

have read but I am not sure that it solves all the difficulties in dispensing with that hypothesis. Because Drury thinks that Luke copied Matthew he dates Luke very late, early in the second century (then why didn't Luke extend Acts to take in the end of the first century?). He likens Luke's theology to that of the Deutero-Pauline letters because they each domesticate the severity of Paul's gospel, in Luke's case by giving Christianity a history with a past. Luke's model historian is

the Old Testament Deuteronomist and Drury tries to show how Luke 9:51–18:14 builds original material and material from Matthew onto a structure derived from Deuteronomy. Whatever one makes of Drury's arguments, and I find them impressive but not always convincing, this is a most important contribution to the study of an evangelist who has not found too much favour recently with theologians.

GEOFFREY TURNER

THE USES OF SCRIPTURE IN RECENT THEOLOGY, by David H. Kelsey. SCM Press, London, 1975. 227 pp. £5.50.

As its title implies, this is a purely factual investigation into how scripture has been used by half-a-dozen recent theologians in the reformed tradition. It makes no attempt to suggest, on the author's own count, how scripture should be used in theology, though it does point out limitations and illogicalities in the uses made by the theologians whose work is examined. The author is interested not primarily in the theologians themselves, but in their use of scriptures as types or examples of a wide spectrum of uses; this is why he includes B B Warfield, a Princeton theologian of the late nineteenth century, whom he takes as exemplifying the theory of plenary verbal inspiration.

Professor Kelsey asks of each of the theologians chosen a set of questions about their use of scripture. What aspect of scripture is authoritative: concepts, history, symbols or doctrines? What makes this authoritative? What is the logical force of this authoritativeness? The diversity of the answers shows the importance of these questions in attempting to construct a theology which is both based on scripture and relevant to modern man. Broadly speaking the theologians examined fall into three classes. There are

those who stick on the level of words or concepts, the sort of approach popularised by Kittel's TWNT, and often liable to the criticisms of James Barr. A newer school of theologians stresses the importance of biblical narrative, since scripture is "the self-revelation of God in historical events". A third school prescind almost entirely from history and concentrates on symbols which occasion an encounter now between the believer and the Lord, so that it becomes entirely unimportant whether the Bible claims to be talking about public events or not. This final position is that of Bultmann, and an interesting exposition of his Heideggerian approach to biblical statements and their logic is one of the clearest I have met (p. 78ff). Another less extreme, representative of this point of view is Paul Tillich.

Perhaps the most interesting observation (p. 206) is that the way scripture is treated by each of these theologians depends on the theological position of each, which in turn is shaped by a prior decision of what Christianity is about. And what does this say about the authority of scripture? The questions asked are profoundly challenging, and the evidence is presented with clarity and good humour.

HENRY WANSBROUGH

PAUL'S LETTERS FROM PRISON, Commentary by G.B. Caird. Q.U.P., 1976. 224 pp. £2.25

This commentary, we are told, appears without the text of the Letters for reasons of economy and to facilitate references to other versions than the RSV. The type and format are small; but let no one think that this is an insignificant commentary.

Rather it is a splendid example of what thorough and patient scholarship can accomplish; and it is refreshing to read that the first three chapters of Ephesians are an almost continuous prayer (page 31) or that the heart of Paul's theology is con-

tained in the phrase *in Christ* (page 34).

The problem of Ephesians is fully discussed. Each argument for and against Pauline authenticity is carefully weighed, and the conclusion is that "there are difficulties in attributing it to Paul, but these are insignificant in comparison with the difficulties of attributing it to an imitator. We shall therefore provisionally accept the traditional ascription. The real test will be whether in the commentary we can make sense of it as a genuine letter of Paul" (page 29). So we turn to the commentary where step by step the assertions of Beare and others are courteously set aside. Thus Ephesians 3:4 "you can perceive my insight" could have been written by Paul without any suggestion of arrogance. He is claiming that the teaching he has put before his readers is based on divine revelation, and now invites them to judge for themselves the validity of his claim. Again, Ephesians 3:10 refers to the manifold wisdom of God now made known through the Church to the principalities and powers. Most commentators take this as sheer fantasy, too bizarre to be taken seriously by a modern reader, while others would discern incipient Gnosticism. But we are reminded that 'principalities and powers' are referred to by Paul in almost all his letters. Heavenly places are not some region remote from the life of earth, but the spiritual environment in which unseen forces compete for men's allegiance. God's purpose is to bring all these powers under the rule of Christ. In earlier letters Paul spoke only of the defeat of the powers cf. 1 Cor. 2:6-8, 15:24-28, Romans 8:37-39, but in Ephesians, Colossians and Philippians he has begun to envisage their redemption. This is a way of saying that even such structures of power and authority as the secular state are capable of being brought into harmony with the love of God. So far from being peripheral or fantastic, the refashioning of the organised life of man is central to God's eternal purpose (page 67).

A second point will serve to illustrate our author's masterly method. There is a fair measure of agreement that Phillip-

ians 2:6-11 was a pre-Pauline hymn. Lohmejer's arguments would appear to have produced an established fact. "It is well to recognise that something is to be said on the other side" (page 101). Did Paul quote this passage as his own or quote it as someone else's? He used these verses because they said what he wanted to be said. Beare's view is that the hymn belongs to the realm of soteriology, not to christology or ethics. But a distinction is needed here. We may talk about the hymn in its previous conjectural existence, or about the hymn as it stands in the present context in Philippians which is both christological and ethical. To isolate these verses from their context is to remove them from the Epistle and so from the New Testament. We may perhaps isolate these verses when speculating about early Christian origins, but not when we are expounding a letter of Paul.

It would be going beyond the evidence to say that the Colossian philosophy was an amalgam of Stoic and Jewish ideas, though that would be closer to the truth than any loose talk about Gnosticism. What we can safely say is that it grew out of the general intellectual ferment of the Greco-oriental world. Its main preoccupation was not with speculation but with conduct. In fact the epistles of Paul, the Pastorals, Hebrews, James and 1 Peter all contain passages of ethical instruction cf. Romans 12:6-21, 1 Thess 4:1-12, Hebrews 13:1-9, 1 Peter 2:11-25, 4:7-11, James *passim*. They all cover much the same ground and are generally written in a simpler style than that of the letter in which they are found. It is now generally agreed that they are evidence of a common oral tradition of catechetical teaching in the missionary growth of the Church.

The authority invoked or rather assumed by the author is not anything extrinsic to the text. Rather is it an authoritative interpretation which stems wholly from the manifestly scholarly approach and usage and wins the adhesion of minds who are free from prejudice and ready made assumptions.

ROLAND POTTER O.P.