man, who is missed by all his former students and friends, among whom also this reviewer is included.

A few inaccuracies noticed in reading the book can easily be corrected by the reader. P. 196: A. Biran was not the director of the Rockefeller Museum; he was, at the time when the book was written, the director of the Department of Antiquities of Israel, whose office was in the Rockefeller Museum (the director of the Museum was, and still is, L. Y. Rahmani). P. 261: The three Dead Sea Scrolls exhibited in the Library of Congress in October 1949 were the complete Isaiah scroll, the Commentary on Habakkuk, and the Manual of Discipline, which were at that time still in the possession of the Syrian Archbishop Athanasius Yeshue Samuel (see BASOR, No. 115 [Oct. 1949], p. 2). P. 266: It was not J. A. Fitzmyer who gave the name “The Genesis Apocryphon” to the fourth scroll of Cave I, but its first editors N. Avigad and Y. Yadin, while Fitzmyer would have favored rather the title “The Book of the Patriarchs,” suggested first by B. Mazar (see J. A. Fitzmyer, The Genesis Apocryphon of Qumran Cave I [Rome, 1966], pp. 4-5). P. 272: Nasser did not close the Suez Canal but nationalized it; this caused the 1956 war, with the result that the canal became inoperable. P. 292: Albright was not picked up by this reviewer on the morning of January 28, 1958, but rather on Sunday afternoon, January 26, 1958; the next day, on Monday morning, he presented a chapel talk at the S.D.A. Theological Seminary. P. 303: The last two lines need transposing. P. 349, line 19: Read “friend” instead of “frend.”

These few minor defects in the narrative of the book do not detract from its extraordinary qualities. A wealth of material is presented in the compass of less than 450 pages, giving us not only the life story of a great orientalist, but also a glimpse of the climate prevailing during the half century in which Dr. Albright played an influential role in biblical and archaeological studies. Hence the book can be highly recommended, and for many years to come it will rank among the biographies of famous scholars.

Andrews University

Siegfried H. Horn


Jack Sanders is concerned with one basic issue—the relation of the NT to ethics. His work is a systematic, critical analysis of the NT documents in an endeavor to see what clues, if any, they may afford as a guide to individual and corporate behavior in modern times. The treatment is exegetical and roughly chronological: he examines in turn Jesus, the Synoptic Gospels and Acts, Paul, the later epistles in the Pauline tradition (Colossians, Ephesians, 2 Thessalonians, the Pastorals, and—interestingly—1 Peter), the Johannine literature, and the later epistles and the Apocalypse.

The results of this study are devastatingly negative. Sanders finds a parallel in Albert Schweitzer’s Quest of the Historical Jesus, as he concludes: “So it is with the study of New Testament ethics. The ethical positions of the New Testament are the children of their own times and places, alien and foreign to this day and age. Amidst the ethical dilemmas which
confront us, we are now at least relieved of the need or temptation to begin with Jesus, or the early church, or the New Testament, if we wish to develop coherent ethical positions” (p. 130).

Thus, Sanders rejects the teachings of Jesus as an ethical model because they are inseparably connected with his imminent eschatology; he finds that Mark sets out merely the ethics of endurance in a hostile world; Luke is no longer ruled by the closeness of the Parousia, but he presents only a vague “goodness”; Matthew intensifies ethical demands in a manner that becomes unthinkable on the non-occurrence of the Eschaton. Likewise, according to Sanders, is Paul governed by the nearness of the End: he intends agapē as primarily eschatological and makes frequent use of tenets of holy law. The NT “Paulinists,” on the other hand, no longer find eschatology as definitive for ethics, but for them Christian behavior tends to collapse into merely good citizenship. Nor is the Johannine ethic any better: the temporal understanding of eschatology has been replaced by tension between the “in” group (believers) and the “world” outside, so that behavior is concerned only with one’s fellow-believer—a way of thinking that displays “weakness and moral bankruptcy” (p. 100). The later epistles follow the general direction of the “Paulinists,” while the Apocalypse, retaining the aspect of imminent eschatology but retreating from ethical responsibility, is “evil” (p. 114).

Professor Sanders’ analysis gives rise to several questions. He has (correctly) pointed out the role of imminent eschatology in NT thought, but to what extent are the ethics in that thought contingent upon the eschatology? He assumes that the radicality of the love command is viable only on a short-term basis; a lengthened view makes it preposterous. If, however, love of neighbor rests upon a particular time view, is it not thereby qualitatively devalued? On the other hand, what if the ethics of the NT are bound up with religion rather than a specific eschatology (which is part of that religion)? It is in this latter regard—the relation of ethics to NT religion—that Sanders’ work appears most vulnerable. He has exegeted passages of the NT which appear to take up ethical concerns, but he has overlooked the larger picture of life in the Spirit and the vitality of the new sense of community. While he has dealt with the words of Jesus, he has quite neglected the most potent factor from the life of Jesus—the cross. As John H. Yoder has argued convincingly in The Politics of Jesus (1972; see my review in AUSS 13 [1975]: 96-97), the cross-ethic colors NT behavior.

Whatever one’s final estimate of Ethics in the New Testament, the book seems destined to influence subsequent writing in the area. While it cannot rank in scope or impact with Schweitzer’s Quest, it will, like the Quest, serve as a point of reference. It is a significant work in the study of NT ethics.

Andrews University

William G. Johnsson


The unique feature of this Synopsis is its new arrangement of the gospel materials. Instead of placing the parallel accounts in vertical columns, Swanson has arranged them in parallel horizontal lines. It is evident that