

were claiming that the law must be obeyed in order to complete one's relationship with God in Christ so that their proposal was in some way a retreat from grace (Gal 5:3-4), does this not entail the implication that one cannot be saved apart from obedience to the law? Does it not follow then that salvation is due in part to human attainment? Even if the traditional works righteousness/ grace righteousness antithesis could not be addressing the explicit views of his Judaizing opponents, it certainly was striking at the unstated premise of their views.

Thus, if the Sanders/Dunn construct has indeed clarified the nature of first-century Judaism so as to more accurately inform our study, McKnight's use of Sanders' work ends up offering strikingly little that is new to our understanding of Galatians and the opponents envisioned, and very likely a lot less. It turns out that, despite the prevailing character of Judaism at the time of Paul, the particular Jewish Christians Paul was facing in Galatians were propounding a "works-righteousness" approach to the law antithetical to the gospel of the grace of God.

Cedarville College
Cedarville, OH 45314

GREG A. COUSER

Morris, Leon. *The Gospel According to John*, rev. ed. NICNT. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995. xxii + 824 pp. \$42.00.

Leon Morris's *NICNT* commentary on the Fourth Gospel has become one of the standard Bible commentaries on the Gospel of John. Morris, a conservative evangelical scholar, retired as principal of Ridley College, Melbourne, Australia, in 1979. He has written more than forty books, including the *Epistle to the Romans* and *The Gospel According to Matthew*, both now part of the *Pillar New Testament Commentary* series.

This is one of the largest commentaries written in the *NICNT* series. Much of its size is due to the huge amount of information provided in the footnotes. In contrast to many commentaries on John's Gospel, that of Morris dedicates only 57 pages to an introduction. The reason for this is because the author had already dealt extensively with introductory questions in an earlier book, *Studies in the Fourth Gospel*, 1969. Morris's commentary, like those of F. F. Bruce on Acts and Hebrews, and of Gordon Fee on Philippians and 1 Corinthians, is notable for its awareness of critical NT scholarship.

Morris argues, on both internal and external grounds, that the author of the gospel is John the Apostle. The place of origin is unknown; the date is uncertain but could well be before A.D. 70. The evangelist writes quite independently of the Synoptics. He may have used sources, but it is impossible to recover them. The gospel is a unified and coherent composition, including chapter 21. John's background is in no way Gnostic but is fundamentally that of the early church itself, with considerable influence from the OT and contemporary Judaism. However, Morris's assessment of John's Gospel is unacceptable to many scholars. For instance, George Macrame points out that the prologue is not a hymn and had no existence apart from the Gospel; the temple cleansing is not the same one described in the Synoptics; Jn 6:51-59 does not refer to the Eucharist, and it is uncertain who wrote the gospel. More recently M. M. Thompson, in her article in the *Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels*, observes that "A common understanding

of the beloved disciple is that he is a person who heard and followed Jesus, although he was not one of the Twelve. That there clearly were such persons is obvious from the rest of the NT (Acts 1:21-26)" (370). In the final analysis, Morris has the better of this argument.

Morris spent more than ten years working on this commentary. While maintaining the same positions taken in his original work, Morris in this new revised edition considered the most important secondary sources and recent studies that have been published over the last two decades. The commentary is now using the New International Version. The space devoted to extensive quotation from the works of other commentators and scholars is counterbalanced in some measure by the elaborate use of abbreviations.

If such points of disagreement are brought sharply into focus by Morris's project of tracing the various issues in the Gospel of John, that is precisely a measure of the importance of the undertaking. Morris's work is a model of clarity and insight. A major strength of the commentary lies in its textual footnotes: they are the bridge in each section between an original translation and a discursive interpretation. They provide access to the translation decisions Morris has made, even for those who do not know Greek. This book is a fine example of a thorough scholarly commitment not to allow the weight of one's conclusions to exceed what the evidence bears. Morris's commentary deserves a careful reading. It will be useful not only for pastors and teachers, but also for students and laypersons.

9104 Linson St.
Silver Spring, MD 20901

PANAYOTIS COUTSOUMPOS

O'Leary, Stephen D. *Arguing the Apocalypse: A Theory of Millennial Rhetoric*. New York and Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 1994. ix + 314 pp. \$39.95.

In *Arguing the Apocalypse*, Stephen D. O'Leary has attempted to provide an understanding of apocalyptic eschatology from the perspective of "rhetoric," broadly defined as embracing both "the texts of persuasive discourse" and "the method of investigating such texts" (4). After introducing the volume in chapter 1, "Toward a Rhetorical Theory of Apocalypse" (3-19), the author sets forth the basic rhetorical (and philosophical?) foundations for his study in chapters 2, "Time, Evil, Authority" (20-60), and 3, "From Eschatology to Apocalypse: Dramatic and Argumentative Form in the Discourse of Prophetic Interpretation" (61-92).

There are three basic *topoi* involved in eschatological-apocalyptic discourse, O'Leary contends: namely, the three items mentioned in the title of chapter 2. And one can certainly agree with him that central to apocalyptic discourse is a *time* frame emphasizing the end of earth's history as the solution to the problem of an earth presently filled with *evil* that will be overcome only by divine intervention, and that the rhetor, in order to get a hearing, must have *authority* for making the particular apocalyptic proclamation and forecast. In the Christian tradition, the Bible is used as authority; or rather, it is the *rhetor's interpretation* of Scripture that stands forth as authority, often enhanced by his/her charisma or other persuasive characteristics (sometimes the charisma takes the primary role in the rhetor's persuasiveness). In dealing with the three *topoi* O'Leary has drawn on insights from Aristotle, Max Weber, and more recently Kenneth Burke, David