

menschliche Sünde und Auferweckt werden durch den Zuspruch der Vergebung. In solcher Umkehr allein kommt es zu einer inneren Veränderung, die dann auch wirklich weltverändernde Folgen hat, die nicht nur menschliche Träume realisiert, sondern Zeichen der in Christus gegenwärtigen Herrschaft Gottes setzt.

Helmut Burkhardt

EuroJTh (1992) 1:2, 184

0960-2720

Entering the Darkness: Christianity and its Modern Substitutes

Edward Norman

SPCK, London, 1991, 106pp., £6.99,
ISBN 0-281-04537-2

RÉSUMÉ

Critique aigüe des tendances courantes dans l'Eglise; affirme qu'un christianisme non-doctrinal et individualiste détruit la cohésion de la communauté chrétienne.

ZUSAMMENFASSUNG

Eine tiefgehende Kritik der gegenwärtigen Entwicklungen innerhalb der Kirche, in der behauptet wird, daß ein individualistisches und von der Lehre losgelöstes Christentum den Zusammenhalt der christlichen Gemeinschaft zerstört.

Edward Norman's book is an incisive critique of trends in the Church which are leading the people of God away from their primary concerns and responsibilities. He points out how deep secularisation has been, and how readily Christians have accepted the morality and priorities of the world. The traditional picture of a heaven for the few and a hell for the many who have refused to renounce worldly passions and desires has given way to a sanctified hedonism which privatises heaven, and allows everyone to imagine that he will go there regardless. The modern Church is a body unaware of the importance of doctrine, and without any clearly formulated teaching which could apply it to the concerns of today. Spiritual formation has become a matter for individual choice, and variety has been exalted as the way forward to true liberation. The fact that it has also produced the effective dissolution of a coherent Christian community is glossed over in

silence. His book may be dismissed by Church leaders today, but future ages may look back to it as a lone voice of truth in a voluble but essentially barren age.

Gerald Bray

EuroJTh (1992) 1:2, 184-185

0960-2720

***The Old Testament in Early Christianity*
E. Earle Ellis**

J.C.B. Mohr, Tübingen, 1991, 188p., Dm 78
(Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum
Neuen Testament 54)

RÉSUMÉ

Exposé précieux de l'emploi de l'Ancien Testament dans le Nouveau; explique comment les auteurs du Nouveau Testament différaient de leurs contemporains juifs, et comment leur approche christocentrique les obligea à faire grand usage de la typologie.

ZUSAMMENFASSUNG

Eine wertvolle Darstellung des Gebrauches des AT im NT in der erklärt wird, wie sich die Verfasser des NT von ihren jüdischen Zeitgenossen unterscheiden und wie ihr christozentrischer Ansatz sie dazu verpflichtete, von der Typologie reichlich Gebrauch zu machen.

Dr. Ellis has given us a short but extremely valuable account of the way in which the OT is used in the NT, based largely on his extensive research into contemporary Judaism. He makes good use of the Qumran material to demonstrate how closely Jesus and his immediate followers adhered to standard Jewish notions of the OT canon, and the ways in which it could and should be understood. He demonstrates that the big difference between Christians and other Jews was that the former placed Jesus Christ at the centre of their hermeneutic. This in turn caused a shift in perspective which had serious eschatological implications. It also ensured that the NT writers would make considerable use of typology in their interpretation of the OT, and Dr. Ellis is concerned to demonstrate the relevance of this for the life of the Church in modern times as well as in the first century. In a study which is always cautious, always thorough and always conservative in its conclusions, he urges us to take NT interpretation of the OT as the basis for

our own understanding of Scripture, and to apply it more readily in our preaching and teaching ministry today.

Gerald Bray

EuroJTh (1992) 1:2, 185-186

0960-2720

Redating Matthew, Mark and Luke: A Fresh Assault on the Synoptic Problem

John Wenham

Hodder & Stoughton, London, 1991, 319pp,
pb. £9.95

RÉSUMÉ

Ce livre explique que les trois évangiles dépendent d'un fonds commun de tradition orale, mais que Matthieu fut écrit en premier et Luc en dernier. Il plaide également en faveur de leurs auteurs traditionnels et les situe très tôt dans le 1^{er} siècle, datant Matthieu de 42, Marc de 45, et Luc de 55. Il se fonde sur des possibilités, qu'on ne peut pas toutes considérer comme probables. Ceci est particulièrement vrai de l'antériorité de Matthieu, en faveur de laquelle ses arguments ne sont pas assez développés. Néanmoins, il démontre que certaines hypothèses critiques reposent sur des données fragiles ou douteuses, et demandent à être réévaluées. C'est un travail impressionnant qui mérite une étude soignée des spécialistes.

ZUSAMMENFASSUNG

Der Verfasser stellt die These auf, daß alle drei Evangelien aus einem gemeinsamen mündlich überlieferten Quellenmaterial stammen, wobei Matthäus zuerst und Lukas zuletzt geschrieben wurden.

Er argumentiert auch für die Glaubwürdigkeit der altkirchlichen Tradition bezüglich der Verfasserschaft und für eine Frühdatierung — Matthäus um 42 n.Chr., Markus um 45 n.Chr. und Lukas um 55 n.Chr. Seine These basiert auf Wahrscheinlichkeiten, von denen nicht alle überzeugend sind. Dies gilt besonders für die von ihm postulierte sehr frühe Datierung des Matthäus, was jedoch nicht ausreichend belegt wird. Er weist allerdings nach, daß einige kritische Thesen unsicher belegt sind und einer Überprüfung bedürfen. Dies ist ein beeindruckendes Werk, das wissenschaftliche Aufmerksamkeit verdient.

John Wenham is known to thousands of theological students for his textbook *The Elements of New Testament Greek*. Readers of his new book will find that they need to have read its predecessor in order to cope with the Greek quotations and synoptic tables liberally spread through its pages. Yet it is simply and clearly written with an attractive English style, and numerous summaries make the argument crystal clear. Wenham expresses his dissatisfaction with much that has been written on the origins of the synoptic Gospels (and he has read a great deal

about them), and argues for a theory that can only be pronounced radical. His book falls into three parts.

First, he discusses the interrelationships of the Gospels and argues that all three depend on a common fund of oral material as their basis; Matthew, however, was written first, and was known to Mark, and both of them were known to Luke who came last. This conclusion depends on arguing that Luke is dependent on Mark and not *vice versa*, that much of Luke and Mark (52 pericopes) have a common origin, and that Luke keeps to the sense of Mark in these passages (but not in others where they are approximately parallel but differ). From this it follows that Luke probably kept to the sense of his other sources, but the differences in sense between Luke and Matthew in much of the so-called Q material make it unlikely that Luke was dependent on Q (still less on Matthew, *pace* M. D. Goulder). Finally, it is argued that Matthew composed a Gospel in Hebrew and that Mark had knowledge of Matthew.

Second, Wenham discusses the external evidence for the composition of the Gospels and argues for the validity of the traditional ascriptions; he also argues that Peter went to Rome about 12 years after the crucifixion.

Thirdly, he discusses how the Gospels were composed, arguing for their basic dependence on oral tradition, and then considers their dates: Matthew c. AD 42; Mark c. AD 45; and Luke c. AD 55 (2 Cor. 8:18 being a reference to the Gospel). Wenham refers only briefly to a further interesting hypothesis that Luke was one of the Seventy and in fact the unnamed disciples who walked to Emmaus (see 'The Identity of Luke', *Evangelical Quarterly* 63, Jan. 1991, 3-44).

Wenham's book contains so much detailed argument that a proper exposition of his case and a reasoned reply to it is not possible in the restricted space available here. I cannot altogether avoid the impression that a good deal of the case is based on possibilities, some of which seem to me to be less than probable. To some extent he has produced a case which is unfalsifiable; thus if Luke used both Mark and oral tradition covering the same ground, then there is no way of telling whether or not he is actually dependent on Mark at any specific point. Further, on this hypothesis, the argument that Luke does not alter the sense of Mark somewhat loses weight, since Wenham seems to want to say that Luke was primarily dependent on oral tradition (Jerusalem catechesis) and only secondarily on Mark. Wenham leaves it vague whether Mark used Hebrew Matthew or Greek Matthew. On the whole he prefers the latter view, and argues that there was an