

above, then concludes that Luke "urges the incompatibility between the old and the new and at the same time insists on the superiority of the *old*" (p. 65). The reason this conclusion is reached may possibly be because the method tends to emphasize differences rather than similarities. Actually, Marcion's omission, even if he understood it in the sense given above, is not conclusive. Also the method attempts to relate these differences to the issues present at the time of the evangelists rather than at the time of Jesus. Carlston speculates that there could very well have been in existence some Christian innovators who were Marcionite in tendency and needed to be told that the old was also good. Because of the nature of the study, it emphasizes the creativity of the evangelist. In this case, he intentionally makes his text say the opposite of what Jesus actually said. In actuality the Lukan passage could very easily have been interpreted to mean that the old and new are incompatible and that it is difficult for people who are used to the old to change to the new, which of course is a fact of life.

A good example of the type of strata that are posited in the Gospels before they are fixed in the form known to us is given in Carlston's discussion of Mk 4:30-32, the parable of the mustard seed. The first stage is in the *Sitz im Leben* of Jesus when it emphasized the contrast between the small beginning and great ending. In the second stage the tree imagery suggests Dan 4, which was brought in to legitimize the entrance of the Gentiles into the Church. In the third stage we return to the first, when Mark again returns to the original emphasis. It is difficult to see how one can say that Mark returns to the original emphasis without changing any of the contents of the parable but by simply placing it before the Parable of the Seed Growing Secretly. Also, without more explicit indications in Mark, it is not very clear to see the tree and its shade as representing a shelter for the Gentiles.

It is unfortunate that Carlston has not given a summary of each of its three sections showing the result of his redaction-critical study. The very purpose of his work to indicate the tendencies and theological emphases of each evangelist would have been well served by such summaries.

Andrews University

SAKAE KUBO

Conzelmann, Hans. *A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians*. Translated by James W. Leitch; bibliography and references by James W. Dunkly; edited by George W. MacRae, S.J. *Hermeneia—A Critical and Historical Commentary on the Bible*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1975. xxii + 323 pp. \$19.95.

This is a translation of Conzelmann's commentary first published in 1969 as part of the Meyer series. English-reading students are fortunate in having this translation, and the attractive format of the series invites the reader to its contents. No doubt because of space limitations the exegesis is short, and full discussion is not possible. Too often the author must simply give his opinion without providing the full evidence necessary. Nevertheless, the

commentary is a model of conciseness in treating as it does the various problems of the book within the space limitations.

Space for footnotes has not been slighted. Fortunately, if the discussion in the text is short the reader can pursue it in the literature cited in the notes. Throughout there are also short excursions.

In introductory matters, it is worthy of note that Conzelmann sees I Corinthians as a unity, though with chap. 13 he wavers. He is opposed to Schmithals' contention that Paul's opponents had a thoroughly worked-out mythological Gnosticism. Instead he considers them proto-Gnostics. He sees also behind all the parties one basic erroneous doctrine—the pneumatic Christology of exaltation. Against this Paul presents his theology of the cross, which destroys human wisdom and boasting. His opponents desire the exalted Christ without the crucified Christ. Another way in which Paul deals with those who think they already enjoy all the eschatological benefits is to point to the fact that the parousia and judgment are yet future and therefore the blessings are yet to come. This is what Conzelmann calls the "eschatological proviso." These two features appear again and again throughout the commentary.

Throughout, Conzelmann also provides interesting aphoristic statements such as "they are to look where 'nothing' is to be seen" in connection with 1:26; "holiness is not the goal of conduct, but its presupposition," in connection with 5:7; "freedom cannot cancel itself by making me unfree," in connection with 6:12.

In regards to certain "problem" passages, Conzelmann favors the uncertain view rather than the optimistic in 7:16 against Jeremias; spiritual betrothal in 7:38, *exousia* as protection against cosmic power in 11:10, vicarious baptism in 15:29.

The excellent bibliography, and the indices of biblical and nonbiblical citations, of subjects, and of modern authors enhance the value of this commentary.

Andrews University

SAKAE KUBO

Finegan, Jack. *Encountering New Testament Manuscripts*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1974. 203 pp. \$10.00.

The unique feature of this approach to NT textual criticism by the noted professor of NT History and Archaeology at the Pacific School of Religion is suggested by the title and the subtitle, "A Working Introduction to Textual Criticism." But before introducing the student to a number of manuscript reproductions the author devotes a section to a large number of technical matters, and a second section to the history of the discipline known as textual criticism.

In the first section he deals with the materials on which ancient books were written and the forms these books took. Then he quite overwhelms the student with such technical matters of paleography as quires and folios, recto and verso, columns and ruling, opisthograph and palimpsest, punctuation, abbreviations, canons, prologues, colophons, stichometry, euthaliana, etc.