

hard not to be grateful to John Howard Yoder, who, apart from his other services to us, has been the inspiration behind the latest phase in Hauerwas' work (the third, by my calculation). *Hauerwas Three* is the best so far. If there was a time when we could fear that the methodological probing would never amount to a substantive ethical discussion; or that the claims for an autonomous intelligibility of differing community 'stories' would yield no more than another pluralist American meta-theology, that time is now past. Hauerwas has never spoken with a more decidedly Christian voice, and has never been more concerned with the central moral issues of our times. Witness this collection of essays, his first sustained address to the questions of Christian political thought.

The essays move from the methodological questions about the Christian voice in society, to substantive discussions of ideology and belief, and from these to the familiar casuistry of nuclear weapons and war. Hauerwas is illuminating on Rauschenbusch and the Social Gospel, paradoxical on the Holocaust and the Jonestown mass-suicide, surprisingly fresh in the concluding set-piece debate between pacifism and the just war. There is a short but beautifully pointed critique of Neuhaus's attempt to claim Christianity for Western democracy. Hauerwas' genius is to set conventional stances in unconventional lighting. He makes us see our most commonsense assumptions as wilful and quirky; the pious platitudes of liberal democracy show up as demonic fanaticisms. And his readers have to wrestle with the problem (which by now they must have come to expect) of knowing where the author himself stands. The more fervently he declares himself, the more hidden his positions become. Many times, for example, he assures us that he is a 'pacifist'. But just what does Hauerwas' pacifism consist in? At points it looks like a kind of just-war theory—and it is not without significance that the name of Paul Ramsey is linked with that of Yoder in the dedication. But then, in the final essay, he makes decisively as if to oppose the two. Does he actually do so? And does he really intend to? Happy the reader who has no doubts on the matter! There will be renewed appeals that Stan Hauerwas will please be so kind as to sit himself down somewhere. But *Hauerwas Four* will not come by that kind of watching; we will know it, as before, by the flash of intellectual fire on some new horizon, lighting it up from East to West.

OLIVER O'DONOVAN

**FREEDOM AND OBLIGATION: A STUDY OF THE EPISTLE TO THE GALATIANS,**  
by C.K. Barrett *SPCK*, 1985, pp. viii, 120. £4.95.

A new book by Professor Barrett is always an important event, and in this instance especially because we are given his treatment of the remaining Pauline *Hauptbrief*, to accompany his commentaries on Romans, 1 Corinthians, and 2 Corinthians. This, however, is not properly a commentary, though it has some of the marks of one. He follows through the argument of Galatians, sometimes in much detail, and discusses how history, theology, and ethics as treated in the letter illuminate the twin themes of freedom and obligation, under the general rubric of the centrality and sufficiency of Christ.

There are footnotes, and sometimes extended discussions of the work of other scholars, for example on the question of whether Paul was fighting on two fronts at the same time, against legalistic rigorists and against antinomians. The final chapter, on the history and significance of the so-called Jerusalem Council, is an epilogue which began as a lecture in Oxford, while the bulk of the book originated as lectures in Australia. It seems that all the chapters were written in 1983, and this date is important because much of the writing that is causing a re-appraisal of Paul and the Law also dates from that year: E.P. Sanders, *Paul, the Law, and the Jewish People*; H. Räisänen, *Paul and the Law*; and also J.D.G. Dunn, 'The New Perspective on Paul' (BJRL). Inevitably one wishes that Barrett's book could have taken account of their views. For example, one wonders how Professor Barrett reacts to the suggestion that 'works of the law' in Gal. 2.16 refers not to doing the

Law in general, but to circumcision, the sabbath, and the food laws in particular as badges of the covenant, so that what is wrong with them is nothing to do with 'legalism' but simply that they separate Jews from Gentiles. Indeed one wonders about his reaction to the claim that Paul does not attack anyone for 'legalism' in the sense of doing the Law in order to establish one's own merit or righteousness before God. Barrett certainly gives the impression of thinking that this is Paul's target.

One of the most delicate questions in the study of Galatians is the appropriate response to Krister Stendahl's *Paul Among Jews and Gentiles*. Stendahl thinks that most exegesis of Galatians is excessively influenced by Luther and 'the introspective conscience of the West'. As is very well known, he thinks that the question in Galatia and in Paul's letter was not 'How can I get right with God?' but 'On what conditions can Jewish and Gentile Christians live together in one community?' As the argument of the letter arises, and as Barrett treats it, this is clearly correct. Yet at some point in Barrett's book that this reader finds difficult to place, we move from the second question to the first. He says (p. 15) 'There can be only one saved people of God' and implicit in his treatment is the conviction that the question about the community runs into and is inseparable from the question of the individual and God. It would be instructive if Professor Barrett, with his strong historical and exegetical senses, could show us how and where in the letter the two questions relate to one another. This, however, is perhaps to ask him to write another book.

As it is, he as usual makes many acute observations, writes penetratingly about historical conundrums, and unobtrusively keeps the reader aware that in writing to Galatia, Paul has not a little to say to the contemporary church as well.

J. A. ZIESLER

**THE OLD TESTAMENT PSEUDEPIGRAPHA AND THE NEW TESTAMENT: Prolegomena for the Study of Christian Origins, by J. H. Charlesworth. Society for New Testament Studies, Monograph Series 54. Cambridge University Press, 1985. £19.50**

This is an entertaining book, but rather an odd one. It contains a lecture delivered in 1983 but now revised, on new opportunities and challenges to be found in the author's newly published *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*; an address given in 1983 and now expanded into two chapters on the pseudepigrapha, early Judaism, Christian origins and the New Testament; together with the minutes of the SNTS pseudepigrapha seminar from 1976–83. Will librarians and scholars take kindly to paying so much for a set of minutes (a quarter of the book), sometimes referring to papers already published; plus a promotion booklet for the two volumes of the *Pseudepigrapha*, a vigorous criticism of E. P. Sanders for having chosen to study rabbinic Judaism rather than the pseudepigrapha, and a plea for all New Testament studies to be merged into a new curriculum of Early Judaism and Christian Origins? There is no denying Professor Charlesworth's enthusiasm. He says 'When these documents are read reflectively and with empathy for hours without interruption, we come as close as we possibly can to the spirit and the vibrating pulse of early Judaism, and the world in which the early Jews, including Jesus, Hillel and Shammai lived' (p. 68).

Leaving aside the promotional aspect, some useful information can be picked up, for example about the dating of documents: a list is offered of Jewish writings that are 'clearly pre-Christian'. Terminology is discarded and revised; the favourite German Spätjudentum rightly becomes 'early Judaism', 'intertestamental' disappears, and 'normative Judaism' never existed. Some pseudepigrapha throw light on Jude, 2 Timothy, Hebrews, James, and Revelation. The Jewish background of christology should benefit from these studies, especially the phrase Son of man which notoriously occurs in the Parables of Enoch. There