

Rohde, Joachim. *Rediscovering the Teaching of the Evangelists*. Trans. by Dorothea M. Barton. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1968. x + 278 pp. \$ 7.50.

Under review is the English edition of an original German work that appeared in 1966. Even though in one of the title pages the claim is made that it now appears "with revisions and additional material from the author," these changes seem insignificant in comparison with the change in the title itself. The German one aptly describes what the book is concerned with, and applies directly to the first two chapters. The English title is totally misleading. To begin with, "Evangelists" refers to the three that gave us the Synoptics, and the attempts at "Rediscovering" are not those of Rohde but those of modern researchers who have applied Redaction Criticism to the first three gospels.

The four main chapters are built up with summaries of the work of others. Very little evaluation of this work is given and at no time does Rohde engage in the application of the method himself. Some attempt is made, however, to relate the work of researchers into one problem to each other, thus giving the reader of this *Forschungsbericht* the impression that he is following some complicated historical developments. But unfortunately he is left at mid-narrative with no sure sense that he has advanced toward some conclusion.

It is, therefore, quite important to recognize what Rohde's intention is. He wishes to say that Redaction Criticism is a legitimate procedure for carrying out research into the gospels, that it supplements and corrects (in that it checks the "community mentality") Form Criticism, that its roots are to be found in the work of scholars who worked at the turn of the century, and that it cannot be dismissed because it is not concerned to establish what actually happened. Therefore any criticism of the method is to be done "on detail points and for its excessive subtlety" (p. 258). In Rohde Redaction Criticism has found the one who was to write its *apologia pro vita sua*.

Rohde feels most triumphant when he can show that those who have challenged the methodological claim of Redaction Criticism actually engage in its practice. Probably it would have been a more convincing *apologia* if Rohde had pulled together some loose ends and shown what he considered to be some "assured results" achieved by the method. Conceivably the method is still in need of perfecting before it can be judged effectively by its accomplishments. Yet it would seem that Rohde could have found significant advances achieved by the method. To point these out would have made Rohde's case appear that much stronger.