

dictionaries, atlases, and the more solid Old Testament introductions. Yet it is not in itself a complete and adequate introduction—it is at best only a supplementary aid and is in no way a substitute for a well-informed teacher or substantial introduction. The gap between the Old Testament and the modern reader cannot be bridged in 136 pages, as Miss Campbell would no doubt agree.

There are some features which mar the value of the book. In the area of fact: the Settlement is described solely as an 'invasion' and no reference is made to the well-established arguments of Alt and Noth for there also being a long period of peaceful infiltration. The Sinai Covenant is not distinguished from Yahweh's election of Israel, a distinction reflected in the Old Testament's use of *hesed* (covenant-love) and *'ahabah* (election-love) (cf. N. H. Snaith, *Distinctive Ideas of the Old Testament*; London, 1944; pp. 131ff.).

And it is extraordinary that in the discussion of Jewish views of the after-life physical resurrection is scarcely mentioned. In the area of interpretation: it is unreasonable to dismiss consistently ideas of God and morality which differ from our own as 'primitive', meaning undeveloped and wrong. It is doubtful, too, whether one can allow the New Testament to be the sole criterion of what is and what is not valid in the Old Testament in the way in which Miss Campbell wishes; the New Testament must itself be measured against the living spirit of the Gospel (cf. J. L. Houlden, *Ethics and the New Testament*; London, 1973).

This almost naive approach to both facts and interpretation points to a failure to enter sympathetically into the thought-world of the Old Testament—and if Miss Campbell has not managed to do that, it is doubtful whether her modern reader will. The gap remains.

RICHARD PEARCE

THE RECOVERY OF PAUL'S LETTER TO THE GALATIANS, by J. C. O'Neill. S.P.C.K. London, 1972. 87 pp. £2.60.

How clear, consecutive and logical can one expect Paul to be? Dr. O'Neill thinks that one can expect a good deal higher a standard than is offered by the present text of the letter to the Galatians. The impetus to his detailed study of the text is given by two considerations, the inability of eminent commentators to agree on any solution to a number of problems raised by the text, and some strangely unexpected attitudes shown towards the Jews. His solution is that at various times scribes have glossed the text, inserting explanations in the margin which have later crept into the text itself, making minor alterations to clarify points which to them were obscure or incorrect; at times also larger insertions were made, explanations and expansions sometimes a whole paragraph in length. Thus almost all O'Neill's alterations to the text are excisions, though occasionally there is a choice of a comparatively obscure or ill-attested MS reading, usually to fit in with another alteration.

Any number of the author's suggestions are attractive, and often they do clear up obscurities and straighten out little difficulties. But a number of important and well-known passages are also cut out or altered. For instance, 1. 13—14, 22—24 are cut out as 'an edifying reminiscence of the conversion of St. Paul' (p. 27), and with them all information of Paul's previous persecution of the Church from the pen of the apostle himself. Strictly speaking O'Neill is correct that Paul's previous Judaism and the opinion of the Jewish churches about him are irrelevant to his present point, that he was directly commissioned by God. But on the other hand the strength

of his previous aversion to Christianity does show the force of the call he received (much as Joseph's hesitation in taking Mary to be his wife underlines that his eventual adoption of Jesus must have had a divine warrant). It is all a question of how much strict logic you can demand. Another excision removes 4.1—3, 8—10; since 3.23—25 also disappears the whole image of the Law as a pedagogue, and of the son who is under tutors until the coming of Christ, is lost. 3.23—25 is 'a profound commentary on Paul, but commentary' (p. 54). The later passage is censured because the two images of the heir being in subjection like a slave, and the real slave ransomed, are 'incompatible' (p. 56). Similarly 4.19 must be doctored: Paul cannot be in birth-pangs 'until Christ is formed in you', because (p. 62) 'formation in the womb cannot follow birth-pangs'. Obviously someone did not mind mixing a metaphor, but I fail to see why one should be less willing to lay the charge at Paul's feet than at those of an anonymous glossator. Finally the whole of 5.13—6.10 has to go, for it is a collection of miscellaneous moral and ethical advice which has no bearing on Paul's theme in Galatians, added by someone who thought that such a letter *should* have a moral section. But who is to say they were wrong? Perhaps Paul thought so too?

On the whole, however, O'Neill remains remarkably sober, avoiding the wild conjectures which are only too often associated with this sort of method. However his suggestions would change the character of the letter considerably, as well as eliminating ideas which we have come to value. The basic question is

whether Paul was so rigorously logical. One would have to abandon the idea of the fiery, somewhat inconsequential Jew, writing in the heat of fury and jumping from one idea to another, and I do not think that the author produces evidence to make this inescapable.

However on a smaller scale he does succeed in eliminating a number of glosses which obscure rather than explain, and so adds clarity to the letter.

HENRY WANSBROUGH

GOSPEL MESSAGE AND HELLENISTIC CULTURE, by Jean Daniélou. Translated, edited and with a Postscript by John Austin Baker. Darton Longman and Todd. London, 1973. 540 pp. £6.75.

Second and third-century Christian writers were pre-occupied with many of the same intellectual difficulties we face today, and with many others which would never occur to us. Here is an account of the main problems they faced between 150 and 250 A.D., and of the principal solutions proposed by Justin, Irenaeus, Hippolytus, Clement of Alexandria, Origen and others. Cardinal Daniélou begins from the complex relationship between Christianity and classical culture and goes on to the nature and role of tradition in the early church, their interpretation of Scripture, God, the Logos, man, angels, demons, space and time. This division by topics sets his book off from author-centred patologies; and its concentration on a single century and its full references distinguish it from general works like Kelly's *Early Christian Doctrines*.

In this book, as in its predecessor, *The Theology of Jewish Christianity (D.L.T., 1964)*, Daniélou has given us a detailed guide to a whole attic-full of ideas, some of which disappeared almost as soon as they were born and others of which are still with us. There must be 3000 quotations from or references to more than sixty authors and anonymous works. Daniélou does not, thank goodness, try to give us a synthesis of early Christian thought on each subject; instead he tells us what various men said, what they meant, and where they may have got their ideas.

That is why, even though it is difficult reading, this book is valuable. By reading any section carefully and looking up the passages referred to, even someone who does not know Greek can learn a great deal about a particular topic. In addition, there are eighteen pages

of textual indexes which enable the reader either to trace the thought of a single author or to use the book as a compact commentary on difficult passages in the dozens of works under discussion. Users of the French edition, frustrated by its lack of a general index, will be happy to find that the English edition has added one.

Prospective users should be advised, however, that the original appeared in 1961 and does not seem to have been revised in preparation for this translation. Faulty references and typographical errors in the French edition have been reproduced in this one, and new errors added. Finally, Daniélou sometimes seems to defend too vociferously a clear line between orthodoxy and heresy. For example, he holds that Origen and gnosticism, though they were at one on many things, were in 'essential conflict' (p. 472) with each other; but nowhere does he show why we must think that the conflict was in the essentials and the agreement in the non-essentials, and not the other way around.

Mr. Baker's translation sticks close to the French, but it is usually English. Despite a few misleading errors (on p. 129, n.1, where Daniélou is not belittling Stoic influences but leaving them to Spanneut, and 'For the purposes of the present chapter' is a red herring; on p. 141, where 'the credence to be accorded them' should be *him*, that is, Papias; and on p. 252, where 'not' has been omitted from 'it is permitted to know God in a state of passion'), he deserves great credit for his labours in making this book accessible to the English-reading public.

MICHAEL SLUSSER