown in 2,11–3,12 (the second "argumentatio"), which is the central section in Campbell's opinion. Here it is made clear to the readers that the Christians' honour may mean something very different from what society understood by it. Peter does not ignore that the members of the community are threatened and even harmed, but he expresses his confidence that through this they will gain a new kind of honour by eventually converting to the faith some of their oppressors. "The *ratio* is a missionary one; Peter's expectation is that those who presently slander the believers will one day, at the day of visitation, glorify God (v. 12b-d)" (232).

Bechtler offers a "purely" social-scientific analysis of the letter in which one can find in the first chapter a brief sketch of earlier research that takes its starting point in Harnack's view that 1 Peter is more of a sermon than of a letter, and evidently ends with a presentation of the work of Martin, Elliott, and also R. Feldmeier (Thuren's *Rhetorical Strategy* is mentioned on pp. 114-118). For Bechtler, the author of the letter wants to provide its readers with "a legitimation of an alternative symbolic universe within which their ambiguous relationship with the society at large need not be feared but may be embraced as the liminal place of the people of God" (40). In chapters three to five Bechtler shows first how 1 Peter describes the life of the Christian as being one of suffering, then how the author characterises this life, and finally, how he makes the image of the suffering Christ the core element in his answer and adhortation.

Three major differences with the views of Campbell are to be mentioned. First, Bechtler does not practice rhetorical criticism on the same scale as Campbell. Second, he gives a central place to the concept of liminality (the Christian lives in an historical and social "in between") as a way to understand (part of) the solution Peter proposes to his readers. And third, in a couple of instances he gives a quite different interpretation of the function of the motif of Christ's suffering. The second of these differences may be one of the reasons why Bechtler seems to be less optimistic in his comment of 2,11-17. Nothing is said of a "missionary" perspective (see above). "On the contrary, 1 Peter implies that recognition of Christians' good deeds will only occur within the Christian communities" (189). As to the third, Bechtler probably holds the more correct view on 3,18-22 when arguing that here, unlike in 2,11-17, Christ's suffering is not presented as a model for the readers to be followed, but as a unique salvific and "unrepeatable redemptive act on behalf of his followers" (196). Campbell on the other hand argues, less convincingly in my opinion, that 1 Peter regards the reference to Christ innocently suffering as an argument *a maiori*: "what is true of Christ must certainly be true for his followers" (179; cf. 180: in 3,18, "Christ's suffering for sins was not only once for all").

J. VERHEYDEN

Giorgio GIURISATO. *Struttura e teologia della Prima Lettera di Giovanni. Analisi letteraria e retorica, contenuto teologico*. (Analecta Biblica, 138.) Roma, Ed. Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1998. (16,5×24), 720 p. ISBN 88-7653-138-6.



This most impressive work on the history of the exegesis of the First Letter of John, more particularly on its structure, was accepted as the Author's doctoral dissertation at the Gregoriana in 1997 (dir. U. Vanni). Giorgio Giurisato offers a very complete survey of the history of research from the earliest references to the letter in the work of Clement of Alexandria to the present day. For the twentieth century, Giurisato discusses no less than eleven types of proposals, often with several variations or nuances within one and the same type of structuring. These include source-critical approaches, theories of loose units, divisions according to the divine attributes of love and faith, divisions based on Christology, cyclical and spiral divisions, rhetorical and discourse analyses, divisions based on the parallelism with the Fourth Gospel, and those scholars who maintain that there simply is no logical structure in 1 John.

At the end of the analytical presentation one may have the impression that C.E. Luthardt was right when exclaiming in his 1860 investigation of the structure of the letter, "Quanta nobis offertur interpretum diversitas!". A systematic treatment could have shown that the situation is perhaps not so completely hopeless and that on some issues at least various approaches have led to similar results. In the second part Giurisato takes up a good deal of the observations that were made in previous research when he gives his own proposal. He argues that the structure and the content of the letter (for the two are connected) are best illuminated by a colometric presentation of the text. He is aware that previous attempts (by Lohmeyer and others) have been criticised for imposing upon the text schemes that are foreign to it. Giurisato presents a structure "per cola et commata" that takes into account the rules and canons of ancient rhetoric and the rhythmic prose of the letter. He is convinced that such a presentation will reveal not only the "architecture" of the letter (266: "la costruzione architettonica"), but will also contribute to discover its theological message. He especially emphasises that this is not a subjective exercise in which (almost) all options are open at all times, but a necessary step that brings to the fore the smaller and the larger components of the text.

For each verse the Author offers a literary and rhetorical analysis and a discussion of its theological content. In the literary analysis he draws attention to such stylistic phenomena as symmetric parallelism, inclusions, word associations, prolepsis, transitions and repetitions of words and motifs, or the *figura etymologica*. In the rhetorical analysis he gives much place to the *chreiae* at the beginning of each of the seven "pericopes" that form the basic division of the letter (1,5; 2,7-8a; 2,18; 2,29; 3,11; 3,23; and 5,5). Two of these follow a chiasmic pattern (2,18 and 3,23). The *chreiae* are further elaborated according to various lines of thought (a *causa*, as in 3,1ff., or a *contrario*, a *comparatione*, *ab exemplo*, or *ab iudicio*). The text is also structured by repeated exhortatory verses (such as 2,15.24.28; 3,13.18; 4,1.7.11; 5,21) in which the audience is directly addressed. This structural analysis is "the hermeneutical instrument to get to the teaching" of the letter, as Giurisato observes with a quotation of A. Vanhoye (297). The overall structure that he discovers from the verse-by-verse analysis is reprinted in the Appendix in a handy format that can be unfolded besides the book. The pericopes are composed according to different structures that vary from relatively simple chiasms (I-IV) to more complex patterns of repetitions (esp. VI).

The letter as a whole is composed along two principles. One is to connect different sections, the other to show a progression of thought. While it is not so

difficult to see how the prologue (1,1-4) and the epilogue (5,18-21) refer to one another (esp. in the third verse: 1,3 and 5,20), the situation is not always that simple when it comes to discover the connections between the pericopes. The formal structure with chreia, elaboration (“operatio”), and exhortation is similar in each of them, but the sixth pericope is much longer than the others (I. 1,5-2,6; II. 2,7-17; III. 2,18-28; IV. 2,29-3,10; V. 3,11-22; VI. 3,23-5,4; VII. 5,5-17). The “operatio” takes different forms, which is the reason for Giurisato to divide the letter into two major parts (I-IV and V-VII). Of interest is the observation that the letter alternates sections of a more general character with others of a more concrete nature (see 2,3-6 and 2,7-11). The letter does not display a “logical” or straightforward progression. Progression occurs by repetition of motifs that were mentioned before but to which are added new nuances. Giurisato thus discovers a threefold thematic progression that culminates in VI: pericopes I, IV, VI deal with Christian life in general; II, V, VI with Christian love; and III, VI, VII with faith. The three are held together by the overarching themes of communion with God and the “three divine persons”, which are again developed in repetitive patterns. With regard to the last of these motifs, one might argue that the Author has somewhat overstated the importance of the role of the Spirit in 1 John. The Spirit is mentioned only in 3,24; 4,2.13; and 5,6.8. The last of these instances is the famous “comma Johanneum” and is highly suspect as an interpolation as Giurisato duly recognizes (263 n. 2).

The Author is currently preparing a similar colometric analysis of the Gospel of Luke and the Book of Acts.

J. VERHEYDEN

Georg GLONNER. *Zur Bildersprache des Johannes von Patmos. Untersuchung der Johannesapokalypse anhand einer um Elemente der Bildinterpretation erweiterten historisch-kritischen Methode.* (Neutestamentliche Abhandlungen NF, 34.) Münster, Aschendorff, 1999. (16×24), x-300 p. ISBN 3-402-04782-9. DM 88.

This revised version of a doctoral dissertation that was directed by J. Gnlika and accepted at the University of Munich, offers an exegetical study of four pericopes from the Book of Revelation that illustrate John’s use of images and their interpretation. These passages are, in the order in which they are discussed in the book, the lament on the fall of Babylon in 18,9-24, the vision of the two beasts in 13,1-18, the scene of heavenly worship in 4,1-11, and the vision of the angel with the scroll in ch. 10. These four texts all contain images that are taken from the Book of Ezekiel and/or Daniel, with some additional motifs that stem from Jeremiah and Isaiah.

For each section the Author has followed a strictly identical pattern: German translation of the text; a synopsis of OT and NT parallels; a text-, literary-, form-, and genre-critical analysis; and a discussion of the meaning of the imagery that occurs in the passage. In a long Introduction (1-64), Glonner gives some information on the Jewish roots of apocalypticism and apocalyptic in the NT and in the Book of Revelation, and some reflections on the use of images in general and on an hermeneutics for an analysis of images in literature. He distinguishes four stages: a description of the image, the origin of the motif, its use by John, and its meaning.

Glonner examines how the images and the way they are adapted by John contain information, not only about his views (and those of his audience) on the Roman Empire as the symbol of the Satanic power that soon will be destroyed and replaced by God's reign (18,9-24), and about recent events and conflicts in his community with the Roman authorities (the fight of the beasts in ch. 13), but also about the author himself (only a Jewish-Christian would be attracted by the scenery of the throne vision of ch. 4), his place in the later stages of Jewish apocalyptic tradition (the combination of features of the Seraphim and the Cherubim to depict the four living creatures in the same ch.), and his consciousness of being a representative of the prophetic tradition of the OT (eating the book).

At the same time Glonner also emphasises that John's dealing with the OT images tends to give them a meaning that not only transcends the purely historical level of Ezekiel's prophecies, but also an openness that makes them useful even for readers of later generations. This is perhaps best argued with regard to the lament over Babylon. John does not say when the fall of Satan-Rome will happen. He only expresses his trust that it will come true and his hope that the injustice for which it stands will be overwon. "Der Prophet versteht ein konkretes geschichtliches Ereignis noch als Wirken Gottes. Johannes dagegen kann ein Handeln Gottes verkünden, das im Eschaton vollzogen werden wird. Als solches ist das Pseudonym Babylon von einer konkreten geschichtlichen Macht ablösbar und wird zu einer allgemeinen gottfeindlichen Grösse" (262-263).

J. VERHEYDEN

Dieter LÜHRMANN, in Zusammenarbeit mit Egbert SCHLARB. *Fragmente apokryph gewordener Evangelien in griechischer und lateinischer Sprache*. (Marburger theologische Studien, 59.) Marburg, Elwert, 2000. (17×24), vii-199 p. ISBN 3-7708-1144-5.

For many years, Dieter Lührmann has been studying the remnants of the earliest non-canonical gospels. The present collection is the fine result of his research. It differs from the section on apocryphal gospels in Schneemelcher's *NT Apokryphen* and similar works in two ways. First, it offers the original Greek text and not only a translation of the writings. Second, it is limited to writings composed before the end of the second century, i.e., before some gospels became the sole normative texts of the church.

Lührmann's collection contains the original Greek text or ancient Latin version (with German translation) and an introductory comment with Bibliography of ten "identified" and seven "non-identified" fragments. To the first group belong, the *Gospel of the Egyptians*, the *Gospel of the Ebionites*, the *Gospel of the Hebrews*, the *Gospel of Marcion*, the *Gospel of Mary*, the *Gospel of Peter*, the Greek fragments of the *Sophia Jesu Christi*, of Tatian's *Diatessaron*, and of the *Gospel of Thomas*, and an untitled gospel that would have been used by the author of 2 Clement. The second group consists of a reference to Matthias "the tax collector" in Clement of Alexandria, PEGerton 2 with P Köln 255, P Merton 51, P Oxy 210, P Oxy 840, P Oxy 1224, and PSI 1200bis. The text of the so-called *Secret Gospel of Mark* is added in an appendix because the letter in which this text was preserved was most probably not written by Clement. "Deshalb verweise ich ihn in den Anhang dieser Ausgabe als nicht apokryph geworden, sondern von vorherein so verfasst" (182).

The general introduction offers information about the discovery of the fragments from the 19th century on. Lührmann also somewhat ironically mentions the recent hype in the media following the discovery, in 1997, of an “unknown Gospel” which afterwards received the title *Gospel of the Saviour*: “1999 war seine Veröffentlichung keine Erwähnung mehr wert” (4). The Introduction also refers to similar collections of apocryphal literature, with an occasional critical remark (e.g., on the very early dating of some of the texts in K. Berger’s and C. Nord’s *Das Neue Testament und frühchristlichen Schriften*, 1999), and to some other secondary literature. Lührmann further discusses some apocryphal material that is found in the textual tradition of the canonical gospels. He also briefly sketches the development towards the Four-Gospel canon, and notes, against W. Bauer’s classical thesis, that a sense of “orthodoxy” probably existed already earlier and that “heretical” works were produced for a much longer period than one would expect on Bauer’s hypothesis. “So stellen sich die Dinge komplizierter da als in den Rastern von Rechtgläubigkeit und Ketzerei, von kanonisch und apokryph” (16). In an appendix one finds Tables with the dates of the MSS, of the editio princeps of the fragments, as well as of the earliest papyri with the text of the canonical gospels.

Lührmann deals with “apokryph gewordener” gospel texts, with (fragments of) works that were composed before some gospels came to be accepted as “canonical”. For various reasons, however, a number of texts and fragments that one might expect to find here are absent from the collection. The *Protevangelium Jacobi* “ist kein eigentliches Evangelium” (17, cf. 7: “die Geschichte Marias ... bis zur Geburt Jesu”). I guess the *Infancy Gospel of Thomas* was left out because it was written too late (end of the second century according to Cullmann in Schneemelcher, 352). The *Epistula Apostolorum*, which is commonly dated in the middle of the second century and of which a fragment in Latin translation has been preserved, is also omitted because of its genre (17: “zwar eine Art Evangelium ... aber in Briefform”). Lührmann follows Schneemelcher’s conclusion for P Berol 11710 (81: a relative recent legend or a gospel?), but he also leaves out P Cair 10735 which Schneemelcher included among the fragments, though with some hesitation (86). P Oxy 1384, which is also excluded by Schneemelcher, is not mentioned. Contrary to Schneemelcher (81: “es bleibt fraglich, ob es sich überhaupt um den Rest eines Evangelium handelt”), Lührmann does regard P Oxy 2949 as a part of the *Gospel of Peter*.

For each text Lührmann offers a most useful Bibliography and a brief but condense introduction dealing with the sources (Patristic literature) or the manuscripts, the content of the writing, and specific problems about the identification and delineation of a citation, the reconstruction of the text, etc. Great care is shown in identifying fragments of ancient gospels in the Fathers (the gospel text is printed in roman, the comments of the Fathers in italic). In reading Schneemelcher’s *NT Apokryphen* one may have the impression that the whole of the fragment that is quoted stems from the gospel. Lührmann’s presentation points out that in some instances only a minor part of it represents the text of the gospel. Of course, not everyone will agree with all of Lührmann’s decisions in this respect.

The first chapter deals with the *Gospel of the Egyptians* (GEG). A gospel with that title was known by Origen (not in Schneemelcher), Hippolytus, Epiphanius, and Clement of Alexandria. Only the last one also quotes some words from it.

Lührmann retains the six fragments (five from *Strom.*, one from Clement's *Excerpta ex Theod.*) that are also accepted by Schneemelcher. He does not mention the two fragments (e and g) that Schneemelcher had quoted but in which he did not find any traces of GEG (175-176). One should well realize that the result is rather meagre. Only a few words of GEG can be recovered from these fragments. Some of the wording is rendered in three slightly different forms, so that it is very difficult to decide which one represents the original text of GEG (cf. frag. 1 μέχρις ἂν ... ὑμεῖς αἱ γυναῖκες τίκτετε, frag. 3 μέχρις ἂν τίκτωσιν αἱ γυναῖκες, and frag. 6 μέχρι τότε εἶναι θάνατον, ἄχρις ἂν αἱ γυναῖκες τίκτωσιν). The wording in the remaining fragments may have been influenced by that of the canonical gospels (Mt): cf. frag. 2 ἦλθον καταλῦσαι (τὰ ἔργα τῆς θηλείας) and Mt 5,17; frag. 4 καλῶς οὖν ἐποίησα (μὴ τεκοῦσα) and Mt 12,12 or Lk 6,27; and the paraphrase of Mt 19,5 (Gen 2,24) in frag. 5 ὅταν τὸ τῆς αἰσχύνης ἔνδυμα πατήσητε καὶ ὅταν γένηται τὰ δύο ἐν καὶ τὸ ἄρρεν μετὰ τῆς θηλείας οὔτε ἄρρεν οὔτε θῆλυ.

This last fragment has a close parallel in 2 *Clem* 12,2 and in other apocryphal writings. Schneemelcher reckons with the possibility that 2 *Clem* (at least in this instance) may also have been quoting from GEG (177). Lührmann is sceptical: "Die Unterschiede zwischen beide Fassungen sprechen aber gegen eine Gleichsetzung mit diesem Evangelium [GEG]" (132). He assigns the quotation, together with all the other quotations of Jesus sayings in 2 *Clem*, to an anonymous gospel (132-137). In the same line, he uses the quotation in 2 *Clem* 5,2-4 to identify P Oxy 4009 as a fragment from the/a *Gospel of Peter*, but 2 *Clem* 5,2-4 itself would stem from the anonymous gospel because of the differences in wording. 2 *Clem* would be our sole witness for this gospel. Lührmann is well aware that the arrangement of the citations which he takes over from R. Warns is very speculative indeed (132: "möge dies ein Beispiel für eine Rekonstruktion sein, die jederzeit wieder aufgelöst werden kann"). Some of the fragments are rather close to the canonical gospels and could be taken for free paraphrases. 2 *Clem* does not say that all the quotations do stem from one and the same source and he gives no title for it. The lack of a clear identification was the reason for Lührmann not to accept the two remaining fragments from Clement of Alexandria from Schneemelcher's list. In so far, this last of the "identified" fragments in Lührmann's list remains quite a mystery.

Two "Jewish-Christian" gospels are mentioned. For the *Gospel of the Ebionites* (GE), Lührmann reproduces the usual list of seven fragments from Epiphanius (*Pan.* 30), but in a somewhat different order than the one that is followed by A.F.J. Klijn in his *Jewish-Christian Gospel Tradition* (1992). He also differs from Klijn (and Schneemelcher and others) by listing only one other Jewish-Christian gospel, the *Gospel of the Hebrews* (GH). The *Gospel of the Nazoraeans* (GN) is not included in Lührmann's collection, because, in his opinion, if such a gospel ever existed, it probably did not date from the second century. "Wenn es denn ein Evangelium der Nazaräer als in sich geschlossenen Text gegeben hat, gehört es in die Nachgeschichte des Kanonisierungsprozesses" (42). Lührmann gives eleven excerpts of GH (some are attested more than once; thus frag. 2 is cited twice by Origen and three times by Jerome). Schneemelcher and Klijn give only seven fragments. The three agree on five fragments: Clem. Al. *Strom.* 2,45,5 and 5,96,3 (L 1ab = S 4ab = K 1); Origen's *CommJn* 2,12 and *HomJer* 15,4, and Jerome's *CommMic* 7,5-7, *CommIs* 40,9-11, and *CommEz* 16,13 (L 2a-e = S 3a-e = K 2a-e);

Jerome *CommEph* 5,4 (L 5 = S 5 = K 14); Jerome *Vir. ill.* 2 (L 6 = S 7 = K 15); Jerome *CommEz* 18,5-9 (L 9 = S 6 = K 22). The first two fragments of S are not retained because the first is in Coptic (a fragment from a homily by Cyril of Jerusalem), but the passage is quoted in the introduction (41), and the second would stem from GN (Jerome, *CommIs* 11,2 = K 21). The remaining fragment in K (Didymus *CommPs* 184,9-10) is in Lührmann's list (L 4 = K 13; S cites it in his introduction). The excerpt from *CommIs* 11,2 does not contain the expression "iuxta/secundum Hebraeos" (καθ' Ἑβραίους), as do most of the other testimonies (but see L 2e: "in evangelio ... quod Hebraeorum lecitant Nazaraei", and L 5: "in Hebraeo evangelio"; see also L 3b below). This is not an indication of the language in which the gospel was written ("Hebraeo sermone conscriptum" in *CommIs* would refer to just that). "Die Angabe führt vielmehr wie bei den anderen Evangelien den Verfasser ein" (43). That is also the reason why Lührmann rejects all of the marginal notes in the NT codices that refer to τὸ Ἰουδαϊκόν (K 25-36, among the fragments from GN), even though two of these codices (566 and 899 at Mt 18,22) add a comment from this "Jewish gospel" that in its latter half is very close to the text of Jerome, *Adv. Pelag.* 3,2,9-14, a passage that does figure in Lührmann's GH list (L 11). Lührmann refers to the parallel in the notes only. One finds the expression "secundum Hebraeos" also in Jerome's *CommMt* 6,11, but this excerpt is not retained by Lührmann because Jerome explicitly adds that it comes from a gospel that was written in Hebrew. Klijn and Schneemelcher have it in their list of GN (K 16, S 5).

Of the remaining fragments from GH in Lührmann's list, 3a (Eusebius, *HE* 4,22,8) does not actually quote from a gospel. Eusebius only says, in a rather confusing way, that Hegesippus was acquainted with a "gospel according to the Hebrews" (ἐκ τε τοῦ καθ' Ἑβραίους καὶ τοῦ Συριακοῦ καὶ ἰδίως ἐκ τῆς Ἑβραϊδοῦ διαλέκτου). Accordingly, the whole fragment is printed in italic, and so is quite exceptional in a list that otherwise is limited to passages that offer the text of the apocryphal gospels. Fragment 3b, from Didymus the Blind, *Eccl. Theol.* 4,223,6-13 (the Woman Caught in Adultery), may be a genuine new excerpt from GH (see Lührmann's articles in *NT* 1987 and 1990), but it is not introduced in the usual way (with καθ' Ἑβραίους or the like). Didymus speaks only of ἐν τισιν εὐαγγελίοις. According to Eusebius, Papias had preserved the same story from τὸ καθ' Ἑβραίους εὐαγγέλιον (*HE* 3,39,17). Klijn discusses it as the first item in his list of "spurious" texts (116-119), and regards the reference to GH as an interpolation by Eusebius who "is merely guessing" (11). Lührmann refers to it in the notes to L 3b (50). Fragments 7-8 (Jerome *CommMt* 27,16 and 27,51) and 10-11 (Jerome *Adv. Pelag.* 3,2,1-9 and 3,2,9-14) are listed by Schneemelcher and by Klijn (nos. 19-20 and 23-24) among the fragments from GN. If "iuxta Hebraeos" is an indication that these excerpts stem from GH, Lührmann may well have a point in including them in his list.

The Gospel of Marcion and Tatian's *Diatessaron* (the Dura Europos fragment) are two texts that are not usually found in collections of apocryphal gospels. Of the former, Lührmann has retained only five fragments from Harnack's reconstruction (Lk 3,1 and 4,31-32; 6,27-38; 11,2-4; 11,29b; parts of 24,38-47), as well as four references to passages that Marcion would have rejected (15,11-32; 19,9b; 19,29-46; 20,37-38). It is Lührmann's purpose to illustrate with these few examples some of the procedures Marcion has followed in restoring what he thought was the original text of "the gospel".



Lührmann has studied in some detail the two Greek fragments from the *Gospel of Mary* (P Oxy 3525 and P Ryl 463) and the two from the *Gospel of Peter* (P Oxy 2949 and P Oxy 4009) in three articles that have appeared in *NT* (1988), *ZNW* (1981), and *NT* (1993) respectively. The last of these fragments was first edited by Lührmann and P.J. Parson in 1994 in the *Oxyrhynchus Papyri* series (vol. 60, 1-5). It offers evidence for GP that was not covered by P Cair 10759. The fragment might be the gospel's version of the mission discourse, or of a dialogue of the risen Lord with his disciples. A rather unexpected guest in a collection of apocryphal gospels is the ostrakon that is added in appendix to the chapter on GP. It shows a figure standing in prayer and bears the inscriptions, "Peter", "the holy one", "the evangelist", as well as a short text on the convex side ("let us honour him, let us receive his gospel"). The ostrakon was first published in 1904 but remained largely unnoticed (see Deissmann, *Licht von Osten*, 1923, 43 n. 4; Van Haelst, *Catalogue*, 1976, n. 741). It would offer further evidence (besides P Cair 10759) for the survival of GP in Egypt as late as the sixth or seventh century.

For the *Gospel of Thomas* (GT), Lührmann cites not only the texts from P Oxy 1, 654, and 655, but also the three fragments from Hippolytus, *Ref.* 5,8,32 (GT 11), Didymus, *CommPs* 88.8 (GT 82), and Macarius, *Logoi* 35,5 (GT 113). He notes that the text as it is quoted takes into account the reconstructions that have been proposed by various scholars (esp. Hofius and Fitzmyer). As to the parallels with the canonical gospels, "Die Angabe von Parallelen in den kanonisch gewordenen Evangelien wird sparsam gehandhabt, um den Eindruck einer ständiger Abhängigkeit zu vermeiden" (108). One could also have opted for a somewhat different policy by offering a more exhaustive list of possible parallels and leave it to the reader to decide whether GT in all these instances shows traces of dependence. For GT 36.2-3 Lührmann reads... οὐ ξα[ί]νει οὐδὲ ν[ή]θει μ[η]δὲν ἔχοντ[α] ἔ[ν]δ[υ]μα. τί ἐν[δ]εῖτε καὶ ὑμεῖς; A different punctuation is possible (full stop after νήθει, and a question that runs as follows: κ[αί] ἐν ἔχοντ[ε]ς ἔ[ν]δ[υ]μα, τί ἐν[δ]ύεσθε καὶ ὑμεῖς;). On the importance of this verse for recovering the original reading of Q 12,27 (with οὐ ξαίνει instead of αὐξάνει), see J.M. Robinson's contribution to the FS Lührmann (2000).

PEgerton 2 is no doubt the most studied of the "non-identified" fragments. A new excerpt of the text was published in 1987 as P Köln 255. The reconstruction of the fragment remains disputed in more than one instance. After ἐντάλ[ματα] (fr. 2 r) the text is probably to be completed, with Mk 7,7, and (καὶ διδασκαλίας?) ἀνθρώπων διδάσκοντες (so Neirynek, *Apocryphal Gospels and the Gospel of Mark*, 1989, 165), and not just with ἀνθρώπων (Lührmann, 151). Lührmann does not mention Neirynek's variant suggestion at fr. 1 v l. 20: [γεγραμ]μένοις, instead of [μμεαρυρη]μένοις, which makes good sense in combination with the following (cf. Jn 5,46 εἰ γὰρ ἐπιστεύετε Μωϋσεῖ, ἐπιστεύετε ἂν ἡμοῖ: περὶ γὰρ ἡμοῦ ἐκεῖνος ἔγραψεν).

These few examples illustrate the many difficulties that remain in reconstructing the text of these gospels. Overall, Lührmann provides a careful presentation of the material. The second-century gospels take a special place within the broad corpus of apocryphal documents and this has been singled out very clearly by this collection. The volume concludes with a vocabulary of the Greek words "im gesicherten Textbestand" (190-199).

Athanasius SCHNEIDER. *“Propter sanctam ecclesiam suam”*. *Die Kirche als Geschöpf, Frau und Bau im Bussunterricht des Pastor Hermae*. (Studia Ephemeridis Augustinianum, 67.) Roma, Institutum Patristicum Augustinianum, 1999. (16x24), 590 p. ISBN 88-7961-030-9.

This voluminous and impressively documented book is the revised version of the Author's doctoral dissertation which was accepted in 1997 by the “Augustinianum” (dir. P. Grech). It is a study of the ecclesiology of the Pastor of Hermae (PH), more specifically of three images that are frequently used by the author to describe the church resp. as God's creation, as a woman, and as a building, and of the way this imagery functions in the Pastor's teaching on penance.

In the Introduction, Athanasius Schneider defines his understanding of these images as symbols, over against allegories, metaphors, or parables. Part I of the book is dedicated to a discussion of the usual introductory questions about the author, date, and structure of PH. Special attention is given to the genre, which is labelled “sui generis” but includes aspects of prophetic, apocalyptic, eschatological, and catechetical literature. As to the content, PH is a work on penance and on the role the Church plays in allowing its members to be accepted into it again when repenting.

The Church is described as the first of God's creation (Vis. II,4,1 πάντων πρῶτη ἐκτίσθη). This image serves above all a didactic and parenetic, rather than a dogmatic, function in the adhortation of the repentant sinners. It makes them aware of their true identity, as members of the Church, and of the extent of their sin. The symbol of the woman is developed in four different forms. As κυρία (Vis. I,1,4), the Church is characterised as authoritative, but the image also incorporates aspects of the biblical Wisdom tradition. As πρεσβυτέρα (Vis. II,1,3), there is added to it not only a parenetic and an eschatological connotation (the πρεσβύτεροι of the heavenly assembly), but, in the combination with πάντων πρῶτη ἐκτίσθη, also a sapiential one. As παρθένος (Vis. IV,2,1), the Church is described in its ethical dimension, while the detail of its “whiteness” again points towards its eschatological dimension. Finally, the Church is also indirectly presented as a mother who addresses her child (Vis. III, 9,1 ἀκούσατε μου τέκνα), which calls forth pedagogical associations.

The building symbolism is developed along two lines. In the first the Church is compared to the corner stone or to stones that are re-used and replaced in their original position (ἀρμόζοντες) after having been cleaned. The second symbol is that of the tower. While it is easy to see how the symbol of the stones can function in a treatise on penance, this may be less clear for the tower symbolism. The key to understanding this symbol can be found in Sim. IX,13,5 in the expression πύργος μονόλιθος, which for Schneider refers to “die Wiederherstellung der formalen Einheit und Gemeinschaft der Sünder mit den intakt gebliebenen Gliedern der Kirche” (381). In so far, the combined images of this building symbolism would illustrate the PH's doctrine that post-baptismal remission of sins can be granted only once.

Schneider's insightful analysis shows the tact of PH in dealing with a fundamental question that would continue to trouble the Church for decades, and a true concern to offer a pastorally satisfying solution that takes into account the real life situation of the community members and safeguards the status of the Church as an institution by giving it a crucial place in the process of repentance. “Die

Botschaft des PH offenbart zweifellos eine eminent pastorale Sensibilität und bezweckt letztlich eine konkrete ekklesial-disziplinäre Lösung einer akuten Krise, die auch die äusseren Lebenvollzüge der Kirche empfindlich berührt hat. Das Kirchenbild des PH, das auch eine deutlich *inkarnatorische* bzw. institutionelle Dimension aufweist, bildet den eigentlichen Schlüssel zum Verständnis der Busse" (469).

The three symbols of the Church as privileged creature, as woman, and as οἰκοδομή - πύργος do not exhaust the symbolic language of PH. In commenting upon these three Schneider occasionally refers to some other images. One such image is that of the green and the withered trees in Sim. IV,1-4 that represent the just and the sinners (and Gentiles). For the time being the trees grow next to one another, but they will be separated in the world to come, which in Schneider's opinion (385) expresses the Pastor's view of the imperfection of the Christian community in this world and must have been an important reason why he defends his position of post-baptismal repentance.

J. VERHEYDEN

Riemer ROUKEMA. *Gnosis and Faith in Early Christianity: An Introduction to Gnosticism*. London, SCM Press, 1999. (13×21), IX-212 p. ISBN 0-334-02773-X. £ 14.95

This book was originally published in Dutch in 1998 (*Gnosis en geloof in het vroege christendom. Een inleiding tot de gnostiek*, Zoetermeer, Meinema) and is now made available to a larger audience in an English translation. In thirteen chapters (covering four parts), R. Roukema offers an introduction into the history and pre-history of the Christian gnostic tradition, with brief presentations of the more important documents (ch. 3-4 and 11) and the gnostic teachers (ch. 10), as well as some of their opponents (ch. 2: Irenaeus; ch. 12: Clement of Alexandria, Origen, and Evagrius Ponticus).

Special attention is given also to the backgrounds of gnosticism in (hellenistic-) Jewish tradition (ch. 5-6), Platonic and neo-Platonic philosophy (ch. 7), and the mystery religions (ch. 8). Christian gnosis is described, in the line of Harnack, as "a form of hellenized Christianity" (ch. 9), by which is meant an attempt at presenting Christian faith in a way that should appeal to the dominant scholarly and cultural trends of the time (and which, according to the Author, is certainly not "elitistic"). In the concluding chapter, Roukema reacts against suggestions to find in the Nag Hammadi documents remnants of an esoteric tradition that could be traced back to Jesus.

J. VERHEYDEN

Hermann Josef FREDE†. *Kirchenschriftsteller. Verzeichnis und Sigel. Aktualisierungsheft 1999. Compléments 1999* par Roger GRYSO. (Vetus Latina. Die Reste der altlateinischen Bibel, 1/1C.) Freiburg, Herder, 1999. (16×24), 136 p. ISBN 3-451-00133-0.

Roger GRYSO. *Altlateinische Handschriften. Manuscrits Vieux Latins. Répertoire descriptif. Première partie: Mss 1-275 d'après un manuscrit inachevé de Hermann Josef Frede†*. (Vetus Latina. Die Reste der altlateinischen Bibel, 1/2A.) Freiburg, Herder, 1999. (16×24), 381 p. ISBN 3-451-00141-0.

These two volumes honouring and continuing the work of H.J. Frede are edited by his successor as director of the Beuron Vetus Latina project. *Kirchenschriftsteller* is a Complement for the years 1994-99 to the fourth edition of Frede's Catalogue that appeared in 1995. The volume offers information on new critical editions of patristic texts in Latin. As the editor indicates in the Preface, it was not the intention to give a complete list of all new editions: "l'absence d'une édition récemment parue n'implique pas nécessairement que nous n'en ayons pas eu connaissance; elle peut signifier que nous ne l'avons pas jugée préférable aux précédentes" (9). Of special importance is the triple set of Concordances at the end (125-135) listing the nos. in this Catalogue with a parallel in the third edition of E. Dekker's *Clavis Patrum Latinorum* of 1995 (cf. *ETL* 1997, 121-143), in the Supplement to Geerard's *Clavis Patrum Graecorum* of 1998, and in the *Clavis Apocryphorum Veteris Testamenti* edited by J.-C. Haelewyck in the same year. Also added in this Catalogue are further references to J. Machielsens's *Clavis Patristica Pseudepigraphorum Medii Aevi*, of which the second volume (1994) had appeared too late to be included in Frede's 1995 edition. In many instances these references are the only new information that is provided (see, e.g., pp. 102-109).

*Altlateinische Handschriften* contains a repertory of 275 manuscripts of (parts of) the Old Latin version. The repertory was compiled by Frede to replace at last the *Vorläufiges Verzeichnis der Handschriften der VL* of 1951 that was "purement provisoire" and is now greatly outdated. At the time of Frede's death the work was finished only for the nos. 1-74 (the Gospels). Nos. 75-162 (rest of the NT and Historical Books of the OT) were available in a first redaction. Gryson took upon him the redaction of the nos. 163-275 (basically, Sapiential Books, Prophets, 1-2 Macc). That is why the second part of this book is written in French.

For each MS the repertory provides, in six sections, codicological and paleographical information (H, of "Handschrift"), a description of its content (I, for "Inhalt"), (partial) editions of the text (E, for "Edition"), a reference to editions that mention the MS in the apparatus (Z, for "Zitiert in"), information on the text type (T, for "Text"), and finally a selective bibliography (L, for "Literatur"). Of course, not all of these sections are always present (see no. 93 H E T L, but no I because the MS is not used in the VL-edition). Among the references that are repeatedly cited (and therefore abbreviated) one finds not only those to the critical editions of the Vulgate and of the Vetus Latina (e.g., Jülicher's *Itala* or VLH, *Vetus Latina Hispana*, for Ayuso Marazuela's), but also to E.A. Lowe's *Codices Latini Antiquiores* and K. Gamber's *Codices liturgici*, and of course to several of the studies of members of the Institute (Fischer, Frede, and Thiele).

J. VERHEYDEN

Patrick DESCOURTIEUX. *Clément d'Alexandrie. Les Stromates. Stromate VI. Introduction, texte critique, traduction et notes.* (Sources Chrétiennes, 446). Paris, Cerf, 1999. (12,5×19,5), 422 p. ISBN 2-204-06348-7. FF 183.

The edition of Clement of Alexandria's *Stromata* in SC proves to be a long and difficult project. The first book of this major work of Clement was edited fifty years ago by C. Mondésert and M. Caster (SC 30, 1951). The former was also responsible, together with P.T. Camelot, for the edition of Book II (SC 38, 1954). Book V was edited, in two volumes, by A. Le Boulluec in 1981 (SC 278-279).

The same scholar also edited Book VII (SC 428, 1997) that forms a unity with Book VI. Most recently has been made available also the text of Book IV (ed. A. van den Hoek, SC 463, 2001), which leaves only Books III and the unfinished Book VIII to complete the edition of the whole work.

In Book VI of the *Stromata*, Clement continues the general purpose of this and several others of his writings, which is to build the foundations for what can be called “a Christian philosophy” and to formulate the principles that should lead the Christian intellectual in his dialogue with the Greek culture of his time.

In the Introduction the Editor offers a detailed description of the contents and structure of the book. He points out that it is in this book (VI,2,1) that one finds Clement’s own definition of the genre of his *Stromata*. He describes it as a collection of “memoirs” διεσπαρμένοις δὲ ἐπίτηδες ἀναμίξ (“dans un soigneur désordre”) and as a meadow (λειμῶνος δίκην πεποικιλται). Book VI is also famous for the impressive anthology of citations from ancient literature (VI,5-27) that should illustrate how the Greeks have continuously been copying each other, to which Clement adds a similar list of examples to prove that they also often borrowed from the Bible without acknowledging it. In the second part of Book VI Clement defends the thesis of the universal salvation that is realised through Christ Jesus (VI,39-51). He also prepares for the third and longest part by introducing here the concept of “the true philosophy” (VI,52-59). The true philosopher is called “the gnostic” (ὁ γνωστικός), who is described as a person of high moral standards, an intellectual and scholar, a “stoic”, in short, “a perfect character” (VI,104-115). The gnostic is a polymath, who is interested in the world of science as well as in that of philosophy (VI,149-161) and Scripture (VI,115-148). In this last section Clement offers his famous commentary on the Decalogue which is as brilliant, because of the clarity of his exposition, as it is remarkable, because of its innovating content. Thus, in commenting upon the sixth commandment, Clement surprises the reader by simply introducing the comment on the prohibition to commit adultery as: “Adultery consists in giving up the true knowledge that is guaranteed by the Church and the correct discernment with regard to God to adopt a wrong opinion (ψευδῆ δόξαν) that is not fitting, either by divinising what is created, or by making for oneself an idol of something that does not exist” (VI,146,3).

Descourtieux has provided a new edition that differs from the classic edition of O. Stählin in some thirty-five instances where the editor has decided to retain the reading of the *Laurentianus* (see the list on pp. 44-45). In most of these cases the differences are minimal. But see the reading διὰ (τὴν νόησιν ἀναλαβῶν τὴν μεγαλοπρεπῆ) of *L* in 115,1 for ἰδίᾳ. “Ainsi se trouvait accentué indûment l’élitisme du gnostique” (43).

J. VERHEYDEN

*Hilaire de Poitiers. La Trinité. Tome I (Livres I-III). Texte critique par P. Smulders (CCL). Introduction par M. FIGURA et J. DOIGNON (†). Traduction par G.M. DE DURAND (†), Ch. MOREL et G. PELLAND. Notes par G. PELLAND. (Sources Chrétiennes, 443.) Paris, Cerf, 1999. (12×19), 396 p. ISBN 2-204-06232-4. 205 FF.*

The edition of Hilary of Poitiers’ treatise on the Trinity in SC is the work of a collective effort. The edition of the Latin text is preceded by a long Introduction

in seven chapters (pp. 9-200). M. Figura has written the first five chapters on the life of Hilary, the arian controversy, and the sources of *Trin.* (I), its structure and content (II), Hilary's teaching on the Trinity (III), the place *Trin.* holds in his works (IV), and the scriptural references and exegetical methodology that is displayed (V). This study, originally written in German, was translated into French by A. Courbon-Koesters. J. Doignon has contributed two chapters on the manuscript tradition of *Trin.* and its rhetorical qualities. G.M. de Durand had provided the French translation, which was revised by C. Morel and G. Pelland who is also responsible for the Notes.

The Latin text basically is a reproduction of the one that was prepared by P. Smulders for *CCL* (vols. 62-62A). However, Doignon discusses some sixty cases (pp. 170-186) for which he proposes a variant reading that is also introduced in the text and duly indicated in the notes. In general, Doignon is less inclined to accept emendations (see at 1,25 "corruptis in melius" for "correptis") and gives greater significance to the readings of the very old manuscript *D* (Paris. lat. 2630, of the fifth or sixth century). Doignon's comment: "Son 'excellence' confère à *D*, en dépit de fautes de lecture, un poids incomparable" (p. 167).

A most interesting aspect of Hilary's *Trin.* is the description, with which he begins the work, of how he discovered the true meaning of such texts as Ex 3,14, Wis 13,5, the Prologue of Jn, and Col 2,8-15, and their significance for explaining the doctrine of the Trinity. Of equal importance is the fact that Hilary is among the very few Western authors of his time to have been acquainted with what had been written in the East about Arius by Eusebius of Emesa, even though he never cites Eusebius and certainly does not merely repeat his views.

J. VERHEYDEN

P.F. BOUTER. *Athanasius van Alexandrië en zijn uitleg van de Psalmen. Een onderzoek naar de hermeneutiek en theologie van een psalmverklaring uit de vroege kerk.* Zoetermeer, Boekencentrum, 2001. (16x24), 381 p. ISBN 90-239-1151-2. FL 65; FB 1300.

Athanasius of Alexandria has left us a large and diverse literary heritage. Besides theological writings proper, such as the *Orations against the Arians*, he also wrote works of an historical-polemical nature to defend his role in the ecclesiastical politics of the 330's to the 350's as well as ascetical writings (the most famous being the *Life of Anthony*) and *Festal Letters* to the Christians of his Egyptian church province. All these works are conspicuous for their frequent use of Scriptural quotations and allusions. Athanasius knew the Bible very well and he also knew how to exploit it as a theological source. It is rather surprising, therefore, that there are so few works of a strictly exegetical nature that can be ascribed with certainty to the Alexandrian bishop. The only exception to the rule is his *Letter to Marcellinus*, an introduction to the reading of the Psalms in the form of a letter. The *Expositions on the Psalms* (EP), another exegetical work preserved in the corpus Athanasianum but of doubtful authenticity, presents itself in a different form. This work treats every Psalm, though rather briefly, and in that respect somewhat resembles a commentary in the modern sense of the word. Athanasius has his commentary of every Psalm preceded by a "hypothesis": indications of how and from which perspective the Psalm should be read, a prerequisite before entering into a more detailed discussion on the Psalm's spiritual



meaning. These features make the EP very much a work that is *sui generis* and not always easy to compare with other writings from the Alexandrian bishop.

With the exception of some authors' contributions on the question of the work's authorship, the EP has not received much scholarly attention to date. One can only be glad, therefore, at the publication of Bouter's book, his doctoral dissertation submitted to the Faculty of Theology of the University of Utrecht (dir. R. Van Den Broek). The book is written in Dutch but has an (unfortunately rather short) English summary at the end. Bouter's work is divided into five chapters. The first deals with the intricate textual transmission of the EP as well as the work's authenticity and date. In the second chapter he presents the basic hermeneutical principles as they are to be detected in the EP, both in the author's explicit assertions and in their application. Bouter distinguishes quite a few of these hermeneutical principles. It might be useful to enumerate them here: In Scripture Christ is to be found everywhere; Scripture has its own divine way of speaking; understanding the Scriptures is not so much a matter of the mind but of a basic spiritual (even holy) attitude; the Old Testament is the shadow of the New Testament; Athanasius' Old Testament was the Septuagint; Athanasius' ideas about the Hebrew canon of the Old Testament; the Psalter is a prophetic book; the Psalter must be explained in line with the "tradition" shaped by the apostles.

In order to apply these hermeneutical principles to any given text from Scripture, one must operate by using what Bouter calls 'exegetical instruments'. These are presented in chapter III. Bouter knows and discusses the so-called tripartite formula: three questions (in most cases: *καιρός, πρόσωπον, πράγμα*) which have to be elucidated with regard to each Psalm, even on each verse. In Bouter's view, however, these are not concrete exegetical instruments in themselves but can be more adequately described as the basic structure that keeps the latter together. He distinguishes four concrete exegetical instruments operative in the EP: looking for the speaking person; the explanation of enigmatic or symbolic terminology; the determination of the genre of the Psalm (historic, prophetic, geared towards the deepening of the Christian's spiritual life); the use of the *tituli* (the superscriptions) of the Psalm. Having sketched the framework within which Athanasius is operating for his exegesis of the Psalter, Bouter continues his work with a detailed discussion of each separate Psalm (chapter IV). In each case he analyses the Alexandrian bishop's exegetical practice, discusses the theological content and, most interestingly, often compares Athanasius' treatment of a given Psalm with Origen's and Eusebius of Caesarea's. Thus Athanasius' exegesis of the Psalter is given a place within the broader stream of patristic exegesis. The final chapter (V) is devoted to a presentation of the theological content of the EP as a whole.

All in all there is much to be praised in Bouter's work. It discusses a document that has suffered in the past from considerable neglect, one that therefore certainly deserves to be the subject of a dissertation. The author has completed his work with thoroughness and made use of most of the secondary literature available on his topic. He has also provided a good survey of the hermeneutical concepts and theological ideas in the work and argued convincingly that many of them can be found elsewhere in Athanasius' other writings. As for Athanasius' place in the Early Christian exegesis of the Psalms, I believe a comparison with other, later authors, would have been a worthwhile contribution. Athanasius' contemporaries such as the Cappadocians (e.g., Gregory of Nyssa's *On the*

*Inscriptions of the Psalms*) and Didymus the Blind's *Commentary on the Psalms* immediately come to mind. Such a more complete picture of the agreements and differences between the EP and the other writings of Athanasius as well as those of other authors would also have offered a broader basis upon which to come to more definite conclusions with regard to the work's authenticity. With regard to the latter issue, Bouter makes a bold attempt, in support of Vian and against a rather large group of scholars, to defend the Athanasian authorship of the EP. The fact that the EP is unlike any other of Athanasius writings does not help us to come to a firm conclusion regarding this issue. In reiterating the arguments supporting Athanasian authorship, however, Bouter has certainly provided scholarship with a worthy service. Besides referring to some specific parallels with the other works of Athanasius (pace Stead), Bouter mentions the following elements: 1. All manuscripts ascribe the EP to Athanasius; 2. Even when excluding Jerome's mention of an Athanasian 'de Psalmorum titulis' as referring to the EP, the earliest unequivocal testimony to the EP as a work by Athanasius goes back as far as Theodoretus of Cyrrhus' quotation thereof (denied, however, by Dorival: the quotation is nowhere to be found in Theodoret's *Commentary on the Psalms*). When one excludes these two, the earliest testimonies date from the 7th and 8th centuries (*Chronicon Paschale* and Germanus of Constantinople); 3. With Vian and against Dorival, Bouter argues that, despite the evident influence of Eusebius of Caesarea, the EP must be considered in sum to be an independent work. With regard to Dorival's hypothesis that the EP was influenced by Cyrillus of Alexandria and thus not written by Athanasius, Bouter argues that the latter was most probably dependent on Athanasius and not *vice versa*. When one adds the parallels to other authentic Athanasian works Bouter's analysis has brought to light, one must conclude that such arguments in favour of Athanasian authorship should not be dismissed all too readily. On the other hand they are certainly not conclusive. First of all, we still do not have a reliable edition of the EP: Vian is still working on it; Bouter used the highly unsatisfactory and incomplete text of the *Patrologia Graeca*. Secondly: Bouter's comparison with Origen and Eusebius is limited to their commentaries on the Psalms. Within the scope of a dissertation this is certainly acceptable, but when we want to come to more definitive conclusions regarding the degree of dependency on Eusebius on the basis of the presence/absence of parallel theological ideas and specific terminology the net must be cast wider and must also include the other works of these two predecessors of Athanasius. This is especially important with regard to Eusebius, since the degree of dependence on the latter is also the basis of Bouter's dating of the EP in the first half of the 330's: the reflected dependency of the EP on Eusebius serves as an indication that the work was written in the first phase of Athanasius' life, when he was already beginning to develop his own theology but was still influenced by Eusebius, something hard to accept after their rupture that took place in 334/5. Hence Bouter's proposition that we date the EP between 330 and 335.

The final conclusion can only be that, in the present state of research, a firm final conclusion with regard to the authorship and date of the EP is impossible. The position chosen by the *Clavis Patrum Graecorum*, therefore, seems the wisest: they include the EP among the authentic Athanasiana, mention that the edition of the *Patrologia Graeca* is not trustworthy, indicate that doubts have been cast on the Athanasian authorship of the text but that the matter is still unresolved. Until Vian publishes his final edition of the EP, the matter must stand as

it is. Bouter's merit, however, is to have reminded us that a case for Athanasian authorship can be made, that more links can be established between the EP and Athanasius' other works than previously has been thought and that, ultimately, the burden of proof lies with those scholars who, against the ascription to the Alexandrian bishop by all the manuscripts as well as in testimonies possibly going back to the fourth century, argue that the text is inauthentic.

J. LEEMANS

Uta HEIL. *Athanasius van Alexandrien, De Sententia Dionysii: Einleitung, Übersetzung und Kommentar*. (Patristische Texte und Studien, 52.) Berlin, De Gruyter, 1999. (23×15,5), ix-344 p. ISBN 3-11-016520-1. \$ 118.00.

The fourth century debates on the Trinity, generally known as "the Arian controversy", witnessed a shift of focus in the 350's. Contrary to the preceding decades, the legitimacy of using *ousia*-related terminology to denote the relationship between the Father and the Son, as in the Nicene Creed, came to the forefront of the discussions. The Second Sirmian Synod (357) tried to prevent the use of such unscriptural terminology (in particular ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας and ὁμοούσιος) and the synod held in Antioch one year later endorsed this decision. Other theologians defended the suitability of using these terms to speak about the relationship between the Father and the Son, among them also Athanasius. The increasing attention to this issue is very clearly present in Athanasius' writings *De decretis Nicaenae synodi* (= Decr.) and *De sententia Dionysii* (= Dion.). Decr. was composed to justify the use of the terminology of the Nicene Creed. Athanasius referred in this work to Dionysius of Alexandria to support his thesis. The "Arians", however, reclaimed Dionysius for their own case. In reaction to this, Athanasius composed his Dion. in order to show that the theological viewpoints of Dionysius were very different from the Arian position and that Dionysius' writings, when correctly interpreted, perfectly supported the case of the "orthodox" party. It is clear that Decr. and Dion. are closely linked to each other. Despite their obvious importance, both writings have received much less scholarly attention than, for example, the double-work *Contra gentes – De Incarnatione* or the *Orationes contra Arianos*. With regard to Dion., this lacuna has now been filled by the book under review, which contains a long introduction, a German translation and a detailed commentary. Though certainly not everybody will agree with all the conclusions defended by Heil, overall it is an excellent work for which the Author is to be congratulated.

In her introduction (pp. 3-74) Heil addresses three issues: the textual transmission of Dion., the date and the long quotations – purportedly of Dionysius of Alexandria – it contains. Her position with regard to the latter two questions deserves particular mention here. As for the date of Dion., which is closely connected to the date of Decr., Heil does not join the large group of scholars who defend a date in the early 350's but proposes a later date, in the last years of that decade (359-360). Dion. does not contain any solid basis to establish a secure date. One is obliged, therefore, to match the few hints Dion. and the intimately linked Decr. contain with what we know from the general theological evolution of the 350's. One can glean from the text that Athanasius wrote his Decr. in reaction to theologians who objected to the use of the Nicene terms *ousia* and

*homoousios* because of their unscriptural character. Acacius of Caesarea played an important part in this controversy. The Council of Nicea already belonged to a quite distant past. According to Heil, the discussion on the *ousia*-terminology fits the theological climate between the second and the fourth Sirmian Creed, when theological debate centered around the controversy instigated by the so-called anhomoeans. Decr. does indeed centre around the issue whether the term *homoousios* reflects the Scriptural message concerning Christ. This period was also, moreover, that in which Acacius of Caesarea was at the forefront of the debate. Dion. can thus fit without difficulty into such a Sitz im Leben. In Decr. Athanasius had written that Dionysius of Alexandria was a supporter of the homoousios. In Dion. he develops this thought by showing how several theological tenets considered orthodox can be found in Dionysius' writings. Instead of a date early in the 350's, therefore, Heil suggests a date in the final years of this decade. This difference of 7 years is more than just a matter of chronology: it completely alters our perception of the Alexandrian bishop's role in the theological controversies of the 350's. According to the traditional date Athanasius was the one leading the debate: he harks back to Nicea and reintroduces the homoousios-issue; Sirmium and its aftermath can then be seen as the "Arian" reaction. If Heil is right, however, the reality is the reverse: together with many other Nicene-oriented theologians (Hilarius, Phoebadius of Agen, Gregory of Elvira) Athanasius reacts to the anhomoean challenge by bringing back within the discussion the homoousios. Heil summarises her position as follows (p. 270): "Auch Athanasius machte sich also erst zum diesem Zeitpunkt [scil. Ende der 50er Jahre] die besondere Terminologie des Nicaenums eigen und nicht – als einsamer Vorkämpfer für das Nicaenum – schon 350/1, wie die bislang überliche Datierung nahegelegt hatte. Dion. schliesst sich unmittelbar an decr. an und dürfte also 359/360 n. Chr. geschrieben worden sein". Heil's reconstruction of the Sitz im Leben of Decr. and Dion. is ingenuous and because of its importance for the theological history of the 350's definitely merits further consideration.

The final part of Heil's introduction deals with the quotations of Dionysius of Alexandria in Dion. Following the lead of an article by Luise Abramowski (1982), Heil questions the almost general assumption that these texts, ascribed to Dionysius of Alexandria, were indeed written by him. Whereas so far in this debate only arguments related to the contents of the quotations and the theological climate of the third resp. fourth century were used, Heil endeavours to provide a more objective basis which she seeks in a detailed statistical and stylistic analysis of the quotations from Dionysius of Alexandria in Dion. on the one hand and the writings that are certainly written by him on the other. As for Dionysius' authentic writings, she limits her analysis to three theological treatises: *Ad Basilidem*, *De promissionibus* and *De natura*. In the statistical analysis she provides a thorough survey of the frequency of the use of particles (*γάρ*, *ἀλλά*, *οὐν*) and of verbs, the length of the sentences and the richness and variability of the vocabulary used. All these are elements that can be taken to remain rather fixed, regardless of the genre of the work ("Es sollen unverfängliche Elementen verglichen werden, die unabhängig von der jeweiligen Gattung spezifisch für einen jeweiligen Autor sein dürften"; p. 45). These statistical analyses should, however, be used with caution, as the following example shows. I analysed the use of *γάρ*, *ἀλλά*, *οὐν* in Dionysius of Alexandria's *Ad Fabianum* (transmitted in Eusebius' *Historia ecclesiastica*). The particle *ἀλλά* occurs four times in the *Letter to*

*Fabian* (0,260%), the particles γάρ and οὖν three times each (0,195%). These percentages are significantly lower than the ones Heil calculated for the ‘Athanasian Dionysius’ (for γάρ, ἀλλά, and οὖν respectively 2,139%, 0,891% and 0,624%) but they are equally, almost without exception, significantly lower than the percentages indicating the frequency with which these particles are used within the three mentioned authentic writings of Dionysius of Alexandria. This does not make Heil’s statistical analysis valueless; it only indicates that her results have to be approached with caution. By her detailed analysis of the construction of sentences and the stylistic ornamentation, however – though necessarily more subjective than the preceding statistical part – Heil has succeeded in persuading me that there is indeed a problem that deserves to be looked into: the difference in style between the works of Dionysius of Alexandria and the quotations of the “Athanasian Dionysius” can definitely be due to the fact that they are the work of two different authors.

The lion’s share of Heil’s work (pp. 74-270) consists of a detailed commentary. The text of Dion. has been broken in subsections. For each of these subsections Heil gives a translation, a paraphrase of the contents and the commentary proper. Moreover, in the footnotes to the translation the reader will find many useful text-critical and stylistic observations. The commentary proper is mostly of a historical-theological nature, though Heil also deals with other issues where appropriate, e.g., the letter-form of Dion. She has employed the greater part of the vast secondary literature available on Athanasius and the Trinitarian controversy of the fourth century. A possibly useful addendum would have been D. W. H. ARNOLD, *Excursus on the Athanasian Use of Sources in De Decretis*, in *PBR* 11 (1992) 33-51. The commentary’s main line of thought reflects Heil’s concern to put Dion. back in the historical-theological context of the 340 and the 350’s. Her thesis, that the quotations of the “Athanasian Dionysius” derive from a work, composed by the Eusebians around the synod of Serdica, awaits further corroboration but certainly deserves a closer look. I missed attention in the commentary for Scriptural quotations and allusions. Heil treats them very briefly and does not go any further than to show how they contribute to the argumentation. In some passages (e.g., chapters 7 and 8) this contribution is rather large. It would have been interesting to know whether Athanasius is adducing these same Scriptural passages also in other works. This could help us to assess the originality and creativity of Athanasius’ use of Scripture.

Two topics are treated more extensively in separate excursuses. In the first of these digressions (p. 88-100) Heil amply documents how Athanasius in several long passages in his writings presents ‘Arianism’ in an oversimplifying way by blotting out the differences between several strands within the Arians as well as by reducing their theological position to some stereotypic formulas. Stereotypic is also the polemical language Athanasius uses throughout Dion., as in all his other works, to denounce his opponents. The excursus devoted to this subject (pp. 101-110) is entitled ‘Polemik und Antijudaismus bei Athanasius’ but Heil gives a general survey of Athanasius’ use of anti-Arian polemical language that goes much further than a discussion of Athanasius frequent styling of the Arians as ‘the new Jews’. Thus, she also includes the use of morally disqualifying terminology (κακός, κακonoία, πονηρός, ...), the portrayal of the Arians as erring (ἀλογία, ψεύδομαι, μανία) and as fighting against God and Christ (θεομάχοι, χριστομάχοι, ἀρνέω, ἀσεβεῖν, ...).

I conclude: Heil's book is a valuable work. By situating Dion. in the context of the theological debates of the mid-fourth century as well as offering a detailed commentary she has done scholarship on Athanasius, his writings and his world an important service.

J. LEEMANS

Ulrike GANTZ. *Gregor von Nyssa. Oratio consolatoria in Pulcheriam.* (ΧΡΗΣΙΣ. Chrêsis. Die Methode der Kirchenväter im Umgang mit der antiken Kultur, 6.) Basel, Schwabe & Co, 1999. (16,5×24), 315 p. ISBN 3-7965-1101-5. FS 50.

The oration remembering the death of the princess Pulcheria, the daughter of the emperor Theodosius the Great who died around 385 at about the age of seven, is one of three consolatory discourses of Gregory of Nyssa that have been preserved. The other two are a discourse for Meletius of Antioch who died in Constantinople during the council of 381, and one for Flacilla, the wife of the emperor and mother of Pulcheria, who died shortly after her daughter.

In her dissertation (Münster, 1997; dir. C. Gnilka), Ulrike Gantz is critical of earlier attempts to regard Christian rhetoric as a mere imitation of ancient models (so J. Bauer in an analysis of the orations in his *Die Trostreden des Gregorius von Nyssa in ihrem Verhältnis zur antiken Rhetorik*, 1892), or as a kind of harmonic "merger" of ancient and Christian culture (R.C. Gregg, *Consolation Philosophy*, 1975). Gantz proposes a new reading of the discourse from the perspective of what C. Gnilka has called, with a term used by the Fathers, the χρῆσις, which means that Christian authors should use the conventions of ancient literature and its contents in such a way that it does not alienate the Christian message. According to Gnilka, this would be the major principle that ruled the way the Fathers evaluated and integrated various aspects of Greco-Roman culture.

Gantz' work contains three parts. In the Introduction she presents the above mentioned methodological approach, discusses the problems in dating the discourses of Gregory, and points out the differences that exist between them and Menander Rhetor's description of the genre in his *Περὶ ἐπιδεικτικῶν*. Part II reproduces the Greek text of the discourse (with German translation) according to the edition of A. Spira in GNO (IX,461-472), with one difference: the parenthesis τὸ βασιλικὸν φημι κράτος in 463,2-3 is omitted. The main body of the dissertation consists of an extensive commentary of the text that is itself divided into three parts (Prooemium, Monody, Consolatio). In the Prooemium (461,3-462,7), the death of Pulcheria is compared to the earthquake that destroyed a neighbouring city the year before and to a "medical" principle that when one is inflicted with two sorts of pain, the heavier one almost eclipses the other. The Monody (462,7-464,9) is an elegy of the deceased, as well as of the emperor and of his wife, and a lament over her death, followed by a description of the funeral ceremony (that most probably had taken place already some time ago). The Consolation (464,10-472,18) begins with a long discussion with a fictive opponent about the way to avoid excessive grief, and continues with two examples from Scripture (Abraham and Sara deploring the imminent death of their son Isaak, and Job wailing for his children). The oration concludes with evoking the motif of the seed that has to die to come to live again in the corn, and reminding the audience of the Christian hope in the resurrection, which will be



the restoration of everything in its original state (472,10-11 τοῦτο γάρ ἐστὶν ἡ ἀνάστασις, ἢ εἰς τὸ ἀρχαῖον τῆς φύσεως ἡμῶν ἀναστοιχείωσις).

In the Commentary Gantz systematically points out how Gregory integrates concepts and ideas that were currently used in consolation discourses, but does so in such a way that they became acceptable for a Christian audience. That this was sometimes a dangerous approach can be seen in the final verses of the discourse. In referring to the resurrection as a restoration, Gregory clearly plays with the concept of “apokatastasis” that was also known in Greek thought and was to be condemned later on in Christian tradition. As Gantz notes, Gregory has already distanced himself from Origen’s position in that he does not connect with it the doctrine of the preexistence of the soul, but later tradition will go further still and avoid the “restoration” motif as such. For Gantz this “misstep” of Gregory is not the proof that the χρήσις approach should best be given up. “Vielmehr zeigt dieses Beispiel, dass der christliche Umgang mit der antiken Kultur ein ‘unermüdlicher besorgter Gedankenprozess’ war” (285; the words are Newman’s).

Gantz’ commentary shows that one cannot regard Christian rhetoric as a mere blueprint of the principles of ancient rhetoric, nor, somewhat naively, as the expression of a kind of natural harmony, but rather as a constant struggle to find a balance between Christian hope and doctrine and ancient thought and literary form.

J. VERHEYDEN

Goulven MADEC. *Le Christ de Saint Augustin. La Patrie et la Voie*. Nouvelle édition. (Jésus et Jésus-Christ, 36.) Paris, Desclée, 2001. (15×22), 288 p. ISBN 2-7189-0966-8. € 23.

Publié en 1989 sous un titre un peu différent (*La Patrie et la Voie. Le Christ dans la vie et la pensée de Saint Augustin*, Paris, Desclée, 1989), l’ouvrage de G. Madec présente de manière synthétique la théologie augustinienne concernant le Christ. Mais en fait, Saint Augustin a-t-il élaboré une christologie? Les auteurs en discutent, et c’est pour relever ce défi que le spécialiste des études augustinienes a entrepris son travail. Le paradoxe est qu’Augustin n’a pas développé de christologie explicite – il ne faut cependant pas oublier l’importance des *Confessions*, livre VII, du *De Trinitate*, livre IV, des lettres et des sermons – mais que le Christ est au cœur de toute son œuvre. Il est le personnage central du cheminement et de la conversion de l’intellectuel fourvoyé dans le manichéisme; il est au cœur du ministère pastoral et épiscopal de l’évêque d’Hippone.

Le livre présente de nombreux passages d’Augustin, mais fait également œuvre historiographique. Trois parties se succèdent. La première est consacrée à la conversion; la deuxième concerne la liturgie (place centrale du mystère du Christ dans la liturgie, dans la prédication et dans l’activité pastorale); la dernière concerne la théologie au sein des controverses, qui est bien plus qu’une simple «théologie d’occasion» (H. de Lubac).

Pour conclure, laissons la parole à l’exégète expérimenté de la pensée d’Augustin: «Lors de sa conversion, en 386, Augustin a trouvé dans le christianisme la vérité du platonisme. Il n’a jamais songé à chercher dans le platonisme la vérité du christianisme» (p. 259).

A. HAQUIN

*Gregorius Magnus, Homiliae in Evangelia*, cura et studio Raymond ÉTAIX. (Corpus Christianorum Series Latina, 141.) Turnhout, Brepols, 1999. (16x25), LXXIV-435 p. ISBN 2-503-01412-7. € 183.

Gregory the Great is the first Latin father to have made available a collection of homilies on the gospels he had preached in church. In the accompanying letter to Secundinus, the bishop of Taormina in Sicily, Gregory briefly presents the contents of the forty texts and their arrangement. All of the homilies date from the first year and a half or so of his episcopate (end of 590 – beginning of 592).

In the introduction to his new critical edition of the homilies and the letter, Raymond Étaix offers the usual information on the manuscript tradition (XIII-XLVIII). With more than 400 MSS, the collection was “un best-seller durant tout le moyen âge”. For his edition Étaix has collated twenty MSS, representing specimens of different textual traditions, including six MSS that still contain the first version of Book I. He further discusses the division into two groups or Books. Half of the homilies are said to have been pronounced by Gregory himself. The others were composed by him to be read by others. The reason why Gregory often apparently did not preach himself probably has to do with his failing health. “C’est que prêcher était un exercice fort pénible. Il fallait se faire entendre d’un auditoire souvent nombreux et parfois bruyant ... Or Grégoire était de santé fragile” (v). Étaix also looks into the vexed question of the revision of the collection. This was probably undertaken by Gregory himself. The revised text was known to his acquaintance Paterius. Apparently Gregory went through the first Book only, which contained the homilies he had composed to be read by the “notarius” and which he had probably revised already once for the first edition of his collection. The homilies he had pronounced himself were not revised. For the sections that contains revisions the two versions are printed in synopsis. The revisions occur mostly in the first homilies. The interventions vary in extent and thoroughness.

Most of the homilies can be dated with relative certainty because of the topic and of the information they provide (usually in a standard formula). Among those that are still debated are Hom. 2, 17, 19-20, and most of the nos. 31-40. Étaix proposes a date for all but three (nos. 33, 39-40) and notes: “La collection tente de couvrir une année liturgique” (LXVIII).

The homilies vary in length from 58 (no. 23) to 538 lines (no. 34; numbering of the edition). The ones in Book II are generally longer than those from Book I. Gregory has preached on all four gospels, with a clear preference for Lk (17): nos. 1 (21,25-33), 2 (18,31-43), 8 (2,1-14), 13 (12,35-40), 15 (8,4-15), 17 (10,1-7), 20 (3,1-11), 23 (24,13-35), 31 (13,6-13), 32 (9,23-27), 33 (7,36-50), 34 (15,1-10), 35 (21,9-19), 36 (14,16-24), 37 (14,26-33), 39 (19,41-47), 40 (16,19-31). There are eleven homilies on Mt: 3 (12,46-50), 4 (10,5-8), 5 (4,18-22), 6 (11,2-10), 9 (25,14-30), 10 (2,1-12), 11 (13,44-52), 12 (25,1-13), 16 (4,1-11), 19 (20,1-16), 38 (22,1-14), ten on Jn: 7 (1,19-28), 14 (10,11-16), 18 (8,46-59), 22 (20,1-9), 24 (21,1-14), 25 (20,11-18), 26 (20,19-31), 27 (15,12-16), 28 (4,46-53), 30 (14,23-31), and two on Mk: 21 (16,1-7) and 29 (16,15-20). Gregory preached on each of the important liturgical feasts: Christmas (no. 8), Epiphany (10), Easter (21) and most of the days of the following week (22-26), Ascension (29), and Pentecost (30). Several of the homilies were held on the feast of a saint. To each is added the full text of the gospel pericope that is the subject of the homily. As

a rule, Gregory follows the order of the text quite consistently, and he also repeats most of it in his explanation. He also often quotes from other Bible passages, and in many instances one can discover allusions to the works of other Fathers, above all Augustine. These are carefully indicated in the apparatus.

Occasionally Gregory also refers to his own homilies. Thus in Hom. 38 (tentatively dated by Étaix on Jan 27 or Feb 3, 592), when explaining Mt 22,14, Gregory recalls his audience of a homily he had preached almost a year before (Hom. 19, March 28, 591?; on Mt 20,1-16)! “Quod tamen in sermone alio iam dixisse me memini, sed uos nequaquam adfuistis” (38, 433-435). When preaching on Jn 14,23-31 (Hom. 30, Pentecost 591), he likewise refers to an earlier homily on Jn 20,19-31 which was held in April (Hom. 26, April 21). He now associates Jn 14,26-27 with 20,19-22. Compare, “Hinc est quod sicut in alio sermone iam diximus, idem Spiritus secundo legitur discipulis datus, prius a Domino in terra degente, postmodum a Domino caelo praesidente, in terra quippe ut diligatur proximus, e caelo uero ut diligatur Deus” (30, 298-302), and, “In terra datur Spiritus, ut diligatur proximus; e caelo datur Spiritus, ut diligatur Deus” (26, 56-57).

Several homilies deal with the Empty Tomb and Resurrection narratives (nos. 21-26 and 29). They were preached on Easter and the days that followed, and on the feast of Ascension (29). In this last homily Gregory recalls the story of Doubting Thomas on which he had preached some weeks before. Twice Gregory gives a very positive appreciation of the disciple. The second passage is clearly composed with an eye on the parallel. Compare, “Egit namque miro modo superna clementia ut discipulus dubitans, dum in magistro suo uulnera palparet carnis, in nobis uulnera sanaret infidelitatis. Plus enim nobis Thomae infidelitas ad fidem quam fides credentium discipulorum profuit, quia dum ille ad fidem palpando reducitur, nostra mens omni dubitatione postposita in fide solidatur” (26, 164-170), and, “Minus enim mihi Maria Magdalene praestitit quae citius credidit, quam Thomas qui diu dubitauit. Ille etenim dubitando uulnerum cicatrices tetigit, et de nostro pectore dubietatis uulnus amputauit” (29, 5-8).

This new edition of Gregory's Homilies on the Gospels finally replaces the old edition of the Maurists that was reprinted in *PL* 76. The editor, in collaboration with B. Judic and C. Morel, is currently preparing an adapted version, with a French translation, for the series of *Sources Chrétiennes*.

J. VERHEYDEN

Georges-Mathieu DE DURAND. *Marc le Moine. Traités. Introduction, texte critique, traduction, notes et index, I-II*. (Sources Chrétiennes, 445, 455.) Paris, Cerf, 1999-2000. (12×19), 418-380 p. ISBN 2-204-06316-9. FF 277.

Almost nothing is known about the author who is commonly indicated in later tradition as “Mark the Monk” (or “the Abbott”). A tradition that dates back to the ninth century at least links Mark to John Chrysostom, but this information is suspect. Others have situated him in the circles around Severus of Antioch, and he has even been identified in certain manuscripts with an ascetic of the same name who is mentioned by Palladius and Sozomenus in their accounts of the development of monastic life in the Egyptian desert. G.-M. de Durand († 1998), who has now for the first time edited the complete works of this author, argues,

on the basis of the content of some of his treatises (esp. the one “On the Incarnation”), that Mark probably lived in the first half of the fifth century in one or another less prominent city of Asia Minor. His writings witness to the growing influence of Cyril of Alexandria’s thought also in these regions after the council of Ephesus in 431. This does not mean, however, that Mark was an unconditional partisan of Cyril’s experiments with theological vocabulary. As de Durand points out, Mark does use Cyril’s καθ’ ὑπόστασιν, but he is much less ready also to follow the Alexandrian in using an expression such as θεοτόκος, that other keyword of the anti-Nestorian controversy.

Ten writings have been preserved under Mark’s name. The majority of these deal with matters of pastoral guidance and of Christian life: on the spiritual law (*Leg.*), the justification by works (*Justif.*), penitence (*Paen.*), baptism (*Bapt.*), fasting (*Jej.*), a dialogue of the intellect with the soul (*Consult.*), a discussion with a lawyer on the benefits of monastic life (*Causid.*), a letter of spiritual advice to a certain Nicholas about the salvation of the soul (*Nic.*), a treatise on Melchizedek (*Melch.*), and one of a more dogmatic nature on the incarnation (*Incar.*). With the exception of the last one (most probably written in the wake of the Ephesian council), none of these writings can be dated with any certainty. Mark nowhere refers to his own writings. Consequently, they have been transmitted in various arrangements in the manuscripts.

Not all of these writings are authentic. *Incar.* and *Nic.* are not attested in the Syriac tradition (which offers some of the oldest evidence for the works of Mark), and the latter is probably not from Mark’s pen. Both writings do already figure, however, in Photius’s *Bibliotheca* (cod. 200) and are for this reason included in the edition. *Jej.* is known in a Syriac version, but is not assigned there to Mark and is also regarded as spurious by de Durand.

Each of the writings is briefly introduced. They represent different literary genres. *Leg.* and *Justif.* are collections of individual sayings, some of them almost aphorisms, that are listed thematically and by association. Some sayings have been expanded into somewhat longer texts (*Justif.* 135, 137, 140, and esp. the last one, no. 211). *Paen.* is a short treatise in thirteen chapters. *Bapt.* on the other hand belongs to the genre of the “erotapokriseis”. In his Introduction de Durand points out the differences with Diadochus of Photicea’s and John of Apamea’s treatment of the matter, esp. in the way they deal with the efficacy of baptism (pp. 288-295). At the end of his edition de Durand has added the text of another short treatise on the same topic and of the same genre by a certain Jerome. The work probably dates from the first half of the seventh century and seems to be influenced by Mark’s. *Bapt.* (2,50-53) also contains a couple of citations from 2 Peter (cf. also *Paen.* 12,9-10 and *Melch.* 10,2-4), which is most remarkable for an author of the early-fifth century. For de Durand it is a strong indication that Mark probably was not a member of the circle of Chrysostom and other Antiochene scholars for whom this letter did not belong to the canon (cf. p. 27).

Probably few are those who will be ready to follow the good advice of those copyists who noted in the margin of some of the manuscripts containing Mark’s works, “Sell everything and buy Mark!”. As de Durand repeatedly observes, Mark’s writings do not belong to the leading guides in Greek ascetic literature. Yet in recent years they have been made available in a French (C.A. Zirnfeld, *Spiritualité orientale*, 41, 1985) and German translation (O. Hesse, *BGH*, 19, 1985). We now also possess a fine critical edition of the Greek text, together with

a new and very accurate translation. The study on the textual tradition that is announced on p. 37 of the Introduction was published in *Revue d'histoire des textes* 29 (1999) 5-38.

J. VERHEYDEN

Louis RIDEZ. *Jésus en images. L'Attente du Sauveur dans les enluminures de l'Évangélaire d'Egbert (vers 980)*. Paris, Cerf, 2001. (21,5×27,5), 59 p. ISBN 2-204-06811-X. € 18.

À l'occasion du Jubilé et de l'entrée dans le 3<sup>e</sup> millénaire, les sections française et allemande de *Pax Christi*, soucieuses de favoriser la réconciliation et la coopération entre les peuples, se sont associées pour éditer et commenter quelques miniatures du célèbre évangélaire appelé *Codex Egberti*, commandé par l'évêque de Trèves vers 980. Dédié à tous les hommes de bonne volonté, ce recueil de qualité fait connaître diverses personnalités du x<sup>e</sup> s. qui ont contribué à créer l'Europe. Quelques enluminures du codex sont reproduites et commentées de manière actualisée: l'annonciation, la visitation, l'annonce à Joseph, la nativité, le massacre des innocents, les mages, la présentation au temple et Jésus parmi les docteurs.

A. HAQUIN

Maria Dominica MELONE. *Lo Spirito Santo nel De Trinitate di Riccardo di S. Vittore*. (Studia Antoniana, 45.) Roma, Pontificium Athenaeum Antonianum, 2001. (17×24), 368 p. ISBN 88-7257-049-2.

L'on s'accorde généralement à considérer le *De Trinitate* de Richard de Saint-Victor (†1173) comme la plus importante théologie trinitaire entre Augustin et Thomas d'Aquin. Si son influence est restée très longtemps plutôt limitée, nous assistons ce dernier temps à une véritable *Richardus-renaissance* (8) due surtout à l'intérêt suscité par son principe de base selon lequel, également en Dieu, la charité parfaite doit nécessairement être une charité interpersonnelle. Richard reprend en effet à son compte l'idée de Grégoire le Grand (134) pour qui seul l'amour altruiste mérite d'être appelé charité: «Jamais on ne dit de quelqu'un qu'il possède proprement la charité à raison de l'amour exclusivement personnel qu'il a pour soi-même» (*De Trin.* III, 2). En Dieu la charité parfaite doit donc tendre vers une autre personne et pour que celle-ci soit digne de l'amour divin, elle doit nécessairement avoir la nature divine. La perfection de l'amour mutuel entre ces deux personnes exige en outre qu'il soit ouvert à une communauté d'amour. Une troisième personne doit donc y être associée: «Ceux qui sont aimés souverainement et méritent de l'être doivent, l'un et l'autre, réclamer d'un même désir un *condilectus* qui leur appartienne, selon ce désir, dans une concorde parfaite» (*De Trin.* III, 11). Richard se distancie donc très nettement de la tradition augustinienne où le Saint-Esprit est défini comme l'Amour réciproque hypostasié du Père et du Fils. Il est selon lui «la personne à laquelle cet amour est donné, *condilectus*» (298). Dans la conception richardienne, Dieu n'est donc pas «l'unité entre l'Aimant, l'Aimé et l'Amour, mais ... la communion des trois Aimants» (298).

Le *De Trinitate* contient ainsi une pneumatologie originale qui, jusqu'à présent, n'a pas encore fait l'objet d'études formelles et thématiques. C'est à cette

lacune qu'a voulu remédier M.D.C., tout en prenant soin de se référer constamment «à la globalité de l'œuvre trinitaire» (11) du Victorin. Son ouvrage se compose ainsi de six chapitres. Après avoir situé Richard dans le contexte de son époque (13-59), elle examine la structure du *De Trinitate*, ses sources et surtout de l'usage qui y est fait de la méthode des *rationes necessariae* (61-120). Dans l'analyse du «modèle trinitaire» (121-177) du Victorin elle insiste particulièrement sur le rôle clé qu'y joue l'*argumentum amoris*, tout comme dans l'exposé des «lignes majeures de sa théologie trinitaire» (179-240) elle souligne celui également très important de la définition de la personne comme *existentia incommunicabilis*. Les deux chapitres consacrés expressément à l'analyse de la pneumatologie richardienne (241-340) montrent ensuite comment celle-ci découle des prémisses ainsi clairement définies et notamment comment la conception occidentale du *Filioque* s'y intègre de la façon la plus harmonieuse (304-330).

M.D.C. a fait en quelque sorte siennes les thèses et les argumentations du *De Trinitate*, aussi les expose-t-elle comme de l'intérieur et avec une clarté remarquable. Elle estime en effet que cette théologie de la «surabondance relationnelle» (347) du Dieu chrétien «qui s'est révélé comme amour» (345) est nettement plus proche des attentes contemporaines que les théologies trinitaires classiques. Par son analyse systématique et approfondie elle a en tout cas pleinement réussi à faire ressortir l'exceptionnelle densité à la fois doctrinale et spirituelle de ce chef d'œuvre de théologie médiévale. Mais n'aurait-elle pas bien fait de rappeler de temps à autre plus explicitement que, même après s'être fait connaître par son Fils unique (cf. Jn 1,18), Dieu reste encore toujours pour la raison humaine un mystère insondable?

A. VANNESTE

UGO DI S. VITTORE. *De Arra anime. L'inizio del dono*. Introduzione, traduzione e note a cura di Milvia FIORONI. (Sapientia, 3.) Milano, Glossa, 2000. (13x20), xxix-123 p. ISBN 88-7105-117-3.

*De arra anime* – The pledge of the soul – is probably the best known writing of Hugh of Saint Victor (ca. 1090/1100 – 1141), as is also evident from the many still extant manuscripts. This meditation is a pearl within the spiritual literature of the already abundant XIIIth century. The soliloquy is actually an interior dialogue between the master and his soul. Hugh wants to know where he has to look for true love and how to excite one's heart to the highest celestial joy (Prologus, 4). For the medieval mystical tradition such a true love can only be fulfilled in the union of spiritual espousal between God and the human person in contemplation and finally in eternal communion with God. Such a love has to be personal and unique. Hugh's soul has a difficulty, however: it is unable to find what has to be loved above everything (10). How can it be found when it is invisible (12)? You have a bridegroom, but you do not know it. He has not yet presented himself. "He sent gifts, gave a pledge (*arram dedit*), a measure of his love (*pignus amoris*), a token of his love (*signum dilectionis*) (18). The dialogue deals precisely with this pledge of God's benevolence, as it is present in the various forms of human love and in human failure to respond thereto. The author stresses how all forms of God's benevolence are ultimately tokens of God's unique personal love for everyone, even when they are expressions of God's love for all – *communiter* – or for some – *specialiter* –. Such personal love is never individualistic



but always shared in community. Hugh's soliloquy praises the gratuitous benevolence of God present in his many gifts. First it is to be seen in creation, whereby that which did not exist has been put into existence and adorned by many gifts, beauty and wisdom. The human person, however, has forfeited these gifts. Prepared by God's love to be a bride, she has prostituted herself (62). Nevertheless, God came down towards mortal beings, took mortality upon himself, endured suffering, overcame death, restored humanity (66). Thus God showed his gratuitous mercy as Saviour once again. Adapting the story of Esther, Hugh shows how one has to prepare oneself to meet the bridegroom and to ascend from the dining room to the intimacy of the inner-chamber. He uses this occasion to indicate the role of the church, the sacraments and other ascetic means in this preparation. The church is the dining room in which God's brides are prepared for the coming wedding. The heavenly Jerusalem is the King's inner-room, in which the wedding itself is celebrated" (86). It is Hugh's conviction that God's love is such that nothing – not even weakness – can exclude one from it when one is elected. God loves us first! The soliloquy ends with a "confession" of praise, which opens a perspective into a brief, transient mystical experience of being touched by the sweetness of the touch, leading into a kind of ecstasy by being drawn away into the unknown (113). This experience is an impressive token and pledge in which the soul recognizes the bridegroom. "Vere ille est dilectus tuus qui visitat te, sed venit invisibilis, venit occultus, venit incomprehensibilis. Venit ut tangat te, non ut videatur a te" (113f.).

The edition of *de Arra anime* prepared by Milvia Fioroni offers a Latin / Italian bilingual text. Next to the concise, neat and skilful Latin of Hugh, the modern Italian translation looks pale and rambling. The introduction gives essential information about the author, his work and the *Arra anime* itself. Each of the six sections of the dialogue is preceded by a summary of the content. This precious jewel of medieval spiritual literature ranks within a mystical movement that found its inspiration in the *Song of Songs* and endeavoured to describe the journey of the soul into the incomprehensible intimacy of God's love, towards the spiritual marriage between God and the soul – experienced already in pledges and tokens of this love.

J.E. VERCRUYSE

*Fête-Dieu (1246-1996), 1. Actes du Colloque de Liège, 12-14 septembre 1996* édités par André HAQUIN; 2. *Vie de sainte Julienne de Cornillon*, édition critique par Jean-Pierre DELVILLE. (coll. Publications de l'Institut d'Études Médiévales de l'Université Catholique de Louvain – Textes, Études, Congrès, 19/1 et 19/2.) Louvain-la-Neuve, Institut d'Études Médiévales de l'Université Catholique de Louvain, 1999. (16,5×24), 244 p.; xxii-282 p. Dépôt légal: 1999/1739/1; 1999/1739/2.

Le premier des deux volumes ici recensés offre les Actes du Colloque historique de Liège consacré à la Fête-Dieu en 1996, à l'occasion du 750<sup>e</sup> anniversaire de son institution. Ces Actes, soigneusement édités et parfois mis au point en français par A. HAQUIN (Louvain-la-Neuve), étudient le contexte socio-historique de la fête, l'évolution des pratiques et doctrines eucharistiques, ainsi que l'iconographie. Les différentes contributions, dont plusieurs très approfondies, sont l'œuvre de spécialistes en la matière: A. HAQUIN, *Préface*; J. LE GOFF, *Contexte*

socio-culturel du XIII<sup>e</sup> siècle en Europe; J.-L. KUPPER, *La cité de Liège au temps de Julienne de Cornillon*; J.-P. DELVILLE, *Julienne de Cornillon à la lumière de son biographe*; M. BARTOLI, *Les femmes et l'Église au XIII<sup>e</sup> siècle*; J. LAMBERTS, *Liturgie et spiritualité de l'eucharistie au XIII<sup>e</sup> siècle*; B. PRANGER, *Le sacrement de l'eucharistie et la prolifération de l'imaginaire aux XI<sup>e</sup> et XII<sup>e</sup> siècles*; P.-M. GY, *Office liégeois et office romain de la Fête-Dieu*; Ch. M.A. CASPERS, *Meum summum desiderium est te habere: l'eucharistie comme sacrement de la rencontre avec Dieu pour tous les croyants (ca. 1200 – ca. 1500)*; J. OLIVER, *Image et dévotion: le rôle de l'art dans l'institution de la Fête-Dieu*; A. GOOSSENS, *Résonnances eucharistiques à la fin du Moyen Âge*; Ch. CASPERS & M. SCHNEIDERS, *Bibliographie de la Fête-Dieu 1946-1997*; P. DE CLERCK, *Bilan et perspectives*. La bibliographie thématique de la Fête-Dieu couronne cet ouvrage et contribue à en faire une référence scientifique obligée en la matière. Dans son bilan de ce congrès historique, qui fut l'œuvre commune de quatre institutions universitaires (Université catholique de Louvain-la-Neuve, Katholieke Universiteit Leuven, Université de l'État de Liège, Institut catholique de Paris), P. De Clerck relève notamment que sainte Julienne «apparaît comme une femme très personnelle, mais nullement isolée, ni socialement ni théologiquement» (p. 229-230): «on ne peut lui imputer la responsabilité de l'autonomie de la communion sacramentelle et de l'adoration du Saint-Sacrement par rapport à la célébration eucharistique», pas plus que «du triomphalisme catholique des processions du Saint-Sacrement, qui lui sont postérieures» (p. 230). L'instauration de la Fête-Dieu apparaît comme un point de cristallisation, qui noue une série de composantes de la vie religieuse de l'époque, dévotionnelles et théologiques, ce qui fera son étonnant succès. Suite au renouveau de la théologie sacramentaire et de l'intérêt pour la pneumatologie, ne faut-il pas aujourd'hui se demander, d'un point de vue œcuménique notamment, si la Fête-Dieu et la piété eucharistique qu'elle véhicule sont en suffisante continuité avec la tradition?

Le second volet du diptyque est consacré à la publication de la *Vita* de Julienne de Cornillon (1192-1258) et à sa traduction française par J.-P. Delville. Pour la première fois, on trouve ici une édition critique du texte latin du manuscrit le plus ancien de la *Vita*. La version des Bollandistes, parue en 1675, utilisait trois manuscrits du XV<sup>e</sup> siècle. Depuis lors, un manuscrit plus ancien a été redécouvert à la Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal à Paris (Bibliothèque Nationale: 1168 A). D'après l'écriture et les miniatures, il peut être daté de 1280 environ, à une vingtaine d'années de l'original, situé entre 1261 et 1263, dont il est peut-être une copie directe. Un autre manuscrit, le II 2759 de la Bibliothèque Royale de Belgique, datant de 1475, a été copié par une religieuse de Valduc, sur base d'un manuscrit, aujourd'hui perdu, qui était conservé à Villers-la-Ville et était déjà cité en 1309. Celui-ci vient confirmer la qualité du B.N. 1168. En effet, la toute grande majorité de ses leçons correspondent à celles du manuscrit de l'Arsenal, ce qui n'exclut pas l'existence de certaines leçons moins bonnes dans ce dernier. On saura donc gré à J.-P. Delville de nous livrer l'*editio princeps* intégrale d'un manuscrit très fiable, copie la plus ancienne en notre possession. Le texte critique très soigné donne en note toutes les variantes des *Acta sanctorum* et de B.R. II 2759, de même que la référence des sources identifiées, des citations bibliques en particulier. La version française, fidèle à la langue originale, essaie de maintenir une certaine constante dans la traduction du lexique de celle-ci, tout en ne cherchant pas à coller à la syntaxe latine. Cette traduction est enrichie de nombreuses

notes explicatives, identifiant les noms de lieu, de personnes, de choses ainsi que d'événements, tentant aussi de dater au mieux les faits mentionnés dans la *Vita*. Tout en lisant le texte original de celle-ci, on dispose ainsi d'une véritable biographie avec tout l'éclairage des recherches récentes. Outre ces qualités d'édition et de traduction, il faut bien sûr aussi souligner la richesse de la matière même de cette *Vita* et des développements historiques, littéraires, théologiques et spirituels dont elle peut être le point de départ. L'hagiographe met en scène une personnalité exceptionnelle, mystique et directrice d'une léproserie, qui oriente progressivement toute sa vie vers un objectif unique: la promotion d'une fête consacrée au Christ dans le sacrement de son corps et de son sang. La *Vita* fait vivre sous nos yeux tout un milieu de femmes du XIII<sup>e</sup> siècle, elle fait aussi défiler les cercles religieux liégeois et namurois de cette époque, dans leurs expressions les plus locales comme dans leurs relations internationales. C'est dire l'intérêt tout particulier de la *Vita venerabilis virginis christi Juliane de corelion* et des études consacrées à la sainte liégeoise rassemblées dans le précédent volume.

J. FAMERÉE

Guido HENDRIX. *Hugo de Sancto Caro's traktaat De doctrina cordis*. III. *Pragmatische editie van Dat boec van der bereydinge des harten naar handschrift Den Haag, Koninklijke Bibliotheek, 135 F 6*; IV. *De sermoenen in handschrift Parijs, Bibliothèque Nationale, 16483. Editie*. Leuven, Bibliotheek van de Faculteit Godgeleerdheid, 2000. XII-175 + XXVI-334 p. ISBN 90-73683-15-7.

With these two volumes G. H. continues his bold (and ever-extending) enterprise which tends to demonstrate that the well-known treatise *De doctrina cordis* was written by Hugh of Saint Cher (see a review of vols. I-II in *ETL* 74 [1998] 208-209). Vol. II contained the «pragmatical» edition of a Dutch translation of this treatise, found in Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, MS 15231. In vol. III another Dutch translation of *De doctrina cordis* is edited, namely the short version transcribed in The Hague, Royal Library, MS135 F 6 (the same version is to be found in Cologne, Diözesanbibliothek, MS 248, but this manuscript offers so few variants that a critical edition based on both codices seemed unnecessary). The Latin sermons edited in vol. IV, after Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, MS lat. 16483, are ascribed in this manuscript to a Gerardus Leodienses, i.e. the author to whom *De doctrina cordis* is currently ascribed. The introduction to the first text is extremely short; the reader has to search a description of the manuscript in vol. I, and the annotations to the text are to be found in the edition of the long Dutch version provided in vol. II. The 70 Latin sermons edited in vol. IV are of very varying length, some covering no more than a few lines, and often present only the framework of a sermon. The many French expressions and passages they contain are very noticeable. The introduction to this edition too is quite short, but several appendices give more information about the sermons: a survey of their length in lines; an alphabetical and a biblical index of themes; an alphabetical index of Hebrew names occurring in the sermons; and an alphabetical index of the verbs in the imperative mood used in them. All biblical quotations occurring in the text are identified. Both editions are carefully made and the text seems absolutely accurate. A more ample introduction and annotation, however, would no doubt have been welcome. Similarly, an explanation of the French

terms used in the sermons and an identification of the non-biblical quotations would have helped the reader through these vivid but not always easily understandable texts.

A. DEROLEZ

Guido HENDRIX. «Cîteaux». *Een stand van het onderzoek aan de drempel van de 21e eeuw. Lezing met bibliografisch complement*. (Introduction bibliographique à l'histoire des couvents belges antérieure à 1706, 40.) Bruxelles, Archives Générales du Royaume, 2001. (17×24), 284 p.

L'infatigable chercheur G.H., déjà surnommé «doctor Cisterciensis», vient de nous livrer, apparemment sous la forme d'une causerie, un aperçu très complet et hautement personnel des recherches et publications des cinquante dernières années consacrées à l'ordre cistercien. La causerie en question est brève, mais fait référence à 66 notes, qui, elles, ne couvrent pas moins de 187 pages. L'Auteur nous surprend agréablement, d'abord par sa connaissance exhaustive de la littérature sur tous les aspects de l'Ordre et sur toutes ses maisons, mêmes les plus obscures et lointaines, et tous ses membres, qui en tant qu'auteurs ou autrement se sont signalés. Ensuite par ses analyses, observations et remarques critiques, qui font de ce répertoire une mine de renseignements. À n'importe quelle page de ce livre, on est certain de trouver des informations intéressantes (parfois même amusantes) sur le contenu et la valeur des publications recensées.

A. DEROLEZ

Frederick E. CROWE. *Three Thomist Studies*. (Lonergan Workshop. Supplementary Issue, Vol 1.) Boston, Lonergan Institute, 2000. (15×23), xxii-260 p. ISBN 0-9700862-0-2. \$ 40.00.

Le livre contient trois études publiées déjà antérieurement. La première «*Universal Norms and the Concrete Operable in St. Thomas Aquinas*» (1-69) a paru dans *Sciences Ecclésiastiques* 7 (1955). Elle se situait dans le cadre de la problématique de l'éthique de situation très actuelle à l'époque. L'A. y explique que les normes universelles ne contiennent que des directives générales: la décision morale repose en fin de compte toujours sur un choix unique.

La deuxième étude, la plus longue, a été publiée dans *Theological Studies* 20 (1959). Elle s'intitule «*Complacency and Concern in the Thought of St. Thomas*» (71-203). Elle se rapporte entre autres à l'ouvrage resté célèbre de A. Nygren, *Erôs et Agapè. La notion chrétienne de l'amour et ses transformations* (Paris, 1944). L'A. y souligne le caractère équilibré de la théologie de la charité du Docteur angélique pour qui l'amour a à la fois une dimension active (que l'A. appelle «*concern*») et une dimension passive (qu'il appelle «*complacency*»).

Parue également dans *Sciences Ecclésiastiques* 13 (1961), la troisième étude «*St. Thomas and the Isomorphism of Human Knowing and Its Proper Object*» (205-235) se réfère directement à un des thèmes fondamentaux de la théorie de la connaissance du célèbre théologien canadien B. Lonergan (1904-1984). L'A. s'y applique à montrer que l'œuvre de l'Aquinatense contient déjà «*at least the rudiments*» (208) de sa doctrine de la «*correspondence between human intellect and its natural object*» (221). Un lexique des termes latins et grecs (237-248) et un index des personnes ainsi que des notions techniques facilitent notablement la

lecture et la consultation de cette réédition qui vise à mettre en lumière l'«*enduring relevance*» (XVIII) de l'enseignement du Docteur commun.

A. VANNESTE

Duarte DA CUNHA. *A amizade segundo São Tomás de Aquino*. S. João do Estoril, Principia, 2000. (16×24), 454 p. ISBN 972-8500-30-0.

«Pour saint Thomas l'amitié est la réciprocité d'un amour de bienveillance fondé dans une certaine communication» (410; cf. *Ila Ilae*, q. 23, art. 1). L'A. estime que le docteur angélique occupe une place particulièrement importante dans l'histoire de la philosophie et de la théologie de l'amitié (17). Cela est dû principalement au fait qu'il conçoit la charité comme une forme d'amitié avec Dieu. Il est vrai que, déjà à partir du XII<sup>e</sup> siècle, l'expression *amicitia Dei* avait été utilisée par certains auteurs spirituels, mais le thème n'avait guère été approfondi. Le point de vue théologique auquel l'Aquinate s'est ainsi placé ne l'a nullement empêché d'intégrer dans sa vision l'apport de la tradition philosophique. L'ossature de sa doctrine de l'amitié est de provenance aristotélicienne, alors que le contenu est marqué par une série d'aspects et de significations qui ne peuvent avoir leur origine que dans le christianisme (409).

L'A. en a fait une étude systématique conforme à toutes les règles de la critique historique. La première partie de son ouvrage (25-150) est consacrée aux sources principales dont saint Thomas s'est inspiré: Aristote (27-62), saint Augustin (63-104), Denys l'Aréopagite (105-114) et saint Bernard (115-150). C'est dans l'ordre chronologique de leur parution que l'A. étudie ensuite dans la deuxième partie (151-404) tous les écrits du Docteur angélique dans lesquels le thème de l'amitié fait l'objet d'une réflexion explicite. Il examine ainsi successivement le Commentaire sur les Sentences (156-198), l'*Expositio super Librum Dionysii de Divinis Nominibus* (199-229), la Somme contre les Gentils (231-260), le Commentaire sur l'Éthique à Nicomaque (260-290), la *Lectura super Joannem* (291-320) et enfin, la Somme théologique (321-404), dernière étape du «parcours de saint Thomas» (409), un parcours qui, sans avoir donné lieu à «des altérations substantielles de sa doctrine» a néanmoins conduit à «un perfectionnement de la synthèse du thème» (409). L'A. ne cache d'ailleurs à aucun moment son admiration pour cette synthèse harmonieuse entre sagesse humaine et foi chrétienne: «Étudier l'amitié chez saint Thomas est apprendre à vivre l'amitié» (431).

A. VANNESTE

Jean-Pierre TORRELL. *Recherches thomasiennes. Études revues et augmentées*. (Bibliothèque thomiste, 52.) Paris, Vrin, 2000. (16×24), 286 p. ISBN 2-7116-1443-3.

Professeur émérite à la Faculté de Théologie de Fribourg, J.-P. T. est un spécialiste reconnu des œuvres de Saint Thomas. Il est entre autres l'auteur d'un classique en ce domaine, traduit en plusieurs langues, *Initiation à saint Thomas d'Aquin. Sa personne et son œuvre*, Paris-Fribourg, 1993. Les quatorze études publiées déjà antérieurement en différentes revues et rassemblées ici accompagnent ou prolongent ses nombreuses autres publications consacrées au Docteur angélique. On y trouve en premier lieu deux éditions de textes destinées à donner une idée du travail d'édition critique toujours en cours à la commission léonine. Sept autres études ont pour objet divers aspects de la pensée théologique du

maître médiéval: sa méthode; la manière dont ses premiers disciples l'ont mise en œuvre; sa conception de la vision de Dieu dans la béatitude; sa théorie de la science du Christ; sa doctrine de l'efficiencia salvifique de la résurrection du Christ; son commentaire sur le prophète Isaïe; son œuvre de prédicateur. La troisième section offre un lot de cinq autres recherches et méditations spirituelles qui invitent à découvrir d'autres aspects peu connus de sa pensée. En effet, on oublie trop souvent que saint Thomas n'était pas seulement un très grand théologien avec une capacité de travail tout à fait exceptionnelle, mais également un frère prêcheur et un homme de prière, auteur notamment de l'*Adoro Te* dont le bref mais beau commentaire de J.-P. T. est repris dans ce volume (367-375).

A. VANNESTE

*Ioannis Ruusbrochii Ornatus Spiritualis Desponsationis Gerardo Magno interprete*, edidit Rijcklof HOFMAN. (Corpus Christianorum, continuatio medievalis 172, Gerardi Magni Opera omnia V,1.) Turnhout, Brepols, 2000. XCvii-230 p. ISBN 2-503-04722-X.

The preface to the present volume reminds the reader of the distant origin of the idea of publishing the collected works of Geert Grote. It dates back to the 1930's. Titus Brandsma, then professor at the Catholic University of Nijmegen (the Netherlands), decided to undertake this project. It remained unfinished due to his untimely death on 26th July 1942 in the concentration camp of Dachau. In 1968, the "Titus Brandsma Institute for the Scientific Study of Spirituality" took up the project once again, thus laying the foundations for a renewed scientific study of the *Devotio moderna*, of which Geert Grote was the originator. The first volume published in the series of *Opera omnia* is Grote's Latin translation of Jan van Ruusbroec's *Geestelike Brulocht* (*The Spiritual Espousals / de Ornatu Spiritualium Nuptiarum*). This volume is the result of a work started when Titus Brandsma was still alive by H.A.M. Douwes but interrupted for professional reasons by the editor who resumed the work after his retirement. The work has now been completed by Rijcklof Hofman.

The importance of the translation becomes evident when one considers that Jan van Ruusbroec (1293-1381) and Geert Grote (1340-1384) were personally acquainted with one another and met in Groenendaal probably in 1378/1379. Notwithstanding his great admiration for the venerable prior, Grote could not refrain from having some doubts about his orthodoxy and criticising some of his utterances. He thus offered himself to correct some of Ruusbroec's treatises before they were published, including the *Geestelike Brulocht*. This treatise had already been translated into Latin by Willem Jordaens, a young confrere of Ruusbroec. If Jordaens "claimed to have re-clothed the original in Latin garments" (J. Alaerts, ed., *Jan van Ruusbroec: Die Geestelike Brulocht*, Tiel / Turnhout, 1988, 114), Grote, who was acquainted with Jordaens' translation (xvi), wanted for his part to translate *interpretatione verbi ex verbo* and present also a literal translation, closely following the vernacular original (Prologus, 3). The Carthusian humanist Laurentius Surius prepared a masterly and brilliant translation of Ruusbroec's works in the XVIth century, one which became the basis for many modern language translations.

The relation between the original redaction and a corrected second redaction of the *Brulocht* and the position of Grote's translation with regard to both is a major



critical problem. It is amply expounded and discussed in the introduction. Admitting fully that this is a rather complex technical issue, I confess that I did not find these pages conspicuous for the clarity of their exposition. A comparison of the variant readings between the first and second redactions led to the conclusion that Grote used the latter of the two. While the agreements between Grote's Latin translation and the second Middle Dutch redaction have been listed in the volume (XCIII-XCVII), there are some places where Grote diverges from the Middle Dutch text. Some instances can be referred to as omissions that do not affect the meaning. Others clarify the text. Others still seem to be "deliberate modifications mitigating possibly hazardous expressions". Furthermore, a number of clarifications and modifications have been introduced *motu proprio* by Grote (see XXVII-XXX). All these divergences are examined in the introduction. The conclusion that Grote is not the creator of the second redaction raises other questions. Who else could have been responsible for it? What is the relation between the changes and Grote's objections? When was Grote's translation made? The editor suggests "that the second redaction version of the *Brulocht* was prepared before 1384 in Groenendaal, that further doctrinal changes were inserted in the first half of 1384 on the advice of Grote, and that Grote finished the definitive version of his *Ornatus spiritualis desponsationis* at about the same time", 1383/1384 also (XXV). Chapters II, III and IV deal, as can be expected in a source edition, with the description and the classification of the various manuscripts and their interdependence and the editorial principles that will guide the editions of the *Opera omnia* of Geert Grote. One of the characteristics of Grote's translation itself is the insertion of a great number of descriptive subtitles between the paragraphs. The comparison between the original Dutch text, the Latin translation of Surius and the modern English version is facilitated by marginal references to the edition of the *Brulocht* in *Corpus Christianorum, Continuatio medievalis* 103, ed. Jos Alaerts.

It is not yet clear from the present first volume what the editorial scheme of the *Gerardi Magni Opera omnia* is. A second volume has been announced: *Die Forschungslage des gesamten Schrifttums*, including the edition of Grote's treatise *Contra turrim traiectensem*. We can only look forward, therefore, and wish the best for the completion of a collection that is important for a better knowledge of Medieval Dutch spirituality as a whole and of the *Devotio moderna* in particular.

J.E. VERCRUISSE

Henri DE LUBAC. *Le mystère du surnaturel*. (Œuvres complètes. Quatrième section: Surnaturel, 12.) Paris, Cerf, 2000. (13×21), XIII-370 p. ISBN 2-204-06355-X. FF 195.

La première édition de l'ouvrage date de 1965. La même année H. de L. publia dans la même collection *Théologie* un deuxième livre *Augustinisme et théologie moderne*. Ses «deux jumeaux», comme il les appellera plus tard, se référaient tous les deux à sa première publication en la matière *Surnaturel. Études historiques* (Paris, 1946), qui avait suscité une très vive controverse parmi les théologiens catholiques, notamment dans les milieux romains. Aussi avait-il tenu à publier sans tarder, en guise de complément, un long article intitulé *Le mystère du surnaturel* dans *RSR* 36 (1949) 80-121. En 1965 H. de L. a donc estimé devoir revenir une nouvelle fois et plus longuement encore sur la question: *Le mystère*

*du surnaturel* est essentiellement une réédition notablement amplifiée de l'article de 1949, tandis que *Augustinisme et théologie moderne* reproduit, en la grossissant de textes nouveaux, la première partie de *Surnaturel. Études historiques*.

Le propos de H. de L. était de remédier à ce qu'à l'époque beaucoup d'intellectuels chrétiens considéraient comme «la maladie du catholicisme moderne», c'est-à-dire «l'extrinsécisme». Les systèmes théologiques post-scolastiques leur paraissaient en effet profondément marqués par la dualité entre l'ordre naturel et l'ordre surnaturel à tel point que ce dernier semblait surajouté à une nature humaine pour laquelle il ne répondait à aucune vraie attente. Aux yeux de H. de L. ce dualisme était la conséquence de l'abandon de l'authentique conception thomiste des rapports entre la nature et le surnaturel. À la scolastique post-tridentine il reprochait concrètement sa mise en question du grand thème thomiste (et patristique) du *desiderium naturale videndi Deum* et l'importance démesurée accordée à l'hypothèse de la *natura pura* supposée indispensable pour la sauvegarde de la gratuité du surnaturel.

Mais si, en dotant l'homme d'une intelligence, Dieu l'a créé avec le désir inné de la vision béatifique, ne s'ensuit-il pas que l'homme est en droit de réclamer celle-ci de son Créateur juste et sage comme un véritable dû? Ce raisonnement n'est-il d'ailleurs pas conforme à l'axiome thomiste «*desiderium naturale non potest esse inane*»? C'est à cette objection que faisait écho l'Encyclique *Humani Generis* (1950) de Pie XII: «*Alii veram "gratuitatem" ordinis supernaturalis corumpunt cum autem Deum entia intellectu praedita condere non posse, quin eadem ad beatam visionem ordinet et vocet*» (Denz. 3891). Déjà en 1946 H. de L. avait cru répondre à cette difficulté en faisant remarquer que «...l'esprit...ne désire pas Dieu comme l'animal désire sa proie. Il le désire comme un don» (*Surnaturel*, p. 483). Sa réponse n'avait donc pas pu convaincre les autorités romaines et l'Encyclique ne faisait qu'aviver encore les discussions. Sommairement parlant l'on peut dire qu'en 1965, lorsque les remous s'étaient quelque peu apaisés, H. de L. espérait que ses «deux jumeaux» allaient apporter une réponse «définitive» à ce qu'il n'avait cessé de tenir pour des reproches (et des accusations!) injustifiés. Essentiels pour ce qui concerne *Le mystère du surnaturel* nous paraissent les passages où il essaie d'expliquer que, même dans sa conception à lui, il y a lieu de parler d'une «double gratuité, (d')un double don divin, ... (d')une double liberté divine» (113): c'est par un *deuxième* acte libre et gratuit qu'après avoir créé librement l'homme avec ancré en son esprit le désir naturel de la vision béatifique, Dieu l'ordonne et l'appelle effectivement à celle-ci.

Nous étions à l'époque parmi ceux pour lesquels cette réponse était toujours loin d'être pleinement satisfaisante (cf. notre note dans *ETL* 44, 1968, 179-190). La question commençait d'ailleurs à perdre de son actualité. Vatican II (1962-1965) ne s'y est jamais intéressé de façon formelle, même si elle constituait dans un certain sens l'arrière-fond de toute une série de problèmes qui y ont été débattus. Il reste que, même dans l'après-Concile, elle a continué à faire l'objet d'études parfois très approfondies. Une mention spéciale revient dans ce contexte à la dissertation doctorale de l'auteur de la préface (I-XIII) de la présente édition M. FIGURA, *Der Anruf der Gnade. Über die Beziehung des Menschen zu Gott nach Henri de Lubac*. Einsiedeln, 1979. M. F. reconnaît aussi bien les limites que les mérites de l'ouvrage qui, dit-il, «a réellement enrichi à la fois la doctrine de la grâce et l'anthropologie théologique» (XIII). Nous souscrivons également très volontiers à sa remarque d'ordre méthodique selon laquelle H. de L. «utilise trop

peu les catégories personnelles, parce qu'il entend rester dans le domaine de l'ontologie formelle» (XII). Qu'il nous soit permis de renvoyer également à notre ouvrage *Nature et grâce dans la théologie occidentale. Dialogue avec Henri de Lubac* (BETL, 1996). Dans l'histoire de la théologie du xx<sup>e</sup> siècle H. de L. restera connu avant tout comme «le théologien du surnaturel». Si, à notre avis, son œuvre reste finalement en quelque sorte inachevée (...ce qui n'en diminue pas l'intérêt, au contraire!) c'est, pensons-nous, entre autres parce qu'il ne s'est jamais suffisamment rendu compte du fait que le terme *surnaturel* lui-même est un néologisme médiéval, contraction de *superadditum naturalibus*: il renvoie dès lors, par son origine, à un contexte foncièrement différent de celui, éminemment personnaliste, de la notion biblique de *charis, gratia*.

A. VANNESTE

Brendan J. CAHILL. *The Renewal of Revelation Theology (1960-1962): The Development and Responses to the Fourth Chapter of the Preparatory Schema De deposito fidei*. (Tesi Gregoriana: Serie Teologia, 51.) Roma, Editrice Pontificia Università Gregoriana, 1999, (17×24), 342 p. ISBN 88-7652-832-6.

During my reading of this volume – a Ph.D. dissertation from the Pontifical Gregorian University written under the direction of J. Wicks – I was increasingly captivated by the manner in which the Author handled his subject. For any scholar of the history of contemporary theology, and, more specifically, of the Second Vatican Council, this book makes for worthwhile reading. It covers the development of Catholic theology of revelation during the period from March 1961 through December 1962, i.e., the preparatory phase of the Council's First Session. Cahill argues that this period constitutes a paradigm shift in official Catholic thinking on revelation. In fact, the volume's contribution, as well as its originality, lies precisely in Cahill's situating this shift in this early period.

The volume consists of five chapters through which the Author aims to give an historical and diachronic overview of the various developments. In chapter one, Cahill outlines the ways in which revelation theology was incorporated into the schemata prepared by the Preparatory Theological Commission (TC). This is significant: instead of focussing on the *Schema constitutionis de fontibus revelationis*, the Author devotes his attention to chapter four of *de deposito fidei*. Cahill argues that the theology of revelation one finds in this chapter primarily reflects the revelation theology of Édouard Dhanis, even though Dhanis' influence was severely diluted through the activities of TC leaders such as S. Tromp and P. Parente. Thus, the fourth chapter's *leitmotiv* was one which defined revelation as merely an external and public matter. In fact, revelation was there presented in ways which would have been familiar to anyone trained in the neo-scholastic "manualist" tradition: revelation consists of a collection of propositions to which the faithful assent. Dhanis' christological and historical emphases simply vanished.

Once inserted, the neo-scholastic concept of revelation as "*locutio Dei attestantis*" remained virtually unchanged throughout the subsequent discussions. Cahill's second chapter is dedicated to showing the reader how the conservatives achieved this consistency. In spite of much resistance to this concept among members of the Central Pontifical Commission (CPC), no substantial changes were introduced. The TC remained convinced that renewal was unnecessary and

that it was sufficient for any theology of revelation to be placed within an apologetic framework.

Chapter three describes the developments during the summer and fall of 1962, just before the Council's opening. During these months, the schema on the sources of revelation was made controversial in that many theologians demanded the incorporation of contemporary theological insights. They wanted to see more biblical language and a toning-down of scholastic emphases (especially by means of presenting revelation as the unfolding of knowledge about God and His mysteries in both Word and Testimony). They particularly wanted a more central place for Christ and the fact of his having perfectly represented the fullness of revelation in both preaching and acting. Thus, revelation was presented as an historical and personal self-communication of God. These demands – expressed most clearly by *periti* K. Rahner, M.-D. Chenu, Y. Congar and E. Schillebeeckx – strongly influenced many bishops and culminated in a call for a new redaction of the fourth chapter of *de deposito fidei*. Specifically, they wanted to see it made into an introduction for *de fontibus revelationis*.

*De deposito fidei* – in spite of all the controversy it generated – never reached the Council floor for debate. Still, the discussions surrounding the text decisively influenced the debate concerning *de fontibus revelationis*. The history of this text is well described in recent studies. The importance of Cahill's synthesis is here demonstrated through his highlighting the influence of (mostly) French theologians in reshaping the revelation theology displayed in *de fontibus revelationis*. After John XXIII had instigated the *commissio mixta de revelatione* – a commission consisting of members of both the TC and the *Secretariatus ad christianorum unitatem fovendam* (SCUF) and founded due to the acrimoniousness of the first session's debate –, it was bishop Garrone's *prooemium* which first adopted crucial elements of the earlier discussion on *de deposito fidei*. His work epitomized the paradigm shift made during Vatican II with regard to revelation theology. Cahill describes this result in chapter five where there is a noticeable acceptance of a biblically-based theology of revelation along with a distinctively christocentric focus. Revelation is presented as the historical unfolding of the mystery of God's salvific plan, an event which climaxed in the coming of Christ. In short, both Word and Testimony are included in this revised account. This new framework, far from the unilateral vision of revelation as the sum of a set of propositions, was capable of integrating an existential element, i.e., experience, into revelation theology. Furthermore, it implied a recognition of a theology of history in which the incarnation of the Son of God was seen as the constitutive moment.

All this is not to say that this book is flawless. For example, in appendix one, more information on some of the personalities involved would have been helpful. Further, I was most surprised to read (p. 137) that during an important meeting the Louvain theologian G. Philips seems to have agreed on the necessity of important amendments on the text of *de fontibus revelationis*. If true, this observation would certainly deserve more study since Philips is known to have given his full assent to the schema as early as the late summer of 1961: "textus omnino placet" (see L. DECLERCK & W. VERSCHOOTEN, *Inventaire des papiers conciliaires de Monseigneur Gérard Philips*, 2001, pp. XLV and 30). If this change in his thinking did occur, can it be dated with precision? This fact would also be important given the role Philips would play later on – as joint secretary of the TC, and virtually taking over Tromp's role – in the redaction of *Dei Verbum*. Third, and also involving a

member of the *squadra belga*, I noted how little attention the Author gave to the intervention of the Bishop of Bruges, E.-J. De Smedt, especially considering the fact that the bishop acted as spokesman for the SCUF (cfr. G. RUGGIERI's *Il primo conflitto dottrinale*, in G. ALBERIGO, *Storia del concilio Vaticano II*, vol. 2., pp. 285-286). Finally, on pp. 209-210 Cahill discusses in some detail Tromp's criticisms of Garrone's *prooemium* and seems to suggest that Tromp had presented these criticisms at the December 4th 1962 plenary meeting of the mixed commission. We know, however, this was not the case, since Tromp was not even given the opportunity to do so (cfr. H. SAUER, *Erfahrung und Glaube*, 1993, p. 229). Obviously, this raises questions regarding the alleged importance of Tromp's *observationes*. Cahill's study would have possibly profited from his having paid more attention to the stringent opposition provided by P. Parente during that very meeting. For instance, in the journals of Mgr. Charue, Namur, we read: "Le soir, commission mixte. On examine le *Prooemium* écrit par Mgr. Garronne. Il est épiluché, surtout par Mgr. Parente" (L. DECLERCK & C. SOETENS, *Carnets conciliaires*, 2000, p. 79).

This book deserves to be praised as a solid contribution to the current research into the development of revelation theology at the Second Vatican Council. Until now, most of the attention has been paid to the way in which the schema *de fontibus revelationis* evolved into the Dogmatic Constitution on Divine Revelation or *Dei Verbum*. This book offers us a wider perspective. The Author has succeeded in clearly presenting several complex theological issues. And, finally, he has performed a genuine service by publishing heretofore unavailable material in his appendices. There several important texts are included, not only in their original Latin, but also in a consistently readable and high-quality English translation.

K. SCHELKENS

Mihai FRATILA. *L'itinéraire baptismal de la pureté. Aspects de purifications dans le rituel de baptême de la tradition byzantine*. (Colectia Intellectus Fidei, 4.) Cluj-Napoca, Editura Viata Crestina, 2001. (14x20), 166 p. ISBN 973-9288-37-5.

Fruit d'un mémoire présenté à l'Institut supérieur de liturgie de Paris en 2000, le présent travail se poursuit aujourd'hui dans la préparation d'une thèse de doctorat. Son auteur, un prêtre roumain, s'interroge sur la thématique de la pureté développée dans le rituel baptismal. Ce langage n'est-il pas archaïque comme le pense volontiers l'homme marqué par la modernité et ne pourrait-on en faire l'économie?

Les rituels tout au long de l'histoire et dans les diverses Églises n'ont cessé de manifester une tension féconde entre le pôle de la purification et celui de la sanctification. Du reste, tout baptisé adulte a fait l'expérience de cette complexité de la conversion, de sorte qu'il ne peut y avoir de *théosis* (divinisation) sans *katharsis*. (purification-conversion). À condition toutefois de ne pas comprendre la purification dans le registre simplement sacral, mais plutôt au plan du combat spirituel, de l'éthique et de la rencontre interpersonnelle avec Dieu au sein de l'Église. Ce combat personnel est mené par l'individu, mais la communauté chrétienne n'abandonne pas l'homme à lui-même: l'exorcisme, par exemple, n'est-il pas le signe que l'Église participe au combat spirituel mené par le futur baptisé et ne révèle-t-il pas la nécessité de la conversion permanente pour tout baptisé, sous peine de régresser hors des frontières de l'Évangile? La recherche à la fois théologique et anthropologique

menée dans ce premier travail peut donner quelques repères pour l'évolution de la liturgie, notamment byzantine, dans un monde marqué par la rationalité.

A. HAQUIN

René METZ. *La consécration des vierges. Hier, aujourd'hui, demain.* Paris, Cerf, 2001. (13,5×21,5), 248 p. ISBN 2-204-06746-6. € 23.

Auteur d'un ouvrage intitulé *La consécration des vierges dans l'Église romaine. Étude d'histoire de la liturgie* (Paris, 1954, 501 p.), R. Metz était tout désigné pour présenter le nouveau Rituel de la consécration des vierges paru à Rome en 1970 et publié pour les diocèses de langue française en 1976.

Son travail comporte deux parties. Tout d'abord, le dossier historique, tant de l'institution que du rituel de consécration qui atteint son apogée au XIII<sup>e</sup> s. (Durand de Mende). En fait, dans les premiers siècles, les chrétiennes qui se consacraient à Dieu dans la virginité vivaient dispersées; dès le III<sup>e</sup>-IV<sup>e</sup> siècle, la vie commune gagne de plus en plus, au point de faire progressivement disparaître l'autre manière. De timides essais de reprise de la consécration des vierges se remarquent au XIX<sup>e</sup> s. (Solesmes, vie commune) et au XX<sup>e</sup> s. (initiatives de certains évêques comme celle du Cardinal Mercier). Au XX<sup>e</sup> s., on assiste successivement à l'interdiction de la consécration des vierges vivant dans le monde (Congrégation des religieux, 1927) et à son autorisation (Congrégation du culte divin, 1970) à la suite des décisions conciliaires (SC. 80). La deuxième partie de l'ouvrage est l'étude à la fois liturgique et canonique du texte actuel de la consécration et de sa lente élaboration pendant le concile Vatican II, sans négliger les textes du Code latin de droit canonique (c. 604) et du Code des Églises orientales catholiques (c. 570). À remarquer que le nouveau livre liturgique prévoit la consécration tant des moniales que des chrétiennes vivant au cœur de la société.

Dans quelques pages bien documentées, l'A. fait état d'une enquête menée en 1995 dans une vingtaine de pays concernant la consécration des chrétiennes vivant dans le monde. À ce moment, on comptait environ 400 cas en France, environ 200 en Argentine, et pour la Belgique une quarantaine. C'est dire que cette forme de vie consacrée semble répondre à certaines attentes. La formation de ces chrétiennes va de une à trois années. Quant à la profession, lieu privilégié de leur témoignage chrétien, elle se situe dans divers secteurs: médical, social, enseignement, mais aussi le tourisme, les arts, le syndicat, sans compter les services d'Église comme la catéchèse.

A. HAQUIN

Giorgio ZEVINI – Pier Giordano CABRA (eds.). *Lectio divina per ogni giorno dell'anno.* Brescia, Queriniana, 2001. Vol. 5: *Ferie del Tempo ordinario (settimane 1-8, anni pari)* (13,5×21), 325 p. ISBN 88-399-2141-9. € 14,46. Vol. 12: *Ferie del Tempo ordinario (settimane 26-34, anno dispari)* (13,5×21), 383 p. ISBN 88-399-2148-6. € 15,49. Vol. 13 *Domeniche del Tempo ordinario (ciclo A)* (13,5×21), 327 p. ISBN 88-399-2149-4. € 14,46. Vol. 16. *Proprio dei santi-1 (gennaio-giugno)* (13,5×21), 328 p. ISBN 88-399-2060-9. € 14,46.

Nous avons déjà rendu compte des précédents volumes de cette collection consacrée au commentaire du lectionnaire dominical et du lectionnaire ferial (cf. ETL 76, 2000, 540-541). Chaque jour fait l'objet d'une présentation exégétique,



d'une réflexion personnelle, d'une proposition de méditation et de prière biblique, et offre un texte contemporain. Tant pour l'action pastorale et la liturgie que pour la formation personnelle et la prière, de tels volumes rendront de grands services. La Parole de Dieu s'y révèle maîtresse de vie.

A. HAQUIN

Paul MAGNIN (ed.). *L'intelligence de la rencontre du bouddhisme: Actes du colloque du 11 octobre 2000 à la Fondation Singer-Polignac «La rencontre du bouddhisme et de l'Occident depuis Henri de Lubac»*. (Études lubaciennes, 2.) Paris, Cerf, 2001. (13x21), 208 p. ISBN 2-204-06726-1. FF 20.

Le livre rassemble les communications des spécialistes du bouddhisme et des théologiens qui ont pris part au colloque organisé par l'Association Internationale Cardinal Henri de Lubac avec le concours de la Fondation Singer-Polignac, le 11 octobre 2000, à l'occasion de la réédition de *La rencontre du bouddhisme et de l'Occident* publiée en 1952 par le P. Henri de Lubac (cf. *ETL* 77 [2001] 504). Au cours de ces dernières décennies le monde occidental n'a pas cessé d'élargir et d'approfondir sa connaissance du bouddhisme. Il a tout particulièrement pris d'avantage conscience de son caractère pluriel et diversifié. Quant au dialogue interreligieux il se déroule aujourd'hui dans un climat notablement modifié surtout depuis Vatican II. Le colloque qui a réuni plus de deux cent cinquante participants a fait ressortir que, si l'ouvrage de H. de L. porte forcément la marque de son époque, sa pensée est néanmoins de nature à jeter «un éclairage très précieux» (112) également sur la problématique actuelle. H. de L. y avait en effet abordé l'étude du bouddhisme avec une ouverture d'esprit exceptionnelle pour son temps. Il le tenait «pour le plus grand fait spirituel après le fait du Christ» (17), ce qui ne l'empêchait nullement de souligner avec vigueur l'unicité et la spécificité irréductible du christianisme. Il avait une méfiance profonde des rapprochements faciles et superficiels et de tout ce qui risquait de mener au relativisme. C'est ainsi qu'il refusait de se représenter «les religions et les sagesse humaines ... (comme) autant de sentiers gravissant, par des versants divers, les pentes d'une montagne unique». Sa conception particulièrement exigeante du dialogue interreligieux l'amenait à les comparer de préférence «dans leurs idéaux respectifs, à autant de sommets distincts, séparés par des abîmes» (120).

A. VANNESTE

L. NAVARRO. *Personae e soggetti nel diritto della Chiesa. Temi di diritto delle persone*. (Subsidia canonica.) Rome, Apollinare Studi, 2000. 235 p. ISBN 88-8333-002-1. € 18,07.

C'est dans une nouvelle collection, *Subsidia canonica*, que le professeur Luis Navarro, ordinaire à l'Université pontificale de la Sainte Croix, a publié ce manuel de droit des personnes. En mettant l'accent sur la dignité de la personne et du fidèle, le rôle des laïcs dans l'Église et dans le monde ainsi que sur les initiatives des fidèles, le Concile Vatican II a donné une impulsion nouvelle à la matière bien reflétée dans l'ouvrage. Le prof. Navarro présente les principaux sujets de la discipline de manière systématique (non exégétique), se situant ainsi dans le droit fil de P. Lombardía et J. Hervada.

S'il limite son étude au droit canonique latin, l'auteur signale les solutions du droit canonique des Églises orientales, lorsqu'elles sont nécessaires ou éclairantes pour la compréhension des concepts. Ainsi une référence au CCEO s'imposait pour expliquer le passage d'un fidèle d'une Église *sui iuris* à une autre (l'Église catholique latine en étant une elle-même). De même, le concept ecclésial de «laïc» est éclairé par la comparaison avec le droit canonique oriental: ce dernier ne reconnaît pas l'acception de laïc de la bipartition du can. 207 §1 latin (fidèle non ordonné ou non clerc), mais admet uniquement celle de la tripartition du §2 (fidèle courant, qui n'est ni clerc ni religieux, au sens de la vie consacrée; cf. can. 399 CCEO).

L'ouvrage se compose de deux parties non formellement distinguées: les personnes physiques (chap. 1 à 7) et les personnes juridiques (chap. 8 à 11). Après avoir précisé le sens des notions techniques telles que les sujets de droit, les personnes physiques et juridiques, ou encore la capacité juridique – à ne pas confondre avec la capacité d'agir –, l'auteur aborde l'incidence du baptême, puis de la (pleine) communion ecclésiale, sur la condition juridique des personnes. Le chap. 3 aborde les éléments déterminants de la position juridique des personnes: l'âge, la santé mentale, l'usage de la raison, ou encore le fait d'avoir subi l'une ou l'autre sanction canonique, influent sur la capacité d'agir. D'autres éléments, tels que la parenté, le rite et le (quasi)domicile, interviennent pour circonscrire la vie juridique de la personne. Les chap. 4 et 5 sont consacrés au statut juridique personnel des clercs. D'où l'explication des notions d'ordination, incardination et agrégation, le passage en revue des différents droits et devoirs correspondants ainsi que de l'éventuelle perte de l'état clérical. Le chap. 6 présente la condition juridique des laïcs, que l'auteur prend soin d'envisager successivement du point de vue de la bipartition (centrée sur la réception ou non du sacrement de l'ordre) et de la tripartition (prenant plutôt en compte la condition de vie et le charisme propre). Enfin, la condition juridique des fidèles de la vie consacrée, y compris les membres des instituts séculiers, fait l'objet du chap. 7.

Non sans tirer parti de son ouvrage *Diritto di associazione e associazioni di fedeli* (Giuffrè, 1991), l'auteur passe ensuite des personnes physiques aux personnes juridiques. Il s'y attelle en quatre étapes: les personnes juridiques en général (chap. 8), les associations de fidèles (chap. 9). Ces dernières sont examinées en tant qu'associations privées (chap. 10) ou associations publiques (chap. 11). L'on retrouve le refus du positivisme légaliste, auquel le droit canonique n'échappe pas du simple fait d'être le droit de l'Église. Ainsi, de même que dans la première partie il souligne justement les droits qui reviennent à la personne avant même d'être baptisée (contrairement à une lecture trop littérale du can. 96), dans la seconde, l'auteur met en exergue les droits revenant aux associations de fidèles non formellement personnalisées. Enfin, à l'attention de l'ensemble des personnes juridiques, il rappelle l'importance de se doter de statuts techniquement au point, non sans fournir des points de repères utiles pour leur élaboration et pour leur reconnaissance ou approbation.

La maîtrise du sujet et le sens pédagogique sont manifestes et constituent les principaux atouts d'un ouvrage qui devrait rendre d'appréciables services tant aux étudiants en droit canonique qu'aux praticiens souhaitant disposer d'un outil de synthèse mis à jour, quitte à en approfondir l'un ou l'autre aspect en recourant à la bibliographie, sommaire mais bien sélectionnée, qu'il contient.

J.-P. SCHOUPPE